

ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASSES AMONG
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

Ian B. Armstrong, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a Major in Psychological Research
December 2021

Committee Members:

John D. Davis, Chair

Roque Mendez

Alessandro De Nadai

COPYRIGHT

by

Ian Armstrong

2021

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Ian Armstrong, refuse permission to copy in excess of the "Fair Use" exemption without my written permission.

DEDICATION

To those who have motivated me to be successful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my family and friends. I was able to complete three degrees and this document because of their support.

I also wish to thank Dr. David Weintraub for his support while writing my statement of purpose and for helping me discover that I can write like I would like to write.

I would like to thank Dr. Kelly Haskard-Zolnierrek and for her support during the Spring of 2020 and for encouraging me to start playing the flute again.

In addition, I would like acknowledge Dr. Joe Etherton as well, for his guidance during 2021.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Jasmine Kienne for her help with proofreading.

I would also like to thank my committee, Dr. Roque Mendez and Dr. Alessandro De Nadai for their feedback, which helped me perfect and complete my thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. John Davis. For I would not be the researcher I am today, without his patience and guidance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Socioeconomic Status.....	1
Social Class Origin.....	2
Class Signals.....	3
First Generation Students.....	4
Differences in Sub-cultures.....	5
Attitude Differences.....	7
Hypothesis.....	8
II. METHOD.....	10
Participants.....	10
Design.....	10
Instruments and Measures.....	11
Procedure.....	12
III. RESULTS.....	13
IV. DISCUSSION.....	15
APPENDIX SECTION.....	19
REFERENCES.....	35

ABSTRACT

There has been an increased interest in social status over the past few decades however, it is still understudied. The present study attempts to fill some of the gaps within the existing literature regarding differences between the classes. We hypothesized that social class origin of the participant will be positively correlated with annual childhood household income and parental educational attainment. Our second two hypotheses used a Survey of Attitudes to measure participant outlooks. Hypothesis two predicted that the upper classes would show greater support for the arts, the importance of fresh air and exercise, and creative work. Our third hypothesis predicted that lower classes, will show higher support for the Democratic party, traditional gender roles, the American way of life, and more positive attitudes towards both smoking tobacco and conforming to group opinion. The hypotheses were tested with a correlational analysis and several t-tests. The first hypothesis was not supported, and the second two hypotheses were only partially supported. These results are important because they help illuminate the need to effectively operationalize social status and that there are still apparent gaps in the literature. This study suggests that the average university undergraduate does not understand the construct of social class.

I. INTRODUCTION

Attitude Differences Between Social Classes Among Undergraduate Students

Over the past few decades, there has been an increased interest social status. The study of socioeconomic status and associated facets, such as social class and social class origin, which were traditionally ignored in the past but have gained traction in the last decade (APA Task Force on Socioeconomic Status, 2007). While there is an increasing amount of research into social class, there are still gaps and contradictions within the literature. Much of the research focuses on socioeconomic status, social class origin, signaling, first generation students, as well as economic and physiological differences. The following research aims to fill some of the gaps in the literature of social class by using a modified version of the Survey of Attitudes created by Byrne (1965), to examine attitude differences between different levels of social class origin within an undergraduate population.

Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status – generally considered to be some combination of income, wealth, educational attainment, and occupational prestige – is a complex construct with many facets which has been neglected within the field of psychology as it was used often as a control variable rather than the focus of the research (APA Task Force on Socioeconomic Status, 2007). In addition to being understudied in the field of psychology, there is no consensus on the best way to assess and conceptualize this construct, but it is often operationalized as a combination of occupational prestige, educational attainment, and income (Diemer et al., 2013). In contrast to the operationalization used by psychologists, sociologists and economists rely heavily upon

economic indicators to define social classes (Diemer et al., 2013). However, many problems exist with relying only upon economic indicators. One such problem can be observed in contrasting the earnings of trades people with educators, in that an occupations salary may not accurately reflect social class. Another problem is that some individuals find questions about wealth and income to be too invasive and may not report or recall the data correctly, resulting in a high nonresponse rate and potentially inaccurate responses (Diemer et al., 2013).

Social Class Origin

Like economic status, social class origin is a specific facet of socioeconomic status, is one of the lesser studied factors. The following literature review focuses on social class origin, operationalized as the highest level of education completed by an individual's parents, because some research theorizes that this facet most strongly influences the social class in which one is raised (Manstead, 2018). The researchers consider using economic measures such as income and wealth of both the participant and the parents of the participant, but does not adopt using economic indicators due to jobs of high income with low occupational prestige. Such working-class jobs include welders, blowout specialists, and other oil-field trades, which can be contrasted with individuals that work in high prestige jobs of relatively modest income such as educators, librarians, and university professors. This research focuses social class origin over social class because individuals can change social class with education and income, but do not fully adopt the culture of their acquired class (Streib, 2015).

