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ABSTRACT

The present study sought to extend the literature examining potential antecedents and outcomes of perceived social status identity. Fouad and Brown’s (2000) conceptualization of Differential Status Identity was used as a conceptual lens for examining the relation of supports and barriers to an individual’s internalization of social status and subsequent career indecisiveness, career choice anxiety, and career decision self-efficacy. This framework offered an opportunity to consider simultaneously the relations of individuals’ experiences with external barriers (i.e., experiences with racism and classism) and external and intrapersonal supports (i.e., family/peer support and coping efficacy, respectively) to an individual’s internalization of status identity. In line with DSI’s conceptualization, status identity was assessed by examining one’s perceived access to economic resources, level of social prestige, and level of social power.

Data from 299 undergraduate students (67.9% female, 55.9% European American) attending a large Midwestern University included responses to measures of status identity, career decision-making, and experiences with supports and barriers. Results supported a number of the proposed relations and provided initial evidence of the usefulness of a new measure of experiences with classism created for the present study. In particular, results indicated that frequency of experiences with systemic classism was negatively related to perceived status, frequency of experiences with personal classism were positively related to perceived status, primary caregiver support was positively
related to perceived status, and having a higher self-reported SES and being European American were positively related to perceived status identity. Contrary to expectations, experiences with racism and support from siblings and peers were not related to perceived status identity. Coping efficacy moderated the relation between systemic experiences with classism and perceived social status. Higher levels of internalized status were positively related to career decision self-efficacy and negatively related to career indecisiveness and career choice anxiety.

Finally, results from an exploratory path model provided support for a number of relations among the primary variables of interest in the present study. Specifically, experiences with personal and systemic classism and support from primary caregivers related significantly to perceived social status after controlling for race and self-reported social class category; support from caregivers related significantly to career decision self-efficacy; coping efficacy moderated the relation between perceived social status and career decision self-efficacy; perceived social status related to career indecisiveness directly as well as indirectly, through career decision self-efficacy; and perceived social status related to career choice anxiety indirectly, through career decision self-efficacy. Implications for practice and education, along with limitations and directions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Social class has long been a focus of attention for behavioral and social scientists. As early as 1949, Centers demonstrated that individuals are aware of the hierarchical structure of society and are conscious that they belong to a particular level in that hierarchy. Subsequent research has revealed that this consciousness profoundly affects the individual’s outlook (Jackman & Jackman, 1983; Kohn, 1969), general well-being, perceived access to societal control (Anderson & Collins, 2001), development of social relationships (Argyle, 1994; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Rossides, 1997), awareness of possible life goals, and characterization of work and education (e.g., Brown et al., 1996; Carter, 1994; Davis & Robinson, 1988; Jackman & Jackman, 1983; Kohn, 1969).

Researchers, thus, have recognized that the effects of social class on an individual are multifaceted and begin in childhood (Steedman, 1986). Little research, however, has been conducted that considers the psychological implications of belonging to a particular class on the individual (Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Frable, 1997). Moreover, most previous research on social class has been limited by its reliance upon sociological, as opposed to psychological, measures of the construct that are categorical rather than quantitative in nature, and that fail to take into account more than parental occupation, education, or income (Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Rossides,
In a 1996 review of the relevant literature on vocational behavior, Brown et al. highlighted some of the weaknesses of relying on standard indicators to determine social class and its relations to individuals’ vocational decisions. They concluded that classifying social class by occupation, education, and income level is inadequate and that these are only partial and indirect indicators of the psychological phenomenon of social class. Brown and colleagues thus proposed using Rossides’ (1990, 1997) model to serve as a starting point for understanding the multifaceted nature of social status along three interrelated dimensions: economic resources (access to economic resources for material goods and leisure activities), social prestige (perception of the extent to which one is valued by society), and social power (perceived personal power to affect change on political and organizational levels).

