2008

COPING WITH EVERYDAY CLASSISM: EXERIEENCES OF LOW-INCOME PEOPLE IN A SOUTHEASTERN RURAL COMMUNITY

Susan Faye Ritz
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Ritz, Susan Faye, "COPING WITH EVERYDAY CLASSISM: EXERIEENCES OF LOW-INCOME PEOPLE IN A SOUTHEASTERN RURAL COMMUNITY" (2008). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1022.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1022

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

COPING WITH EVERYDAY CLASSISM:
EXERIECES OF LOW-INCOME PEOPLE
IN A SOUTHEASTERN RURAL COMMUNITY

BY

SUSAN FAYE RITZ

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FUFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2008

ABSTRACT

The present research provided an in-depth look at experiencing and coping with everyday classism in a sample of low-income people in a mid-size southeastern rural United States community. The study employed a qualitative methodology consisting of semi-structured interviews and analyzing the collected data using Grounded Theory Method. Of 50 participants selected for an interview, 40 described experiences with classism, each discussing two incidents, for a total of 80 incidents shared. Seven of the remaining 10 participants felt that they had not experienced classism, but at the same time, they provided insight into one proactive coping strategy that they appeared to use to avoid the recognition of prejudice and discrimination.

The 80 classist incidents described by those who shared experiences with classism occurred in 14 different environmental domains, entailed nine distinct types of classist behaviors, and involved 23 categories of alleged perpetrators. The majority of incidents were believed to be communicated in a blatant fashion and most participants reported experiencing classist events with high frequency. The bulk of incidents were believed to be strictly classist in nature, though some were reported to have also involved racism, some sexism, and some ableism.

Participants also described their responses and how they did, and did not, cope with their classist incidents. They responded behaviorally, emotionally, spiritually, and cognitively. In general, participants were greatly negatively affected by their classist experiences. Half responded passively to their perpetrators and most experienced a variety of negative emotions and feelings in response to their incidents. But some participants employed positive coping strategies in which they actively confronted their

perpetrators, had neutral emotions in response to potentially hurtful situations, coped spiritually, or disidentified as low-income.

Cultural, situational, and individual differences in experiences and responding styles were explored. Implications for low-income people, psychology, and public policy were discussed. Methodological considerations were presented. Several ideas for future research to answer new questions have come from this investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend a very special thank you to my major professor, Dr. Bernice Lott, for being an outstanding mentor to me over the past eight years. Dr. Lott has gone above and beyond in her mentorship, by taking a personal interest in me and my aspirations, since even before I attended the University of Rhode Island. Since I met her at a professional conference in 2002, she has supported me, inspired me, and challenged me, in all of my work and endeavors. A true role model and advocate she has been. I would also like to recognize Dr. Lott for taking the time, though she did not have to, to serve as my major professor during her retirement. One thing I have learned since knowing her, Dr. Lott is by no means retired.

I would also like to express great thanks to my other committee members, Dr. Margaret Rogers and Dr. Lynn McKinney, for their continued support. Thank you for being available, and for your guidance and encouragement throughout the dissertation process. My gratitude also goes out to Dr. Laura Beauvais and Dr. Kathryn Quina for cheerfully agreeing to serve on my oral defense examining committee and expressing interest in my research topic and findings.

This research could not have been conducted without the Chattanooga Area Food Bank. I am grateful to Claire Sawyer, Executive Director, for permission to conduct this research at the center, and to Rachel Sterchi-Elliott, Services Coordinator, for all of her assistance during the interview process. A big thank you also goes to Kimberly Gregg, student at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, for transcribing the audio-taped interviews quickly, accurately, and unexpectedly, with thoughtful and useful additional observations of participants' unspoken responses.

This research was also made possible by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, the University of Rhode Island, and Bi-Lo Grocery Stores. I would like to express much appreciation to SPSSI for the \$1000 Grants-in-Aid Research Award, URI for the \$1000 Graduate Student Research Award, and Bi-Lo for the \$300 worth of gift card donations that I administered to participants.

Finally, I would like to say an extra special thank you to my parents and family without whom I could not have accomplished the goal of being the first to attend college in my family, and ultimately, to attain a Ph.D. Thank you for your unwavering support, continued encouragement, and countless sacrifices. But most importantly, thank you for believing in me. We did it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	1
1.2 Literature Review.....	2
Defining Classism.....	2
Perpetrator's Perspective Research.....	4
Attribution Research.....	5
Attitude Research.....	7
Target's Perspective Research.....	15
Experiencing Classism.....	15
Coping with Classism.....	20
1.3 The Present Study.....	22
2 Method.....	23
2.1 Participants.....	23
2.2 Measures.....	29
Interview Guide.....	29
Demographic Survey.....	31
2.3 Procedures.....	31
Recruitment.....	31
Introduction.....	32
Interviews.....	32
Wrap-Up.....	33
2.4 Analysis.....	33
Grounded Theory Analysis.....	33
Cultural Analysis.....	35
Trustworthiness of Analysis.....	36
Reflexivity.....	37
3 Results.....	40
3.1 Research Q1: Experiencing Classism.....	40
Descriptive Analyses.....	40
Environmental Domains.....	41
Classist Behaviors.....	44
Alleged Perpetrators.....	47
Nature of Incidents.....	49
Intersections with Other Forms of Prejudice.....	50
Frequency of Classism.....	50
Qualitative Narratives.....	51
Social Service Agencies.....	51
Grocery Stores.....	55
Doctors' Offices.....	58

	With Intimates.....	61
	Department Stores.....	63
	Church.....	65
	Restaurants.....	67
	School.....	69
	Landlords.....	70
	Workplace.....	71
	On the Street.....	72
	Seeking Employment.....	73
	Seeking Housing.....	74
	Bank.....	74
3.2	Research Q2: Coping with Classism.....	75
	Descriptive Analyses.....	75
	Behavioral Responding.....	76
	Emotional/Spiritual Responding.....	81
	Cognitive Responding.....	86
	Qualitative Narratives.....	87
	Behavioral Responses.....	87
	Passive Responding.....	87
	Active Responding.....	89
	Emotional Responses.....	92
	Negative Emotions.....	92
	Neutral Emotions.....	94
	Spiritual Response.....	95
	Cognitive Response.....	96
4	Discussion.....	97
4.1	Experiencing Classism.....	97
	Environmental Domains.....	97
	Classist Behaviors.....	98
	Alleged Perpetrators.....	99
	Nature of Incidents.....	99
	Frequency of Classism.....	100
	Intersections with Other Forms of Prejudice.....	100
	Cultural Differences in Experiences.....	101
4.2	Coping with Classism.....	103
	Behavioral Responses.....	103
	Situational Differences.....	104
	Cultural Differences.....	106
	Emotional and Spiritual Responses.....	107
	Situational Differences.....	109
	Individual Differences.....	110
	Cultural Differences.....	111
4.3	Implications for Low-Income People, Psychology, and Policy.....	112
4.4	Methodological Considerations.....	116
5	Conclusion.....	121

APPENDICES

A	Interview Guide.....	123
B	Demographic Survey.....	125
C	Interview Protocol.....	126
D	Informed Consent.....	127
E	Debriefing.....	129
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		130

LIST OF TABLES

1. Percent Participant and CAFB Clients on Selected Demographic Characteristics.....	24
2. Participants' Employment Status.....	25
3. Participants' Past Jobs by Industry Sector.....	27
4. Number and Percent of Incidents and Participants by Environmental Domain.....	41
5. Percent Participants Disproportionately Reporting Incidents within Domain.....	42
6. Number and Percent of Classist Behaviors and their Percent of Total Incidents.....	43
7. Percent Participants Disproportionately Reporting Classist Behaviors.....	45
8. Number and Percent of Incidents by Alleged Perpetrators.....	47
9. Classist Behaviors and Alleged Perpetrators by Environmental Domain.....	48
10. Covert/Subtle Incidents by Type of Classist Behavior.....	50
11. Other Prejudice by Demographic Characteristic and Environmental Domain.....	51
12. Category, Nature, and Description of Responses to Participants' Incidents.....	76
13. Percent Participants Disproportionately Responding Behaviorally.....	77
14. Behavioral Responding by Environmental Domain.....	79
15. Behavioral Responding by Classist Behavior.....	79
16. Behavioral Responding to Alleged Perpetrators.....	80
17. Behavioral Responding by Nature of Incident.....	81
18. Percent Participants Disproportionately Responding Emotionally and Spiritually....	82
19. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Environmental Domain.....	83
20. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Classist Behavior.....	84
21. Emotional and Spiritual Responding to Alleged Perpetrators.....	85
22. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Nature of Incident.....	86
23. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Behavioral Responding.....	86
24. Percent Participants Disproportionately Reporting Cognitive Responding.....	87

Coping with Everyday Classism:

Experiences of Low-Income People in a Southeastern Rural Community

Statement of the Problem

Over 25 years ago, Pettigrew (1980) made a plea for social psychology to address issues related to classism. Calling for research on both non-poor people's attitudes and beliefs and poor people's experiences, he noted that "social psychology as a discipline has not directed its attention to an understanding of poverty" (p. 189). More recently, Bullock (1995) argued that the U.S. is not a classless society, asserting that psychologists have sidestepped most issues relating to social class unless the focus was "research questions that pathologize and stigmatize the poor" (p. 119). Research on the social psychology of classism is sparse. Social psychology as a discipline has given the topic of social class little attention, and consequently, has also contributed to making "invisible those who are not middle-class" (Lott, 2002, p.100).

The American Psychological Association (2000) has recently recognized the need for research on socioeconomic issues in its *Resolution on Poverty and Socioeconomic Status* in which it advocated for "more research that examines the causes and impact of poverty and economic disparity, and related issues such as socioeconomic status, classism... stereotypes, and the stigma associated with poverty" (p. 3). In 2006, The Council of Representatives approved a permanent APA Committee on Socioeconomic Status. Bullock and Lott (2001) have outlined a research agenda focused specifically on classist attitudes, beliefs, and discrimination arguing that "a strong research agenda on poverty and classism is an urgent direction for psychologists" (p. 158). They identify

poverty's relevance to social issues, noting that "its relative invisibility in psychology reflects the discipline's dominant middle-class standpoint" (p. 189) and they advocate for psychology's role in promoting social justice. These arguments are strengthened in Lott and Bullock (2007), a book on psychology and economic injustice.

It is promising to note that, although work still remains to be done, there is an emergent body of literature beginning to shed light on the attributions for poverty, negative attitudes and prejudice toward poor people, and stereotypes about poverty and people who are poor. However, not much is known about the ways in which low-income people experience and cope with incidents of classism, especially everyday incidents of classist discrimination, that is, routine behaviors directed at people who are poor due to their membership in a low-income group. Journalists (e.g., Becker, 2002; Bernstein, 2005; Borg, 2004; DeParle, 2005b; Kaufman, 2005; Lu, 2004; Pear, 2003; Relin, 2004; Schemo, 2002; Shipler, 2004b; Urrea, 2005; Ziner, 2005a) and sociologists (e.g., Anderson, Snow, & Cress, 1994; Fothergill, 2003; Kerbo, 1976; Kissane, 2003; Rank, 1994; Walker & Collins, 2004; Warr, 2005; Weinger, 1998) have produced a number of reports of the experiences of low-income groups but research in social psychology has lagged. Thus, the focus of this study is to explore the experience of and coping with everyday classism in a group not typically studied, in a sample of low-income people who receive food assistance in a southeastern rural community.

Literature Review

Defining Classism

Bullock (1995) defined classism as "the oppression of the poor through a network of everyday practices, attitudes, assumptions, behaviors, and institutional rules" (p. 119).

Lott (2002) defined it as stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination against people who are poor, with prejudice defined as negative attitudes and stereotypes as related beliefs. Discrimination is operationalized by behaviors that achieve distancing through “separation, exclusion, devaluing, discounting, and designation as ‘other’” (p. 100) in institutional and interpersonal contexts. Thus, classism is the institutional and interpersonal oppression of poor people through stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination -- where (a) stereotypes (cognitive component) are well-learned and widely-shared beliefs associating a group of people with certain traits, (b) prejudice (affective component) is negative feelings toward persons based on their group membership, and (c) discrimination (behavioral component) is behavior directed against persons due to their membership in a particular group.

Institutional classism is an “everyday exclusion of poor people from social institutions” (Bullock, 1995, p. 135) which “punishes members of low-status groups by erecting barriers to full societal participation” (Lott, 2002, p. 104). Thus, institutional classism is discrimination perpetrated by institutions (e.g., organizations, foundations, agencies, businesses, governments) through policies (e.g., rules, guidelines, procedures, regulations, laws). This form of classism typically occurs in the context of education, housing, health care, employment, consumption, legal assistance, politics and public policy. Institutional discrimination generally reflects the interests of powerful majority groups, and consequently helps to maintain the status quo through harmful social, political, and economic effects on minority group members (Pincas, 1996).

Interpersonal classism occurs in situations of face-to-face contact between individuals. It too is “composed of the related but independent dimensions of prejudice,

stereotypes and discrimination” (Bullock, 1995, p. 119), but pertains to responses to low-income people that are directly communicated by verbal and nonverbal behavior in the presence of low income people, with harmful psychological consequences for these minority group members (Graves, 1997).

Everyday classism refers to the routine encounters with prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination that low-income group members experience on a daily basis in their social interactions (Essed, 1991; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Hyers, 2007; Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998). Swim et al. (1998) suggested that experiencing everyday prejudice is an integral part of everyday life for targets. They asserted that expressions of prejudice are common, consist of both overt and subtle instances, can emanate from both strangers and intimates, can arise in both short and long-term interactions, and target people both directly (as an individual) and indirectly (as a member of a group).

Because everyday classism is experienced in interpersonal settings, the remainder of this literature review will explore the social psychology of classism as it occurs in the interpersonal context. This body of research has been divided into two areas:

‘Perpetrator’s Perspective Research’ and ‘Target’s Perspective Research’. While the purpose of perpetrator’s perspective research is to examine attributions for, attitudes toward, stereotypes of, and prejudice against stigmatized groups, the intent of target’s perspective research is to provide an insider’s view by exploring the psychological experience of being a target of prejudice (Nelson, 2002).

Perpetrator’s Perspective Research

This body of research deals with attributions for, attitudes toward, stereotypes of, and discrimination against poverty and poor people (Nelson, 2002). It includes attribution

research, which describes explicit causal beliefs for poverty, and attitude research, which includes both stereotyped beliefs about and prejudice against people who are poor.

Attribution research. Attributions for poverty are explicit causal beliefs, and include individualistic explanations (or “internal” causes), structural explanations (or “external” causes), and fatalistic explanations (or causes over which individuals and societies have little control). Attributions are related to attitudes (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001), and may also “serve to justify classist behaviors” (Bullock, 1995, p. 130), because individualistic attributions for poverty are mostly comprised of stereotypes about people who are poor which inherently places blame on them for their own circumstances.

Much of this research (Chafel, 1997; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Feagin, 1975, Golding & Middleton, 1982; Halpern, 1993; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Singh, 1989; Smith & Stone, 1989) has found that people tend to assign and give more credence to individualistic attributions (e.g., lack of effort, lack of thrift and proper money management, lack of high intelligence) as explanations for poverty rather than structural attributions (e.g., having to attend bad schools, low wages, being a victim of discrimination) or fatalistic attributions (e.g., bad luck, illness, unfortunate circumstances). A series of studies conducted between 1982 and 1995 suggested that this trend may be intensifying (Weaver, Shapiro, & Jacobs, 1995). These researchers revealed that the tendency to blame poor people for their own plight of poverty was substantially higher in the mid-1990s than it was in the early-1980s.

Other research has suggested that attributions for poverty may vary by demographic factors such as race/ethnicity, religion, class status, age, employment status,

political affiliation, and education. For instance, people who tend to make individualistic attributions for poverty are more likely to be White/European American, Protestant and Catholic, middle-class, and over the age of 50 (Feagin, 1975), employed (Furnham, 1982a), have a conservative political affiliation (AuClare, 1984; Colasanto, 1989; Furnham, 1982ab; Feagin, 1975; Zucker & Weiner, 1993), and moderately educated (Feagin, 1975; Feather, 1974), although the latter varies somewhat depending on the person's field of college study (Guimond & Palmer, 1990).

Other research suggests that attributions about poverty are related to beliefs about welfare, as well as the core American sociopolitical values and ideologies of Protestant Work Ethic (values related to work, individual achievement, and discipline), Belief in a Just World (the belief that people get what they deserve in life), and Right Wing Authoritarianism (submission to established authorities, adherence to social conventions, and a predisposition to aggress against sanctioned targets). For instance, those who believe that too much money is spent on welfare (Alston & Dean, 1972; Feagin, 1975) or have a negative attitude in general toward welfare payments (Furnham, 1982c; Zucker & Weiner, 1993), as well as people high in Protestant Work Ethic (Furnham, 1982c, Wagstaff, 1983a), Belief in a Just World (Wagstaff, 1983a; Zucker & Weiner, 1993), and Right Wing Authoritarianism (Cozzarelli et al., 2001), appear to attribute internal causes to poverty.

Cozzarelli et al. (2001) found evidence for most of these factors in a thorough exploration of middle-class college students' attributions for poverty. Their participants tended to attribute individualistic factors to poverty (e.g., lack of effort and laziness, lack of thrift and proper money management, lack of motivation caused by being on welfare,

failure to attempt to self-improve, loose morals, alcohol and drug abuse), than external factors (e.g., failure of industry to provide enough jobs, prejudice and discrimination in hiring, prejudice and discrimination in promotion and wages, a federal government which is insensitive to the plight of the poor, being taken advantage of by the rich, and not having the right contacts to help find jobs) or cultural factors (e.g., being born into poverty, being born with a low IQ, not inheriting money from relatives, the breakdown of the nuclear family, having to attend bad schools, and low paying jobs for poor people). Further, individualistic attributions were especially likely among younger, White/European American, Republican/Conservatives who highly endorsed Protestant Work Ethic and Right Wing Authoritarian sociopolitical ideologies. While those who held a high Belief in a Just World were not significantly more likely to make internal attributions than those low in this value, they were less likely to make structural and cultural attributions.

Attitude research. Another area of perpetrator's perspective research examines attitudes toward poor people. An attitude is "a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor" (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998, p. 1). This body of research suggests that attitudes toward low-income people are generally quite negative, with some variation according to the particular low-income socioeconomic group under investigation.

One area of relevant research examines attitudes toward homeless people. Research suggests that attitudes toward homeless people are generally positive and supportive (Barnett, Quackenbush, & Pierce, 1997; Benedict, Shaw, & Rivlin, 1988; Hocking & Lawrence, 2000; Minick, Kee, Borkat, Cain, & Oparah-Iwobi, 1998; Toro &

McDonell, 1992) although other findings suggest ambivalence (Link et al., 1995; Phelan, Link, Moore, & Stueve, 1997). For example, Link et al. (1995) found that homeless people were stigmatized, but that research participants were also generally supportive of policies to help them. From their nationwide telephone survey of over 1500 people, they concluded that the average American believes that about one third of homeless people are mentally ill, that they have negative characteristics, and that they are undesirable to be around. However, they also found that their research participants were sympathetic toward homeless people and claimed to want to help them. In a telephone study of social distancing from homeless people, Phelan, Link, Moore, and Stueve (1997) described a hypothetical 30-year old poor man as being homeless or as living in a small apartment and asked whether respondents would hire him for odd jobs, would like him to live in their community, would choose him as a close friend, or would approve of him working at their local school. Participants showed significantly greater social distance if he were homeless than if he lived in a small apartment.

Other research suggests that these attitudes may vary with the perceiver's demographic characteristics and core American sociopolitical values and ideologies. For example, Barnett et al. (2001) found that their participants (fourth-grade, high school, and college aged students) displayed a "high level of public concern regarding the plight of the homeless" (Barnett et al., 1997, p. 296). However, those who expressed "fear and anger toward the homeless" (e.g., scared that the homeless person might hurt me, angry that the person isn't doing enough to find a place to live, etc.) tended to attribute homelessness to either "negative characteristics" (e.g., being lazy, stupid, irresponsible) or "social maladjustment" (e.g., having a drug problem, drinking problem, or being

mentally ill). Gender and age also played a role. The perceptions of and reactions to homeless people were generally more negative among older (high school and college) and male participants. Similarly, in development of their scale measuring public attitudes toward homelessness, Guzewicz and Takooshian (1992) found a wide range of attitudes toward homeless people ranging from sympathy to anger to disgust. Participants most sympathetic to homeless people were significantly lower in Right Wing Authoritarianism and Belief in a Just World. Somerman (1993) found relationships between participants high in Protestant Work Ethic and anti-homeless attitudes and negative beliefs about homeless people.

Another area of research examines attitudes toward people who receive welfare. There is clear consensus in this body of literature; people who receive welfare are typically disliked and stigmatized. For example, Maurer, Park, and Judd (1996) examined college students' attitudes toward 15 cultural groups (e.g., 'Whites', 'Blacks', 'Asians', 'Republicans', 'gays', etc.) and found that welfare recipients were the least liked. Similarly, Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick (1999) examined college students' attitudes toward 17 cultural groups (e.g., 'housewives', 'feminists', 'blind people', 'retarded people', 'disabled people', 'Jews', etc.) and found that welfare recipients was the only group to be perceived as lacking competence and warmth and to be both disliked and disrespected. In a study of income source on new neighbor evaluations, Kirby (1999) found that college students and homeowners both rated hypothetical potential new neighbors worse if they were described as receiving public assistance than if they had inherited or worked for their income. Even people who receive welfare tend to dislike other welfare recipients as demonstrated by their efforts to cognitively distance themselves (Bullock, 1999;

Seccombe, James, & Walters, 1998).

The aversion to welfare recipients may stem from people's beliefs that too much money is being spent on welfare (Kluegal; 1987; Shapiro, Patterson, & Young, 1987; Smith, 1987; Weaver et al., 1995), that too many people receiving welfare should be working (Feagin, 1975; Kallen & Miller, 1971; Shapiro et al., 1987), and that welfare is wasteful, excessive, and unproductive (Phelan et al., 1997; Smith, 1987). Related is the belief that welfare recipients take advantage of their benefits. For example, welfare has been compared to a drug addiction in which payments are the narcotic (Mills, 1996), and poor women are believed to get pregnant so that they can collect welfare support (Price, Desmond, & Eof, 1989; Price, Desmond, Snyder, & Kimmel, 1988). Poor people are perceived to prefer to stay on welfare (Colasanto, 1989; Price et al., 1988, 1989) and that they live well off of their assistance (Price et al., 1989). Welfare recipients have been characterized as dishonest, dependent, lazy, uninterested in education, and promiscuous (see Bullock, 1995, for a review; e.g., Alston, & Dean, 1972; Colasanto, 1989; Feagin, 1975; Feather, 1974; Furnham, 1982c, 1983; Kaus, 1991; Kluegel, 1987; Magnet, 1991; Mead, 1991; Murray, 1991; Roff & Klemmack, 1983).

Furnham (1985) found that age, alienation, and Protestant Work Ethic may be related to attitudes toward social security and acceptance of social welfare programs. Osgood (1977) suggested that people living in rural areas may be less supportive of welfare programs than people living in urban areas. Racism is also a probable factor in understanding the general public's attitudes toward those who receive welfare since a dominant belief is that most welfare recipients are minorities of color (Axelson & Hendrickson, 1985; Bullock, 1995; Guishard, 1992; Hagen, 1995; Misra, Moller, &

Karides, 2003; Taylor, 1999).

A final area of research that examines attitudes toward and beliefs about poor people in general has identified dominant stereotypes. For example, Cozzarelli et al. (2001) found that, when compared to members of the middle-class, college students were significantly more likely to stereotype poor people as being lazy, unmotivated, stupid, uneducated, immoral, dirty, unpleasant, unkind, inconsiderate, embarrassing, mentally ill, physically ill, depressed, weak, angry, violent, criminal, abusive, alcoholic, drug abuser, promiscuous, and as having too many children. Hoyt (1999) found similar results in her two part study. In part one, participants were asked to list common cultural stereotypes used by society for the terms middle-class and lower-class. Results indicated that participants listed few positive stereotypes, and that the term lower-class tended to include descriptions such as uneducated, lazy, dirty, racial minorities, criminals, and drug and alcohol users. In part two of the study, participants were asked to share their own personal beliefs about people in these two socioeconomic groups. Results were nearly identical to those in the first half. Participants tended to describe people who are poor as almost exclusively possessing negative traits (e.g., lazy, dirty, low in intelligence) while middle-class people were described as having mostly positive traits. Further, there were significantly more negative traits listed for poor people than people from the middle-class and significantly more positive traits listed for middle-class people than for people who are poor.

In a study by Luft (1957), college students were asked to pretend that they were either a poor man or a rich man and then to describe their personalities. These results revealed that when they identified as being a rich man, participants described themselves

as being fairly healthy, happy, and well adjusted. However, when they identified as being a poor man, participants described themselves as being more antisocial, more nervous, less self-reliant, having less personal worth, and having poorer social skills than when they identified as being a rich man.

Negative beliefs about low-income women were reported by Lott and Saxon (2002). Participants were shown the photo of a hypothetical woman identified by ethnicity (White, Latina, or Jewish), socioeconomic status (middle-class or working class), and target role (vice president for a parent-teacher organization in one study, and possible girlfriend for their brother or cousin in a second study) and asked to rate them on various characteristics. Results revealed that social class played an important role in the characteristics attributed to the working class women. Specifically, these women were rated as more crude and more irresponsible than the middle-class women.

Juhnke, Barmann, Cunningham, and Smith (1987) had college students varying in appearance (poorly dressed or well dressed) ask for directions from passer-bys to either a high-status location (tennis club) or a low-status location (thrift store). Results indicated that passer-bys spent more time giving directions to poorly-dressed students who asked for directions to the thrift shop than to poorly-dressed students who asked for directions to the tennis club, but that there were no differences in amount of time spent giving directions to well-dressed students regardless of the destination.

Similarly, Darley and Gross (1983) found that college students evaluated low-income children as less intelligent than children from the middle-class. In this study, participants viewed a videotape of a 4th-grade girl taking an oral achievement test which included varying visual cues (child's clothes and playground in the background) and

verbal cues (information about parents' education and income) about her socioeconomic background. Despite the fact that both groups received identical feedback about the child's performance on the test, participants in the low-income background condition rated her as having lower ability than those in the high-income background condition.

Baron, Albright, and Mallory (1995) found similar results. In a series of two studies, college students were presented with hypothetical people from different social class backgrounds (lower income or higher income) and varying information about how they performed on an intellectual ability task (performed well, performed poorly, or no information given). Results indicated that when participants were told that a target had performed well or poorly, they rated their task performance as such. However, when they were not given performance feedback, participants rated lower income targets as performing less well than those from the higher income social class.

Low-income children have been found to perceive other low-income children less favorably than higher income children. In a study with children between the ages of 6 and 15 (Skafte, 1988) participants rated young strangers (in their own age group) who were described as being poor significantly worse than the strangers who were described as being wealthy or who were described neutrally. Strangers who were described as wealthy were perceived to be more intelligent, to make better grades, to make friends more easily, to be more likely to succeed in the future, and to be healthier and happier than the poor or neutral strangers. Conversely, poor strangers were perceived to steal more often, to feel worse about themselves, and to make friends less easily than wealthy or neutral strangers.