Many terms in the study of socioeconomic status – such as social class, stratification, and social status – are used interchangeably to describe the higher order

construct that represents an individual's relative position and power within a given economic and socio-cultural hierarchy, but in actuality refer to different aspects of the construct (Diemer et al., 2013). While there is no standardized definition of social class, most social scientists agree that the construct can be broken down into four major levels, which can differ in their attitudes, preferences, affect, and perceptions of experience and stress. The four levels include the upper class (contains the most educated and affluent), middle class (many of whom are educated but not always affluent), working class (many of whom tend to be neither university educated nor affluent), and working poor (Streib, 2015).

Class Signals

There are class-based differences in identity-signaling behaviors. Identity-Signaling behavior is conceptualized as behavior that is designed to tell others about oneself (Gal, 2015).

In 2017, Kraus, Park, and Tan studied class signaling of three stimuli. The first was a 60 second interaction, the second were photographs from Facebook, and the third was a brief recording of speech. Their results showed that individuals were able to guess the subject's social class with above average accuracy. They went further and tested if speech style, regardless of content, can reveal an individual's social class. The experiment isolated seven specific words of over 200 subjects, which were then presented to the participants. Again, participants were able to identify the subject's social class with above average accuracy.

In addition to behavioral signals, research has uncovered physiological signals such as facial features and expressions. Bjornsdottir and Rule (2017) operationalized social class as income and tested their hypotheses in multiple experiments. The first experiment used 80 male and 80 female faces, all of whom earned significantly more or less than the U.S. median income and found that participants were able to accurately identify the subject's social class at better-than-average rates by simply studying facial features. The influence of factors such as classism, class warmth, and participants' income were investigated with multiple linear regressions and did not produce significant results. A second experiment was performed to replicate the first with a different set of faces and confirmed results. Another set of experiments investigated which facial features conveyed the most information about social class. These experiments revealed that while the whole face provides information about one's social class, the eyes and mouth provide the most. It is theorized that the eyes and mouth transmit the most information about social class because emotional expressions become imprinted due to repeated use. The upper classes seem to enjoy greater subjective well-being whereas the lower classes seem to experience less, which lead to displaying positive and negative affect, respectively, which leave impressions on the face, especially in the eyes and mouth.

First Generation Students

Much of the research into class differences has focused on educational outcomes, especially university graduation rates. For first generation university students, typically from lower classes, about 33% dropped out after three years contrasted with 14% of continuing generation students, typically from upper-class homes (Cataldi et al., 2018). Additionally, individuals raised in lower classes are less likely to apply, be selected, and

be successful in institutions such as universities because such institutions possess upper-class norms such as independence and self-expression and they can have trouble integrating and connecting with professors and other students (Manstead, 2018). Lower-class norms feature interdependence, valuing group harmony, and deferment to authority, which were not as common within universities as upper-class norms (Lareau, 2011; Manstead, 2018). Despite the differences in enrollment and graduation rates, there was little difference in post-graduation salaries between first generation and continuing generation students (Cataldi et al., 2018).

Differences in Sub-cultures

Social class origin, is linked to a variety of life outcomes, such as physical and mental health, educational attainment, income and wealth, as well as the number of pollutants to which one is exposed, hostile familial interactions, brain architecture, and substance abuse (Diemer et al, 2013). The social class in which one is raised influences language, empathy, and self-concept (Manstead, 2018). It can also influence how individuals attend to work, manage finances, and raise children (Streib, 2015). One of the differences in how upper and lower classes attend to work is whether they bring their work home at the end of the day (Streib, 2015). University professors and other educators, typically upper- and middle-class occupations, tend to bring assignments home to grade and identify with their occupation title, while lower-class occupations such as manual labors or tradespeople do not/cannot bring work home and do not identify with their occupation title.

Parents in the upper social classes raise children with a style called “concerted cultivation”, whereas parents in the lower social classes raise their children with a

concept called “accomplishment of natural growth” (Lareau, 2011). The concerted cultivation style of parenting tends to use a more democratic relationship between the parents and children, versus a more authoritarian style found in the accomplishment of natural growth style, which is correlated with more assertive upper-class children and more passive lower-class children (Lareau, 2011). Lareau (2011) found that children of lower social classes tend to become independent earlier than children of higher social classes. Parents who use the concerted cultivation parenting style enroll their children in many extracurricular activities, which helps their children learn to navigate institutions and develop the style of social competency most valued by institutions, but can develop a sense of entitlement (Lareau, 2011). While parents who use the concerted cultivation style enroll their children in more activities, they tend more flexible with their rule. In contrast, accomplishment of natural growth features more flexibility in choosing activities and friends (Lareau, 2011). Parents who use accomplishment of natural growth tend to set rigid boundaries and focus on discipline and allow their children flexibility within the rigid boundaries. This can be contrasted with concerted cultivation in which child rearing is often seen as a project (Lareau, 2011).