Also complicating previous research on social class standing is the lack of consensus about the definitions and operationalizations of this construct in research (Heppner & Scott, 2004; Holt & Griffin, 2005; Liu et al., 2004; Smith, 2005). Indeed, in their 2004 review of the literature on social class, Liu and colleagues pointed to the problems inherent in the use of a variety of indices of social class standing (particularly because they are often used interchangeably) including: social class, social status, and socioeconomic status. These authors concluded that, overall, this concept has been used poorly in psychological research, and argued that more sophisticated conceptualizations and operationalizations of social class standing as a subjective variable are needed.

Furthermore, previous literature is limited by its lack of sophisticated understanding of the intersection of social class with other social group identities such as race/ethnicity (Brown, 2000; Rojewski & Yang, 1997). Specifically, the mechanisms by
which contextual variables such as race and class intersect and thereby are internalized by the individual remain unclear despite mounting calls for more sophisticated research in this area (e.g., Flores & Ali, 2004; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Lee & Dean, 2004). Indeed, recent empirical investigations have demonstrated the importance of considering the intersection of identities for an individual (e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2003). The present study, therefore, sought to explore the more global construct of social status relative to traditional vocational outcomes, and included consideration of perceived identity as a racially and socially positioned individual, according to Fouad and Brown’s (2000) Differential Status Identity framework.

**Social Status and Vocational Psychology**

Historically, vocational psychologists have called attention to the role of contextual variables in career development (e.g., Super, 1957). Recently, vocational psychologists have become increasingly aware of the need to broaden our understanding of social status as an important contextual variable that has a number of potential implications for future research and practice (e.g., Betz, 2001; Blustein, 2001; Subich, 2001). To date, components of an individual’s social status (e.g., race and class) have been demonstrated individually to be related to vocational constructs and a more sophisticated understanding of their interrelationship may offer important information for practitioners working with clients from underrepresented groups in society.

Specifically, race has been demonstrated to be related to vocational variables, including career barriers (Pearson & Bieschke, 2001), career aspirations, interests, perception of opportunities (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005), perceptions of barriers (McWhirter, 1997), access to positive role models (Zirkel, 2002), tendency to foreclose
on career choice prematurely (Leal-Muniz & Constantine, 2005), and access to career development resources (Diemer, 2002). Similarly, social class standing (as measured by traditional, sociological indices such as parental education and income) has been demonstrated to be related to vocational constructs, including educational expectations of family members and individuals (Hanson, 1994; Sewell & Shah, 1968), parental involvement in education (Sewell & Shah, 1968), educational opportunities afforded to individuals, initial work values (Lindsay & Knox, 1984), level of career adaptability, achievement of consistency between work and goals, and the ways that individuals make meaning of their work and find motivation for it (Blustein, Chaves, Diemer, Gallagher, Marshall, et al., 2002).

In combination, these bodies of literature point to the important relations that contextual variables such as race and class have to the vocational development of the individual. Given the documented influence of race and class on an individual’s career development, it is surprising that, to date, a sophisticated understanding of the intersection of these two contextual variables on an individual’s subsequent vocational behavior does not exist (Flores & Ali, 2004). In fact, a number of authors recently have called for greater attention to understanding this intersection of identities in relation to vocational behavior (e.g., Ali, McWhirter, & Chronister, 2005; Betz, 2001; Blustein, 2001; Brown, 2004; Lee & Dean, 2004; Liu et al., 2004).

**Differential Status Identity**

Not surprisingly then, psychologists have begun to press for stronger theoretical models and more sophisticated assessments of social status from a perspective that considers the economic, historical, social, and political culture in which individuals
operate (e.g., Fouad & Brown, 2000; Liu et al., 2004). With the introduction of Differential Status Identity (DSI), Fouad and Brown (2000) proposed such a multifaceted framework for further understanding the process by which contextual variables such as social class standing and race are internalized, as well as the psychological effects of this internalization on the perceived personal power of the individual. Specifically, DSI is intended to tap dimensions of social status that are “social and behaviorally salient (real or perceived) and that differentiate individuals and their in-groups from members of ordinant out-groups” (p. 387).