Negative attitudes toward poor people have been reported to vary by demographic characteristics such as race/ethnicity, age, social status, political affiliation, and

education. For instance, Jacob (2000) found that a hypothetical low-income White woman was characterized as lazy and ugly, while a hypothetical Black woman with identical income was characterized as determined, stressed, and frustrated by a sample of African-American participants. Further, Leahy (1981) found that as middle-class youth progress from children to adolescents, there is an increasing tendency to describe people who are poor not only in terms of physical characteristics, but also in terms of individual differences in effort, ability, and other personality traits. Clydesdale (1999) found that people of higher social status, with more education, and who are politically conservative have more negative attitudes toward the poor.

Stoicism and core American sociopolitical values and ideologies may also play a role in negative attitudes toward people who are poor. For instance, in a study by Wagstaff and Rowledge (1995), participants high in stoicism (lacking in emotional involvement, lacking in emotional expression, and exercising emotional control or endurance) were more likely to be unsympathetic to emotionally disturbing and tragic experiences described on audiotape by low-income people. Further, Harper, Wagstaff, Newton, and Harrison (1990) found that participants who were high in Belief in a Just World held negative attitudes toward poor people and were also high in Protestant Work Ethic. Wagstaff (1983b) found a significant relationship between participants high in Belief in a Just World and negative attitudes toward poor people, political conservatism, victim derogation, and high levels of Protestant Work Ethic. MacDonald (1972) found that participants who were high in Protestant Work Ethic were high in Right Wing Authoritarianism, negative attitudes toward people who are poor, and opposition to a minimum annual income.

Target's Perspective Research

This body of research explores the psychological experience of being a target of classism (Nelson, 2002). This body of literature includes the experiences of classism by low-income people, through experiencing stigma, stereotypes, and prejudice, as well as the way in which they cope with these experiences.

Experiencing classism. At the most fundamental level of experiencing classism is the stigma due to poverty. Goffman (1963) defined stigma as an attribute assigned to an individual that causes that individual to be negatively evaluated, an attribute that is deeply discrediting, that reduces that person “from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one” (p. 3). Stigmatized individuals are people said to “possess (or are believed to possess) some attribute, or characteristic, that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular social context” (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998, p. 505). Experiencing stigma involves experiencing a situational threat in which awareness of being a member of a negatively evaluated group could influence the way in which the individual is treated or judged (Jones, Farina, Hastorf, Markus, Miller, & Scott, 1984; Katz, 1981); this includes the possibility of being a target of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination (Goffman, 1963; Jones et al., 1984).

One body of literature, mostly drawn from sociology, anthropology, social work, business, and education, describes the experience of being stigmatized due to being in a low-income group. This work has focused on a variety of different groups: homeless people (Cohen, 1990; Kozol, 1988); homeless panhandlers (Anderson et al., 1994; Clark, 1997; Lankenau, 1999a, 1999b; Milner, 1994); homeless children (Polakow, 2003; Roschelle & Kaufman, 2004); welfare recipients (Davis & Hagen, 1996; Jarrett, 1996;

Kerbo, 1996; McCormack, 2005; Rank, 1994; Seccombe et al., 1998); welfare-to-work participants (Riemer, 1997a, 1997b); working poor people (Greenlee & Lantz, 1993); people who receive charity (Fothergill, 2003); people who use non-profit services (Kissane, 2003); poor people and their families (Walker & Collins, 2004); people living in poor neighborhoods (Cattell, 2001; Warr, 2005); poor residential care facility tenants (Wilton, 2003); low-income older women (Barusch, 1997); low-income single-parent mothers (Richards, 1989); poor children and adolescents (Greenlee & Lantz, 1993; Philips & Pittman, 2003; Weinger, 1998); unemployed poor people (Burman, 1988, 1996; Howe, 1990; Kingfisher, 1996; McFadyen, 1995; Newman, 1989; Wadel, 1973); unemployed middle-class people (Letkemann, 1998); unemployed professionals (Letkemann, 2002); working class law students (Granfield, 1991); and people in organizations that have recently gone bankrupt (Sutton & Callahan, 1988).

Research suggests that people who are poor understand, interpret, and are affected by stereotypes about their group. For example, in a study by Weinger (1998), low-income children were asked to look at photographs of two different social status houses (a run-down looking house and a suburban-looking house) and to describe the people who might live there. The children said that they expected other people to describe the run-down house as nasty, disgusting, messy, dirty, ugly, crazy, and stupid, and the people living in them as not good people, mean, cruel, unkind, troublemakers, not taking care of their family, and doing drugs. Interestingly, they themselves described the run-down house as needing paint and the people living in it as needing money and a job.

Low-income college students have been reported to experience stereotype threat. Steele, Spencer, and Aronson (2002) defined stereotype threat as: “when a negative

stereotype about a group that one is part of becomes personally relevant, usually as an interpretation of one's behavior or an experience one is having, stereotype threat is the resulting sense that one can then be judged or treated in terms of the stereotype or that one might do something that would inadvertently confirm it" (p. 389). Similar to studies that demonstrate this phenomenon with African-American college students on general tests of ability (Steele & Aronson, 1995), and women college students on tests of math ability (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999), Croizet and Claire (1998) found that this phenomenon may also apply to low-income college students on tests of verbal ability. The researchers had low-income and middle-class college students in France complete a standardized verbal achievement test in the presence of, or not in the presence of, the stereotype that low-income people have deficient language skills. In the first condition, participants were told by an instructor that they would be taking a diagnostic test of verbal ability. In the second condition, they were told they would be completing a non diagnostic verbal exercise. Results indicated that low-income students performed significantly worse than middle-class students in the 'verbal diagnostic condition', but not in the 'verbal exercise condition', suggesting that the mere knowledge of the negative stereotype that low-income people have deficient language skills affected low-income students' performance.

Low-income people experience everyday prejudice due to their group membership. Everyday prejudice refers to the routine encounters with prejudice that stigmatized group members face on a daily basis in their social interactions (Essed, 1991; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Hyers, 2007; Swim et al., 1998). Swim et al. (1998) suggested that experiencing everyday prejudice is an integral part of everyday life for

members of subordinate groups, that acts of prejudice are common, that they consist of both overt and subtle instances, can emanate from both strangers and intimates, and can arise in both short and long-term interactions with perpetrators.

Beagan (2005) conducted a qualitative exploration of everyday classism as experienced by low-income medical students in Canada. Her results indicated that students from working class or impoverished backgrounds tended to report that their class background negatively impacted their school experience and routinely experienced marginalization and isolation. Participants reported lacking the social networks needed to excel in medical school, feeling alienated within the culture of medical school, being marginalized by jokes and derogatory comments that implied that they did not belong, feeling that they did not fit in well at school, and that they were growing isolated from family and friends.

Ritz and Hyers (2004) conducted a qualitative exploration of everyday classism as it is experienced by low-income state college and community college students in the southeastern U.S. Although state and community college campuses are considered less elite than medical school, these low-income students also reported experiencing everyday classism on their campuses. Regardless of which college campus students attended, participants reported routinely experiencing the flaunting of wealth and material items by others, being excluded and/or avoided, being the target of insensitive and classist remarks, encountering middle-class assumptions in their conversations, and dealing with bureaucratic hassles in their financial aid offices. Further, these experiences were described as integral parts of their everyday lives, consisting of both blatant and subtle instances, emanating from both strangers and intimates, and arising in both short and

long-term interactions with perpetrators.

Everyday experiences with classism have also been reported by a sample of women who receive welfare. Bullock (1995) visited shelters for poor women and attended advocacy groups for people receiving public assistance. The women with whom she talked discussed incidents involving potential landlords stereotyping them as “wild” or “on drugs”, making it difficult for them to find housing, social workers not explaining welfare or the process involved in receiving welfare or public assistance, other shoppers scrutinizing their purchases and being impatient when they have to pay with food stamps, store clerks making insensitive and derogatory comments about shoppers when they use their food stamps, bus drivers harassing them when they used a free bus pass by asking for multiple forms of identification and making insensitive comments about it, bank tellers displaying condescending attitudes and making loud comments when they were trying to cash their welfare checks, and family and friends excluding and distancing themselves as a result of their receiving public assistance.

Ouellette (1993) found that working class and poor college students reported routinely experiencing classism in the classroom, in their dorm, and in university offices. Similarly, Ryan and Sackray (1992) reported that low-income students frequently experience alienation and middle-class assumptions in the classroom. Seccombe et al. (1998) found that low-income women on welfare reported routinely hearing disparaging remarks at the grocery store and by welfare workers. Bullock (1995) reported observing low-income children in her neighborhood lined up outside of stores with only two permitted in at one time, likely from the belief of store owners that poor children will steal from them.

Coping with classism. Another area of research on target's perspective explores how low-income people cope with experiences of classism. Coping involves "conscious volitional efforts to regulate emotion, thought, behavior, physiology, and the environment, in response to stressful events or circumstances" (Compas, Conner-Smith, Saltzman, Thomsen, & Wadsworth, 2001, as cited in Miller & Kaiser, 2001, p. 77). Crocker et al. (1998) argued that "rather than passively accepting them, the stigmatized actively attempt to cope with the predicaments their stigma creates" (p. 521). Miller and Kaiser (2001) clarified that stigmatized individuals "have a vast array of responses to stressors resulting from devalued social status, including emotional, cognitive, biological, and behavioral responses" (p. 73).

Crocker et al. (1998) outlined strategies for coping with stigma which include: (a) attributing negative outcomes of being stigmatized (both individually and as a group) to external causes such as prejudice and discrimination; (b) making downward social comparisons (of both personal and social identities); and (c) psychologically disengaging (or disconnecting self-esteem from the personal outcomes of a stigmatizing situation) as well as psychologically disidentifying (or altering personal identity in a particular domain to protect long-term self-esteem). Similarly, Major and O'Brien (2005) proposed that individuals who are stigmatized cope by: (a) attributing negative events to discrimination (versus to the self); (b) disengaging self-esteem and effort from identity threatening domains (versus engaging and striving in these domains); and (c) increasing identification with one's stigmatized group (versus distancing oneself from the group).

Coping strategies have been found to differ depending on the low-income group. For example, Letkemann (2002) found that unemployed professionals coped with their

stigma through voluntary disclosure of their jobless status to a network of family and friends, maintaining close social relationships with these networks, concealing and camouflaging their jobless status by either acting and dressing like they were employed or by staying at home, and by socially withdrawing through avoidance of family, friends, and social environments. Sutton and Callahan (1988) studied people in organizations that have recently gone bankrupt and reported the use of five techniques for coping: denying responsibility, accepting responsibility, concealing, withdrawing, and defining their situations as temporary.

Roschelle and Kaufman (2004) found that homeless children manage their stigma through either forming strategies of inclusion to establish harmony with peers and strangers (through forging friendships, passing, and concealing) or through strategies of exclusion including aggressive and nonconciliatory attempts to gain social acceptance (through verbal denigration and physical and sexual posturing). In a study of rural Appalachian working poor people, Greenlee and Lantz (1993) found that this low-income group coped with their poverty and related stigma through positive emotional coping strategies (such as focusing on only the present and problems at hand, turning to religion, and finding support through family and friends) as well as negative emotional coping strategies (such as isolating themselves, using alcohol, and taking medicine for anxiety and depression).

Jarrett (1996) found that low-income women who receive welfare assistance challenged the negative evaluations of their family roles and work by highlighting their successes as parents and making great efforts in seeking employment. Barusch (1997) found that low-income older women coped with their stigma by redefining poverty to

exclude themselves, emphasizing that their poverty was temporary, comparing themselves to others less fortunate, counting their blessings, and managing their emotional responses to poverty. A study of low-income people who lived in poor neighborhoods (Warr, 1995) found that people coped with the stigma of their community both positively by creating supportive local bonding social networks in an attempt to generate social capital for their neighborhoods, and negatively by frequently confining themselves to their community and wearing “disguises” when they left.

The Present Study

The present study is an effort to expand our knowledge about classism (APA, 2000; Bullock, 1995; Bullock & Lott, 2001; Lott, 2002; Lott & Bullock, 2001; Lott & Bullock, 2006; Pettigrew, 1980) by contributing to studies about the target’s perspective. It will explore the reported experiences of being a target of classism by low-income food assistance program clients in a mid-size southeastern United States rural community. Little is known about the variety of ways in which low-income people experience classism in their daily lives, especially among this particular group of people, and less is known generally about the ways in which people who are poor cope with incidents of discrimination and negative evaluation. The present study asks two research questions: (1) What is the experience of everyday classism in a sample of low-income food assistance program clients in a rural southeastern community? and (2) In what ways do these people cope with everyday classism?

Method

Participants

Fifty low-income adult clients of the food box program at the Chattanooga Area Food Bank (CAFB) participated in individual face-to-face semi-structured interviews. The CAFB is a member of America's Second Harvest Food Bank Network, and is headquarters for over 360 non-profit agencies (e.g., childcare centers, soup kitchens, church pantries, homeless shelters, group homes, and youth and senior programs) in the Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia tri-state region that join efforts to end hunger by distributing food to those in need. CAFB clients are pre-qualified as low-income by receiving a food box voucher from First Call for Help, an information and referral service of The United Way of Greater Chattanooga. This hotline is set up to assist low-income people in a variety of ways, such as helping them pay their rent and utilities, finding quality and affordable child care, and receiving food assistance from local food pantries, soup kitchens, and homeless shelters. I obtained written permission to conduct the study at the CAFB from the Executive Director, with whom I have worked in the past as a research associate for one of their bi-annual hunger studies assessing the needs of Chattanooga regional area food programs and their clients (Sterchi-Elliott, Ritz, & Anderson, 2001).

Table 1 presents data on the demographic characteristics of participants in this study and CAFB clients in general¹. Among participants, there were slightly more women

¹ To protect the privacy of clients, the CAFB does not record demographic data on their food box recipients. The information presented in Table 1 is based on CAFB estimates and survey data collected from 69 randomly selected clients who participated in a hunger study assessing the needs of Chattanooga regional area food programs and their clients (Sterchi-Elliott, 2005).

(n=30) than men (n=20), and about an equal number of White/European-American (n=26) and ethnic minority (n=24) interviewees, the latter primarily being African-American (n=22), plus one who identified as Bahamian and one Fijian). Not surprisingly, seven of the White participants (27%) and four of the Black participants (18%) also identified as Cherokee Indian, which is common for the southeastern region of the U.S.

Table 1. Percent Participants and CAFB Clients on Selected Demographic Characteristics

Demographic Characteristic	% Participants	% CAFB Clients	% Difference
Male	40	35	+5
Female	60	65	-5
European-American	52	51	+1
African-American	44	44	0
Other	4	5	-1
Ages 18-65	82	79	+3
Over 65	18	21	-3
Single	34	25	+9
Married	18	25	-7
Divorced	24	19	+5
Widowed	18	15	+3
Separated	6	16	-10
Employed	10	20	-10
Unemployed	90	80	+10
Less than high school	34	41	-7
Diploma/GED/Equivalency	20	37	-17
Some college/2-year degree	46	22	+24

Note: Age percents are based on adult clients only. Of all clients, CAFB estimates 30% are children under the age of 18, 55% are ages 18-65, and 15% are over the age of 65.

Participants' ages ranged from 21-91 ($M = 46.8$, $Mdn = 47$) with age normally distributed across six adult age categories: five were between the ages of 18-25; four were between the ages of 26-35; twelve were between the ages of 36-45; twelve were between the ages of 46-55; eight were between the ages of 56-65; and nine were over the age of 65. One

third of the sample was single ($n=17$), one quarter divorced ($n=12$), nearly one in five married ($n=9$), nearly one in five widowed ($n=9$), and a few were separated ($n=3$). There was a range of 1-4 adults ($M = 1.8$, $Mdn = 2$) living in each household and 78% ($n=39$) of participants had children (range=1-5, $M = 2.4$, $Mdn = 2$). Of the 82% of participants who were not currently married ($n=41$), a little over a third ($n=15$) were caring for children under the age of 18 at home (e.g., were single-parents; this includes those caring for children in their home who are single, widowed, divorced, or separated). Nearly two-thirds of these single parents ($n=9$) were older participants between the ages of 47-66 caring for their grandchildren. There were slightly more women (60%) and Black (60%) single-parents; five were Black women (33%), four were White women (27%), four were Black men (27%), and two were White men (13%).

Table 2. Participants' Employment Status

Employment Status	Number	Percent
Full-Time Employment	2	4
Part-Time Employment	3	6
Unemployed with No Financial Assistance	16	32
Unemployed and Receiving Disability Income	19	38
Unemployed and Receiving TANF	6	12
Unemployed and Receiving Social Security	4	8

Table 2 illustrates a breakdown of participants' employment status. Only five participants (10%) were employed at the time of the interview, two full-time (a registered nurse and insurance agent) and three part-time (a console operator, factory worker, and baker). Both full-time workers were single mothers, and two of the part-time workers were single fathers, none of whom received any other form of financial assistance. The remaining forty five participants were unemployed (90%) with either no financial

assistance or were receiving Disability Income, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or Social Security. About one third of the sample were unemployed with no other form of assistance. Of particular notice among these participants, was one woman who noted that she was having trouble holding down a job because her only child had been killed recently in a car accident, one single father who was caring for an autistic son without any help, and three homeless men. The latter had access to kitchens where they are able to prepare the meals from food provided in their food boxes. Most unemployed participants with no other form of assistance indicated that they were trying to get approved for financial assistance and/or find jobs. The largest group of participants, over one third of them, were receiving Disability Income (slightly more men: $n=11$, and Black: $n=12$, and ranging in age from 35-66; $M = 52.8$, $Mdn = 51$). About one in ten participants was receiving TANF (all women, mostly White: $n=4$, and ranging in age from 38-65; $M = 50.2$, $Mdn = 47$) or Social Security (two White women ages 78 and 91, one 78 year-old White male, and one 65 year-old Black female).

Participants have held a variety of jobs in the past, with only two indicating that they have never been employed outside the home (one single 35 year-old man with a disability who has never been able to work and one 78 year-old widowed woman who proudly noted that her husband “has always provided for [her]”). The 48 participants who had worked in the past cited 96 jobs (range 1-4, $M = 2$, $Mdn = 2$). I aggregated the multiple responses and then categorized them into one of twelve “supersectors” of industry as outlined by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS; U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006). Table 3 lists participants’ past jobs by industry sector.

Table 3. Participants' Past Jobs by Industry Sector

Industry Sector	Number	Percent
Leisure and Hospitality	18	36
Manufacturing	14	28
Construction	13	26
Wholesale and Retail Trade	12	24
Other Services	9	18
Education and Health Services	6	12
Financial Activities	5	10
Professional and Business Services	5	10
Natural Resources and Mining	4	8
Transportation and Utilities	4	8
Government	3	6
Information	3	6

A little over one third of participants have worked in the leisure (screen play writer, singer, artist) and hospitality (all in food and beverage either as a fast food worker, server, cook, baker, dishwasher, or bus person) industry. About one quarter reported having held jobs in manufacturing (carpet mill, cotton mill, foundry, factory, warehouse, packaging), and construction (built houses, repaired highways, or were laborers skilled in remodeling, carpentry, maintenance, repairs, or painting), and the wholesale and retail trade, specifically the latter (either as a salesperson, cashier, layaway agent, or customer service representative). About one in five reported holding past jobs that fell into the “other services” category (lawn care provider, landscaper, nanny, babysitter, laundry, housekeeping, car washer). About one in ten reported having held past jobs in education (either as a teacher or teaching assistant) and health services (either as a registered nurse or certified nursing assistant), and the financial activities sector (either as a bank teller or insurance agent), and professional and business services (e.g., mechanic, janitor, cosmetologist, day care worker, secretary). Four participants reported having worked in the natural resources and mining industry (all as coal miners) and the transportation and

utilities sector (one dispatcher and three truck drivers). Three reported having worked in government (all men who were military veterans) and information sectors (publisher, editor, and camera woman).

In looking at education levels, one third of participants (n=17) had less than a high school education, nearly two thirds (n=11) of whom were women between the ages of 47 and 91, with the lowest grades completed being 4th and 5th grades for a 78 year-old woman and 91-year old woman respectively. This is common for older women in the southeastern U.S., because during the early to middle part of the 20th century in this part of the country, young girls were encouraged or forced to quit school at an early age to stay home and help with the household chores and younger children or to get married and move into another household (this is the case for my mother and all five of her sisters who are from this region). Of the other two thirds of participants, one in five (n=10) reported finishing high school with a diploma or receiving a GED or equivalency, and almost half (n=23) completed at least some college or earned a 2-year Associate's degree (although none reported earning a Bachelor's degree or higher).

In recruiting study participants, selection was driven by an attempt to have a diverse sample with respect to age, gender, and race/ethnicity. With the exception of education levels, the selected participant demographic characteristics outlined in Table 1 are fairly reflective of CAFB clients (ranging from 0-10% difference). The difference in education levels between participants and CAFB clients may reflect a changing demographic among clients served at the CAFB, as the CAFB data were taken from a client survey conducted two years earlier in 2005. It is possible that there is a shift in level of need for food from less educated people (78% of CAFB clients in 2005 with less

than or high school education compared to 54% of participants with this education level in 2007) to more educated people. It could also indicate that less educated people in need of food may be obtaining food assistance at other CAFB pantries in the region, or are resorting to soup kitchens or homeless shelters, while more educated people are relying on the CAFB food box program for help. These data have been shared with the CAFB for their further study.

Measures

Interview guide. The semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix A) was developed with broad open-ended interview questions designed to elicit rich descriptions about participant's experiences (Willig, 2001). The questions were developed using a method outlined by Spradley (1979) to help researchers stay aligned with the nature of their research objectives. To this end, I developed two descriptive questions and one structural question. Descriptive questions are questions about anecdotes, and life histories and "prompt the interviewee to provide a general account of 'what happened' or 'what is the case'" (Willig, 2001, p. 24). My first interview question is descriptive in that it asks participants to describe their experiences with classism and my third interview question is descriptive in that it asks participants to rate the frequency with which classist incidents occur in their lives. Structural questions are questions about how knowledge is organized and "prompts interviewees to identify categories and frameworks of meaning that they use to make sense of the world" (Willig, 2001, p. 24). My second question is a structural question in that it asks participants to discuss the ways in which they cope with classism in an effort to uncover mechanisms used to deal with their prejudicial experiences. Research questions (RQ) and their corresponding interview questions (IQ) are as follows:

(RQ1) What is the experience of everyday classism in a sample of low-income food assistance program clients in a rural southeastern community?

(IQ1) Can you share an incident that you have experienced recently in which you felt that you were treated differently, or disrespected, or insulted because you are a low-income person? (Seek two experiences and probe for...)

- a. Perpetrators - Who was involved in this incident?
- b. Nature - Would you say this was an obvious or subtle incident?
- c. Intersections - Was any other type of prejudice involved, such as associated with your race or your gender or your age?

(RQ2) In what ways do low-income food assistance program clients in a rural southeastern community cope with everyday classism?

(IQ2) In thinking about this experience, can you describe what you did? That is, how did you react? (Ask after each incident described in IQ1 and probe for...)

- a. Behavioral coping - Did you react in any direct or active way? Did you react in any indirect or passive way?
- b. Emotional Coping - How did it make you feel? Did it affect your emotions or how you felt about yourself?

The third interview question also corresponds to the first research question, but was asked last, as not to interrupt the flow of participants' descriptions of specific incidents.

(IQ3) I'd like to get an idea of how frequently you may experience incidents like these. Can you tell me how often you experience such incidents of prejudice or discrimination or unfair treatment because you are a low-income person (e.g., daily, often, every once in a while, rarely)?

Demographic survey. The demographic survey (see Appendix B) was designed to assist in verifying the selection of a diverse sample and for description of the sample. At the conclusion of the interview, participants were asked questions about race/ethnicity, gender, age, marital status, family structure, education, occupation, and employment status, and I documented their responses on the survey.

Procedures

The interviews were conducted in a small private conference room located in-between the administrative offices and food distribution center at the CAFB. They proceeded in four phases: recruitment, introduction, interview, and wrap up (see Interview Protocol in Appendix C).

Recruitment. I approached clients as they arrived at the CAFB to pick up their monthly or emergency food boxes and verified that they were there to pick up a food box for their own use (to eliminate social workers who came to pick up for their clients) and were at least eighteen years old (as some children came to pick up for their parents or grandparents). I then introduced myself and asked if they had the time and interest to participate in a brief interview about their experiences with prejudice as a low-income person. I informed them that the interview would take about half an hour and that they would receive a \$20 Bi-Lo Grocery Store Gift Card for their time. If the client agreed to participate (only three whom I approached declined), I first made sure that their voucher was valid for that day so that they would be able to get the food box for which they had come directly after the interview was finished.

In recruiting, I paid close attention to people who had children in their vehicles or who were passengers (since the distribution center from which I recruited is located in

front of the parking lot). I made sure to the best of my ability that it was not unsafe or inconvenient for a person to participate. People with children were invited to bring them into the interview if they wished; four participants had children with them and did so. I attempted and was successful in selecting a diverse sample of clients with respect to age, race/ethnicity, and gender. Six participants approached me, asking to participate, and they were included.

Introduction. I began by introducing myself and mentioned my own low-income background and stressed the personal relevance of the research. Next, an informed consent form (see Appendix D) was distributed, explained, signed, and collected, and the goals and procedures of the interview were outlined. Participants were informed that the goal of the research was to listen to low-income people talk about their interactions with others and whether and how they experience classist attitudes, prejudice and/or discrimination. I encouraged respondents to talk about any such incident – small or large. I explained to the participants that they would be answering a few questions and encouraged them to respond to them openly and freely. Participants were assured that I was not connected to the CAFB, and was just using their facilities, and that I would protect the confidentiality and anonymity of their comments. Any questions participants had were answered before the interview began.

Interviews. The interview phase followed a semi-structured format. I followed my interview guide, but was also open to other information that arose naturally within the interview. This type of interview format is especially useful for “steer[ing] the interview to obtain the kind of data which will answer the research question[s]” while striving for the “right balance between maintaining control of the interview and where it is going, and

allowing the interviewee the space to re-define the topic under investigation and thus generate novel insights” (Willig, 2001, p. 22). I tried to ensure the comfort of participants as they talked about their experiences (Sciara, 1999). For example, I nodded and affirmed their experiences with empathy and understanding. At times a participant was upset and even began to cry. In these cases, I asked if they would like to stop the interview and assured them that they would still receive their gift card if they chose to stop. None of the participants chose to stop the interview and all indicated that it felt good or vindicating to discuss their experiences. Each interview lasted between 15 and 45 minutes, depending on how much the participant wanted to share.

Wrap-up. During this phase, participants were asked to respond to the short demographic survey and were assured that the information provided would not be shared with the CAFB. The survey took less than a minute to complete. Participants were debriefed (see Appendix E) and given a \$20 Bi-Lo Grocery Store Gift Card in exchange for their time (for which they expressed gratitude). No participant appeared to be upset at the end of the interview and in many cases (when the content of the interview called for it) they were given a list of local resources for low-income people (provided by the CAFB).