Manstead (2018) highlights a difference between the “hard interdependence” of the lower classes and “expressive independence” of the upper classes. Hard interdependence is ‘hard’ because of the resilience required to cope with adversity and as well as an interdependence to cope with higher levels of financial constraint and less agency. This can be contrasted with a freedom to express oneself afforded to upper class individuals due to a lack of financial constraints and a culture that promotes self-expression.

Attitude Differences

With the observable differences in how individuals from different classes behave, it is reasonable to assume social classes differ in the attitudes they hold regarding general outlook and personal philosophy. While research into social class is growing, research into attitudes held by the different classes is growing at a much slower rate. Members of higher classes tend to display an independence due to their freedom from financial and other hardships, contrasted with interdependence displayed by lower-classes due to hardship (Manstead, 2018).

Another example can be found with Byrne, Clore, and Worchel (1966), who investigated the effects of economic similarity and dissimilarity on interpersonal attraction and found that individuals of high economic standing indicated higher levels of interpersonal attraction to individuals of similar economic standing ($t(82) = 3.62, p < .001$) and individuals of low economic standing indicated higher levels of interpersonal attraction to individuals of high economic standing ($t(46) = 5.47 p < .001$).

An older example of research into these differences is by Brownson et al. (1992), with a survey of over 2,000 people from two large cities in Missouri. Most respondents believed that smoking was harmful, regardless of social class. However, differences were found when participants were asked if they knew the association between smoking and conditions such as lung cancer, emphysema, and heart disease. While more than 50% of participants knew of the association, a greater portion of individuals from higher classes were more aware. The study also revealed that individuals of lower classes were less aware of the health benefits of smoking cessation.

In contrast, Goldstein (1993) surveyed over 700 households in a major western city in Canada and did not find many significant attitude differences between classes regarding attitudes towards smoking tobacco. One curious finding was that smoking attitudes and prevalence occurred in a parabola, with the lowest and highest classes demonstrating the lowest prevalence and most negative attitudes.

Attitude differences as pertaining to politics, Brewer and Stonecash (2007), presented findings about class and cultural divides within politics. One such finding is higher support for the Democratic party within the lower classes and a decrease in support for the Democratic party among individuals from higher classes; 43% in the 1950s versus 25% in the 2000s (Brewer & Stonecash, 2007). It should be noted, however, that support within the lower classes dropped from 51% to 31% during the same period.

Despite the increasing amount of research into social class, there are still gaps and contradictions within the literature. The following research will be investigating attitude differences between social classes within an undergraduate population, with the hope of filling some of the gaps and addressing the contradictions.

Hypothesis

Three hypotheses have been formulated to investigate attitude differences between social classes within an undergraduate population.

First, we predict that social class of the participant is positively correlated with both parental educational attainment and childhood household income.

Second, we predict that the upper classes (middle class and above) will show more favorable scores relating to enjoyment of foreign movies and classical music due their financial freedom and exposure, as noted by Manstead (2018) and Lareau (2011). We also predict they will indicate higher support the importance of fresh air and exercise because of the work presented by Brownson et al. (1992). While Brownson et al. (1992) did not specifically examine support for fresh air and exercise, it is plausible that the upper classes could show greater support because they were more aware of the benefits of smoking cessation and the negative health effects of smoking.

Our third hypothesis is that lower classes (working class and below), will show higher support for the Democratic party because of the data presented by Brewer and Stonecash (2007). We predict they will support conforming to group opinion, due to the interdependence noted by Manstead (2018). Additionally, we predict more positive attitude towards smoking because of the work by Brownson et al. (1992).

II. METHOD

Participants

Participants ($n = 339$) were recruited from the criminal justice and psychology Human Subject Pools of a medium-sized university in Texas. The Human Subjects Pool allows students enrolled in introductory-level courses to participate in and learn about the research process. One participant was excluded for not providing social class information and another was excluded for indicating membership to three classes. Within the sample, 237 participants were female, or about 70%. There were 97 males, which accounted for about 29% of the sample. Four individuals, or about 1.2% of our sample identified as third gender/non-binary. One individual declined to provide a sex. Please see figure 1 for a visual representation of the Sex Distribution. The average age was about 20 years old, with a mode of 19 years old and positive skewness. Please see figure 2 for a visual representation of the Age Distribution. Within the sample, 136 (40%) participants were White, 132 (39%) were Hispanic, 31 (9%) were African American, 21 (6%) indicated mixed race, eight (2%) indicated Asian, seven (2%) indicated other, and four (1%) did not answer. The exclusionary criteria required participants to be over 18 and only participate once.