Analysis

Grounded Theory Analysis. In order to provide a full analysis of the data (Willig, 2001), the interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed with all identifying information removed to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of participants and those with whom they interact. The interview transcripts were analyzed using a post-positivist variation of Grounded Theory Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). To capture the richness

of the data without imposing theoretical constraints upon participants' experiences (Willig, 2001), no a priori categories for describing participants' experiences were used. Instead, themes in participants' experiences were identified as they emerged from the data. This is achieved by beginning with data that "relate to specific incidents, facts, or events and progressively develop[ing] abstract classifications or categories which integrate and explain the data and organize the relationships within them" (Chamberlain, 1999, p. 184). The end result is a theory that is grounded in the data, with categories that have evolved within the research process. I proceeded with my analysis using four strategies of grounded theory: coding, constant comparative analysis, theoretical sampling, and theoretical saturation (Chamberlain, 1999; Willig, 2001).

Coding progressed in three phases: open, axial, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In the open coding phase, "the data [were] 'broken up' to identify categories" (Chamberlain, 1999, p. 185). I achieved this by reading through the transcripts several times, looking for and documenting emergent themes within. In the axial coding phase, themes were "refined, developed, and related to one another" (Chamberlain, 1999, p. 186). I achieved this by re-reading through the transcripts several more times looking for data that confirmed or elaborated, or disconfirmed or elucidated, the themes identified in the first phase of coding. In the selective coding phase, the core category, or "the central category that ties all other categories in the theory together, [was] identified and related to other categories" (Chamberlain, 1999, p. 186). I achieved this by creating a coding matrix, in which I was able to examine the consistency of categories and their interpretations, as well as their relationship to the core category. Once fully satisfied, the theory was established as grounded in the data.

Constant comparative analysis, theoretical sampling, and theoretical saturation all occurred in the later two coding phases. Using constant comparative analysis methods, I systematically compared themes for similarities and differences among the themes to “promote the identification of the properties of categories and also of the links and relationships between categories” (Chamberlain, 1999, p. 187). To refine my categories, I used theoretical sampling methods to determine their validity in which I “check[ed] emerging theory against reality by sampling incidents that may [have] challenge[d] or elaborate[d] its developing claims” (Willig, 2001, p. 35). Analysis continued until the point of theoretical saturation was reached, ensuring that all variation in the text was accounted for, or “when there are no gaps in the theory and all categories can be meaningfully linked together to provide a comprehensive explanation of the phenomenon” (Chamberlain, 1999, p. 186).

Cultural analysis. When the overall analysis was complete, I explored variations in findings related to race/ethnicity, gender, and age. Specifically, I compared findings for White (n=26) and ethnic minority respondents (n=24), male (n=20) and female respondents (n=30), and younger adult (ages 18-35; n=9), mid-aged adult (ages 36-55; n=24), and older adult respondents (ages 56 and older; n=17). The categories for race/ethnicity and gender are both meaningful and closely distributed in numbers but the age categories were created based on where I suspected differences might exist. That is, it did not make sense to dichotomize age at the median (e.g., participants under the age of 47, participants over the age of 47), because I suspected that certain experiences, responses, and coping strategies may vary based on whether one was younger, mid-aged, or older. Thus, age categories, for the purpose of the cultural analysis, are meaningful but

not equally represented numerically.

I compared percent of participants within each demographic category reporting a specific response to the percent of participants within those categories represented in the sample, using a 5% difference as my benchmark to indicate a disproportionate response (the equivalent of 2.5 persons out of the sample of 50). I chose 5% as my benchmark as to be able to capture subtle, yet recognizable, differences in experiences across cultures, though most differences were much larger than this (disproportionate differences ranged from 5%-82%, depending on the category). So, in examining racial/ethnic differences, I compared percent of participants' responses by how they responded if they were White to 52% (26 White participants in the sample constituting 52% of the sample; anything 57% or larger was deemed a disproportionate response) and African-American to 48% (n=24; 53% disproportion benchmark). If a response was disproportionately reported by race/ethnicity, I considered it to reflect a racial/ethnic difference in the sample. So, for example, if 58.3% of participants who reported 'receiving bad service' were African-American (versus 48% present in the sample and higher than the 53% benchmark for this group), I concluded that this type of classist experience may reflect a racial/ethnic difference in experience and noted that it was reported disproportionately more by African-American than by White participants. For gender differences I used 40% for men (n=20; 45% disproportion benchmark) and 60% for women (n=30; 65% disproportion benchmark). For age differences I used 18% for younger adults (n=9; 23% disproportion benchmark), 48% for mid-aged adults (n=24; 53% disproportion benchmark), and 34% for older adults (n=17; 39% disproportion benchmark).

Trustworthiness of analysis. In assessing the quality of trustworthiness of

analysis, I used four criteria for qualitative methods that parallel four criteria used with quantitative methods (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merrick, 1999). Internal validity was assessed by establishing *credibility*, which is the likelihood that the findings produced are credible. To achieve this, I had prolonged engagement with the data, ensuring that sufficient time was spent analyzing the transcripts to have persistent observation. I spent several weeks reading and coding and re-reading and re-coding my transcripts until I felt completely confident that I knew my data and was satisfied that I represented it correctly. External validity was assessed by establishing *transferability*, which is the extent to which findings compare to other samples and theories. To achieve this, I provided ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973, 1975) of the sample and discussion of prior theory so that the reader can “reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 316). I provided rich details about participants in the method section, and where appropriate in the results section, and discussed in-depth prior related research in the introduction section. Reliability was assessed by establishing *dependability*, which is a testament to the consistency of the qualitative process. To achieve this, my analysis was subjected to an ‘inquiry audit’ (Merrick, 1999) in which the consistency of my findings were evaluated by a qualified collaborator (my major professor). Finally, objectivity was assessed by *confirmability*, which is a testament to the accuracy of the qualitative product. To achieve this, I included selected passages of quotations in order to support the conclusions that I have drawn. Also, the data and findings, interpretations, and recommendations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were presented to my dissertation committee for approval.

Reflexivity. I acknowledge reflexivity in this research, or the “awareness of the

researcher's contribution to the construction of meanings throughout the research process" (Willig, 2001, p. 10). I kept reflexive memos during the interview process in which I reflected upon "the ways in which [my] own values, experiences, interests, beliefs, political commitments, wider aims in life, and social identities have shaped the research [and] the assumptions [I] have made in the course of the research" (Willig, 2001, p. 10). Specifically, I considered the ways in which being from a low-income background and its related advantages and consequences of being an 'insider' may have contributed to the construction of meaning throughout the research process, from the development of my research questions, to the analysis of my data, to the interpretation of the findings.

In reviewing my reflexive memos, and in reflecting back on the experience itself, it is clear that being a vested 'insider', both on a personal and professional level, has contributed to the construction of meaning in this research. My own personal experiences growing up in a low-income family, and consequently, my compassion and understanding of other low-income people and their experiences, is what motivated me to conduct this research. I also recognize the influence of my professional mission as a multicultural psychologist, which is to work to alleviate classism and to help to create a more just and caring society where low-income people may be treated more fairly. These personal and professional identities have clearly helped to shape this research. The development of my research questions, the methodology I selected for answering those questions, where I chose to conduct my study, the interview questions I created, the particular participants I sought, how I interacted with those participants, how I analyzed my data and interpreted my findings, and the assumptions and conclusions I drew from my findings, are all a reflection of who I was, and who I am, who I am becoming, and

who I hope to be. I am present throughout this research.

Reflexivity “also involves thinking about how the research may have affected and possibly changed us, as people and as researchers” (Willig, 2001, p.10). Undertaking this project has greatly influenced me. Though I knew it from the start, going through the research process has made me *more* aware of just how deeply invested I am in poverty and class issues, particularly in how low-income people psychologically experience, internalize, respond to and cope with classism. I am enthused about disseminating the results on a local level, presenting the findings at regional and national conferences, and submitting the paper for publication. This research will influence my ideas for future studies, for a course I will develop, a workshop I may conduct, a program I may implement, and policies I will support.

Results

Research Question 1: Experiencing Classism

To answer the research question, *'What is the experience of everyday classism in a sample of low-income food assistance program clients in a southeastern rural community?'*, participants were asked if they could share an incident they experienced recently in which they felt they were disrespected or insulted due to being low-income. If not described in their initial response, I further probed by asking them who was involved in the incident, whether they felt the incident was an obvious or subtle act, and whether they believed that any other form of prejudice (e.g., associated with race, gender, or age) may have been involved. I also asked later in the interview (after discussing responses to their incidents which are detailed under Research Question 2) how often they experienced such incidents of prejudice or discrimination or unfair treatment due to being low-income.

Descriptive Analyses

Of the 50 participants selected for an interview, 40 (80%) described experiences with classism, each discussing two incidents (out of two incidents that were sought for each participant reporting classism), for a total of 80 incidents shared. The remaining 10 participants felt that they had not experienced classism, but at the same time, may have inadvertently provided insight into one proactive coping strategy that may be used to avoid the recognition of prejudice and discrimination (and is discussed later with Research Question 2 results). The 80 classist incidents described by those who shared experiences with classism reportedly occurred in 14 different environmental domains (see Table 4), entailed nine distinct types of classist behaviors (see Table 6), and involved 23 categories of alleged perpetrators (see Table 8).

Table 4. Number and Percent of Incidents and Participants by Environmental Domain*

Environmental Domain	# Incidents	% Incidents	# Participants	% Participants
Social Service Agencies	15	18.75	13	32.5
Grocery Stores	14	17.5	13	32.5
Doctors' Offices	11	13.75	11	27.5
With Intimates	10	12.5	10	25
Department Stores	7	8.75	6	15
Church	5	6.25	5	12.5
Restaurants	4	5	4	10
School	3	3.75	3	7.5
Landlords	3	3.75	2	5
Workplace	2	2.5	2	5
On the Street	2	2.5	2	5
Seeking Employment	2	2.5	2	5
Seeking Housing	1	1.25	1	2.5
Bank	1	1.25	1	2.5

*Number of incidents is out of all 80 incidents reported and thus totals 80 and 100% correspondingly. Participant data reflects how many participants reported at least one incident in each domain. Since participants reported two incidents each, this does not total 40 participants nor does the corresponding percent equal 100.

Environmental domains. The 80 classist incidents shared occurred in 14 different environmental domains. Nearly two-thirds (n=50; 62.5%) occurred either in a social service agency, grocery store, doctor's office, or with intimates (family and friends). Further, a quarter to a third of all 40 participants reported at least one incident occurring in these four environmental domains. The other third of incidents occurred in department stores, at church, in restaurants, at school, with landlords, at work, on the street, while seeking employment, while seeking housing, and at the bank. Most participants (n=35; 87.5%) reported each of their two incidents as occurring in different domains. However, five participants reported both of their incidents as occurring in the same domain; two reported both of their incidents as occurring in a social service agency, one reported both incidents as occurring in a grocery store, one reported both incidents as occurring in a department store, and one reported both incidents as occurring while with a landlord.

Table 5. Percent Participants Disproportionately Reporting Incidents within Domain*

Domain	White	Minority	Male	Female	Young	Mid	Older
Social Services	61.5	38.5	30.8	69.2	15.4	69.2	15.4
Grocery Stores	46.2	53.8	38.5	61.5	23.1	46.2	30.7
Doctors' Offices	72.7	27.3	27.3	72.7	27.3	45.4	27.3
With Intimates	60	40	40	60	20	40	40
Department Stores	16.7	83.3	66.7	33.3	0	33.3	66.7
Church	60	40	0	100	0	40	60
Restaurants	50	50	50	50	0	75	25
School	66.7	33.3	0	100	66.7	33.3	0
Landlords	0	100	0	100	0	100	0
Workplace	100	0	100	0	100	0	0
On the Street	50	50	100	0	50	50	0
Seek Employment	50	50	50	50	0	100	0
Percent in Sample	52	48	40	60	18	48	34

*Only two participants each reported incidents with landlords, in the workplace, on the street, and while seeking employment. For these domains, it is only documented as a disproportionate difference if both participants were of the same race/ethnicity, gender or age group, as 50% is misleading and does not accurately reflect a demographic difference here. Only one participant each reported an incident while seeking housing and at the bank and thus is not appropriate for this analysis and is not included in this table.

Table 5 reflects racial/ethnic, gender, and age differences in reported incidents by environmental domain (see pp. 36-37 'Cultural Analyses' for a description of demographic categories and the analysis procedures). Compared to the racial/ethnic composition of the sample, White participants were disproportionately more likely to report classist incidents occurring in social service agencies, doctors' offices, with intimates, at church, and at school, and both participants who reported incidents as occurring at work were White. Ethnic minority participants were more likely to report their incidents as occurring in grocery and department stores, and both participants reporting incidents occurring when with landlords were African-American. There were no disproportionate racial/ethnic differences in the percent of reported incidents occurring in restaurants, on the street, or while seeking employment.

In looking at variations in findings related to gender, men were disproportionately more likely to report incidents occurring in department stores and restaurants, and both incidents described at work and on the street were reported by men. Women were more likely to report their incidents as occurring in social service agencies and doctors' offices. All incidents occurring at church, at school, and with landlords were reported by women. Incidents described as occurring in grocery stores, with intimates, and while seeking employment were proportionately reported by men and women.

The only domain where age did not seem to play a role was on the street. Younger adults disproportionately reported more incidents as occurring in grocery stores, doctors' offices, and at school, and both incidents occurring in the workplace were reported by this age group. Mid-aged adults were more likely to report incidents in social service agencies and at restaurants, and both participants who reported incidents occurring with landlords and while seeking employment were of this age group. Incidents occurring with intimates, in department stores, and at church were reported more by older adults.

Table 6. Number and Percent of Classist Behaviors and their Percent of Total Incidents*

Classist Behavior	# of Behaviors	% of Behaviors	% of Incidents
Condescending Attitude	38	35.2	47.5
Derogatory Remarks	31	28.7	38.75
Bad Service	12	11.1	15
Differential Treatment	8	7.4	10
Looked/Glared/Stared At	8	7.4	10
Followed/Watched	4	3.7	5
Harassment	3	2.7	3.75
Excluded/Avoided	2	1.9	2.5
No Service	2	1.9	2.5

*A total of 108 classist behaviors occurred across the 80 incidents shared (range = 1-3 behaviors per incident; mean = 1.35 behaviors per incident). Thus, percent of behaviors is out of 108 classist behaviors and the column total equals 100%. Percent of incidents is out of 80 incidents shared and so the column total does not equal 100%.

Classist behaviors. Nine types of classist behaviors occurred across incidents (see Table 6): condescending attitude, derogatory remarks, bad service, differential treatment, looked/glared/stared at, followed/watched, harassment, excluded/avoided, and no service. Being a target of a *condescending attitude* involved receiving from a perpetrator a nonverbal display of dislike or distaste in a ‘better than’ or ‘higher than’ the participant attitude, typically communicated to the participant by how a perpetrator looked at them or the body language they used. *Derogatory remarks* involved direct verbal communication to the participant in an insulting or demeaning manner. *Bad service* involved receiving service as a customer or client that is less than what the participant felt they should have received simply because they are low-income (e.g., at a restaurant, in a department store, or at the doctor’s office when waiting longer than patients with insurance or better insurance to be seen by their doctor). *Differential treatment* consisted of being treated differently than higher income people, but in a less business-like setting (e.g., by landlords as compared to their other higher income tenants) or a less service-oriented situation (e.g., by potential employers as compared to other better-dressed applicants) or through differential physical treatment (by doctors through their treatment of ailments as compared to patients with insurance or better insurance than the participant). Being *looked/glared/stared at* entailed a nonverbal expression of impatience, disbelief, disgust, and/or ridicule by perpetrators (e.g., while waiting for a participant to use their food coupons or looking for more money to pay in a grocery store) or directed at physical appearance or attire (e.g., visually communicating to participants that they look dirty or that their clothes are not good enough or that they don’t belong in a restaurant). Being *followed/watched* involved a nonverbal expression of suspicion of potential theft,

specifically occurring in grocery and department stores. *Harassment* entailed a physical expression of aggression or intent to harm which made participants feel threatened by a perpetrator. Being *excluded/avoided* involved a feeling of being left out or ignored. *No service* meant that a participant was turned away from a particular service.

Nearly half of all 80 incidents shared included being a target of a condescending attitude, while over a third of all incidents included being a target of derogatory remarks; these two classist behaviors comprised nearly two-thirds of all the classist behaviors reported (n=69; 63.9%). Fifteen percent of incidents included receiving bad service, one in ten involved receiving differential treatment, and one in ten entailed being looked/glared/stared at; these three classist behaviors constituted another quarter of all classist behaviors reported (n=28; 25.9%). The remaining 15% of incidents included being followed/watched, harassed, excluded or avoided, and turned away from service, altogether a little over one in ten of all the classist behaviors (n=11; 10.2%).

Table 7. Percent Participants Disproportionately Reporting Classist Behaviors*

Classist Behavior	White	Minority	Male	Female	Young	Mid	Older
Condescend Attitude	57.9	42.1	39.5	60.5	26.3	47.4	26.3
Derogatory Remarks	54.8	45.2	22.6	77.4	16.1	48.4	35.5
Bad Service	41.7	58.3	33.3	66.7	8.3	58.4	33.3
Differential Treatment	50	50	12.5	87.5	12.5	62.5	25
Looked/Glared/Stared	37.5	62.5	25	75	12.5	62.5	25
Followed/Watched	25	75	100	0	25	50	25
Harassment	33.3	66.7	66.7	33.3	0	66.7	33.3
Excluded/Avoided	50	50	50	50	50	50	0
No Service	50	50	0	100	50	50	0
Percent in Sample	52	48	40	60	18	48	34

*Only two participants reported being excluded/avoided and receiving no service. For each of these classist behaviors, it is only documented as a disproportionate difference if both participants were of the same race/ethnicity, gender, or age group, as 50% is misleading and does not accurately reflect a demographic difference here.

Table 7 reflects racial/ethnic, gender, and age differences in classist behaviors reported by participants (see pp. 36-37 'Cultural Analyses' for a description of demographic categories and the analysis procedures). Compared to the racial/ethnic composition of the sample, White participants were disproportionately more likely to report experiencing condescending attitudes, while ethnic minorities were more likely to report receiving bad service, being looked/glared/stared at, being followed/watched, and being harassed. There were no disproportionate racial/ethnic differences in the percent of participants who reported derogatory remarks, differential treatment, being excluded or avoided, and receiving no service.

Gender did not seem to play a major role in whether participants reported being targets of a condescending attitude or being excluded or avoided with both men and women proportionately reporting these types of classist behaviors. However, men were disproportionately more likely to report being harassed, and only men reported being followed/watched. Women were more likely to report experiencing derogatory remarks, bad service, differential treatment, and being looked/glared/stared at, and all incidents of receiving no service were reported by women.

In looking at variations in reported experiences by age, younger participants were disproportionately more likely to report being a target of a condescending attitude and to be followed/watched, while mid-aged participants were more likely to report experiencing bad service, differential treatment, being looked/glared/stared at, and being harassed. Older participants did not disproportionately report any of the nine classist behaviors identified. There were no age differences in reports of experiencing derogatory remarks, being excluded/avoided, and receiving no service.

Table 8. Number and Percent of Incidents by Alleged Perpetrators*

Alleged Perpetrators	# of Incidents	% of Incidents
Service Representatives	16	20
Doctors	8	10
Family	8	10
Cashiers	7	8.75
Customers	7	8.75
Managers	4	5
Salespeople	4	5
Congregation	4	5
Landlords	3	3.75
Secretaries	2	2.5
Host/hostesses	2	2.5
Friends	2	2.5
Students	2	2.5
Potential Employers	2	2.5
Nurse	1	1.25
Wait Staff	1	1.25
Minister	1	1.25
Teacher	1	1.25
Employers	1	1.25
Coworkers	1	1.25
Potential Landlord	1	1.25
Police Officer	1	1.25
Passerby's	1	1.25

*Perpetrator data is out of all 80 incidents shared and equals 100%

Alleged perpetrators. Table 8 lists the 23 categories of alleged perpetrators.

Nearly two-thirds of incidents (n=50; 62.5%) were perpetrated by service representatives (all but one in a social service agency), doctors, family, cashiers (in grocery stores), customers (in grocery and department stores and restaurants), and managers (in grocery and department stores). The remaining third (n=30; 37.5%) were perpetrated by salespeople (in department stores), church congregations, landlords, secretaries (in doctors' offices), host/hostesses (in restaurants), friends, students, potential employers, and a nurse, wait staff (in a restaurant), minister, teacher, employer, coworker, potential landlord, police officer, and passerby's (on the street).

Table 9 illustrates the type of classist behaviors, and the categories of people who allegedly perpetrated these behaviors, reported within each environmental domain.²

Table 9. Classist Behaviors and Alleged Perpetrators by Environmental Domain*

Environmental Domain	Classist Behavior	Alleged Perpetrators
Social Service Agencies	Derogatory remarks Condescending attitude Bad service Harassment	Service representatives
Grocery Stores	Derogatory remarks Condescending attitude Looked/glared/stared at Bad Service Followed/watched	Cashiers Customers Managers
Doctors' Offices	Differential treatment Condescending attitude Derogatory remarks Bad service No service	Doctors Secretaries Nurse
With Intimates	Condescending attitude Derogatory remarks	Family Friends
Department Stores	Condescending attitude Followed/watched Bad service Looked/glared/stared at Derogatory remarks	Salespeople Managers Customer
Church	Condescending attitude Derogatory remarks	Congregation Minister
Restaurants	Bad Service Looked/glared/stared at Condescending attitude No service	Host/hostesses Customers Wait staff
School	Looked/glared/stared at Excluded/avoided Derogatory remarks Condescending attitude	Students Teacher

² Though types of behaviors and categories of perpetrators were similar across domains, the nature of the incidents varied depending on the environmental context in which they occurred. Also, many incidents entailed more than one classist behavior (e.g., experiencing a condescending attitude and derogatory remarks in one incident). Thus, participants' classist behaviors will be presented in the next section by each environmental domain.

Landlords	Differential treatment Harassment	Landlords
Workplace	Condescending attitude Looked/glared/stared at	Employers Coworkers
On the Street	Condescending attitude Derogatory remarks Excluded/avoided Harassment	Passerby's Police officer
Seeking Employment	Differential treatment Condescending attitude	Potential employers
Seeking Housing	Condescending attitude Derogatory remarks Differential treatment	Potential landlord
Bank	Bad Service Derogatory remarks	Service representative

*Environmental domain, classist behaviors, and alleged perpetrators are listed from most to least frequent in occurrence (see Tables 4, 5, and 6). That is, though classist behaviors and alleged perpetrators are categorized by environmental domain, alleged perpetrators do not necessarily correspond with the adjacent classist behavior in the table.

Nature of incidents. The majority of the 80 incidents described were perceived to be communicated in a blatant or obvious manner (n=64; 80%) with only one of five believed to be covert or subtle (n=16; 20%). As seen in Table 10, nearly two thirds of the incidents that involved being looked/glared/stared at were considered to be communicated subtly and half of the incidents involving being excluded/avoided were also believed to be covert, but only two classist behaviors of this type were reported. Only a third of the incidents that included receiving bad service were considered to be communicated in a subtle manner, indicating that this type of classist behavior tends to be perceived as being more obvious. Similarly, behaviors that included being a target of a condescending attitude, derogatory remarks, and differential treatment were mostly considered to be blatantly communicated to participants. All incidents that involved being followed/watched, harassed, and being turned away from service were also believed to be communicated to participants in an obvious manner.

Table 10. Covert/Subtle Incidents by Type of Classist Behavior*

Classist Behavior	# Subtle Behaviors	# Total Behaviors	% Subtle Behaviors
Looked/Glared/Stared At	5	8	62.5
Excluded/Avoided	1	2	50
Bad Service	4	12	33.3
Condescending Attitude	7	38	18.4
Derogatory Remarks	4	31	12.9
Differential Treatment	1	8	12.5

*The number of subtle behaviors equals 22 and not 16 because some incidents contained more than one classist behavior. Participants were asked to rate the overall incident as subtle or obvious so all behaviors within each incident were rated the same.

Intersections with other forms of prejudice. Most incidents were believed to be only classist (n=68; 85%), but 15% were perceived as also involving racism (n=4; 5%), or sexism (n=4; 5%), or ableism (n=4; 5%). As shown in Table 11, one out of four participants who reported racism as also involved was White and three out of four who reported sexism as also involved were men. Three out of four who reported ableism as also involved were mid-aged adults, supporting research suggesting the fluidity of disability across the lifespan (Olkin, 2001). Three of the 16 intersected incidents occurred while with landlords, two while with intimates, two while at social service agencies, and one each while seeking employment, at a restaurant, on the street, at church, and in a grocery store.

Frequency of classism. Three quarters of the 40 participants who reported experiences with classism (n=30; 75%) said that they occur with high frequency; nine (22.5%) claimed that they occur ‘daily’ and 21 (52.5%) said that they occur ‘often’. Only one in four (n=10; 25%) reported low frequency occurrence of classism; seven (17.5%) specified that they occur ‘every once in a while’ and three (7.5%) indicated that they occur ‘rarely’.

Table 11. Other Prejudice by Demographic Characteristic of Respondent and Environmental Domain*

Other Prejudice Involved	Demographic Characteristic	Environmental Domain
Racism	Black	Seeking Employment
	Black	With Landlord
	Black	At Restaurant
	White	Social Service Agency
Sexism	Male	With Intimates
	Male	Social Service Agency
	Male	On the Street
	Female	With Landlord
Ableism	Mid-Aged	At Church
	Mid-Aged	With Intimates
	Mid-Aged	With Landlord
	Older Adult	At Grocery Store

*Demographic characteristics correspond with the adjacent environmental domain.

Qualitative Narratives

Participants were eager to tell their stories and shared rich narratives about their experiences with classism. The following section presents sample qualitative passages of reported incidents and the perpetrators allegedly involved. Intersections with other forms of prejudice and group differences are highlighted.

Social service agencies. Nearly a third of participants (n=13; 32.5%) described 15 classist incidents (2 shared two incidents in this environmental context) occurring in social service agencies (18.75% of all incidents reported). Within the 15 incidents, nine involved derogatory remarks, eight involved a condescending attitude, two involved bad service, and one involved harassment. All incidents were allegedly perpetrated by service representatives in these agencies. One incident was reported to have also involved sexism and one was believed to have also involved racism. Incidents occurring in social service agencies were reported disproportionately more by participants who were White, women, and mid-aged adults.

One classist behavior that participants described experiencing was derogatory remarks.

Here a 47 year-old divorced Bahamian woman with a disability shares her experience:

They are not understanding. This one woman, she was very disrespectful at the social security department - very, very discriminating. She was at the window, you know where you have to fill out the forms, and she was talking to me very nasty. They need to change those people out there. She was cold blooded nasty.

A 65 year-old widowed African American woman raising her three grandchildren

explains why she will not return to a human service agency:

Well, I am not going up there no more, you know, at human services. Those ladies will talk down to you in a hot second. They send so many people out of there crying... the way they talk to you.

In the following passage, a 53 year-old unemployed African-American woman raising her granddaughter also shared her incident involving derogatory remarks:

I had to go get some help with a light bill, because it was so high, I couldn't pay it. Out of six hundred and something dollars it would have been close to like four hundred, and I would have two hundred to live off of, and I had to buy food. Because they only give me fourteen dollars in food stamps, I can't do it on that. And the woman that I saw, they sent me back she looked at me, and she said 'Ok, what did you do with the rest of the money?' I said 'I'm sorry, what did you say?' She said 'what did you do with the rest of your money?' ... I said 'I have bills I have to pay.' 'We don't care about that'. That's what she said, 'we don't care about that, what did you do with your money?' Ok she went 'three hundred dollars and so and so for food, what did you do with the rest of your money?'... She said 'we don't, I don't care about that, we don't care about stuff like that.'

Other participants shared experiences of condescension. Here a 23-year old unemployed single White woman going to school full-time discusses an incident:

Well actually when I try to... I am trying to get a job and I go to school, and the lady there was just kind of, I don't think she really, I don't think she really believed me... And I just really don't understand why they treat people who are in there, like condescending... And they reacted like 'what are you doing here?', and I was thinking to myself, 'I am just trying to get help with food', you know? I just felt like she was condescending.

A 65 year-old widowed African American woman raising her three grandchildren

elaborated on an incident in which she experienced a condescending attitude:

Say for instance, now, there's this place that gave me the food voucher to come here, and there are these two receptionists. And one of them, it's a Christian organization, and one of them you know, is just rude... I don't know, she's kind of like... to me it's just like looking down on me...

Here, a 40 year-old unemployed single White father raising an autistic son shares his incident:

Well I tried, I am trying to get some help. And I take in my son... I went there four times, and it was real frustrating because I have always worked really, really hard. I just have had a really hard two or three years... I have been there four times, I had proof, and the lady just didn't even act like she cared, she didn't give a flying crap about me, bad attitude, you know...

In this case, when I asked him whether he thought any other form of prejudice may have been involved in this incident, he believed that sexism was also a part of it, replying:

Oh yeah! Because I'm in need – and I'm a man, you know...

A 59 year-old divorced White man with a disability also described being a target of a condescending attitude:

Well, [my friend] and I went down to human services to get help with the electric bill, because she had a run in with the bank and the bank took six hundred dollars worth of charges which completely ate her SSI check... And so we went down to human services to get help, and it was as though she was talking *at us* and not *with us*. She had her pre set ideas of what the situation was; I don't think she heard two sentences that she said. And she told [my friend] to come back with a certain amount of documentation, which is ok. But it was more or less like she didn't have the time to talk to us. It was beneath her dignity to take the time to really have a decent conversation. And it really upset [my friend].

When I asked him whether he thought any other form of prejudice might be involved, he felt that racism also played a role:

Well, also because she was Black and we were White – that definitely came through real strong.

Two participants described incidents involving receiving bad service in which they were not given the proper referral to First Call for Help, a social service information and help line. A 47 year-old divorced White woman raising her three grandchildren describes her incident:

Yeah... I don't have a social security card. I call them for help about two or three weeks in a row sometimes... Well they won't help us because I don't have a social security card. And I called for like two or three weeks in a row and they just tell me to go 'there', and I keep telling them 'I can't go there because I don't have a social security card'. And they say 'well we don't have *nothing else*, so I don't know what to tell you, I'm sure *you'll* figure something out'. That really hurt. And to feed my grandkids, I really don't know what to do!

A 43 year-old White woman out of work due to an injury discusses her experience with receiving bad service, which also included being a target of a condescending attitude and derogatory remarks.

Well, like, for the past three months, I've been trying to get help. And like I said, it was, like I mean, those people look at you like you are a piece of dirt... I mean, it is horrible... They're just very cold. I went to see the partnership for family and children services the other day, and I said 'please, can you all help me? I have nowhere to go.' And they just, she just said, 'no, I don't know what to tell you. You can go to a shelter.' They were just very cold, just 'go to a shelter.' You are at rock bottom and you need help and they just act like... I told her I am driving on fumes, and she said 'ma'am, I don't know what to tell you, I don't have any gas money to give you'. She yelled at me and embarrassed me to death. I said 'I am not talking about you personally. I was told that you all give gas vouchers here'. And then she just treated me like an idiot, I was so embarrassed.

One participant discussed an incident of harassment, which also included being a target of derogatory remarks. This 40 year-old single White man receiving disability elaborated:

Well, well, I, yeah, I went to um, human services. I went there to get some help with getting my electric and my water bill, and the lady was just outrageous to me. She talked to me like I was a piece of dirt. And they didn't pay the bill for me. And not only that, but when I walked out, the woman followed me out to the car like she was trying to intimidate me or something.

Grocery stores. Close to a third of participants (n=13; 32.5%) shared 14 classist incidents (one shared two incidents) occurring in a grocery store (17.5% of all incidents reported). Seven incidents involved derogatory remarks, six involved a condescending attitude, four involved being looked/glared/stared at, three involved receiving bad service, and two involved being followed/watched in grocery stores. Seven incidents were allegedly perpetrated by cashiers, five by customers, and two by store managers. One incident was felt to have also involved ableism. Ethnic minority participants and younger adults reported disproportionately more incidents occurring in grocery stores.

A 66 year-old White woman with a disability described an incident in which a cashier made derogatory remarks to her when using her food stamp card:

I've been in a Food Lion, and you have to punch my number in on my food stamp card, and this little girl said, 'I ain't supposed to be doing that.' And she wasn't supposed to do this and she wasn't supposed to do that. Just rude to me. So I just tried my best to get the number in myself. I said I wasn't gonna come back, and she said 'that's fine with me.' That was just kinda when I felt bad.

Here, an unemployed 50 year-old White woman shared an experience of being a target of a condescending attitude from a cashier over using coupons and a food stamp card:

I did have a problem recently with a lady at Walmart. She got all bent out of shape because I had all these coupons I was using. You know when you live on a budget, you gotta, you gotta save every dime. So I bring all these coupons and she is giving me all these stipulations, and then when I bring out my food stamp card, she gave me a look like, 'oh my Lord'... You know, she was just like, I don't know, she just acted like I was a burden to her. You know, that I was using coupons and had a food stamp card.

A 21 year-old Fijian man working part-time described a cashier's condescending attitude and derogatory remark over a food stamp card:

Oh yeah. Sometimes when you go to the grocery store the cashier is rude to you. You got to use food stamps and they're like, 'oh great, here we go again.' And they just look at you, they just look at you like you're a problem.

A 55 year-old disabled African-American woman described an incident in which she experienced a derogatory remark and bad service from a cashier because she did not have enough money to pay:

I have experienced prejudice being in the grocery store, and running short, and the lady says, 'well I am just going to take and put it all back and you can just start all over' and stuff like that. I mean, all she had to do was take so many items off, but instead she took everything off and made me have to wait in the back of the line until she got to the rest of her customers. The ice cream went bad too.

In the following passage, a disabled 59 year-old African-American woman describes an incident in which a cashier displayed a condescending attitude over using a food stamp card, and also gave bad service:

Well, you can tell when you come in to the grocery store. Like, they gave me food stamps, and when I went to use my card, this woman just kind of looked down at me. And it took me a minute to check out, and she can see that I was struggling with my oxygen, but she wouldn't help me. She just stood there.

In this case, when I asked her whether she thought any other form of prejudice was involved, she believed that her disability played a role:

Well, because I have a disability, and it's obvious. They just don't act right.

A 47 year-old Bahamian woman with a disability shared an incident with a cashier that involved a derogatory remark, condescending attitude, and bad service, all over not having enough money to pay:

Yeah, I was in the grocery store, and I didn't have enough money to pay, and she just acted like I was a bother to her. You know, like I wasn't worth her time. Then she just took the Pampers from the buggy. I think the Pampers was like twenty dollars. She wanted to take them, and I told her, 'no, we can't take the Pampers.' She said, 'well then, what do you suggest?' We had to take the milk off.

Customers were involved in grocery store incidents too. In this incident, a 40 year-old homeless White man discusses his experience with condescending attitudes from other customers over using a food stamp card that wouldn't slide through the machine:

When I am in Walmart, and I go to use my food stamp card, you know, they have to type the number in because it doesn't slide. I just feel this overwhelming aura of the people around me that like, 'grrrrr, I have to work and you know, you're on food stamps'. You know, where I am at now, is just a small drop in the bucket. You know, it is hard to get by on what I make now. When I hand them the card and say, you know, 'it doesn't slide, you have to scan it'. Before I say anything the people in line are like, you know... you can always feel that aura.

Here, a 41 year-old White woman working full-time describes her experience with being looked/glared/stared at by customers over not having enough money to pay:

Yeah, I mean, I guess there were a few times where I would have to put back a few items, and you know, you get your glares from people behind you... And you know, I was already embarrassed with the food stamp card anyway to begin with. And once that happens, you are very careful to pick up only things you can afford and to keep a closer check on how much you are spending.

This incident involved being looked/glared/stared at and a derogatory remark from a customer when an unemployed 56 year-old White woman did not have enough money:

There was one, I can usually get it close to the nearest dollar, but there have been a couple of times recently that I didn't and I would have to put something back. There has been a couple of times where I would try to dig and get out the change and you see the people behind you just staring at you and getting impatient. And I have heard a couple of comments like, um, 'I wish I had gotten in the line with the other person.' You know, just rude.

A 37 year-old African-American man working part-time described a similar experience of being looked/glared/stared at and hearing a derogatory remark from a customer in line:

I was just in a store, and I guess I put too much stuff up. There was a long line behind me, and the cashier had to uh, void some of the stuff off. I didn't have enough money. And the people in line behind me, you know, giving me the look, breathing hard, impatient. You know, stuff like that. I heard somebody say, 'you need to hurry up!' It kind of got to me because you think you got all the money to get this, and you got your family, and they want this, and you look in your wallet and you don't got it, and you're like, 'ugh, man, we got to put this back.'

Two incidents reported were of being followed and watched by grocery store managers. A 35 year-old White man working part-time shared his incident:

I went into um, Bi-Lo a few months ago, and I had some raggedy pants on, I just got off from work, and um, somebody was following me around the store like I was fixin' to steal something out of the store or something. It was a manager. He had one of those nametags on.

An unemployed 41 year-old African-American male reported a similar incident in which he was followed and watched by a grocery store manager:

They follow me around the grocery store too, you know, looking poor. I've been followed, I've been watched, I've been stared at. They try to be discreet, but you know when someone's watching you. At times I dread going to the grocery store.

Doctors' offices. A little over a quarter of participants (n=11; 27.5%) each described one classist incident that took place in their doctor's office (13.75% of all incidents described). Four of the incidents involved differential treatment, three involved a condescending attitude, two involved derogatory remarks, two involved bad service, and one involved receiving no service. Eight incidents were allegedly perpetrated by doctors, two by secretaries, and one by a nurse. Incidents occurring in doctors' offices were believed to be only classist in nature. Participants who were White, female, and younger reported disproportionately more incidents occurring in doctors' offices.

One type of incident participants' described is receiving differential medical treatment from their doctors due to either being on TennCare or being uninsured. An uninsured single 21 year-old White mother of two talked of her treatment:

When I took the babies to the doctor, they didn't have insurance. I took them to the doctor because they were very sick, and he didn't treat them properly because of the fact that I didn't have the insurance or the money to pay for everything like I needed to. And it was like they kind of brushed us off because of the fact that I didn't have this money to hand out for medical care and that kind of thing... When he did the testing is when he found out that she didn't have insurance and that kind of thing. That kind of made me feel uncomfortable, as if I wasn't taking care of the children properly, because I didn't have the insurance or the extra money to put into that kind of testing. And instead of giving the medication the doctor felt that she needed, he came up with something else that wasn't quite as good, and he wasn't sure if it would have the same effect, but he felt it would do

because we couldn't pay that... He thought it was a good possibility. He said that there was no guarantee.

A 65 year-old White woman receiving TennCare aid reported the following:

I had a problem with my doctor. They were giving me certain medicines that I could not take, and he insisted on prescribing those medicines because TennCare would pay for them. And I refused to take them. So I had to leave Chattanooga for care, and go to Nashville for care, because I can't trust these.

Differential treatment by her doctor was also experienced by this uninsured 38 year-old

White woman:

At the doctor, if you don't have insurance, they are like, 'there is nothing really wrong with you.' Like my hand, I had fell and caught myself with my hand, they said it was the way I was moving my arm so much, it may have just been some nerve damage. Didn't x-ray me or nothing. Because I didn't have insurance. They just come in and asked if I had insurance and I told them no. The next thing I know the doctor comes in and says that it is just a muscle spasm and stuff like that. Put a hand brace on and that was the end of it. Didn't X-ray it or do nothing.

Two incidents involved receiving bad service from doctors in which participants were made to wait longer than other insured or better-insured patients to be seen, even with an appointment. A 41 year-old unemployed and uninsured African-American man reported:

Well, sometimes you know, when you go into the doctors, and there can be 10-15 people there, and even though you have an appointment, you're the last person seen, you know, because you don't have insurance.

A similar experience was mentioned by a 50 year-old White woman on TennCare:

Ok, I went to the doctor, and I am on TennCare. So I noticed that everybody there was getting attention... So finally I just said, 'look, how long do I have to wait? I have an appointment' And she said, 'they do not give precedence when you are on TennCare. Sorry.' I want their attention and I'm not getting it. You just didn't get it. At all.

One incident entailed receiving no service from a doctor. This 22 year-old White woman described her situation:

Well, at the doctor's, after I turned twenty one, they cut me off. I was taking like twenty pills a day, which was my medicine. And I'm supposed to have two

surgeries. And uh, the question is, are they supposed to do something? They tell me they can't see me because I don't have a card. So you can't get any help, you know what I am saying? Crazy. It seems like, wherever I call they just kind of blow me off.

A 50 year-old White woman raising her two grandchildren experienced derogatory remarks from her doctor:

At the doctor's office. My doctor, he um, when he said that my blood sugar was 350, he turned on me. Kinda like, 'why are you not doing this? Why are you not doing that? Why are you not eating right? Why are you not taking your medicine? I don't understand?' I guess he wouldn't...

Other incidents involved being the target of a condescending attitude from secretaries. In this incident, a 66 year-old disabled White woman explained:

I have had problems with the, um, the uh secretary at the doctor's office. She thinks that she is better than you are... I used to go to this place over on 23rd, and when I walked in, you know, she made it like she knew better than you. So I just quit going... To me she is a snob.

A 21 year-old Fijian man working part-time described an incident with a secretary at his doctor's office:

Ok, something did happen at the doctor's office. I lost my insurance card over the last couple of years, and it has never been a problem up until, maybe it was, I think it was in December. I went to have blood work done at my doctor's office. So um, the lady at the desk said that she had called Medicare, and my number and my name were not matching up. Well I had never heard that before and she was making me feel like I was trying to scam Medicare. It really um, it really ticked me off because of her attitude. I felt prejudiced, and you know, I actually could not believe that she was actually being that way towards me in that situation. The thing about it was, that when she said she called Medicare, um, from the time that I had went in and sat down, I never even saw her on the phone.

One incident, involved a condescending attitude and derogatory remarks from a nurse. Here, a 44 year-old White woman on welfare explained:

The nurse used classifications such as 'our patients have a type of hepatitis, our homeless population. They are nasty, they are filthy, they are dirty, don't touch them, don't touch them, don't touch them. I use rubber gloves. I'm sorry, but true.'

With intimates. A quarter of participants (n=10; 25%) each shared a classist incident that took place with people they knew intimately, their family and friends (13.75% of all incidents shared). Eight of these incidents involved a condescending attitude and four of them involved derogatory remarks; eight were perpetrated by family members and two by friends. Two of the incidents were believed to be intersected with other forms of prejudice; one was believed to also involve sexism and one also involved ableism. Disproportionately more participants who were White and older reported these incidents.

Most of the incidents were allegedly perpetrated by family. Here, a 63 year-old African-American man with a disability reported experiencing a condescending attitude from his family:

Yeah, um, my family. They know that I can't work so... I tried to move in beside my sister. It's real hard, you know, I am treated like a second class citizen. They treat me like, more like a bother. They're not worried about you. It doesn't matter. You're not spending money in the house. You're not putting in, even though I help a little bit with my food stamps, but it's like, it doesn't matter. I'm not bringing anything in there and so I'm a second class citizen.

A 48 year-old African-American woman with a disability describes a similar experience:

Well, um, for the most part, well, I will say that my family has a tendency to kind of look at me maybe a little differently because they are doing very well in the work force. And sometimes maybe I will ask to borrow five dollars you know, I'm kinda like living from paycheck to paycheck, but you know, we all are people who have our ups and downs, our good days our bad days. But I certainly have been looked at as... I have really fallen on hard times. I really just don't have much to hold onto, and there's desperation. I think some people have a tendency to be like 'they're up on their level'. They have a tendency to put you down when they are not thinking. That's what I have a sense from with my family.

A divorced 40 year-old White man raising his autistic son discusses an incident in which his ex-wife was condescending toward him:

Yeah, my wife, well ex-wife now, but anyhow, she was like the director of an HR department in [a Kentucky State Department], I mean, she had the Master's and that kind of thing. Well anyhow, I was sober, had been sober, was in a twelve-step recovery program, and she just, just constantly attacked my character. You know about the money. I know, I do believe I can make six figures. I totally have that in my mind. But the fact that I wasn't doing anything, she just looked down on me. I was just not showing. She just treated me like a bum.

When I asked him if he thought any other form of prejudice may have been involved, he said that he believed sexism played a role.

Well, yeah, because I'm a man. And she was the one making the money.

Here, a 39-year old White woman receiving welfare shared an incident involving derogatory remarks made by her mother:

My husband, he doesn't work, he's looking for a job, and he has the worst luck ever in finding a job, and we always need money. I asked my mama for help. She just said, "he needs to get off his butt and work. He just wanna sit at home and do nothing." And she don't know what is going on. It's hard for him to find a job.

Other incidents involved both condescending attitudes and derogatory remarks from family. Here, a 50 year-old disabled White woman shares an incident with her sister:

I can go other places, but the one that is coming up, the one that is in my heart, the one that hurts the most, is with my own sister... I can remember, when I was able to work and do certain things, but now I'm bi-polar. So there was a time when status was not an issue. Anyway, she come up the other day and she said, she was helping me with doctor's bills and trying to get me to the dentist and get my blood pressure medicine. She told a doctor and nurse about it and wanted a doctor to help, and I didn't ask her. And so she offered to help, but then she said, 'I just want you to know, I'm not making money, I can't take care of you all the time.' I'm like, you know, 'I didn't ask you to.' I felt, it felt good at first, because she was concerned and she was helping me. And if it was her, I have no question, you know, if I've got it then she's got it. I don't care what it was, if she needs me I would be there. No questions asked. And so that hurt me. I know she loves me, and I love her. But the way that she looked at me. That's what hurts the most.

In this case, when I asked her whether she thought any other form of prejudice may have been involved, she felt that her disability played a role.

It's about me not having money but I know she don't like the bi-polar. Our mom had it and I think I remind her of that.

A condescending attitude and derogatory remarks from a sister was also described by this 35 year-old White male trying to find a job:

Ah, with my oldest sister. She came from the same status I did, and then she went to ECPC, got a computer education degree and now she thinks she is better than anybody else. She looks down on us and she puts everybody in the family down. You know, 'well if you would have gone to school...'

Two incidents reportedly involved friends. Here, a married 28 year-old African-American mother of two describes her experience of being a target of a condescending attitude from a close friend:

Like, I have a friend, and we are close, and she's in school, doing the things she wants to do. She's not married, she doesn't have any kids, so, to me of course she is doing good, and she's proud of where she is going. And it's like, maybe she thinks that I should have waited before getting married and having my kids and I could be where she is at and I shouldn't be suffering, like I'm suffering now, and struggling. Like she'll tell me, she is the type of person that will tell me what is on her mind. And if its something I don't wanna hear, or I feel that's too strong, you know, she just gives me the impression that maybe she is kinda disgusted by the way I am living.

A 57 year-old African-American man with a disability also reported derogatory remarks from a friend:

Last night, I was at a friend's house, and uh, I owed him some money. He came through as disrespectful because he took his jacket off and he called me outside. Now to me, if he weren't on medication, and younger than my son, you know what I'm saying? But I was like 'ok' and went outside... He came out and kind of called me out in front of everybody, and said 'I want my money. You better give me my money you owe me.' He said that in front of everybody. So disrespectful.

Department Stores. Fifteen percent of participants (n=6) reported seven classist incidents (one shared two incidents) that took place in a department store (8.75% of all incidents described). Three incidents involved being a target of a condescending attitude, two involved being followed/watched, two involved bad service, one involved being

looked/glared/stared at, and one involved derogatory remarks. Four incidents were perpetrated by salespeople, two by store managers, and one by another customer.

Incidents occurring in department stores were reported to be only classist in nature. They were reported disproportionately more by those who were ethnic minority, men, and older adults.

Most incidents were perpetrated by salespeople. A disabled 43 year-old African-American homeless man discussed his experience:

Seems like you ain't got a Visa card nobody wants to wait on you no more. You know what I am saying? Especially at the big stores, you know? So it is just like, there is a lot of prejudice there. 'People with cash ain't no good.' You know what I'm saying?

In this passage, a single 55 year-old African-American disabled man shared an incident in which a salesperson displayed a condescending attitude over not having enough money:

It happens about all the time, especially when it comes to money situations, 'cause you just don't have the money to give them... Like, for example, I had a woman at JC Penny that was irritated because I didn't have enough money... I was trying to buy my daughter a birthday gift, but I didn't have enough money, and the woman at the counter was looking down on me because I didn't have enough money. And that's embarrassing.

Here, a disabled 57 year-old African-American woman described an incident with a salesperson:

Well, it was like this... I was first in line, and this other lady was in line behind me, but they waited on her first before they did me... I looked just like a regular person and she had all these rings on and credit cards. I won't go back no more.

A single 55 year-old African-American disabled man also received bad service:

I wanted to get [my girlfriend] a Christmas gift. So I saved up a little tiny bit of money and wanted to get her this perfume. So the sales lady immediately took that I wanted the less expensive perfume, and I didn't want the lesser expensive perfume, I wanted the Angel perfume for her because it was absolutely wonderful, and plus you can refill the bottle whenever you go back in for a lower price. I mean it is just a really nice ladies perfume. And um, I kept trying to explain that,

'I don't want that one, this is what I want, I know exactly what I want' and it was like the lady prejudged, thinking that I didn't have the money to pay for what I wanted to get. And she kept trying to steer me towards the lower price.

Two participants described incidents involving store managers, specifically being followed/watched. A 63 year-old unemployed homeless African-American man explained:

Every time you go into a store, you know, especially like Sears and stuff, they think you're gonna steal something. And so you know, they are just watchin', the managers follow you.

A similar incident involving being followed/watched was described here by a 59 year-old disabled White man:

You are treated differently. Like the people who when you go shopping, you know, like at the mall, they immediately take a look at you, like they think you are going to stuff something up in your shirt. Its, I mean it seems like unless you are going in there dressed to the nines, people have a tendency to be a little more leery of you, you know, especially the people in charge, they will watch you.

A 47 year-old African-American mother of three described an incident in which another customer made a derogatory remark to her, displayed a condescending attitude, and stared at her and her daughter:

I took my daughter to this store, she wanted this jacket. And they had the jackets marked down to like five dollars. And she was asking for one and asking for one, and she was like 'oh mama look, oh mama look, they got them all the way marked down'. And the cashier was like, 'well um, I was wondering where you had been, because you were looking at them, and I knew when I marked them down you were supposed to come and get one, because that's when we see you is when we put out the good sales.' That was fine because she was nice, but the lady that was standing at the counter, she had a brown one, her kid had a brown one, and she said, 'I don't want this no more' and it was directed at me. She was looking down her nose at us. And she stared at me and my daughter the whole time.

Church. Five participants (12.5%) shared one classist incident each that occurred at their church (6.25% of all incidents reported), four allegedly perpetrated by fellow members of their congregation and one by a minister. Four of the incidents involved a condescending attitude and four involved derogatory remarks. One incident was believed

to also reflect ableism. Only women, and disproportionately more White and older adults, reported experiences with classism occurring at their church. No younger participants reported this type of incident.

In the following passage, a 65 year-old married African-American woman on social security shared an incident in which she experienced a condescending attitude from fellow members of her congregation at church:

Some of the women who go to my church... I need help but I don't put my business out like that... But like these two ladies that go to my church, one of them is very, very talented, she sings in the choir. So my husband hurt his back on the job, and we were not doing so well... And these women were just like kind of like... They were just looking down on me. I told my husband, he said 'you just feel like they are snobs.' I know women. I know those women and they are trying to be like, more, like they are better than me.

In this incident, a widowed 91 year-old White woman on social security discussed an incident involving being a target of both condescending attitudes and derogatory remarks from her church congregation:

When I filed chapter fourteen it came out in the newspaper. Everybody in the church, 'I read about you in the newspaper. Are you filing chapter fourteen?' And on, and on, 'ah, you got a lot of bills, you got a lot of money, those bills should be paid off.' So um, they even came to court on the day that I had to go in for my chapter fourteen. And they put it all over the church, and they were just talking about me, you know, making rude comments and such... And I was, of course, I was miserable. They all looked down on me. I stopped going to that church...

A 39 year-old widowed White woman also reported condescending attitudes and derogatory remarks from her church congregation:

Well, um, I went to this church with, me and my late husband went um, for about ten years. So I went to file for some help, and um, they asked me why I had not been going to church. I said that I had been going to another church with my sister since my husband passed. And they said, 'well can't they help you then?' I told them, I said 'the church is just now getting started.' I was just like, 'I am sure they are not able to help right now.' And they were like, you know, 'well you replaced us. Sorry.' They didn't want to help me. I thought, I guess they're too good for me now. I thought, are they being like this because of my husband passing away?

Because he was the member of the church and I wasn't. And I think that is what kind of upset me. Thinking well, if he had not have died they probably would have helped me...

Similarly, this 44 year-old widowed White woman described an incident involving a condescending attitude and derogatory remarks from her congregation at church:

When my husband died, I experienced it. When my husband died, the church would come into my house and make fun of my house. They would say things like I wasn't doing what I was supposed to be doing. And this is girl, I had been in church for twenty five years, I can't believe she... She made me feel less, like I was less than her. And that's what it made me feel like. I left that church and went to another church...

In this case, when I asked this woman if she thought that any other form of prejudice could have been involved in this incident, she felt that her disability played a role:

Well, as you can see, I'm disabled. When my husband died I didn't have much help with the house. I know it's old, but we used to be able to keep it up.

A disabled 55 year-old widowed African-American described an incident with her minister in which she overheard him making derogatory remarks about her:

I was going to church being a good citizen, and a member of the church and I, when my husband passed we paid to have everything taken care of. There were a lot of doctor's bills left and everything, and I was going on and on and on, and I then experienced one of the ministers talking about me because I was not able to pay my tab. He was saying, 'her husband was spending all that money she was getting, his money and hers, and she was paying tabs and doing everything, and she ain't able to do it now, so who is going to help her 'cause she done, she is like that now, now the tables done turned so look at her, she done.'