Design

The study used a survey to collect responses and the hypotheses were tested using correlational tests in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, version 27 (IBM, 2020). We analyzed the participants responses in relation to their indicated social class(es) and other questions. This project dichotomized the independent variable into two levels for some of the analyses. This was done because the previous literature often does. The first

level is the upper-classes, operationalized as middle class and above, and the second level is the lower-classes, operationalized as working class and below. One reason the research team did not choose socioeconomic status is because it refers to one's current position on the socio-cultural hierarchy, rather than the norms one adopted as a child.

Instruments and Measures

The research team assessed participant social class and attitudes, as well as age, sex, national origin, and ethnicity. We also collected the educational attainment of both the participant and their parent(s), estimated family household income during childhood, and personal importance of one's social class. These were collected because both Manstead (2018) and Diemer & colleagues (2013) note the need for objective and subjective measures of social class because individuals self-identify with their social class because an individual may not identify with the class attributed through objective measures, such as income and educational attainment. Participants had the option to select multiple social classes so we can assess the attitudes of class-mobile individuals because there is little data on those individuals.

We assessed attitudes with a modified version of the Survey of Attitudes created by Byrne (1965). The researchers selected 20 questions from the original 56-item survey of attitudes. We modified several questions to improve clarity and relevance, based on previous experience. The questions assessed attitudes relating to a number of topics, such as: gender stereotypes, health, entertainment, politics, the arts, fresh air and exercise, creative work, support for the two major political parties, the American way of life, smoking or vaping tobacco, conformity and personal philosophy. The questions used a modified 6-point Likert scale in which the first point represents strongly disagree and the

sixth point represents strongly agree. Some questions were reverse coded, in which the first point represents strongly disagree and the sixth point represents strongly agree. In terms of validity, Byrne and Griffitt (1973) reviewed over a decade of research into the interpersonal attraction paradigm, within which the Survey of Attitudes is a key factor. They found that the similarity-attraction paradigm work among diverse populations such as fourth-grade students, individuals of low socioeconomic status, individuals who are institutionalized for schizophrenia and alcohol misuse, senior populations, and students of different ethnicities (Byrne & Griffitt, 1973)

Procedure

This online study was administered with Qualtrics and participants accessed it through an anonymous link provided by the SONA system. Participants were presented with a consent form that they must fill out before continuing. Granting consent brought the participant to the demographic's questions, where as a lack of consent brought participants to the end of the survey. The 20 questions assessing attitudes followed the 10 demographics questions. Upon completing the survey, a written debrief was presented, and students received credit through the university SONA system.

III. RESULTS

Hypothesis one predicted that social class is positively correlated with both educational attainment and childhood household income. Statistical analysis did not support this hypothesis. The correlation between social class and educational attainment of the parent/guardian who was the primary source of income was significant, moderate, and negative; $r(335) = -.378, p < .001$. Simply stated, participants from more educated and affluent homes tended to indicate lower social class. The correlation between social class and educational attainment of the parent/guardian who was not the primary source of income was not significant; $r(336) = -.081, p = .135$. This suggests that secondary income source has little influence on an individual's social class. The correlation between social class and estimated household income was significant, medium, and negative; $r(334) = -.417, p < .001$. These results suggest that college students from more affluent homes commonly identify with lower classes, and students from less affluent homes commonly identify with higher classes. The strength of the correlations were labeled in accordance with the levels established by Cohen (1988), in which .1 is small, .3 is medium, and .5 is large.

Hypothesis two predicted that the upper classes (middle class and above) will show more favorable scores relating to the enjoyment of foreign movies and classical music, and the importance of fresh air and exercise. A T-test was performed, the results of which partially supported the hypothesis. The upper classes showed more support for foreign movies ($M = 2.55, SD = 1.29$) but lower support for classical music than lower classes ($M = 3.83, SD = 1.46$); $t(335) = -2.25, p = .03$, and $t(335) = 3.63, p < .001$, respectively. The effect size for foreign movies was small at $-.279$ and $.450$ for classical

music, which is medium. There were no statistically significant differences between classes regarding the importance of fresh air and exercise ($M = 5.36$, $SD = .95$); $t(334) = .587$, $p = .557$.

Our third hypothesis predicted that lower classes (working class and below), will show higher support for the Democratic party, and more positive attitudes towards both smoking and conforming to group opinion. Another T-test was performed, and the results did not support the hypothesis. Analysis revealed that the lower classes showed greater support for the Republican party ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 1.65$; $t(131) = 4.72$, $p < .001$). The effect size was .645, which is slightly above medium. In addition, the analysis did not reveal statistically significant support for smoking or vaping tobacco ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.59$) or conforming to group opinion ($M = 2.95$, $SD = .93$); $t(334) = -1.54$, $p = .124$, and $t(334) = .98$, $p = .33$.