Restaurants. Four participants (10%) each described a classist incident in a restaurant (5% of all incidents shared). Two incidents involved bad service, one involved being looked/glared/stared at, one involved a condescending attitude, and one involved receiving no service. Two of the incidents were said to be perpetrated by a host/hostesses, one by other customers, and one by wait staff. Racism was reported to also have been involved in one incident. Three out of four of the incidents were reported by mid-aged

adults. No incidents occurring in restaurants were reported by older adults.

In this passage, a 45 year-old African American unemployed man described an incident of bad service he received from a hostess:

Uhh, I went to um, [a specific restaurant] down there, I was down there, and so I walked in, I looked real homeless, I had raggedy clothes on, and it took her about a few minutes, then she finally got me in... But, uh, the people that were dressed more normal, they got in first. And then they looked at me like I was carrying a bomb. They were in their seats, you know.

Here, a 47 year-old White woman receiving welfare assistance shared her experience of being turned away from service by a host:

Well, actually, I went to a restaurant... and because I wasn't dressed nice they wouldn't serve me. I went in to get a coke and the guy at the door told me there was a coke machine down the street. I am sure it was the way I was dressed. You know, I had to get my jacket and sit in the back of the truck to get my grandkids.

When I asked this participant whether he thought that any other form of prejudice might have been involved, he felt like his race played a role:

Definitely. Because I'm Black. It was a pretty nice restaurant.

In this passage, a 47 year-old African-American mother of two describes an incident in which she felt that other customers in the restaurant were looking/glaring/staring at her:

Well, this particular thing happened in December. We went out to eat and all of these people were there, and you know, we don't have anything, but we were clean. And, it was like, when they got ready to seat us, it was like, the people that were sitting there were just staring at us, like you know, 'did you all take a shower today?' And it was kind of embarrassing. They just stared.

A 33 year-old divorced White father of three describes bad service and a condescending attitude from restaurant wait staff:

You know, let's say for instance, if you go into a real nice restaurant, and you're dressed like this, somebody's not going to approach you... Just pick a restaurant, any restaurant. If you go in there looking all raggedy, the wait staff looks at you like 'what are you doing here?' They just look at you funny. And they can be a little smart with you, like just throwing your cup down and walking away. You

ask where the straws are and they go 'over there' and don't bring you one. They're not interested in giving you 'just the normal service'. It's just like that. Some people just think they're better than others. They ain't no better than we are.

School. Three participants (7.5%) each described a classist incident that took place either on their college campus or at their children's school (3.75% of all incidents shared). One participant reported being both excluded/avoided and looked/glared/stared at by other students at school, another experienced derogatory remarks from fellow students on campus, and the third entailed a condescending attitude from teachers. All of these incidents were described by women, two out of three were White, and two out of three were younger adults.

A 47 year-old African-American mother of three reported how her children are excluded/avoided and looked/glared/stared at by other students at school:

If my kids aren't dressed a certain way, and I look around and I see you know, certain ones looking at them. They look cute, they straight. They are always clean, they are always clean you know. We may not have all the expensive things, you know, but I am glad I am here for them. And I feel it. You know, like, 'why are they looking at my baby like that?'. But she is a pretty girl, so that's what I keep saying, you know, but I know it's not always that. But I try to make sure that I keep it to a point to where they don't feel it. When they do feel it then they come and tell me and we deal with it. I tell them don't let them get to you because everyone is entitled to the way they want to think be it wrong or be it right. But you know how it feels when you think they are talking about you or whatever... Because it doesn't matter how good they were ever, if you aren't fitting in, or feel like you aren't fitting in, that is a permanent mark, and it hurts.

A single 23 year-old White woman going to school full-time shared an experience of hearing derogatory remarks from a fellow student on campus:

It's just, I guess I am self conscious sometimes about clothes and stuff like that, because it is really hard when you're trying to pay for basic stuff. So it's... you know what I am saying? I feel like people are like, just the other day, a girl made a rude comment like, my friend and I were in the cafeteria, and she said something rude about my clothes and I was like 'oh'...

In this passage, a 25 year-old single White mother of two described experiencing a condescending attitude from teachers at her daughter's school:

Well, we live in a low income neighborhood and go to one of those schools, and it is a very prejudiced area... I know they kind of make it where, they try to help with the fact that there are low-income kids by not allowing kids to come in with very expensive clothes, and they only want certain brands and that kind of thing. So it should make everyone kind of equal, but if for some reason you didn't get the higher dollar clothes, they still notice, even though everyone has to wear the same thing. The teachers and stuff, would you know, cause a problem with it... 'Who could afford stuff from Hamilton place' and 'who could afford stuff from Wal-Mart'... Um, the teachers felt that the parents weren't good enough to make enough money for their kids to go out to the mall and buy all of these expensive clothes, you know. We were only able to afford stuff from Wal-Mart or K-Mart or wherever. They looked down on the parents because they just aren't good enough.

Landlords. Two participants (5%) reported three classist incidents (one shared two incidents) that took place while dealing with their landlords (3.75% of all incidents described). Both participants described differential treatment from their landlords, one sharing a second incident of harassment. All three incidents with landlords were believed to involve other forms of prejudice. One was believed to have also involved racism, one involved ableism, and one involved sexism. Both participants reporting incidents occurring with landlords were ethnic minority mid-aged women.

A 47 year-old African-American woman with a disability discussed her incident of differential treatment by her landlord:

Well, where I live at now, my landlord, a White lady, she acts like she got a problem with me. She will do things for the White chick, but not me.... But then again, it may be because I'm on Section 8, and that is for low income folks. So like, you have to call in an order when you have something wrong with your house. And I have called in, and this other lady has called in after me, cause I go down there and this other lady came in, and I had a work order already and she didn't, and she got hers got done before mine. It's supposed to be first come, first served. But she always comes first. She's White.

When I asked her to clarify what types of prejudice were involved, she quickly answered:

Racism and classism. That's what it is.

A 49 year-old widowed African-American woman described an incident with her landlord:

My landlord. When I moved here September of last year, I didn't have heat. When I get there, I didn't have no heat. I was having a hard time, I was on disability, and I told him, 'the apartment is cold and there are holes in the wall.' And I went into the bathroom and took a cold shower... Well he brought me an oil heater. It'll have to do, but it aggravates me, 'put the good heat on', this don't work. I am very, I am mad. Takin' my money. I seen the problem when I rented it. I seen the problem now for like three months and, um, I don't know why he picked me out. But I found out they all paying the same amount of rent upstairs but they got a whole apartment and normal heat. I am very upset with him. And the place is a dump. He says he will do a little at a time. But the other two apartments he put, they got brand new carpet, he painted it, made it look good. They have heat. He can put one of the heaters in my apartment, I said that to him. He said it won't work. He knows exactly what he's doing.

This participant believed that ableism also played a role in this incident:

Because I'm handicapped and can't do nothin' about it. I can't get around much.

In a second incident, this participant described being sexually harassed by her landlord:

He's been coming in, I know it's him. He didn't change my locks. My door is not safe no way. I told him about all of this. I told him I got to get someone to fix it for me, and he told me the property don't belong to me, just in a very smart way. So I told him, I told him that I have someone coming for my door for me, and I call him back and he said he was going to do it. So then my friend's not going to do it. And he said 'I thought so because the property belongs to me.' I could have gotten it done; I could take my wrench, if I wanted to, and get the whole thing done ok. He's just waiting to make a move on me. I know all of this here...

When I asked her if she thought that any other form of prejudice may have been involved in this incident, she quickly recognized the sexism:

Well of course. It ain't just 'cause I'm poor. It's being a female. He knows what he's doin'. I'm a female and I want to lock the door.

Workplace. Two participants (5%) shared one classist incident each that occurred at work (2.5% of all incidents reported). One incident entailed a condescending attitude

from employers and the other being looked/glared/stared at by coworkers. Both incidents were reported by younger White men.

A 35 year-old single man who was unemployed at the time of his interview reflected back on his experience of being a target of a condescending attitude from his prior employers:

My last job... The owners of the restaurant were from Canada and no matter what I done for these people they was always giving me bad input, not doing my job right, not doing this right. I was doing four peoples' jobs and getting paid for one. So I just tried to get them to explain to me what I was doing wrong, so I could show them I'm doing a hundred and twenty percent. But then, they wouldn't give me a reason, they just terminated me three days before Christmas. They were millionaires and they just looked at me like I was from a lower status than them.

The following incident of being looked/glared/stared at by coworkers is described by a 35 year-old married father going to school full-time:

Um, at my work... Basically we all make about the same, maybe they make about a dollar or two more than me. But then, the way people look at you, and they will look at you... Just because you dress, just because you dress differently doesn't mean you're low-income. It has a lot to do with the way you dress yourself.

On the street. Two participants (5%) each described one incident occurring on the street (2.5% of all incidents shared). One of the incidents entailed being a target of a condescending attitude, derogatory remarks, and being excluded/avoided by passerby's on the street, in which sexism was believed to also have been involved. The other incident entailed being harassed by a police officer on the street. Both participants were men, one younger and White, the other an African-American mid-aged adult.

In this passage, a 32 year-old homeless White man with a disability describes his experience:

People get hateful to you. I don't do anything.... I'm just walking, getting to know people, getting to know everybody and trying to meet new friends. I try to help anyone I see, I try to help anyone I can. Most of the time I just walk off...

I'm not doing anything, but they just see me, they don't like me, they look at me like dirt. This lady said I was a piece of trash to her daughter. I was just being friendly. I didn't ask for anything. Sometimes they cross the street so they don't have to talk. I just walk off.

When I asked him whether he thought any other form of prejudice might be involved when this happens, he felt that his gender may be playing a role:

Well, I am a man, you know, and I'm supposed to making the money...

In this incident, a 37 year-old African American single father working part-time to make ends meet explains an incident in which he was harassed by a police officer:

Well, I was standing in this place called Bowing Heights - it is in the projects. I guess you can say it is a low income area. And uh, I was walking late one night and I had a trench coat on and I had my earphones on. I was just coming home from work. There was a policeman um, looking for some narcotics. I guess some guy supposed to have dropped it, and he was looking for it with a flashlight. And I had my earphones on, and I had my radio up, and uh, I heard some, he shined his light at me, it was late at night, and he shined his light at me and told me to uh, stop. So I stopped and went to pull my earphones off, but before I could get to them, he rushed up to me and did some kind of move and got me on the ground and put a gun to my head... And uh, he said if I uh, made any noise or rough back at him, he would blow my GD brains out. And I didn't and he stuck his knee in my ribs. Then some people ran over and said 'hey hey, that's not him. You all got the wrong guy.' But he didn't do nothing. He didn't let go. Eventually he left. I got up, dusted myself off, and kept walkin'...

When I asked this participant if racism was involved in this incident, he replied:

No, we were both Black. He targeted me because I was in that area and it was dark. They think everyone in that neighborhood, Black, White, Yellow, Blue, you know, that everyone in that neighborhood is supposed to be like slingin' drugs, or doin' gang bangin. You know, just doin' the negative.

Seeking employment. Two participants (5%) each shared one classist incident that occurred while they were seeking employment (2.5% of all incidents reported); they received differential treatment by potential employers. Both participants were mid-aged adults, one a White woman and one an African-American man.

A single 38 year-old White mother of two described her incident with differential treatment while trying to find a job:

With trying to get a job. I went in and asked for an application. They told me they didn't think they was taking them, but would check. So I stood there for a few minutes, because I was like, I don't wanna come back, then this nice dressed lady walked in, and they gave her an application and she filled it out. I'm like, 'hey, I'm livin' in a tent here!' And they refused me.

A single 45 year-old unemployed African-American man shared his experience:

Yeah, uh, McDonalds on [some street]. I went there to apply for a job and the manager said 'sir, we are not taking applications at this time'. And basically she said it about the way I was dressed. You know, 'cause she was looking at me like, it was you know, she just looked like, 'oh, he aint lookin' for a job, he looks like a bum.' I could see it in her attitude toward me... She just seemed more uh, she was a corporate type person... its all about appearances. I just didn't look the part.

When I asked him whether he thought any other form of prejudice may have been involved in this incident, he suspected that his race may have played a role:

Well, it was clearly over how I was dressed. But I did wonder if being Black was a part of it too. They don't have many Blacks over there in that neighborhood and I don't know if they want us around.

Seeking housing. One participant (2.5%) described a classist incident that took place while seeking housing (1.25% of all incidents shared). The incident was reported by a 51 year-old African-American woman with a disability:

Well, you know, like these people won't even look at you. Like if you tell them that you are on a certain income, and like 'do you all help people based on their income or people who may get help with the housing authority?' Then they don't even want you in there. They won't rent to you at all... I have had, I have called, and 'well, I don't even know what that is. No we don't take that" and that kind of attitude. They are so rude the way they talk to you. But that's the way they keep you out. Especially when you're broke.

Bank. One participant (2.5%) shared a classist incident that occurred at the bank (1.25% of all classist incidents). It was reported by a 65 year-old White woman who was recently widowed:

Yes, I have a problem, I have a disability income, you know um, and the bank, they said they sent me a letter saying they are going to be charging me for going into a reserve that I have had for thirty years. But every time I went into that reserve, basically with my income, I am always tapping into that extra quite often... So they said that they sent me a letter saying that they were going to um, charge me ten dollars every time I did that, but they didn't send me a letter, at least I never got one. It always got put back at the first of the month. I put a hold on my checking account because I thought someone was stealing from me. I never got the letter they sent. So I went down to the bank to talk to them about it and then, they were so rude. They said they couldn't help me. They told me that the letter had been sent out almost a year ago and that 'I had problems and that I couldn't stay on top of my account.' They wouldn't give any of it back. They wouldn't work with me in any way. They took my whole \$650 and that was all I have to live on. By the time they ate that up all I got left for this month to live on is \$18.34. So I cried right there.

Research Question 2: Coping with Classism

To answer this research question, '*In what ways do these low-income people cope with everyday classism?*', I asked participants to describe how they had reacted to each incident they shared. If not addressed in their response, I followed up by asking them if they reacted in any direct or active way or indirect or passive way (as a probe for behavioral responding). Also, I made sure they addressed how the incident made them feel and whether it affected their emotions or how they felt about themselves (to probe for emotional responding).

Descriptive Analyses

Though I only anticipated and probed for two, four categories of responses were identified: behavioral, emotional, spiritual, and cognitive (see Table 12). All 80 incidents were responded to behaviorally, with two types of passive responses and five active coping strategies. Participants also responded to their incidents either emotionally, with one negative response and one positive coping strategy, or spiritually, a reactive coping strategy that seemed to prevent emotional engagement with the negative experience. Also

of interest, seven of ten participants who claimed that they did not experience classism, inadvertently provided insight into a proactive cognitive coping strategy they may be employing to help to prevent recognition of classist incidents.

Table 12. Category, Nature, and Description of Responses to Participants' Incidents*

Category	Nature	Description	Number	Percent
Behavioral	Passive	Do nothing	26	32.5
		Physical withdrawal	16	20
	Active	Directly calling out	15	18.75
		Lodging a complaint	8	10
		Educating perpetrators	5	6.25
		Using diplomacy	5	6.25
		Using body language	5	6.25
Emotional	Negative	Negative emotional response	56	70
	Positive	Neutral emotional response	12	15
Spiritual	Reactive	Turning to/giving troubles to God	12	15
Cognitive	Proactive	Psychological disidentifying	7	70

*All participants who reported incidents of classism responded behaviorally (calculations = 100%) and either emotionally or spiritually (with these two calculations combined to = 100%). Cognitive responding was demonstrated by 7 of the 10 participants who said they do not experience classism, which is 70% of this group of interviewees.

Behavioral responding. All 80 incidents were responded to behaviorally, with two types of passive responses and five active coping strategies. About half of all incidents were responded to in a passive way (n=42; 52.5%). In a third of incidents, participants passively reacted by *doing nothing* (n=26; 32.5%), and in one in five, they *physically withdrew* from the stigmatizing environment in which the classist incident occurred (n=16; 20%). The other half of incidents were responded to actively (n=38; 47.5%) with participants employing five coping strategies in which they either verbally or nonverbally confronted the perpetrator(s) with respect to the classist behavior(s). In nearly one in five incidents, they verbally confronted perpetrators by *directly calling out* the inappropriate behavior (n=15; 18.75%). One in ten incidents were responded to by *lodging a formal*

complaint with the perpetrator's superior (n=8; 10%). Participants also responded by *educating* perpetrators about their situation in five incidents (6.25%), *using diplomacy* to mediate the situation in five more (6.25%), and *using body language* to communicate their disapproval of the behavior in the remaining five (6.25%).

Over half of the 40 participants reporting experiences with classism behaviorally responded to both of their incidents in the same manner. That is, a third of participants responded to both of their incidents passively while a quarter actively coped with both. The remaining 40% of participants responded passively to one incident while actively coping with the other. This finding suggests that behavioral responses to classism may depend both on the individual and the situational context in which it is experienced.

Table 13. Percent Participants Disproportionately Responding Behaviorally

Behavioral Response	White	Minority	Male	Female	Young	Mid	Older
PASSIVE	57.1	42.9	38.1	61.9	19.1	47.6	33.3
Do Nothing	53.8	46.2	38.5	61.5	23.1	46.2	30.7
Physical Withdrawal	62.5	37.5	37.5	62.5	12.5	50	37.5
ACTIVE	47.4	52.6	31.6	68.4	21.1	58	21
Directly Calling Out	33.3	66.7	20	80	6.7	73.3	20
Lodging a Complaint	37.5	62.5	25	75	12.5	50	37.5
Educating perpetrators	80	20	20	80	40	40	20
Using Diplomacy	80	20	60	40	40	40	20
Using Body Language	40	60	60	40	40	40	20
Percent in Sample	52	48	40	60	18	48	34

Table 13 highlights racial/ethnic, gender, and age differences in behavioral responding (see pp. 36-37 'Cultural Analyses' for a description of demographic categories and the analysis procedures). Compared to the racial/ethnic composition of the sample, White participants reported disproportionately more passive responses to their incidents; they were particularly more likely to physically withdraw from their

environments than ethnic minority participants. White participants were also more likely to educate perpetrators about their situations and use diplomacy to mediate the situation among the active coping strategies. However, it was ethnic minority participants who were more likely to report using active coping strategies overall, and particularly by directly calling out perpetrators, lodging a formal complaint with a superior, and using body language to express their disapproval of the classist incident. There were no racial/ethnic differences in passively doing nothing in reaction to classist incidents.

In examining gender differences in behavioral responding, women reported disproportionately more active responses, being more likely to directly call out, lodge a complaint, and educate perpetrators. Men, however, also actively coped with their situations, specifically being more likely to use diplomacy and body language in response to their incidents. There were no gender differences in passive responding.

There were no age differences in overall passive responding, though younger participants were disproportionately more likely to do nothing in response to their incident. Mid-aged participants were more likely to use active coping strategies overall, particularly by directly calling out perpetrators, though younger participants were more likely to educate perpetrators about their situations and to use diplomacy and body language in response to their incidents. There were no age differences in responding among older respondents.

As seen in Table 14, passive responses were most likely in grocery stores, while with intimates, in a church, at restaurants, on the street, and in response to the incident while seeking housing, and the one at the bank. Active responses were most likely in social service agencies, doctors' offices, department stores, at school, and with landlords.

There was no difference in responding in the workplace and while seeking employment with one participant responding passively and one actively in these domains.

Table 14. Behavioral Responding by Environmental Domain

Environmental Domain	# Incidents	% Passive	% Active
Social Service Agencies	15	40	60
Grocery Stores	14	57.1	42.9
Doctors' Offices	11	36.4	63.6
With Intimates	10	60	40
Department Stores	7	42.9	57.1
Church	5	100	0
Restaurants	4	75	25
School	3	33.3	66.7
Landlords	3	0	100
Workplace	2	50	50
On the Street	2	100	0
Seeking Employment	2	50	50
Seeking Housing	1	100	0
Bank	1	100	0

Table 15. Behavioral Responding by Classist Behavior

Classist Behavior	# Incidents	% Passive	% Active
Condescending Attitude	38	55.3	44.7
Derogatory Remarks	31	58.1	41.9
Bad Service	12	41.7	58.3
Different Treatment	8	37.5	62.5
Looked/Glared/Stared At	8	75	25
Followed/Watched	4	75	25
Harassment	3	33.3	66.7
Excluded/Avoided	2	100	0
No Service	2	100	0

Table 15 indicates that most incidents involving a condescending attitude, derogatory remarks, being looked/glared/stared at, and followed/watched elicited a passive response from participant. Incidents that involved being excluded/avoided and receiving no service were responded to the same way. In two-thirds of the incidents

involving harassment, and over half involving differential treatment and bad service, participants actively confronted their perpetrators.

Table 16. Behavioral Responding to Alleged Perpetrators

Alleged Perpetrators	# Incidents	% Passive	% Active
Service Representatives	16	43.75	56.25
Doctors	8	37.5	62.5
Family	8	75	25
Cashiers	7	28.6	71.4
Customers	7	71.4	28.6
Managers	4	75	25
Salespeople	4	25	75
Congregation	4	100	0
Landlords	3	0	100
Secretaries	2	50	50
Host/hostesses	2	100	0
Friends	2	0	100
Students	2	50	50
Potential Employer	2	50	50
Nurse	1	0	100
Wait Staff	1	100	0
Minister	1	100	0
Teacher	1	0	100
Employers	1	0	100
Coworkers	1	100	0
Potential Landlord	1	100	0
Police Officer	1	100	0
Passerby's	1	100	0

Of particular interest, is how participants responded to the perpetrators of their classist incidents (see Table 16). In the majority of incidents perpetrated by family, customers, and store managers, participants responded to their perpetrators passively, as they did to incidents perpetrated by church congregation members, restaurant host/hostesses, and a wait staff, a minister, coworkers, a potential landlord, a police officer, and passerby's on the street. On the other hand, in most incidents perpetrated by doctors, cashiers, and salespeople, participants actively confronted their perpetrators, and they did

so in response to incidents with landlords, friends, and a nurse, a teacher, and employers. Participants responded equally actively and passively to incidents involving secretaries, students, and potential employers.

Table 17. Behavioral Responding by Nature of Incident

Nature of Incident	# Incidents	% Passive	% Active
Blatant/Obvious	64	50	50
Covert/Subtle	16	62.5	37.5

Table 17 presents data on passive and active responses as related to the nature of the incident. Incidents perceived to be more blatant or obvious were equally responded to in passive and active ways. Close to two-thirds of incidents considered more covert or subtle were responded to in a passive manner (n=10; 62.5%).

Emotional and spiritual responding. Participants also responded to their incidents either emotionally or spiritually (see Table 12). Participants emotionally responded to 70% of the incidents negatively, describing a variety of negative emotions (e.g., feeling hurt, low, discouraged, upset, depressed, rejected, disgusted, irritated, frustrated, agitated, mad, angry, resentful, humiliated, embarrassed, uncomfortable, stressed). Some focused on the negative way they were treated (e.g., like dirt, trash, a nobody, incompetent, inadequate, low-class, less than, not good enough, small, dirty, second class citizen). Others discussed how the treatment made them feel about themselves (e.g., ‘I felt bad about myself’, ‘It made me feel like I wasn’t good enough’, ‘I have no self-esteem to begin with and she just made it worse’, ‘It’s just the kind of thing that makes you feel like your life doesn’t matter’, ‘I felt very inadequate... I wanted my dignity back’).

Another 15% of incidents, however, were emotionally coped with in a positive

way. In these cases, participants responded with neutral emotions; they did not let the situation emotionally affect them, stating that they don't care about other people's opinion of them. Unexpectedly, the remaining 15% of incidents were coped with spiritually, a reactive coping strategy that seemed to prevent emotional engagement with the negative experience altogether. In these incidents, participants claimed that the situations did not affect them because they 'turned over' or 'gave their troubles to God' to deal with, which meant they didn't have to.

Sixty percent of the 40 participants who responded emotionally or spiritually responded to both of their incidents in the same way. Half of the participants responded to both of their incidents with negative emotional responses, 7.5% responded to both of their incidents spiritually, and one responded to both of their incidents with neutral emotions. The remaining 40% of participants responded in emotionally and spiritually different ways for each of their incidents. This finding suggests that emotional and spiritual responding to classism may also depend on both the individual and the situational context in which it is experienced.

Table 18. Percent Participants Disproportionately Responding Emotionally and Spiritually

Response	White	Minority	Male	Female	Young	Mid	Older
Negative Emotions	53.6	46.4	39.3	60.7	19.6	50	30.4
Neutral Emotions	58.3	41.7	58.3	41.7	41.7	33.3	25
Turned to God	33.3	66.7	8.3	91.7	0	75	25
Percent in Sample	52	48	40	60	18	48	34

Table 18 highlights racial/ethnic, gender, and age differences in emotional and spiritual responding (see pp. 36-37 'Cultural Analyses' for a description of demographic categories and the analysis procedures). White participants responded disproportionately

more than minority participants with neutral emotions while ethnic minority participants were more likely to ‘turn to God’ with their troubles. Men were more likely to respond with neutral emotions while woman were more likely to respond spiritually by ‘giving their troubles to God’. Younger participants more often reacted with neutral emotions reaction and mid-aged adults were more likely to cope spiritually.

Table 19. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Environmental Domain

Environmental Domain	# Incidents	% Negative	% Neutral	% Spiritual
Social Service Agencies	15	73.3	13.3	13.3
Grocery Stores	14	42.9	21.4	35.7
Doctors’ Offices	11	81.8	9.1	9.1
With Intimates	10	70	20	10
Department Stores	7	71.4	14.3	14.3
Church	5	60	20	20
Restaurants	4	100	0	0
School	3	66.7	0	33.3
Landlords	3	100	0	0
Workplace	2	50	50	0
On the Street	2	50	50	0
Seeking Employment	2	100	0	0
Seeking Housing	1	100	0	0
Bank	1	100	0	0

Table 19 shows that participants responded to the majority of incidents occurring across nearly all of the domains (social service agencies, doctors’ offices, with intimates, in department stores, at church, in restaurants, at school, with landlords, while seeking employment, and the incident while seeking housing and the one at the bank) with negative emotions. Incidents occurring in grocery stores were also more likely to be responded to with negative emotions, though a third occurring in this domain were coped with spiritually, and one in five incidents were reacted to with neutral emotions. A third of incidents occurring at school, and one in five occurring at church, were coped with

spiritually, while one in five incidents occurring with intimates and at church were coped with by having a neutral emotional reaction in response to potentially hurtful situations.

Table 20. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Classist Behavior

Classist Behavior	# Incidents	% Negative	% Neutral	% Spiritual
Condescending Attitude	38	65.8	15.8	18.4
Derogatory Remarks	31	71	9.7	19.3
Bad Service	12	83.3	0	16.7
Differential Treatment	8	87.5	12.5	0
Looked/Glared/Stared At	8	50	25	25
Followed/Watched	4	50	50	0
Harassment	3	100	0	0
Excluded/Avoided	2	0	50	50
No Service	2	100	0	0

Table 20 shows responses to different types of classist behaviors. Participants responded with negative emotions to the majority of incidents across classist behaviors (condescending attitude, derogatory remarks, bad service, and differential treatment, harassment, and no service). Incidents involving being followed/watched were equally likely to result in negative emotions and with a neutral emotional reaction. Half of incidents involving being looked/glared/stared at were also responded to with negative emotions; a quarter were coped with by having a neutral emotional response, and another quarter were coped with spiritually. Nearly one in five incidents involving condescending attitudes and derogatory remarks were coped with spiritually.

Emotional and spiritual responding to alleged perpetrators was also explored. As shown in Table 21, the majority of incidents across alleged perpetrators were responded to negatively (service representatives, doctors, family, customers, salespeople) with all incidents perpetrated by landlords, secretaries, host/hostesses, potential employers, a nurse, wait staff, minister, teacher, employers, potential landlord, and police officer

resulting in negative emotions. Incidents perpetrated by managers and friends were equally likely to be emotionally responded to negatively as they were with a neutral response; incidents perpetrated by students were as likely to be responded to negatively as to be coped with spiritually. Half of incidents perpetrated by church congregations resulted in negative emotions, though one resulted in a neutral emotional response, and one was coped with spiritually. Many incidents perpetrated by cashiers were responded to negatively, but they were more often coped with spiritually. In both incidents perpetrated by coworkers and passerby's on the street, participants reacted with a neutral emotional response.

Table 21. Emotional and Spiritual Responding to Alleged Perpetrators

Alleged Perpetrators	# Incidents	% Negative	% Neutral	% Spiritual
Service Representatives	16	75	12.5	12.5
Doctors	8	75	12.5	12.5
Family	8	75	12.5	12.5
Cashiers	7	42.9	0	57.1
Customers	7	57.1	14.3	28.6
Managers	4	50	50	0
Salespeople	4	75	25	0
Congregation	4	50	25	25
Landlords	3	100	0	0
Secretaries	2	100	0	0
Host/hostesses	2	100	0	0
Friends	2	50	50	0
Students	2	50	0	50
Potential Employer	2	100	0	0
Nurse	1	100	0	0
Wait Staff	1	100	0	0
Minister	1	100	0	0
Teacher	1	100	0	0
Employers	1	100	0	0
Coworkers	1	0	100	0
Potential Landlord	1	100	0	0
Police Officer	1	100	0	0
Passerby's	1	0	100	0

Emotional and spiritual responding by nature of incident was examined (see Table 22). The majority of covert/subtle and blatant/obvious incidents were responded to with negative emotions. However, a quarter of the incidents described as being more subtle were responded to spiritually.

Table 22. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Nature of Incident

Nature of Incident	# Incidents	% Negative	% Neutral	% Spiritual
Blatant/Obvious	64	71.9	15.6	12.5
Covert/Subtle	16	62.5	12.5	25

A final area of interest in relation to emotional and spiritual reactions is how participants behaviorally responded to classist incidents (see Table 23). Participants tended to react with neutral emotions way when they passively behaviorally responded. When they spiritually reacted by turning their troubles over to God, they more often actively responded to their classist incident.

Table 23. Emotional and Spiritual Responding by Behavioral Responding

Behavioral Response	# Incidents	% Negative	% Neutral	% Spiritual
Passive Responding	42	53.6	66.7	33.3
Active Responding	38	46.4	33.3	66.7

Cognitive responding. Unexpectedly, 7 of the ten participants who claimed that they did not experience classism, inadvertently provided insight into a possible proactive cognitive coping strategy they might be employing to help prevent recognition of class prejudice (see Table 12). When I asked these participants if they could share an incident they experienced recently in which they felt they were disrespected or insulted due to being low-income, these participants said they could not, and disidentified with their

class status; instead they each described what they felt was their personal identity (e.g., ‘a modest person’, ‘a person from a good school’, ‘a person with a disability’, ‘a neighbor, ‘a son of preacher’, ‘a farmer’, ‘a person with a disability’). Both men and women disidentified proportionately to their representation in the sample, though disproportionately more White and older participants did so (see Table 24).

Table 24. Percent Participants Disproportionately Reporting Cognitive Responding

Cognitive Response	White	Minority	Male	Female	Young	Mid	Older
Proactive Disidentify	57.1	42.9	42.9	57.1	14.3	28.6	57.1
Percent in Sample	52	48	40	60	18	48	34

Qualitative Narratives

Participants reported being greatly affected by their classist experiences and described behavioral, emotional, and spiritual responses to the incidents. A cognitive response was also identified by those who said they did not experience classism. The following section presents a sample of how participants responded to and coped with their situations.

Behavioral responses. Participants responded to their incidents with passive and active behaviors. Participants responded passively by doing nothing or physically withdrawing from the environment in which the incident occurred.

Passive responding. Participants responded to a third of reported incidents by doing nothing, by passively accepted the classist treatment. That this was sometimes seen as a way of not jeopardizing the services they needed, is demonstrated in the following passages:

Nothing... They gonna come into that situation and they gonna be right all the time. So there aint nothin’ to do about it. I don’t matter.

I didn't do anything. I did nothing. I just kept my mouth shut.

I just kind of ignored it and went about my business.

No. No. I am a very quiet type of person, a real quiet shy type of person. So I kept my thought to myself. I knew to just shy away from those folks and sit down. I just sat there and waited.

I was upset, but I didn't want to take any action on it because I do understand that that is her job and that is how she feeds her family, her livelihood.

I just suck it up and just let them say what they want to say because they can tear up your form... I just had to suck it up because she was the one with authority. And I run into that type of thing quite often.

No, I didn't do anything. I just tried not to pay any attention to it.

No, no. I don't like to make scenes. Like I said, I just ignored it.

I kept my mouth shut. I didn't want to say anything that would affect getting the help that we needed... We were at her mercy you know...

I just let it go. I am not a confrontational person. I am just a little woman in this world, who is a little woman in this world. So I just let it go.

No, I don't do anything, because I expect it. When I see that I am walking up to the aisle, I pretty much know. I can pretty much judge what's going to happen...

No. I'm the type of person that just keeps her mouth shut... I go home and say, well, next time I'll remember who they were, and I won't bother asking or saying anything to that person.

Participants responded to one of five incidents by physically withdrawing from the stigmatizing environment, sometimes without the goods or services they needed, as seen in these passages:

I just got what I needed, well, mostly what I needed, and then paid and left.

I just usually sit there until I can't wait anymore, because I have other stuff to do, and then I just get up and leave. I don't even get to see the doctor sometimes.

If it's real bad, I just leave. And I don't go back there.

No, I didn't say anything. I just walked out.

I just kind of walked off...

I, you know, I am the type of person... rather than argue with her and fuss with her, I just left everything in the basket and left. I didn't buy anything.

I just cried and walked away.

I just tried to keep my cool, and left, and just stopped going there anymore.

It's okay. I just left. And I'm not going back.

I just held my eyes shut and walked off.

I just try to get out of the way. It's hard with your family, but when that happens, I just leave.

I just left. And I won't go back [to that doctor] again.

I just walked away because I know that it won't do no good, 'cause she is like a brick wall. No matter what you say to her it's just gonna bounce right back at you.

Active responding. Half of incidents were responded to by actively confronting perpetrators by either directly calling them out, lodging a formal complaint, educating them about their situations, using diplomacy to mediate the situation, or using body language to express their disapproval of the classist behavior(s).

In response to 15 incidents, participants directly called attention to the classist behavior, as demonstrated in these passages:

Well sometimes I say something to the person at the desk. I say 'what's going on here, I've been waiting a long time, I have an appointment, and all these other people are going in front of me.'

I stood my ground. I was not just assertive, but a little bit aggressive, and also insulting as well. He kind of backed down and apologized. He did apologize.

No, I would ask, and I would tell them, 'why won't you help me?'

No, I just let her know how shallow she was. Sometimes she was cool about it and sometimes she wasn't. You just have to call it out.

I just said, 'Baby, hon, this is your job. I don't have anything to do with that.'

I finally just said, 'Look, I notice that everybody is getting attention here but me. What's up?'

Well I'm not one to let people run over me. I stand up for myself. If they say anything, I just confront it head-on.

I just said 'Wow, she goes before me?' They just sat there. So I just asked, 'Why did she get hers before me? I was here first, and I put my order in first.'

I went up and asked her how she could let her fill out an application after telling me that they weren't taking any more.

In response to 10% of incidents, participants actively confronted the classist behaviors by lodging a formal complaint:

I went and got the manager. I said, 'I spend my money in your store and this is how I'm gonna be treated? I want my money back. If I'm gonna spend my money here, I'm gonna be treated fair.' They reimbursed me my money and I went to another store.

Well I didn't say anything to her personally, but I have to the guy that interviews me. I said, 'Now this is not right. She is undermining me everyday. What are you gonna do about it?' He said he would take care of it.

Yes, I called Nashville. And I've done that more than once. I let them know... I spoke to the supervisor... I told them about the situation... I spoke to the supervisor and he apologized and then they reinstated me. So yes, I report it.

Well, I went up to the manager and told him. But he didn't do anything. I went back in there three weeks later and it was the same thing...

Well I called [the mayor] who is an old friend of mine, and I let him know the situation, you know. I felt that was totally uncalled for. And I let him know.

I called back, this happened about two years ago, and I called back after it happened, and I told a manager all about what had happened to me and I never saw her there again.

In response to five incidents, participants tried to educate perpetrators about their situations:

Well, I just told her that I was sorry, that I didn't mean to, you know, impose on her in anyway. But this is just how my situation is. It's just the way it is, and she has to understand that.

I try, I try to defend myself and defend my family. I do try and defend myself... Because she doesn't understand. I mean, the way I see it, people don't understand what you are going through until they actually get in that situation. It's pretty hard to judge someone, you know, until you experience it yourself...

I said, 'Whoa, wait a minute. You don't know me. You don't know me and you don't know where I've been. You don't know what I've been through. You don't know what I have had to do to survive.'

I push forward and try to educate them... Some people do things a little bit differently. I just try to explain the way it really is.

In five incidents participants used diplomacy to mediate the situation, as demonstrated in the following passages:

Well, I was kind of cool and collected. I told her, I tried calmly to get my point across to her. I said, 'Ma'am, you don't understand, that is my check. I will lose the roof over my head'. I said, 'If I don't have my check, I will lose the roof over my head. Do you understand?'

I didn't show my butt or anything. I operated with diplomacy. That's how you have to do it. I responded like 'No, no, I am sure those are very nice, but this is what I want.'

I tried to be as nice about it as I possibly could and not say anything out of the way that could incriminate me. But at the same time, I tried to make him realize that even if they had to do something different, the baby still needed to have the same kind of care as if we had the extra money to pay for everything... It's just the way I did it. I have a way of being really tactful.

I just tried to get them to explain to me what I was doing wrong, and tell them I'm trying one hundred and twenty percent. I just talked to them like a human being.

In response to another five incidents, participants used body language to confront their perpetrators (e.g., laughing, smiling, standing tall, and making direct eye contact):

Yeah! I just turned around and looked at him like, 'dude quit following me'! And he just looked at me funny and sort of walked off...

I just looked at him and smiled. Like 'see me, I'm smiling at you, I'm responding to you. You aint getting' away with that.'

I just kind of busted out laughing. I wanted her to know that I had heard her...

I just kind of stood tall, crossed my arms, and just looked at her. She got the point. Then I just smiled at her for a moment and then went on. You know what I mean?

Emotional responses. Participants responded to their incidents emotionally, with negative emotional responses or by coping with a neutral emotional reaction in response to the negative incident.

Negative emotions. Participants responded to 70% of incidents with a variety of negative emotions. They also discussed their negative treatment and how it made them feel about themselves, as seen in the following passages:

It was real embarrassing. And frustrating too. And it makes me angry.

Yeah it does, yeah, I mean it does affect me. I feel bad because you know, the situation I am in... And then you have to deal with this... Its really, really stressful, very stressful.

It's just really frustrating.

Sometimes I will feel discouraged. All discouraged. It really gets to me sometimes.

I cried. I cried. Sometimes I couldn't help it. I did cry in front of them. And also became very angry. And I hated them. I have gotten really mad.

I was just so embarrassed. [I felt] like a piece of dirt lying on the ground.

Angry, sad, I felt bad about myself (upset)...

I felt bad that they... I felt bad. I just felt bad...

Like I am a nobody, like he can do what he wanna do. That agitates me real bad.

It stuck in my mind, and it really did something to me. It gave me a set back because I feel that I was really treated bad.

It made me feel less, like I wasn't doing what I was supposed to be doing. And that's exactly what it made me feel like.

It made me feel incompetent, made me feel like I wasn't good enough, it made me feel like I was low class trash. That was the way she felt about me. That is what it made me feel like about myself.

It made me feel like I was less, you know, less American... something like that...

I just felt uncomfortable about the whole situation. It is hard enough to have to ask for help, and then on top of it, they go treating you differently.

I was just upset. And frustrated... He definitely let me flounder for about a minute [looking for more money to pay for groceries]. And that was pretty embarrassing.

I felt horrible. I have no self-esteem to begin with and she just made it worse.

It's just humiliating...

Small, very small, real small...

Well it just made me feel like, feel like, I don't know how to say it... That the people who have more money really don't care about the people who are lower class who can't do like they can.

It makes the kids look down on themselves because they don't feel like they are good enough.

It hurts my feelings...

Like I was dirt. That I didn't matter.

It's just the kind of thing that makes you feel like your life doesn't matter... If you don't have the big bucks, then what good are you. You get the attitude that you don't matter.

They want to do everything to make you feel like dirt. They make you feel like dirt, like you don't matter. And it hurts...

It made me feel very rejected, almost dirty... It also made me feel very resentful of the lady because of the way she treated us. I mean, she didn't even have two words to say to me. It was like I was invisible. Like she didn't even acknowledge that I was there. Like I was nothing.

I felt like she was treating me like a second class citizen, and I was just plain mad!

I was mad, I was mad, I was maa-aad!

Like I was low. Low, low, low. It felt like, 'I was here first. Why does she get to go before me?' It hurt my feelings, I know that!

Very low, very low... Like I need to get a better job. They make me think, 'Well, you don't need it, you need to go get a better job.'

It made me kind of upset. It made me feel like she didn't like me or something.

I got embarrassed. And my self-esteem is naturally low so...

Horrible. Not good... Made me feel bad. And I don't know, but people think that they are better than you are because you are on a low income.

Like she thought she was better than me. Better than my daughter. And now me, I could take it, but when they do that to my girl, oooohhhhh!!!!

My little girl, she used to cry, she was so depressed. She even went through a thing where she was like, 'I can't wear that this week because I wore it last week'... Because it doesn't matter how good you are, if you aren't fitting in, or feel like you aren't fitting in, that is a permanent mark, and it hurts.

I felt very inadequate... I wanted my dignity back. And yeah, it made me feel very terrible.

It's almost like you become a second class citizen so to speak.

It hurts my feelings because she is supposed to be the older sibling, she is supposed to look out for her baby brother.

It kind of upset me because the way I look at it is, they put their pants on like everybody else.

I was upset! I was surprised! Why would they treat me this way?

Neutral emotions. Fifteen percent of incidents were coped with in a positive way. In these cases, participants responded with neutral emotions; they said they did not let the situation emotionally affect them because they don't care what other people think of them. The following passages illustrate such responses:

Um, me, I don't care... I don't care what anybody thinks of me. I try to just deal with it and move on.

I just don't even let it bother me... No, I got more things to worry about than what other people think or got to say.

It doesn't matter, because I know... I just refuse to let it, you know, there's just no reason to cry about it.

No I'm better than that. Let them have their ways. I still walk up proud you know.

Honestly, no, because I didn't, I didn't bring myself to that position. I do have a lot of talent. And I've been sober for two years. So I don't let that stuff bother me.

It didn't affect how I feel about myself, I mean, I am a pretty confident person. What I have seen in life makes me who I am. I know who I am... I know that what I have is what I was meant to have and the things I don't have was meant for me not to have. So just because they do that doesn't make you less of a person.

No, no, I just ignore it all the time. I just let it go... I feel like my home is as good as anybody else's. No, no. That is one thing that doesn't bother me.

No. It's didn't make me feel anyway. 'Cause I know how I am, who I am.

I am not going to let that drag me down. I am not going to let someone else's views affect me anymore.

I could really put them in their place if I chose to, but I'm tired. I'm over that stuff. I just try to find humor in life.

Spiritual response. To the remaining 15% of incidents, participants reactively coped spiritually. Some participants claimed that the situations did not affect them because they 'turned over' or 'gave their troubles to God' so they didn't have to deal with them. The following passages illustrate participants' spiritual coping:

No, not really. I just prayed about it. I said God please forgive them for what they said. That's all I done.

No. There is only one on the whole earth that you have to be approved by and that is God. So if I can satisfy God then I am going to be happy.

It really don't bother me, you know. It used to bother me, but you know, as you get closer to the Lord, you know, things like that don't bother me anymore.

No, I feel good about myself because I know I got the Lord with me. As long as I have the Lord with me, Jesus Christ, I know I have done well.

I believe, I am a believer, and I consider myself to be Christian. And I know the difference between right and wrong... You know, Jesus Christ was a Christian, and if they are really Christians they would get that too. Anyway, that's where I stand. I just try not to put myself out like that.

When you turn your problems over to the Lord and leave it there, and mean it, then he will fix everything for you.

I thought it over, I thought it through, and I talked to almighty God. I looked at it like this – the Lord will help me make sense out of it. What goes around comes around, what goes up must come down. The Lord will make sense of it. These things gonna happen.

Well, that may have been true back in the day, but since I turned my life to Lord, no. My life has been really good. God has really blessed me. I turned my life to the Lord and it gets better and better every day. So, no, it doesn't bother me...

For my personal belief, I just think 'things will get better.' I just pray about it and don't let it get to me.

You know, God, he makes his rounds and he tries to get to everybody. He's like Santa Claus. But you know, he moves through us. I try to see the positive things and the human side of things. So I don't let it get to me.

Cognitive response. Seven of ten participants who claimed that they did not experience classism proactively coped by disidentifying with their class status. As seen in the following passages, these participants did not identify as low-income, though they clearly were; they identified as something else:

I never have. Well, my mother always had a good income. And so, just because I have a disability and can't work... And we have always been real modest people. All my life my father has worked and my mother has worked, so...

Not really... They aren't treating me different where I go... But I didn't go to the normal schools that the children around here go to like Howard and Brainerd [low-income schools] and all that...

No, I don't have no bad experiences. I have made money in my life and we all fall on that line where we are in an iffy situation. It's just been since the disability.

No, I have never experienced it. I have always felt that was personal. I don't share that with people outside my home. We have done alright. We are just one of the neighbors.

No, I really don't have that problem. My son is the preacher you know.

No... No... We had a farm out in [a certain county] and we had 284 acres. My family's always been farmers. So no.

No, I haven't experienced any classism. Everyone knows I'm just trying to raise my grandchildren.

Discussion

Experiencing Classism

Semi-structured interviews with low-income clients of the Chattanooga Area Food Bank yielded rich narratives about their experiences with classism and the ways in which they have responded to the classist incidents. Forty participants claimed to have experienced classism and shared a wealth of information about the incidents. They reported routinely encountering class prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination in social interactions and these classist experiences were described as an integral part of their everyday lives. The expressions of classism were common, were both overt and subtle, emanated from both strangers and intimates, arose in both short and long interactions, and participants were prejudicially targeted both directly and indirectly. In short, participants described experiencing everyday classism.

Incidents were reported in 14 different environmental domains, entailed nine distinct types of classist behaviors, and involved 23 categories of alleged perpetrators. The majority of incidents were believed to be communicated in a blatant fashion (though some were felt to be more subtle) and most participants reported experiencing classist events with high frequency ('daily' or 'often'). Most incidents were believed to be strictly classist in nature (though some were reported to have also involved racism, some sexism, and some ableism). Other forms of prejudice may have played a larger role than participants believed since differences by race, gender, and age were found.

Environmental domains. The incidents shared were described as occurring in 14 different environmental domains: social service agencies, grocery stores, doctors' offices, while with intimates, in department stores, at church, in restaurants, at school, while with

landlords, at the workplace, on the street, while seeking employment, while seeking housing, and at the bank. Two-thirds of these incidents were reported to have occurred in social service agencies, grocery stores, doctors' offices, and while with intimates. Among these, it is especially startling that the highest number of classist incidents reported occurred in social service agencies, as reported by a third of participants. These agencies are designed specifically to assist low-income people in need. These data suggest that such agencies are high priority areas for attention, or that incidents in these contexts have higher salience for participants and thus were recalled more easily, or that participants spent more of their time in these contexts. This is an important area for further investigation.

More research is needed to further explore experiences with classism in particular environmental domains. For example, research on low-income people's experiences in doctors' offices seems especially important as the outcome of interactions, particularly with doctors, will affect health outcomes. Classism at work (Bullock, 1994) should be studied because, in general, these are places of daily interaction. Research on experiencing classism at church would provide another unique perspective.

Classist behaviors. Nine distinct types of classist behaviors were identified: condescending attitude, derogatory remarks, bad service, differential treatment, looked/glared/stared at, followed/watched, harassment, excluded/avoided, and no service. There are reports of these types of behaviors in the everyday classism literature (Beagan, 2005; Bullock, 1995; Ouellette, 1993; Ritz & Hyers, 2004; Ryan & Sackray, 1992; Seccombe et al., 1998). However, more research is needed on low-income people's experiences with bad service, no service, and negative treatment by landlords and

potential employers.

All of the classist behaviors reported by participants have also been documented in the everyday racism literature, particularly as experienced by African-Americans (Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Sue, Capodilupupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, et al., 2007; Swim et al., 1998). Examining whether and to what extent experiences may be intersected, that is, due to being both low-income and African-American, would also provide a unique insight into compounded experiences with prejudice.

Alleged perpetrators. Perpetrators of classist behaviors were identified as: service representatives, doctors, family members, cashiers, customers, managers, salespeople, congregations, landlords, secretaries, host/hostesses, friends, students, potential employers, and a nurse, wait staff, minister, teacher, employer, coworker, potential landlord, police officer, and passerby's on the street. Nearly two-thirds of incidents were perpetrated by service representatives, doctors, family, cashiers, customers, and managers, which corresponds to the environmental domains in which they occurred (social service agencies, grocery stores, doctors' offices, and while with intimates). It is surprising that family members were the third most frequently mentioned perpetrators of classism. Although the everyday prejudice literature suggests that intimates perpetrate prejudice, I did not expect family to rank so high on the list. Contrary to reports by African-Americans that they tend to turn to family as sources of social support in response to racism (Feagin & Sikes, 1994), many of these participants' families were reported to be sources of prejudice and discrimination and non-support.

Nature of incident. In the majority of incidents described, classism was perceived to be communicated in a blatant or obvious manner (e.g., bad service, condescending

attitude, derogatory remarks, differential treatment, being followed/watched, harassed, and turned away from service), with only one in five believed to be covert or subtle (e.g., looked/glared/stared at). The majority of everyday classism incidents reported by the participants were mostly overt. This could be because overt incidents may be more salient and more easily recalled. It could be because these participants live in the south where prejudice and discrimination may be more blatantly expressed (e.g., more old-fashioned prejudice). It also could be that classism is a more overtly expressed type of prejudice than racism or sexism, because it is more acceptable, or at least less challenged and less often discussed.

Frequency of classism. A total of 80 incidents were reported, two from each participant who shared experiences with classism. Perhaps they could have reported more incidents if asked to do so. A majority of participants indicated that they experience class prejudice with high frequency (either ‘daily’ or ‘often’). Only seven claimed to experience classism ‘every once in a while’ and three ‘rarely’. This finding seems the clearest indicator that participants are indeed experiencing everyday classism, supporting the notion that low-income people’s encounters with prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination in their social interactions are routine, and an integral part of their everyday lives.

Intersections with other forms of prejudice. Most respondents reported incidents to be strictly classist in nature, with only four perceived as also involving racism, four sexism, and four ableism. Noteworthy among these were three men who felt their incidents also involved sexism (only one woman felt her gender played a role). The men believed they were negatively evaluated because they were low-income and did not fit

their stereotypical gender roles as ‘providers’, ‘breadwinners’, ‘workers’, ‘successful’. Being a target of sexist stereotypes is reported in the everyday sexism literature, but is documented with women (Swim et al., 1998), not men. These findings suggest that future research should explore the particular experiences of low-income men in more depth.

Cultural differences in experiences. Though most incidents were believed to be strictly classist in nature, it is possible that other forms of prejudice may have played a larger role than participants believed. For example, White participants reported disproportionately more experiences with condescending attitudes and incidents occurring in social service agencies, doctors’ offices, while with intimates, at church, at school, and at work. On the other hand, African-American participants reported disproportionately more experiences of receiving bad service, being looked/glared/stared at, being followed/watched, and being harassed, as well as incidents occurring in grocery and department stores and with landlords.

Men described disproportionately more incidents involving harassment, and all participants who were followed/watched were men. They also reported disproportionately more incidents in department stores, restaurants, at work, and on the street. Women reported disproportionately more experiences of being a target of derogatory remarks, bad service, differential treatment, being looked/glared/stared at, and being turned away from service. They also reported disproportionately more incidents occurring in social service agencies and doctors’ offices, and all of the experiences occurring in church, at school, and with landlord were reported by women.

Age also played a role, with younger participants describing disproportionately more experiences with condescending attitudes and being followed/watched, as well as

incidents occurring in grocery stores, doctors' offices, and at school. Both incidents occurring at work were reported by younger participants. Mid-aged participants, on the other hand, reported disproportionately more experiences with bad service, differential treatment, being looked/glared/stared at, and harassment, as well as incidents occurring in social service agencies and restaurants. All incidents occurring with landlords and while trying to find a job were described by mid-aged adults. Older respondents described disproportionately more incidents occurring while with intimates, in department stores, and at church.

It is important to consider the intersection of class status with other categories. All four incidents of being followed/watched in both grocery and department stores were reported by men, three of them African-American. All three incidents occurring while with landlords were reported by mid-aged minority women. Two out of three incidents of harassment were reported by mid-aged minority men. Both incidents occurring at the workplace were reported by young White men. Future research should explore these intersected experiences.

The ethnic and age differences in classist experiences found in this study provide a starting point for further examination. It could be that people experience different types of incidents in different environments that are related to ethnicity, gender, and/or age. Conducting a daily diary study would be a step in the right direction in understanding the typicality of classist events, the relationship with characteristics of alleged perpetrators, the situational context in which such events occur, and participant characteristics. Also, though I attempted to select a diverse sample in order to capture a variety of experiences, there is no way of knowing if my sample's experiences are truly representative of the

cultural groups to which they belong. Future research should be conducted with larger randomly selected samples where statistical differences may be assessed so that results are generalizable.

Coping With Classism

In addition to describing their experiences with classism, participants described their responses. In general, participants were greatly negatively affected by their classist experiences and demonstrated few active coping skills. Half responded passively to their perpetrators and experienced a variety of negative emotions and feelings in response to their incidents. But some participants employed positive coping strategies in which they actively confronted their perpetrators, had a neutral emotional response to the negative incident, turned their troubles over to God to deal with, or disidentified as low-income.

Miller and Kaiser (2001) suggested that stigmatized individuals “have a vast array of responses to stressors resulting from devalued social status, including emotional, cognitive, biological, and behavioral responses” (p. 73). Participants in the present study demonstrated behavioral, emotional, spiritual, and cognitive responses to classist incidents.