IV. DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic status – generally considered to be some combination of income, wealth, educational attainment, and occupational prestige – is a complex construct with many facets which has been neglected within the field of psychology as it was used often as a control variable rather than the focus of the research (APA Task Force on Socioeconomic Status, 2007). This construct is difficult to study because there is no universal definition and various assessment techniques have drawbacks. The results of hypothesis one of this study, highlights the variations in definitions and difficulty in measurement.

The present study attempted to clarify and fill the gaps within the existing literature. In addition to attempting to measure the construct, researchers also investigated attitude differences between social classes. The differences were hypothesized because the classes vary in how they signal class membership, based on differences noted by Diemer et al., (2013), Kraus et al., (2017), and Bjornsdottir and Rule (2017). Another class-based difference is how the parents tend to raise children, which can lead to differences in life outcomes, such as education, wealth, and health (Diemer et al, 2013). There is also variation in how the classes attend to work and whether they take work home with them at the end of the day (Streib, 2015).

The first hypothesis predicted a positive correlation between both parental income and educational attainment, and social class. However, this was not supported by the analysis and the inverse was found. One possible explanation is that social class is neither salient nor understood by the sample population. This result could also be produced by inaccurate social appraisal, in which the participant primarily interacts with few social

classes and cannot accurately judge class membership. Finally, this could be due to the measure used to assess social class. It should be noted that the correlation between parental educational attainment and household income is positive and what one would expect to see, which supports the former two explanations.

Hypothesis two predicted that individuals from the upper class, upper-middle class, and middle class would show greater enjoyment of foreign movies, classical music, and the importance of fresh air and exercise due their financial freedom and exposure, as noted by Manstead (2018) and Lareau (2011). This hypothesis was only partially supported by the analysis. The upper classes showed greater support for foreign films but less support for classical music, when compared to the lower classes. However, based on the effect sizes indicate that class has a small effect on ones appreciation of foreign moves and a medium effect on ones appreciation of classical music. There were no statistically significant differences between classes regarding the importance of fresh air and exercise.

The final hypothesis predicted that the lower classes would show higher support for the Democratic party, and more positive attitudes towards both smoking or vaping tobacco and conforming to group opinion. The lower classes showed higher support for the Republican party, which suggests a recent political shift that should be investigated further and is contrary to the findings of Brewer and Stonecash (2007). The effect size suggests that class has a medium effect on political beliefs, at least in our sample. Contrary to the some of reviewed literature, the lower classes did not demonstrate statistically significant results smoking or vaping tobacco and conforming to group

opinion. It should be noted that this study reinforces the findings of Goldstein (1993), which noted no difference in attitudes towards smoking tobacco.

There are several note-worthy limitations to the study. The first of which is that the sample population was comprised of university students from introductory psychology and criminal justice classes, primarily in their late teens or early twenties, which could reduce the external validity and generalizability of the study. The data was not analyzed by ethnicity, which could produce different results. Some participants did not understand social class; many participants indicated that they were raised in an affluent household but chose middle class when one would expect to see upper or upper middle class. Additionally, some students indicated belonging to a higher class while indicating that their childhood household was not affluent. Another limitation was the operationalization of social class. As discussed in the literature review, there is not a universal operationalization of social class, which could reduce generalizability. The second to last limitation is the number of social classes presented to participants. The participants were presented five classes to choose from, which could reduce the sensitivity of the measure. Adding a “lower-middle class” option might have different results. The final noteworthy limitation, which Rhemtulla et al. (2012) shows as a gray area, is using correlational techniques to analyze ordinal data.

This research suggests that some of the literature on attitudes possessed by the various social classes may no longer be accurate, due to its age. It also highlights the need for more precise ways of defining and assessing social class, social class origin, and socioeconomic status, due to negative results of hypothesis one. These results can help future researchers more effectively study this construct, which could help reduce the

differences in health and educational outcomes between classes, and improve upward mobility. Research into this topic can also be used to help universities improve retention and graduation rates of first-generation students caused the mismatch between social class based sub-cultures within the university.

APPENDIX SECTION

A. Consent Form.....20

B. Demographics Information21

C. Modified Survey of Attitudes26

APPENDIX A

Ian Armstrong, a graduate student at Texas State University, is conducting a research study to differences in attitudes held by different social classes within a university population. You are being asked to complete this survey because you are a student at Texas State University.

Participation is voluntary. The survey will take approximately 30 minutes or less to complete. You must be at least 18 years old to take this survey.

This study involves no foreseeable serious risks. We ask that you try to answer all questions; however, if there are any items that make you uncomfortable or that you would prefer to skip, please leave the answer blank. Your responses are anonymous.