Behavioral responses. Crocker et al. (1998) argued that “rather than passively accepting them, the stigmatized actively attempt to cope with the predicaments their stigma creates” (p. 521). In this study, half of respondents responded passively (doing nothing or physical withdrawal), with the other half actively coping with their situations by confronting perpetrators (directly calling them out, lodging a complaint, educating them about their situations, using diplomacy, and using body language). That participants responded equally passively and actively to their classist incidents should be further

explored. A comparison of active responses to racism, sexism, and classism would be of interest. Perhaps targets of racism and sexism are more likely to respond actively, compared to targets of classism, as these former forms of prejudice are more widely understood and addressed and are considered by many to be no longer acceptable in mainstream U.S. values.

A little over half of the participants in this study behaviorally responded to both of their reported incidents in the same manner, while the rest responded passively to one incident while actively coping with the other. This suggests that behavioral responses to classism may depend both on the individual and the situational context in which the incident is experienced. Swim et al. (1998) agree that situational factors play a role in how targets of prejudice behaviorally respond. Support for situational differences in responding can be seen in this research through the difference in passive and active responses across environmental domain, type of classist behavior, alleged perpetrators, and nature of the incident.

Situational differences in behavioral responding. Participants tended to passively respond to incidents occurring in restaurants, while with intimates, in grocery stores, at church, and on the street. Incidents involving being looked/glared/stared at, followed/watched, derogatory remarks, condescending attitudes, and being excluded/avoided tended to be responded to the same way. In the majority of incidents perpetrated by family, store managers, customers, church congregations, and host/hostesses, participants more often reacted passively. Most incidents considered more covert or subtle were responded to in a passive manner. However, half of incidents perceived to have been communicated in a blatant or obvious manner were also responded to passively.

Participants tended to actively confront perpetrators when the incident occurred at school, doctors' offices, social service agencies, department stores, and while with landlords. Incidents involving harassment, differential treatment, and bad service more often elicited an active response. Participants tended to actively confront salespeople, cashiers, service representatives, doctors, landlords, and friends. Half of incidents perceived to be communicated in a blatant or obvious manner were responded to actively.

A further exploration of situational influences on behavioral responding to classism would be useful. The data here simply describe the differences in participants responding based on the environmental context they were in, the classist behavior they experienced, the perpetrator of the behavior, and the nature of the incident. What explains the differential responses to classism? For example, it could be that the formality (e.g., while in a restaurant) or casualness (e.g., while with friends) of environmental domains may mediate low-income people's responses to classist incidents as they attempt to adhere to society's rules of behavior in these settings. Or, it is possible that responses to certain types of classist behaviors may be mediated by whether they were perpetrated in a high stress (e.g., worried about the outcome of a doctor visit) or low stress (e.g., waiting for an annual check-up) situation. Further, low-income people may respond differently to perpetrators based on their social status in the particular situation (e.g., responding to another customer in a grocery store line versus responding to their doctor). Or, they may respond differently when overt behaviors are perceived as threatening (e.g., when being harassed) versus when they are perceived as rude (e.g., experiencing a derogatory remark). Low-income people may respond differently in a high-need context (e.g., social service agencies, doctors offices, grocery stores) versus when in a low-need context (e.g.,

in church or with family or friends) as not to jeopardize getting the goods and services for which they came.

Cultural differences in behavioral responding. Participants responded to their situations differently across race/ethnicity, gender, and age. White participants reported disproportionately more passive responses to their incidents; they were particularly more likely to physically withdraw from their environments in response to classist incidents. They also reported disproportionately educating perpetrators about their situations and using diplomacy to mediate the situation. It was African-American participants, however, who reported disproportionately more use of active coping strategies overall; they were particularly more likely to directly call out perpetrators, lodge a formal complaint, and use body language to express their disapproval.

Women reported disproportionately more active responses, being more likely to directly call out, lodge a complaint, and educate perpetrators in response to their classist incidents. Men reported disproportionately more use of diplomacy and body language.

Younger participants were disproportionately more likely to do nothing in response to a classist incident. Mid-aged participants were more likely to use active coping strategies overall, particularly by directly calling out their perpetrators, while younger participants were more likely to educate perpetrators about their situations and to use diplomacy and body language in response to their incidents.

Future research should investigate such ethnic, gender, and age differences in behavioral responding to classist events. Dominant responding patterns by particular groups may reflect group experiences. For example, minorities of color, with histories of experiencing and responding to racism, may be more likely to actively confront incidents

of prejudice and discrimination. Perhaps personality factors are involved, such as characteristics of the target of prejudice (e.g., assertive versus compliant personalities). Or characteristics of the perpetrator play a role (e.g., their race, gender, or age).

Also of interest are four trends in responding that seemed to cut across ethnicity, gender, and age. Mid-aged ethnic minority women reported disproportionately more active confrontation overall, especially directly calling out their perpetrators. Conversely, younger White women reported disproportionately more incidents in which they educated perpetrators about their situations. Young minority men reported disproportionately more use of body language in response to their classist incidents.

Emotional and spiritual responses. Participants were greatly negatively affected by their experiences. They responded to a majority of their incidents with a variety of negative emotions (e.g., feeling hurt, low, discouraged, upset, depressed, rejected, disgusted, irritated, frustrated, agitated, mad, angry, resentful, humiliated, embarrassed, uncomfortable, stressed). They also discussed their negative treatment (e.g., treated like dirt, trash, a nobody, a nothing, incompetent, inadequate, low-class, less than, not good enough, small, dirty, second class citizen) and how it made them feel about themselves. (e.g., ‘I felt bad about myself’, ‘It made me feel like I wasn’t good enough’, ‘I have no self-esteem to begin with and she just made it worse’, ‘It’s just the kind of thing that makes you feel like your life doesn’t matter’, ‘I felt very inadequate... I wanted my dignity back’). That the majority of incidents elicited such an array of negative emotions and feelings from participants should be further explored. For instance, the effect of classist treatment on self-esteem is an area for investigation. If self-esteem is affected, is it a short-term or long term effect? Is the effect mediated by other factors, such as level of

identification with one's group or characteristics of the perpetrator?

It is promising to note that in response to 15% of incidents, participants reacted to their potentially hurtful situations with neutral emotions. Participants said they did not let the classist incident emotionally affect them because they don't care what other people think of them. Research should further explore low-income people's emotional resiliency in the face of potentially hurtful experiences. It could be that these participants have personality styles or specific motivations that may cause them to navigate their worlds in a more positive way. Or perhaps they are responding in a way that protects their self-esteem. Crocker et al. (1998) suggested that "when one disengages one's self-evaluation in a domain from one's outcomes in the domain, those outcomes become less relevant to one's self-esteem (p. 528). It could be that participants' past experiences with classism have led them to learn how to psychologically disengage their emotions in response to current incidents, causing self-esteem in the situation to remain intact.

Spiritual coping was also demonstrated. This seemed to prevent emotional engagement with the negative experience altogether; the participants claimed that the situations did not affect them because they 'turned over' or 'gave their troubles to God'. Greenlee and Lance (1993) found 'turning to religion' to be a positive coping strategy to classism among rural Appalachian working poor people, a sample geographically next door and culturally similar to the low-income people I interviewed (with some local residents originating from this region). Such findings from the present study validate prior research findings about spiritual coping as a response to classism.

This type of coping strategy may be more dominant among rural Southeastern people in general. The most recent American Religious Identification Survey (Kosmin,

Mayer, & Keysar, 2001) lends some credence to this hypothesis. Tennessee is among the top five states with the lowest percent of residents (9%) who claim to have 'no religion' (with the Carolinas, Alabama, and Mississippi, which are all in the southeast and the Bible Belt). Christians constitute the majority of self-identified religions in Tennessee (82%); 39% are Southern Baptist, 10% United Methodists, 6% Church of Christ, 6% Roman Catholic, 3% Presbyterian, 2% Lutheran, and 2% Pentecostal. In the survey, 12% identified as 'other Christian'. Five percent refused to answer. Only three percent claimed 'other religion' - Islam or Judaism.

A little over half of participants in the current study emotionally and spiritually responded to both of their incidents in the same way, while the rest described a different emotional and/or spiritual response from one incident to the other (e.g., experiencing negative emotions to their first incident and spiritually coping with the second incident). This suggests that emotional and spiritual responding to classist events may also depend on both the individual and the situational context in which it is experienced.

Situational differences in emotional and spiritual responding. Negative emotions were the primary responses reported to classist incidents, but a number of incidents in grocery stores, with intimates, at church, at work, and on the street, as well as incidents involving being followed/watched, excluded/avoided, and looked/glared/stared at were responded to with a neutral emotional response. These participants said they did not let the situation emotionally affect them. This was also the case with incidents involving managers, friends, salespeople, and church congregations.

Evidence for situational differences in spiritual coping was found. A notable portion of incidents in grocery stores and at school, as well as incidents involving

derogatory remarks, condescending attitudes, and being looked/glared/stared at and excluded/avoided were coped with spiritually. A majority of incidents involving cashiers resulted in turning to God. A fair amount of incidents perpetrated by customers, church congregations, and students resulted in coping through religion. A quarter of incidents described as being covert were responded to spiritually.

Investigation into situational influences on emotional and spiritual responding to classism might identify reliable differences. For example, it could be that familiarity with a perpetrator may mediate whether one experiences negative emotions or copes with a neutral emotional reaction in response to a negative event. Perhaps a target of classism may be more likely to turn their troubles over to God if a classist behavior is perpetrated during a friendly exchange versus an unfriendly one. Or, one may be more likely to feel negative emotions in response to a classist incident perpetrated by an unattractive face than an attractive one. People may respond differently when overt behaviors are perceived as part of a perpetrator's personality rather than as a deliberate act of prejudice.

Individual differences in emotional and spiritual responding. Participants reacted in different emotional and spiritual ways depending on how they behaviorally responded to their incidents. Participants reacted with negative emotions to incidents they both passively and actively responded to, but they were more likely to react in a neutral emotional way when they passively responded to perpetrators. When they spiritually reacted to their incidents by turning their troubles over to God, they more often actively responded to their perpetrators. This latter finding is interesting because it suggests that the incident affected these respondents though they believed that it did not. Future research should further explore the connection between behavioral and spiritual coping. Whether and to what extent coping

with classism through religion may empower low-income people to actively confront perpetrators of prejudice, as well as other possible benefits of spiritual responding as a way of coping, should be explored.

Cultural differences in emotional and spiritual responding. Though there were no differences in participants who experienced negative emotions from their incidents (all participants were equally negatively affected), coping by having a neutral emotional response and spiritual coping varied by race, gender, and age. Disproportionately more young White men tended to have a neutral emotional response to potentially hurtful events, while disproportionately more mid-aged Black women coped spiritually in response to their classist incidents. Young White men, by virtue of their dominant group memberships, may be more resilient to incidents of negative evaluation. Perhaps mid-aged Black women more often cope spiritually as a part of a cultural religious norm.

Cognitive response. Finally, seven of the ten interviewees who claimed that they did not experience classism, inadvertently provided insight into a cognitive coping strategy they may be employing to help prevent recognition of class prejudice. They disidentified with their class status, instead describing what they felt to be their personal identities. Crocker et al. (1998) explain that, in comparison to disengagement which serves a short-term function of disconnecting self-esteem from outcomes in a particular situation, disidentification refers to “the more chronic adaptation - in response to the chronic threat of stigmatization in a domain – of dropping, or not taking on the domain as a personal identity, as a long-term basis of self esteem” (528). Further research examining low-income people’s use of psychological disidentifying strategies as a self-esteem protection mechanism should be explored.

The results of the present study have significant implications for low-income people, psychology, and public policy. In their daily lives, low-income people must frequently navigate incidents of negative evaluation. Participants in the present study shared classist incidents occurring nearly everywhere or in every type of context - from home to school to church to the store to the bank to the doctors' office to restaurants to work - to when dealing with landlords to when among intimates - to when trying to find a job or seeking housing. Within these environmental contexts, there was a multitude of perpetrators of classism, ranging from complete strangers to people participants knew intimately. Most incidents were overtly expressed and occurred with high frequency. Is there any refuge from classism for low-income people?

Participants reported being affected by their classist incidents and experienced a variety of negative emotions. They discussed their treatment in detail and how it made them feel about themselves, with many noting or alluding to the negative effect on their self-esteem. Even those who responded with a neutral emotional response and those who coped cognitively may also experience negative consequences. It is possible that those who did not let their classist experiences emotionally affect them may have disengaged their emotions from the incident in order to protect their short-term self-esteem. Those who coped cognitively disidentified with their class status, which serves to prevent recognition of prejudicial events in order to protect long-term self-esteem. Although disengaging and disidentifying are "fundamentally normal, nonpathological, and adaptive" coping strategies, they may have the negative result of reducing motivation to achieve a goal in a particular domain (Crocker et al., 1998, p. 531), which in turn may be

interpreted as a lack of ability instead of blocked opportunities (Crocker & Major, 1989). That is, if a low-income person disengages their emotions in response to a classist incident, or disidentifies with being low-income so as not to recognize incidents of classism, they may have protected their self-esteem, but the outcome of their goal in that particular situation may be affected. For example, a low-income person may experience a derogatory remark from a social service agent during the process of applying for services, and they may respond by disengaging their emotions (e.g., ‘that doesn’t bother me) which protects their short-term self esteem. Another person may respond by disidentifying as low-income (e.g., ‘this is only a temporary situation, I’m not really low-income’) which protects their long-term self-esteem. However, these responses may have the negative consequence of reducing motivation to achieve their goal in the situation, which could affect whether they successfully navigate getting the service(s) for which they came (e.g., leaving before the goal was met, not providing all of the information needed to acquire services, etc.). The failure to attain the goal may then be interpreted as a lack of ability on the part of the client, instead of a consequence of the rudeness of the social service agent.

It is also important to note the economic injustices experienced by participants in the present study. Through analysis of the sample characteristics and listening to the experiences participants shared, four major areas of concern surfaced: food insecurity, unemployment/underemployment, access to affordable and safe housing, and access to health care. Lott and Bullock (2007) highlight these areas of concern for low-income people, noting that food, fair and sustainable wages, housing, and health care (and child care, though not discussed in the present study) are basic resources for human welfare. They also discuss the intricate relationship between access to resources and social power,

arguing that “those with less access to resources who find formidable barriers in their paths as they move toward obtaining what is needed for the welfare of themselves and their families have less power than those with greater access” (Lott & Bullock, 2007, p. 47). So, low-income people are necessarily contained in an oppressive cycle of social class inequalities and devalued social status. Because they have fewer resources, they encounter daily struggles to get their basic needs met, while at the same time, facing the consequences of being a target of negative evaluation and classist behaviors.

Classism and economic injustice must be reduced, and ultimately, eliminated. Individual, group, and societal level strategies can be useful (Jones, 2002). Individual level interventions may reduce the likelihood that people use stereotypes when judging others and include individual efforts to suppress stereotypes and self-regulation of prejudiced responses (Jones, 2002). One way individuals may become motivated to suppress classist stereotypes and regulate their classist responses is through cultural sensitivity training. This type of exercise would include visits to businesses, agencies, schools, and other organizations, to educate people who are not low-income about the realities of poverty, the lives of low-income people, and the consequences of classism and economic injustice.

On a group level, professional activism for social change and economic justice would serve to reduce or eliminate classism (Lott & Bullock, 2007). Psychologists could improve the situations of low-income people in at least two ways. First, more research on classism and economic injustice would be beneficial in bringing the situations of low-income groups of people more central in the scholarly spotlight. However, studies should not pathologize those who are poor (Bullock, 1995) or take a blame-the-victim approach

(Lott & Bullock, 2007), but instead should focus on the stigma associated with poverty (Pettigrew, 1980), the everyday experiences of low-income people (Ritz & Hyers, 1994), and the systemic barriers affecting income inequalities (Sklar, Collins, & Leondar-Wright, 2003). Lott and Bullock (2007) advocate for research that “situates poverty in a broader context of inequality, power, and intergroup relations instead of being focused on the behaviors and choices of poor and working-class persons” (p. 108).

A second strategy psychologists can use to help reduce and/or eliminate classism and economic justice is understanding and participating in collective action. Lott and Bullock (2007) argue that, in addition to examining factors related to community mobilizing and political activism, psychologists can themselves help to become change agents. Through participatory action research (Cherry & Borshuk, 1998; Fine et al., 2003; Lewin, 1946, 1951), psychologists can work in and with low-income communities in contributing to social change efforts. Psychologists can work with grass roots organizations and examine ways in which low-income people can most effectively initiate and navigate community mobilizing efforts to eradicate social injustices and income inequalities.

Societal level interventions can also focus on multiculturalism and legislating against classism and economic injustice. With multiculturalism, “the best way to achieve social harmony is to recognize and appreciate our diversity... various groups in society have mutual respect for one another’s culture... each group in society retains distinct cultural characteristics” (Jones, 2002, p. 82). Sue, Bingham, Porche-Burke, & Vasquez (1999) discuss the diversification of the U.S. - what they call the ‘changing complexion of society’. The authors note that “the population of the United States is undergoing

radical demographic changes that will continue well into the 21st century... racial and ethnic minorities will become a numerical majority by the year 2050” (p. 1063). In the years to come, the changing face of society alone may stimulate multiculturalism as a mainstream U.S. value.

Legislation against discrimination is also a way to promote social harmony; it reduces the impact of prejudice on minority group members’ lives, establishes norms for appropriate behavior, and encourages people to think differently if they are led to behave differently (Jones, 2002). Policies designed to end hunger and food insecurity, anti-class discrimination laws in employment and the housing industry, universal health care, and other related policies to reduce economic inequalities are greatly needed (Lott & Bullock, 2007). Such legislation will not only help low-income people in attaining the resources they need to survive, but will allow for greater upward social mobility, while at the same time, helping to change attitudes and beliefs about low-income people and the lives they lead.

Methodological Considerations

The present study employed the qualitative method of semi-structured interviews and analyzing data using Grounded Theory Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). I chose a qualitative method because it was the best fit for my research questions which sought to explore low-income people’s experiences with classism and the ways in which they cope with incidents of negative evaluation. Qualitative research methods are used to investigate “how people make sense of the world and how they experience events... and [is] concerned with the quality and texture of experience, rather than identification of cause-effect relationships” (Willig, 2001, p. 9). I used a semi-structured interview format

with broad open-ended interview questions so that I could elicit rich descriptions about participant's experiences (Willig, 2001). In order to capture the desired quality and texture of participants' lives, I designed descriptive (anecdotal, biographical) and structural (organization of knowledge, frameworks of meanings) interview questions (Spradley, 1979).

Little is known about how low-income people experience and cope with classism. Grounded Theory is "aimed at generating more insightful accounts, contextual explanations, or middle-range theories" (Henwood & Pidgeon, 2003, p. 132). This approach to analysis allows themes in participants' responses to emerge from the data without imposing theoretical constraints (Willig, 2001), so that contextual details can be explored and new knowledge generated. Indeed, the research findings presented here demonstrate this richness and insightfulness. Thick descriptions of participants' experiences were captured (e.g., experiences with a variety of classist behaviors across a range of domains and perpetrators, the depth and breadth of participants' negative emotions in response to their classist incidents) and unexpected findings emerged (e.g., spiritual coping with classism, disidentifying as a coping strategy).

However, qualitative methods have their critics. Merrick (1999) points out, "for some, considerations of qualitative research prompt thoughts of relativism and loosely established truths" (p. 25). Some believe that it is impossible to establish reliability and validity of observations in qualitative research (Jessor, 1996). Others challenge this notion. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) assert that there are many different evaluation criteria for assessing research depending on one's epistemological stance. They note the positivists' set of criteria, as seen in classic quantitative studies, which they believe

should be applied to all research – internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity. However, they also explain the post-positivists' perspective, which asserts that qualitative methodologies require a unique set of evaluation criteria.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed such evaluation criteria, what they refer to as “parallel criteria” to be used in parallel to the positivist benchmarks, and I employed such criteria in this research in an attempt to establish the trustworthiness of my analysis. Specifically, to address internal validity, I established credibility (the likelihood that the findings produced are credible) by having prolonged engagement with the data. I addressed external validity by establishing transferability (the extent to which findings compare to other samples and theories) by providing thick description of the sample and discussion of prior theory. Reliability was addressed by establishing dependability (consistency of the qualitative process), in which my advisor evaluated the consistency of my findings. Objectivity was addressed by establishing confirmability (accuracy of the qualitative product), in which I provided selected passages of quotations in order to support the conclusions I drew, and submitted my dissertation to my committee for their review.

Despite these efforts, some might argue that reliability remains compromised as it would be difficult to reproduce the analyses and thus check on the findings. Other qualitative researchers note, however, that with this methodology “the idea of reliability as reproducibility is rejected... qualitative researchers generally agree that a study cannot be repeated even by the same investigator, given the unique, highly changeable, and personal nature of the research endeavor” (Merrick, 1999, p. 26). I think both of these arguments have merit. This research generated novel insights that may not be reproduced.

However, many of the findings are reproducible (e.g., experiencing negative emotions from classist incidents), and in fact, verified findings from other studies of classism (e.g., spiritual coping as a response to classism). The present study also helped to generate new hypotheses for further testing and new follow-up research questions. This attests to the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

I acknowledge reflexivity, or the “awareness of the researcher’s contribution to the construction of meanings throughout the research process” ... [which] also involves thinking about how the research may have affected and possibly changed us, as people and as researchers (Willig, 2001, p. 10). I considered and discussed ways in which being from a low-income background may have contributed to the construction of meaning throughout the research process, both personally and professionally, from the development of my research questions, to the analysis of my data, to the interpretation of the findings. I also shared ways in which undertaking this project has influenced me, from the deepening of my personal investment in class issues, and my plans for disseminating the results on a local level, presenting the findings at conferences, and submitting the paper for publication. I also considered how this research may influence me in the future – via research, courses, workshops, programs, and policies I may get involved in.

Some argue that reflexivity may be problematic in research. Willig (2001) argues that positivists believe that the “goal of research is to produce knowledge; that is, understanding that is impartial and unbiased, based on a view from ‘the outside’, without personal involvement or vested interests on the part of the researcher” (p. 3). Other post-positivist researchers, however, believe that reflexivity can be a beneficial part of any

research process. Camic, Rhodes, and Yardley (2004) note that “those with ‘inside’ knowledge [are] not only able to provide insights into formal and informal practices and connections that no outsider could have obtained, but [are] in a position to critically evaluate and challenge the accounts offered by other insiders” (pp. 12-13).

My low-income background provided an advantage. I was able to build rapport with participants and perhaps they shared more sensitive experiences with me than they would have with someone from a different economic background. I identified with the nature of their experiences and understood what they entailed, and when they were discouraged, my support and encouragement was genuine, and they knew it. However, being from a low-income background with my own sets of experiences may have its disadvantages. I could have fallen prey to confirmation bias (e.g., finding what I expected to find), and I could have overlooked important observations simply because they did not relate to my own particular experiences. Research from a more detached observer may support, reject, clarify, or add to my findings. I believe that research from both an ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ perspective is useful, both with its own set of advantages and strengths, challenges and limitations.

Conclusion

The present research provided an in-depth look at experiencing and coping with everyday classism in a sample of low-income people in a southeastern rural community. The findings reveal a variety of classist experiences occurring across a multitude of environmental domains initiated from a large number of perpetrators of prejudice. The results also provide evidence for the ways in which low-income people do, and do not, cope with classist incidents. Potential intersections of prejudice and cultural, situational, and individual differences in experiences and responding were explored. Implications for low-income people, psychology, and public policy were discussed. Methodological considerations were presented. Several ideas for future research to answer new questions have also come from this investigation.

It was over a quarter of a century ago that Pettigrew (1980) made a plea for social psychology to address issues related to classism and nearly a decade ago that the American Psychological Association (2000) adopted a *Resolution on Poverty and Socioeconomic Status*. Seven years ago, Lott and Bullock (2001) proposed a research agenda on poverty and classism, noting its “urgent direction for psychologists” (p. 158), and last year they released an award-winning book on psychology and economic injustice (2007). Establishment of an APA Committee on Socioeconomic Status suggests increased attention to social class. Yet, despite these calls to attention, classism and economic injustice is alive and thriving. Much work remains to be done in addressing class issues in the U.S.

Now that our society is displaying an increased level of multicultural acceptance, as evidenced by our first ever African American president, and second woman vice-

presidential candidate of a major party, it is clear that we are moving in the direction of greater social equality. The experiences of participants in this research, however, suggest that classist behaviors and negative attitudes toward low-income people prevail and that experiences with classism are an integral part of everyday life. Social integration for low-income Americans is still an issue of great concern – and the time for social change is way overdue. As Eleanor Roosevelt so eloquently said over 55 years ago in her Remarks to the United Nations (1953):

“Where, after all, do human rights begin? In the small places close to home – so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: The neighborhood... the school or college... the factory, farm, or office. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination.”

APPENDIX A: Interview Guide

Today I would like to talk with you briefly about any experiences you might have had that seemed to show prejudice or discrimination related to your being low-income. I am particularly interested in your everyday experiences in the community, in places such as at stores, schools, restaurants, or at church or place of worship, and with people such as social service workers, doctors, your children's teachers or other school staff, public bus drivers, or even with family and friends. Keep in mind that no incident is too small. You may have been treated with disrespect by what someone said or did or even how they looked at you. Experiences may have been obvious or subtle and may have come from strangers or people you know such as family, friends, coworkers and employers.

I will be asking you a few questions and hope that you will answer openly. Everything you share with me here today will be kept completely confidential – I will only use this information in my research and your identity will remain anonymous. Anything that could identify you will be omitted from the tape recordings and only I will have access to them. [pause]

Do you have any questions? [pause] OK – let's begin.

1) Can you share an incident that you experienced recently in which you felt that you were disrespected or insulted because you are a low-income person?

Probe for:

- a. Perpetrators: Who was involved in this incident?
- b. Nature: Would you say that this was an obvious or subtle incident?
- c. Intersections: Was any other type of prejudice involved (e.g., associated with race or your gender (sex) or your age)?

2) In thinking about this experience, can you describe what you did? That is, how did you react?

Probe for:

- a. Behavioral Coping: Did you react in any direct or active way? Indirect or passive way?
- b. Emotional Coping: How did it make you feel? Did it affect your emotions or how you felt about yourself?

REPEAT 1) Can you recall another incident that was similar to this one, or one that was different but in which you also felt you were not being respected or treated fairly because you are a low-income person?

Probe for:

- a. Perpetrators: Who was involved in this incident?
- b. Nature: Would you say that this was an obvious or subtle incident?
- c. Intersections: Was any other type of prejudice involved (e.g., associated with race or your gender (sex) or your age)?

REPEAT 2) In thinking about this experience, can you describe what you did? That is, how did you react?

Probe for:

- a. Behavioral Coping: Did you react in any direct or active way? Indirect or passive way?
- b. Emotional Coping: How did it make you feel? Did it affect your emotions or how you felt about yourself?

3) Finally, I'd just like to get an idea of how frequently you are experiencing incidents like these. Can you tell me how often you experience such incidents of prejudice or discrimination or unfair treatment because you are a low-income person (e.g., daily, often, every once in a while, rarely)?

OK - that's all the questions I have today. Is there anything else you would like to add?
[pause]

Thank you for sharing your experiences with me. Your input is really valuable. [debrief]

APPENDIX B: Demographic Survey

Because class prejudice is experienced by many different groups of people, I am interested in a little bit of background information about you. Please be assured that all of the information that you provide will be kept completely confidential and anonymous and will NOT be shared with the Chattanooga Area Food Bank or anyone else. Only I will see this information and I will only use it for the purposes of this research study.

How old are you? _____ **Current Occupation** _____

What other jobs have you had? _____

Do you have any children? ___ yes ___ no **How many children do you have?** _____

How many children at home with you? ___ **How many adults at home with you?** _____

Marital Status (please check only one)

- ___ Single
- ___ Married
- ___ Divorced
- ___ Separated
- ___ Widowed
- ___ Living with domestic partner

Education (please check only one)

- ___ Less than high school
- ___ Finished high school
- ___ GED or equivalency
- ___ Vocational or technical school
- ___ Some junior college
- ___ 2 year Associate's degree
- ___ Some undergraduate college
- ___ 4 year Bachelor's degree
- ___ Some graduate school
- ___ Master's degree or higher

Gender (please check only one)

- ___ Male
- ___ Female

Employment Status (check only one)

- ___ Full-time
- ___ Part-time
- ___ Unemployed
- ___ Receive disability
- ___ Receive TANF

Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply)

- ___ Black/African-American
- ___ White/Caucasian
- ___ Latino/Latina
- ___ Asian-American
- ___ American-Indian
- ___ Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- ___ Other (specify) _____

APPENDIX C: Interview Protocol

Recruitment

- Try to select a diverse sample of clients with respect to age, ethnicity, and gender
- Approach client upon arrival and verify that he or she is here to pick up a food box for them self and is over the age of 17
- Introduce myself and indicate that I am a college student conducting research
- Ask client if they would like to participate in a brief interview about experiences with prejudice as a low-income person
- Inform them that the interview should only take about half an hour and that they will receive a \$20 Bi-Lo Grocery Store Gift Card for their time
- Make sure they are parked in a parking space (not at the loading dock) and have voucher run to ensure they are able to get their food box that day
- Escort participant back to interview room and offer them a beverage and snack

Introduction

- Thank participant for agreeing to participate
- Make participant comfortable by disclosing my low-income background and stress how the research is personally important to me
- Assure them that I am not connected with CAFB and will protect their comments
- Distribute, explain, read, and collectively sign two copies of informed consent
- Have participant keep one copy and put the other in an envelope and seal it
- Ask participant if they are ready to begin
- Start the tape recorder

Interview

- Ask the questions in the order they are presented
- Allow the interview to shift to an unanticipated but related topic
- Be prepared to redirect interview back to the interview questions
- Be sensitive to participant's experiences
- Include personal experiences if sought from the participant
- Watch the time and guide interview accordingly

Wrap Up

- Turn off the tape recorder
- Read aloud and complete the short demographic survey
- Answer any questions and address any potential concerns
- Ask for advise in reporting findings (e.g., to a local community or religious group)
- Distribute debriefing form and \$20 Bi-Lo Grocery Store Gift Card
- Thank participant for his or her time and escort back out to the warehouse entrance

APPENDIX D: Informed Consent

Title of Investigation: Coping with Everyday Classism: Experiences of Low-Income People in a Southeastern Rural Community

Investigator: Susan Faye Ritz, M.S., Behavioral Science Program, Department of Psychology, University of Rhode Island

Explanation of the Study

I am interested in your experiences with disrespectful treatment due to being low-income. You will take part in an audio-taped interview with an investigator from a low-income background. I encourage you to freely share your opinions and experiences during the interview, but you do not have to answer any question that may make you feel uncomfortable. The interview will last about 30 minutes, depending on how much information you would like to share. You will then complete a brief demographic survey that should take no more than 1-2 minutes to complete. You will receive a \$20 Bi-Lo Grocery Store Gift Card for your participation.

Participant Rights

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to stop participating at any time and to refuse to answer any questions. All of your responses and materials and any specific identifying information about incidents or perpetrators of prejudice reported in this study will be kept completely confidential. The interview will be tape recorded and transcribed word-for-word so that it can be analyzed and then the tape will be destroyed. The transcript data will be stored securely for three years following completion of the study and then destroyed. Please be assured that only the researcher will have access to the information you provide. This research is in no way connected to the Chattanooga Area Food Bank, and they will not have access to your information, other than being able to see the final report in which your identity will be unknown.

There are no major risks or benefits for you in participating in this study, but it may help psychologists learn more about how low-income people experience and cope with classism.

If you have any questions, or if you are not happy about the way in which this study is conducted, you may discuss these issues with Susan Faye Ritz anonymously at (401) 480-7479, or you may contact her advisor, Dr. Bernice Lott, of the Psychology Department at the University of Rhode Island at (401) 874-2157, or a staff member at the office of the Vice Provost for Research at the University of Rhode Island at (401) 874-4328.

Consent to Participate

I, _____ (please print name) agree to participate as a volunteer in this study as an authorized part of the education and research program at the University of Rhode Island. I understand the information given to me and have received answers to any questions I currently have about the research procedure. I understand that I will receive a \$20 Bi-Lo Grocery Store Gift Card for my participation in this study. I understand and agree to all of the conditions of the study described above. I am 18 years of age or older. I understand that I will receive a signed copy of this form.

Date

Participant Signature

Date

Investigator Signature

APPENDIX E: Debriefing

Thank you for your participation in this study. I plan to compile the results of this study into a report to help psychologists learn more about the types of experiences with prejudice and discrimination that low-income people sometimes face. I also hope to share these findings with local community and religious groups to help improve services and relationships with low-income people. Your information will remain completely confidential and no identifying information will be included in the report. If you would like a copy of the final report for this project, or if you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at:

Susan Faye Ritz
M.S./PhD Candidate
Psychology Department
Behavioral Sciences Program
University of Rhode Island
10 Chafee Road, Suite 8
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881
susanfayeritz@yahoo.com
(401) 480-7479

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alston, J. P., & Dean, K. I. (1972). Socioeconomic factors associated with attitudes toward welfare recipients and the causes of poverty. *Social Service Review*, 46, 13-22.
- American Psychological Association. (2000). *Resolution on poverty and socioeconomic status*. Retrieved March 27, 2002 from <http://www.apa.org/pi/urban/povres.html>.
- Anderson, L., Snow, D. A., & Cress, D. (1994). Negotiating the public realm: Stigma management and collective action among the homeless. *Research in Community Sociology*, 1, 121-143.
- AuClaire, P. A. (1984). Public attitudes toward social welfare expenditures. *Social Work*, 29, 139-144.
- Axelson, L. J., & Hendrickson, R. M. (1985). Notes on policy and practice: Middle-class attitudes toward the poor; Are they changing? *Social Service Review*, 59, 296-304.
- Barnett, M. A., Quackenbush, S. W., & Pierce, L. K. (1997). Perceptions of and reactions to the homeless: A survey of fourth-grade, high school, and college students in a small midwestern community. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 6(4), 283-302.
- Baron, R. M., Albright, L., & Mallory, T. E. (1995). Effects of behavioral and social class information on social judgment. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 308-315.
- Barusch, A. S. (1997). Self-concepts of low-income older women: Not old or poor, but fortunate and blessed. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 44(4), 269-282.
- Beagan, B. L. (2005). Everyday classism in medical school: Experiencing marginality and resistance. *Medical Education*, 39, 777-784.
- Becker, E. (2002, December 18). Mayors report requests for food and shelter are up. *The New York Times*. Retrieved December 19, 2002 from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Benedict, A., Shaw, J., & Rivlin, L. (1988). Attitudes toward the homeless in two New York City metropolitan samples. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 17, 90-98.
- Bernstein, N. (2005, August 15). Invisible to most, immigrant women line up for day labor. *The New York Times*. Retrieved August 16, 2005, from <http://www.nytimes.com>.

- Borg, L. (2004, August 3). Less is expected of poor students. *The Providence Journal*, pp. B1, B3.
- Bullock, H. E. (1994). Class diversity in the workplace. In F. J. Crosby & M. S. Stockdale (Eds.), *The psychology of management and workplace diversity* (pp. 224-242). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bullock, H. E. (1995). Class acts: Middle-class responses to the poor. In B. Lott & D. Maluso (Eds.), *The social psychology of interpersonal discrimination* (pp. 118-159). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bullock, H. E. (1999). Attributions for poverty: A comparison of middle class and welfare recipient attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 2059-2082.
- Bullock, H. E., & Lott, B. (2001). Building a research and advocacy agenda on issues of economic justice. *Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP)*, 1(1), 147-162.
- Burman, P. (1988). *Killing time, losing ground: Experiences of unemployment*. Toronto: Wall and Thompson.
- Burman, P. (1996). *Poverty's bonds: Power and agency in the social relations of welfare*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- Camic, P. M., Rhodes, J. E., & Yardley, L. (2003). Naming the stars: Integrating qualitative methods into psychological research. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 3-15). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cattell, V. (2001). Poor people, poor places, and poor health: The mediating role of social networks and social capital. *Social Science & Medicine*, 52, 1501-1516.
- Chafel, J. A. (1997). Societal images of poverty: Child and adult beliefs. *Youth and Society*, 28, 432-463.
- Chamberlain, K. (1999). Using grounded theory in health psychology: Practices, premises, and potential. In M. Murray & K. Chamberlain (Eds.), *Qualitative health psychology: Theories and methods* (pp. 183-201). London: Sage.
- Cherry, F., & Borshuk, C. (1998). Social action research and the commission on community interrelations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54, 119-142.
- Clark, C. (1997). *Misery and company: Sympathy in everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Clydesdale, T. T. (1999). Toward understanding the role of Bible beliefs and higher education in American attitudes toward eradicating poverty, 1964-1996. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38, 103-118.
- Cohen, N. L. (1990). Stigma is in the eye of the beholder: A hospital outreach program for treating homeless mentally ill people. *Bulletin of the Meninger Clinic*, 54, 255-258.
- Colasanto, D. (1989). Bush presidency tarnished by growing concern about poverty. *Gallup Poll Monthly*, 287, 2-6.
- Compas, B. E., Conner-Smith, J. K., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, A. H., & Wadsworth, M. E. (2001). Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence: Problems, progress, and potential in theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(1), pp. 87-127.
- Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A. V., & Tagler, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(2), 207-227.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96, 608-630.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 504-553). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Croizet, J. C., & Claire, T. (1998). Extending the concept of stereotype threat to social class: The intellectual underperformance of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 588-594.
- Darley, J. M., & Gross, P. H. (1983). A hypothesis-confirming bias in labeling effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 20-33.
- Davis, L. V., & Hagen, J. L. (1996). Stereotypes and stigma: What's changed for welfare mothers. *Affilia*, 11(3), 319-337.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Part V: The art of interpretation, evaluation, and presentation. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 479-483). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeParle, J. (2005, October 2). Study finds many children don't benefit from credits. *The New York Times*, pp. WK1, WK4.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude strength and function. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 269-322). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. New York: Sage.
- Feagin, J. R. (1975). *Subordinating the poor: Welfare and American belief*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Antiracist discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 101-116.
- Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1974). Explanations of poverty in Australia and American samples: The person, society, or fate? *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 26(3), 199-216.
- Fine, M., Torre, M. E., Boudin, K., Bowen, I., Clark, J., Hylton, D., Martinez, M. et al. (2003). Participatory action research: From within and beyond prison bars. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardly (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 173-198). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 473-490.
- Fothergill, A. (2003). The stigma of charity: Gender, class, and disaster assistance. *Sociological Quarterly*, 44(4), 659-680.
- Furnham, A. (1982a). Explanations for unemployment in Britain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 12(4), 335-352.
- Furnham, A. (1982b). Why are the poor always with us? Explanations for poverty in Britain. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 311-322.
- Furnham, A. (1982c). The Protestant work ethic and attitudes toward unemployment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 55(4), 277-285.
- Furnham, A. (1983). Attitudes toward the unemployed receiving social security benefits. *Human Relations*, 36(2), 135-149.
- Furnham, A. (1985). The determinants of attitudes toward social security recipients. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(1), 19-27.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1975). From the natives' point of view. *American Scientist*, 63, 47-53.

- Glaser B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Golding, P., & Middleton, S. (1982). *Images of welfare*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Granfield, R. (1991). Making it by faking it: Working-class students in an elite academic environment. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 20, 331-351.
- Graves, S. B. (1997). The social psychology of interpersonal discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 3(1), 77-79.
- Greenlee, R., & Lantz, J. (1993). Family coping strategies and the rural Appalachian working poor. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 15(2), 121-137.
- Guimond, S., & Palmer, D. L. (1990). Type of academic training and causal attributions for social problems. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(1), 61-75.
- Guishard, J. (1992). People who live in posh houses shouldn't throw stones. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 9(3), 42-47.
- Guzewicz, T. D., & Takooshian, H. (1992). Development of a short-form scale of public attitudes toward homelessness. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 1, 67-79.
- Hagen, M. G. (1995). References to racial issues. *Political Behavior*, 17(1), 49-88.
- Halpern, R. (1993). The societal context of home visiting and related services for families in poverty. *Future of Children*, 3, 158-171.
- Harper, D. J., Wagstaff, G. F., Newton, J. T., & Harrison, K. R. (1990). Lay causal perceptions of third world poverty and the just world theory. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 18(2), 235-238.
- Henwood, K., & Pidgeon, N. (2003). Grounded theory in psychological research. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 131-155). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hocking, J. E., & Lawrence, S. G. (2000). Changing attitudes toward the homeless: The effect of prosocial communication with the homeless. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 9(2), 91-110.
- Howe, L. (1990). *Being unemployed in northern Ireland: An ethnographic study*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hoyt, S. K. (1999). Mentoring with class: Connections between social class and developmental relationships in the academy. In A. J. Murrell, R. J. Ely, & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations. Applied Social Research* (pp. 189-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles*, 56(1-2), 1-12.
- Jacob, J. M. (2000). *Beliefs about women held by African American women and men differing in level of acculturation*. Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Rhode Island, Kingston.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1996). Welfare stigma among low-income African-American single mothers. *Family Relations*, 45(4), 368-374.
- Jessor, R. (1996). Ethnographic methods in perspective. In R. Jessor, A. Colby, & R. A. Shweder (Eds.), *Ethnography and human development* (p. 3-14). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, E. E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A., Markus, H., Miller, D., & Scott, R. A. (1984). *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Jones, M. (2002). *Social psychology of prejudice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Juhnke, R., Barmann, B., Cunningham, M., & Smith, E. (1987). Effects of attractiveness and nature of request on helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127(4), 317-322.
- Kallen, D. J., & Miller, (1971). Public attitudes toward welfare. *Social Work*, 16, 83-90.
- Katz, I. (1981). *Stigma: A social psychological perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kaufman, L. (2005, January 8). For some homeless couples, shelter is an office floor provided by the city. *The New York Times*, p. B1.
- Kaus, M. (1991). The work ethic state. In T. A. Mehuron (Ed.), *Points of light: New approaches to ending welfare dependency* (pp. 19-36). Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Kerbo, H. R. (1976). The stigma of welfare and a passive poor. *Sociology & Social Research*, 60(2), 173-187.

- Kingfisher, C. P. (1996). *Women in the American welfare trap*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kirby, B. J. (1999). Income source and race effects on new-neighbor evaluations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 1497-1511.
- Kissane, R. J. (2003). What's a need got to do with it? Barriers to use of nonprofit social services. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 30(2), 127-148.
- Kluegal, J. R. (1987). Macro-economic problems, beliefs about the poor and attitudes toward welfare spending. *Social Problems*, 34, 82-99.
- Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Kosmin, B. A., Mayer, E., & Keysar, A. (2001). *The American Religious Identification Survey*. Unpublished report. The Graduate Center, City University of New York.
- Kozol, J. (1988). *Rachel and her children*. New York: Crown Publishers
- Lankenau, S. E. (1999a). Stronger than dirt: Public humiliation and status enhancement among panhandlers. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28(3), 288-318.
- Lankenau, S. E. (1999b). Panhandling repertoires and routines for overcoming the nonperson treatment. *Deviant Behavior*, 20(2), 183-206.
- Leahy, R. L. (1981). The development of the conception of economic inequality: I. Descriptions of comparisons of rich and poor people. *Child Development*, 52(2), 523-532.
- Letskemann, P. (1998). *Becoming unemployed: A case study of experiences of dislocation among members of a specific professional workplace*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Letskemann, P. (2002). Unemployed professionals, stigma management and derivative stigmata. *Work, Employment, & Society*, 16(3), 511-522.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2, 34-46.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Link, B. G., Schwartz, S., Moore, R. E., Phelan, J., Struening, E. L., Stueve, A., &

- Colten, M. E. (1995). Public knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about homeless people: Evidence for compassion or fatigue? *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 533-555.
- Lott, B. (2002). Cognitive and behavioral distancing from the poor. *American Psychologist*, 57(2), 100-110.
- Lott, B., & Bullock, H. E. (2001). Who are the poor? *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(2), 189-206.
- Lott, B., & Bullock, H. E. (2007). *Psychology and economic injustice: Personal, professional, and political intersections*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lott, B., & Saxon, S. (2002). The influence of ethnicity, social class, and context on judgments about U.S. women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(4), 481-499.
- Lu, A. (2004, March 23). Agencies say hunger on rise outside cities across region. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 24, 2004, from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Luft, J. (1957). Monetary value and the perception of persons. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 245-251.
- MacDonald, A. P. (1972). More on the Protestant ethic. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 39, 116-122.
- Magnet, M. (1991). The underclass: What can be done? In T. A. Mehuron (Ed.), *Points of light: New approaches to welfare dependency* (pp. 99-112). Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 393-421.
- Maurer, K. L., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (1996). Stereotypes, prejudice, and judgments of group members: The mediating role of public policy decisions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32(5), 411-436.
- McCormack, K. (2005). Stratified reproduction and poor women's resistance. *Gender & Society*, 19(5), 660-679.
- McGrath, J. E., & Johnson, B. A. (2003). Methodology makes meaning. How both qualitative and quantitative paradigms shape evidence and its interpretation. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 31-48). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- McFadyen, R. G. (1995). Coping with threatened identities: Unemployed people's self-categorizations. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social*, 14(3), 233-256.
- Mead, L. (1991). The work obligation. In T. A. Mehuron (Ed.), *Points of light: New approaches to ending welfare dependency* (pp. 57-72). Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Merrick, E. (1999). An exploration of quality in qualitative research: Are "reliability" and "validity" relevant? In M. Kopala & L. A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Using qualitative methods in psychology* (pp. 25-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). A theoretical perspective on coping with stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 73-92.
- Mills, F. B. (1996). The ideology of welfare reform: Deconstructing the stigma. *Social Work*, 41(4), 391-395.
- Milner, M. J. (1994). *Status and sacredness: A general theory of status relations and an analysis of the Indian culture*. New York: Oxford.
- Minick, P., Kee, C. C., Borkat, L., Cain, T., & Oparah-Iwobi, T. (1998). Nurses' perceptions of people who are homeless. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 20(3), 356-369.
- Misra, J., Moller, S., & Karides, M. (2003). Envisioning dependency: Changing media depictions of welfare in the 20th century. *Social Problems*, 50(4), 482-504.
- Murray, C. (1991). How social policy shapes behavior. In T. A. Mehuron (Ed.), *Points of light: New approaches to ending welfare dependency* (pp. 73-84). Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Nelson, T. D. (2002). *The psychology of prejudice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Newman, C. S. (1989). *Falling from grace: The experience of downward mobility among the American middle class*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Olkin, R. (2001, January). Could you hold open the door for me? Paper presented at the National Multicultural Conference and Summit of the American Psychological Association, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Osgood, M. H. (1977). Rural and urban attitudes toward welfare. *Social Work*, 22(1), 41-47.
- Ouellette, L. (1993). Class bias on campus. *Utne Reader*, 59, 19-24.

- Pear, R. (2003, May 13). New study finds 60 million uninsured during a year. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 14, 2003, from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1980). Social psychology's potential contributions to an understanding of poverty. In V. T. Covello (Ed.), *Poverty and public policy* (pp. 189-233). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company.
- Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., Moore, R. E., & Stueve, A. (1997). The stigma of homelessness: The impact of the label of "homeless" on attitudes toward poor persons. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(4), 323-337.
- Philips, T. M., & Pittman, J. F. (2003). Identity processes in poor adolescents: Exploring the linkages between economic disadvantage and the primary task of adolescence. *Identity*, 3(2), 115-129.
- Pincus, F. L. (1996). Discrimination comes in many forms: Individual, institutional, and structural. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(2), 186-194.
- Polakow, V. (2003). Homeless children and their families: The discard of the post-welfare era. In S. Books (Ed.), *Invisible children in the society and its schools* (2nd ed., pp. 89-110). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Price, J. H., Desmond, S. M., & Eof, T. A. (1989). Nurses' perceptions regarding health care and the poor. *Psychological Reports*, 65(3, Pt 1), 1043-1052.
- Price, J. H., Desmond, S. M., Snyder, F. F., & Kimmel, S. R. (1988). Perceptions of family practice residents regarding health care and poor patients. *Journal of Family Practice*, 27(6), 615-620.
- Rank, M. R. (1994). A view from the inside out: Recipients' perceptions of welfare. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 21(2), 27-47.
- Relin, D. O. (2004, April 4). Won't you help feed them? *Parade*, pp. 6-9.
- Richards, L. N. (1989). The precarious survival and hard-won satisfaction of White single-parent families. *Family Relations: Journal of Applied Family & Child Studies*, 38(4), 396-403.
- Riemer, F. J. (1997a). Quick attachments to the workforce: An ethnographic study of a transition from welfare to low-wage jobs. *Social Work Research*, 21(4), 225-232.
- Riemer, F. J. (1997b). From welfare to working poor: Prioritizing practice in research on employment-training programs for the poor. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 85-110.
- Ritz, S. F., & Hyers, L. L. (2004). *The stigma of poverty: The nature and implications of*

everyday classism. Manuscript submitted for publication.

- Roff, L. L., & Klemmack, D. L. (1983). Attitudes toward public welfare and welfare workers. *Social Work Research & Abstracts*, 19(3), 29-30.
- Roschelle, A. R., & Kaufman, P. (2004). Fitting in and fighting back: Stigma management strategies among homeless kids. *Symbolic Interactionism*, 27(1), 23-46.
- Ryan, J., & Sackray, C. (1992). Bob Cole. In M.L. Anderson & P.H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (pp. 110-120). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Schemo, D. J. (2002, August 9). Neediest schools receive less money, report finds. *The New York Times*. Retrieved August 10, 2002, from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Sciara, D. (1999). The role of the qualitative researcher. In M. Kopala & L. A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Using qualitative methods in psychology* (pp. 37-48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Secombe, K., James, D., & Walters, K. B. (1998). "They think you ain't much of nothing": The social construction of the welfare mother. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60, 849-865.
- Shapiro, R. Y., Patterson, J. R., & Young, J. T. (1987). The polls: Public assistance. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51, 120-130.
- Shipler, D. K. (2004, February 21). Total poverty awareness. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 22, 2004, from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Singh, A. K. (1989). Attribution research on poverty: A review. *Psychologia*, 32, 143-148.
- Skaft, D. (1989). The effect of perceived wealth and poverty on adolescents' character judgments. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 129(1), 93-99.
- Sklar, H., Collins, C., Leondar-Wright, B. (2003). The growing wealth gap. In T. E. Ore (Ed.), *The social construction of difference and inequality: Race, class, gender, and sexuality* (2nd ed., pp. 90-95). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Smith, T. W. (1987). That which we call welfare by any other name would smell sweeter. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51, 75-83.
- Smith, K. B., & Stone, L. H. (1989). Rags, riches, and bootstraps: Beliefs about the causes of wealth and poverty. *Sociological Quarterly*, 30, 93-107.
- Somerman, F. B. (1993). Values, attitudes, and belief determinants of willingness to

accept a facility for the homeless. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 2(3), 177-192.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 4-28.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797-811.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image. The psychology of stereotype threat and social identity threat. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 34, 379-440.

Sterchi-Elliott, R. (2005). *Needs of the hungry: Chattanooga regional assessment of area food programs and their clients*. Report prepared for the Chattanooga Area Food Bank, Chattanooga, TN.

Sterchi-Elliott, R., Ritz, S. F., & Anderson, R. (2001). *Needs of the hungry: Chattanooga regional assessment of area food programs and their clients*. Report prepared for the Chattanooga Area Food Bank, Chattanooga, TN.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Sue, D. W., Bingham, R. P., Porche-Burke, L., & Vasquez, M. (1999). The diversification of psychology. *American Psychologist*, 54(12), 1061-1069.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286.

Sutton, R. I., & Callahan, A. L. (1988). The stigma of bankruptcy: Spoiled organizational image and its management. In K. S. Cameron, R. I. Sutton, & D. A. Whetten (Eds.), *Readings in organizational decline: Frameworks, research, and prescriptions. Ballinger series on innovation and organizational change* (pp. 241-263). New York: Ballinger Publishing Company/Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Swim, J. K., Cohen, L. L., & Hyers, L. L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and discrimination. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The targets perspective* (pp. 37-60). San Diego: Academic Press.

Taylor, J. Y. (1999). Colonizing images and diagnostic labels: Oppressive mechanisms for African American women's health. *Advances in Nursing Science. Special*

- Toro, P. A., & McDonnell, D. M. (1992). Beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge about homelessness: A survey of the general public. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 20*(1), 53-80.
- Urrea, L. A. (2005, October 2). City of the big gaps. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 3, 2005, from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (November 8, 2006). *Industry at a Glance*. Retrieved March 10, 2007 from <http://www.bls.gov/iaghome.htm>.
- Wadel, C. (1973). *Now, whose fault is that? The struggle for self-esteem in the face of chronic employment*. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Wagstaff, G. F. (1983a). Attitudes to poverty, the Protestant ethic, and political affiliation: A preliminary investigation. *Social Behavior and Personality, 11*, 45-47.
- Wagstaff, G. F. (1983b). Correlates of the just world in Britain. *Journal of Social Psychology, 121*(1), 145-146.
- Wagstaff, G. F., & Rowledge, A. M. (1995). Stoicism: Its relation to gender, attitudes toward poverty, and reactions to emotive material. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(2), 181-184.
- Walker, R., & Collins, C. (2004). Families of the poor. In J. Scott, J. Treas, & M. Richards (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to the sociology of families. Blackwell companions to sociology* (pp. 193-217). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Warr, D. J. (2005). Social networks in a discredited neighborhood. *Journal of Sociology, 41*(3), 285-308.
- Weaver, R. K., Shapiro, R. Y., & Jacobs, L. R. (1995). The polls-trends: welfare. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 59*, 606-627.
- Weinger, S. (1998). Poor children "know their place": Perceptions of poverty, class, and public images. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 25*, 100-118.
- Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Wilton, R. D. (2003). Poverty and mental health: A qualitative study of residential care facility tenants. *Community Mental Health Journal, 39*(2), 139-156.
- Ziner, K. L. (2005, March 22). Report: Face of homeless changing. *The Providence*

Journal, pp. B1, B3.

Zucker, G. S., & Weiner, B. (1993). Conservatism and perceptions of poverty: An attributional analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 925-943.