Reasonable efforts will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private and confidential. Any identifiable information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. The members of the research team, the funding agency (remove funding agency if study is not funded), and the Texas State University Office of Research Compliance (ORC) may access the data. The ORC monitors research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants.

Your name will not be used in any written reports or publications which result from this research. Data will be kept for three years (per federal regulations) after the study is completed and then destroyed.

You will receive course credit if you participate through the SONA system

If you have any questions or concerns feel free to contact Ian Armstrong or his faculty advisor, Dr. John Davis:

Ian Armstrong, graduate student
Psychology Department
512-762-2783
Iba2@texasstate.edu

Dr. John Davis, Professor
Psychology Department
512-245-3162
jd04@txstate.edu

This project 7492 was approved by the Texas State IRB on 3/31/2021. Pertinent questions or concerns about the research, research participants' rights, and/or research-related injuries to participants should be directed to the IRB chair, Dr. Denise Gobert 512-716-2652 – (dgobert@txstate.edu) or to Monica Gonzales, IRB Regulatory Manager 512-245-2334 – (meg201@txstate.edu).

If you would prefer not to participate, please do not fill out a survey.

If you consent to participate, please complete the survey.

APPENDIX B

Demographics Information

Q2 Age

Q3 Please indicate your sex

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Non-binary / third gender (3)
- Prefer not to say (4)

Q4 Ethnicity

Q5 In which country were you born?

Q6 The social class(es) with which I most identify is (are): (Select all that apply)

- Upper Class (1)
- Upper-Middle Class (2)
- Middle Class (3)
- Working Class (4)
- Working Poor (5)

Q7 My social class is an important part of my identity (check one)

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Moderately disagree (2)
- Slightly disagree (3)
- Slightly agree (4)
- Moderately agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q8 Please indicate the highest level of education completed by the parent/guardian who was the primary source of income during your childhood (check one)

- Less than high school diploma (1)
- High school diploma or equivalent (2)
- Some college (3)
- Associates or Technical degree (4)
- Bachelor's degree (5)
- Some post-graduate (6)
- Master's degree (7)
- Doctoral/Professional degree (8)

Q9 Please indicate the highest level of education of the parent/guardian who was **NOT** the primary source of income during your childhood (check one). Check N/A if not applicable

- Less than high school diploma (1)
- High school diploma or equivalent (2)
- Some college (3)
- Associates or Technical degree (4)
- Bachelor's degree (5)
- Some post-graduate (6)
- Master's degree (7)
- Doctoral/Professional degree (8)
- N/A (9)

Q10 Please indicate your highest level of education.

- Less than high school diploma (1)
- High school diploma or equivalent (2)
- Some college (3)
- Associates or Technical degree (4)
- Bachelor's degree (5)
- Some post-graduate (6)
- Master's degree (7)
- Doctoral/Professional degree (8)

Q11 Please indicate the estimated total annual household income of your childhood home.

- Unsure (1)
- Prefer to not answer (2)
- \$0-\$25,000 (3)
- \$25,000-\$50,000 (4)
- \$50,000-\$75,000 (5)
- \$75,000-\$100,000 (6)
- \$100,000-\$125,000 (7)
- \$125,000+ (8)

APPENDIX C

Modified Survey of Attitudes

Q12 American Movies and Television Programs (check one)

- I enjoy American movies and television programs very much. (1)
- I enjoy American movies and televisions programs. (2)
- I enjoy American movies and television programs to a slight degree. (3)
- I dislike American movies and television programs to a slight degree. (4)
- I dislike American movies and television programs. (5)
- I dislike American movies and television programs very much. (6)

Q13 Social Aspect of College Life (Check one)

- In general, I am very much against an emphasis on the social aspects of college life. (1)
- In general, I am against an emphasis on the social aspects of college life. (2)
- In general, I am mildly against an emphasis on the social aspects of college life. (3)
- In general, I am mildly in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of college life. (4)
- In general, I am in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of college life. (5)
- In general, I am very much in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of college life. (6)

Q14 Classical Music (check one)

- I dislike classical music very much. (1)
- I dislike classical music. (2)
- I dislike classical music to a slight degree. (3)
- I enjoy classical music to a slight degree. (4)
- I enjoy classical music. (5)
- I enjoy classical music very much. (6)

Q15 American Way of Life (check one)

- I strongly believe that the American way of life is not the best. (1)
- I believe that the American way of life is not the best. (2)
- I feel that perhaps the American way of life is not the best. (3)
- I feel that perhaps the American way of life is the best. (4)
- I believe that the American way of life is the best. (5)
- I strongly believe that the American way of life is the best. (6)

Q16 Money (check one)

- I strongly believe that money is not one of the most important goals in life. (1)
- I believe that money is not one of the most important goals in life. (2)
- I feel that perhaps money is not one of the most important goals in life. (3)

- I feel that perhaps money is one of the most important goals in life. (4)
- I believe that money is one of the most important goals in life. (5)
- I strongly believe that money is one of the most important goals in life. (6)

Q17 Political Parities (check one)

- I am a strong supporter of the Democratic party. (1)
- I prefer the Democratic party. (2)
- I have a slight preference for the Democratic party. (3)
- I have a slight preference for the Republican party. (4)
- I prefer the Republican party. (5)
- I am a strong supporter of the Republican party. (6)

Q18 Group Opinion (check one)

- I feel that people should always ignore group opinion if they disagree with it. (1)
- I feel that people should usually ignore group opinion if they disagree with it. (2)
- I feel that people should often ignore group opinion if they disagree with it. (3)
- I feel that people should often go along with group opinion even if they disagree with it. (4)
- I feel that people should usually go along with group opinion even if they disagree with it. (5)
- I feel that people should always go along with group opinion even if they disagree with it. (6)

Q19 Creative Work (check one)

- I enjoy doing creative work very much. (1)
- I enjoy doing creative work. (2)
- I enjoy doing creative work to a slight degree. (3)
- I dislike doing creative work to a slight degree. (4)
- I dislike doing creative work. (5)
- I dislike doing creative work very much. (6)

Q20 Novels (check one)

- I dislike reading novels very much. (1)
- I dislike reading novels. (2)
- I dislike reading novels to a slight degree. (3)
- I enjoy reading novels to a slight degree. (4)
- I enjoy reading novels. (5)
- I enjoy reading novels very much. (6)

Q21 Universal Health Care (check one)

- I am very much opposed to Universal Health Care as it operates in Great Britain. (1)
- I am opposed to Universal Health Care as it operates in Great Britain. (2)

- I am mildly opposed to Universal Health Care as it operates in Great Britain. (3)
- I am mildly in favor of Universal Health Care as it operates in Great Britain. (4)
- I am in favor of Universal Health Care as it operates in Great Britain. (5)
- I am very much in favor of Universal Health Care as it operates in Great Britain. (6)

Q22 Foreign Movies (check one)

- I enjoy foreign movies very much. (1)
- I enjoy foreign movies. (2)
- I enjoy foreign movies to a slight degree. (3)
- I dislike foreign movies to a slight degree. (4)
- I dislike foreign movies. (5)
- I dislike foreign movies very much. (6)

Q23 Strict Discipline (check one)

- I am very much against strict disciplining of children. (1)
- I am against strict disciplining of children. (2)
- I am mildly against strict disciplining of children. (3)
- I am mildly in favor of strict disciplining of children. (4)
- I am in favor of strict disciplining of children. (5)
- I am very much in favor of strict disciplining of children. (6)

Q24 Foreign Language (check one)

- I am very much in favor of requiring students to learn a foreign language. (1)
- I am in favor of requiring students to learn a foreign language. (2)
- I am mildly in favor of requiring students to learn a foreign language. (3)
- I am mildly opposed to requiring students to learn a foreign language. (4)
- I am opposed to requiring students to learning a foreign language. (5)
- I am very much opposed to requiring students to learn a foreign language. (6)

Q25 College Education (check one)

- I strongly believe it is important for a person to have a college education in order to be successful. (1)
- I believe it is important for a person to have a college education in order to be successful. (2)
- I believe that perhaps it is important for a person to have a college education in order to be successful. (3)
- I believe that perhaps it is not important for a person to have a college education in order to be successful. (4)
- I believe that it is not important for a person to have a college education in order to be successful. (5)
- I strongly believe that it is not important for a person to have a college education in order to be successful. (6)

Q26 Women in Today's Society (check one)

- I strongly believe that women are not taking too aggressive a role in society today. (1)
- I believe that women are not taking too aggressive a role in society today. (2)
- I feel that perhaps women are not taking too aggressive a role in society today. (3)
- I feel that perhaps women are taking too aggressive a role in society today. (4)
- I believe that women are taking too aggressive a role in society today. (5)
- I strongly believe that women are taking too aggressive a role in society today. (6)

Q27 Exhibitions of Modern Art (check one)

- I dislike looking at exhibitions of modern art very much. (1)
- I dislike looking at exhibitions of modern art. (2)
- I dislike looking at exhibitions of modern art to a slight degree. (3)
- I enjoy looking at exhibitions of modern art to a slight degree. (4)
- I enjoy looking at exhibitions of modern art. (5)
- I enjoy looking at exhibitions of modern art very much. (6)

Q28 Careers for Women (check one)

- I am very much in favor of women pursuing careers. (1)
- I am in favor of women pursuing careers. (2)

- I am mildly in favor of women pursuing careers. (3)
- I am mildly opposed to women pursuing careers. (4)
- I am opposed to women pursuing careers. (5)
- I am very much opposed to women pursuing careers. (6)

Q29 Men's adjustment to stress (check one)

- I strongly believe that men adjust to stress better than women. (1)
- I believe that men adjust to stress better than women. (2)
- I feel that perhaps men adjust to stress better than women. (3)
- I feel that perhaps men do not adjust to stress better than women. (4)
- I believe that men do not adjust to stress better than women. (5)
- I strongly believe that men do not adjust to stress better than women. (6)

Q30 Fresh Air and Exercise (check one)

- I strongly believe that fresh air and daily exercise are not important. (1)
- I believe that fresh air and daily exercise are not important. (2)
- I feel that probably fresh air and daily exercise are not important. (3)
- I feel that probably fresh air and daily exercise are important. (4)
- I believe that fresh air and daily exercise are important. (5)
- I strongly believe that fresh air and daily exercise are important. (6)

Q31 Smoking or Vaping Tobacco (check one)

- In general, I am very much in favor of smoking or vaping smoking tobacco. (1)
- In general, I am in favor of smoking or vaping tobacco. (2)
- In general, I am mildly in favor of smoking or vaping tobacco. (3)
- In general, I am mildly against smoking or vaping tobacco. (4)
- In general, I am against smoking or vaping tobacco. (5)
- In general, I am very much against smoking or vaping tobacco. (6)

Q32 Drinking (check one)

- In general, I am very much in favor of college students drinking alcoholic beverages. (1)
- In general, I am in favor of college students drinking alcoholic beverages. (2)
- In general, I am mildly in favor of college students drinking alcoholic beverages. (3)
- In general, I am mildly opposed to college students drinking alcoholic beverages. (4)
- In general, I am opposed to college students drinking alcoholic beverages. (5)
- In general, I am very much opposed to college students drinking alcoholic beverages. (6)

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association, Task Force on Socioeconomic Status. (2007).
Report of the APA Task Force on Socioeconomic Status. Washington, DC: APA.
- Brownson, R. C., Jackson-Thompson, J., Wilkerson, J. C., Davis, J. R., Owens, N. W., & Fisher, E. B., Jr (1992). Demographic and socioeconomic differences in beliefs about the health effects of smoking. *American Journal of Public Health*, 82(1), 99–103. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.82.1.99>
- Bjornsdottir, R. Thora & Rule, Nicholas. (2017). The visibility of social class from facial cues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 113. 530-546. <https://doi:10.1037/pspa0000091>.
- Byrne, D., Clore, C.R., and Worchel, P. (1966). The Effect of economic similarity-dissimilarity on interpersonal attraction, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4(1), 220-224
- Byrne, D., & Nelson, D. (1965). Attraction as a linear function of proportion of positive reinforcements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1(6), 659–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022073>
- Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. (1973). Interpersonal Attraction. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 24(1), 317-336.
- Cataldi, E. F., Bennett, C. T., Chen, X., Simone, S. A., (2018). First-generation students: College access, persistence, and postbachelor’s outcomes. *U.S. Department of Education NCES 2018-421*.

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Diemer, M., Mistry, R., Wadsworth, M., Lopez, I., & Reimers, F. (2013). Best practices in conceptualizing and measuring social class in psychological research. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 13*(1), 77-113
- Gal, D. (2015). Identity-signaling behavior. In M. I. Norton, D. D. Rucker, & C. Lamberton (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of consumer psychology*. (pp. 257–281). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107706552.010>
- Goldstein, J. (1993). Stratification and smoking: A search for class-based smoking lifestyles. *Journal of Drug Education, 23*(4), 357–373.
<https://doi.org/10.2190/MX8D-526B-VXDH-3VD7>
- IBM Corp. Released 2020. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 27.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp
- Kraus, M. W., Park, J. W., & Tan, J. J. X. (2017). Signs of social class: The experience of economic inequality in everyday life. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(3), 422–435. <https://doi:10.1177/1745691616673192>
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press

- Manstead A. (2018). The psychology of social class: How socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*(2), 267–291. <https://doi:10.1111/bjso.12251>
- Rhemtulla, M., Brosseau-Liard, P. É., & Savalei, V. (2012). When can categorical variables be treated as continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods under suboptimal conditions. *Psychological methods*, *17*(3), 354–373. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029315>
- Stonecash, J. M., & Brewer, M. D. (2007). *Split: class and cultural divides in American politics*. CQ Press.
- Strieb, J. (2015). Explanations of how love crosses class lines: Cultural complements and the case of cross-class marriages. *Sociological Forum*, *30*(1), 18-39. <https://doi:10.1111/socf.12143>