As a construct, DSI purports to address the social and psychological consequences of occupying a certain position on the stratification hierarchy (i.e., social class position and racial/ethnic group membership), particularly when an individual is a member of a non-ordinant (non-majority) group. Consistent with previous research that suggested one’s membership in non-ordinant groups is most salient and therefore internalized at the deepest level (Jackman & Jackman, 1983), DSI proposes that individuals who occupy such positions are likely to experience greater psychological consequences of their status than are those who occupy more ordinant (i.e., majority group) positions (Fouad & Brown, 2000). Specifically, individuals who are members of non-ordinant groups in society are expected to be influenced by their group membership to a greater extent than are those who are (or are perceived to be) members of ordinant groups.

Fouad and Brown (2000) drew from a body of previous theoretical and empirical literature examining the influence of race and class in their conceptualization of DSI (e.g., Argyle, 1994; Centers, 1949; Jackman & Jackman, 1983; Kohn, 1969). Specifically, DSI extended Cross’ (1971, 1991) and Helms’ (1990) racial identity
theories and answered calls for a more integrative framework by which to examine various aspects of individuals’ perceived identity that account for within racial/ethnic group as well as between racial/ethnic group differences. Thus, similar to racial identity theories, DSI proposes that non-ordinant aspects of one’s identity are the facets most salient to the individual.

Although racial identity theories have garnered significant empirical support for some of their tenets (namely that it is important to consider multiple components of identity that individuals may internalize), this body of research has been plagued by relatively small effect sizes, which contribute to the inconclusiveness of results (see Fouad & Brown, 2000, for a review). Some have proposed that these small effect sizes may be the result of limitations in measurement (e.g., Lemon & Waehler, 1996; Yanico, Swanson, & Tokar, 1994) and others have suggested that they are a byproduct of failing to tease apart social class standing from racial/ethnic group membership (e.g., Rossides, 1997). In a similar vein, the relatively small effect sizes that have been demonstrated in some previous social class research have been attributed to problems with measurement and confusion around the definition of social class. Indeed, in their 1993 review, Betancourt and Lopez highlighted the need for psychologists to consider more multidimensional measures of social class. Specifically, the authors noted that results of previous research on the influence of the more simplistic and unidimensional construct of social class (as measured by self-categorization into a social class group) have been more inconsistent than results of research including the broader construct of socioeconomic status (as measured by a combination of parental education, income, and occupation).

Extending this line of reasoning, Fouad and Brown’s (2000) DSI may offer a mechanism
to address some limitations of prior research as it attends to the importance of considering both race/ethnicity and class through its multidimensional conceptualization of social status as comprised of access to economic resources, social prestige, and social power.

Differential Status Identity, thus, offers a new conceptual understanding of social status that incorporates the complexities related to the intersection of identities for individuals (Fouad & Brown, 2000). Although DSI is innovative and suggests the importance of understanding the effects of socialization experiences on one’s internalization of social status, Fouad and Brown offered little insight into the specific mechanism(s) by which one internalizes one’s perceived social status. In particular, socialization experiences posited to be important to development and the specific mechanisms by which they are expected to contribute to identity formation remain unclear. DSI is proposed as a way to conceptualize the manner in which multiple learning experiences in individuals’ lives intersect and are internalized by the individual, yet Fouad and Brown failed to propose specific mechanisms involved in this process; the authors, therefore, provide little guidance around how these learning experiences should be operationalized in future research.

The present study, thus, sought to explore the potential relations among a selection of socialization experiences that appear to be consistent with Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of DSI and perceived social status. Specifically, experiences with classism, experiences with racism, and support from family and peers were included as socialization experiences that may be related to an individual’s perception of her or his social status. Although these experiences are in no way hypothesized to be inclusive of
all of one’s socialization experiences thought to relate to internalized status, they were chosen based on their consistency with Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of elements of one’s learning history that likely influence one’s perceived identity.

An additional purpose of the present study was to examine the relations of these socialization experiences and perceived social status to traditional vocational outcomes that have garnered significant attention within the vocational literature (career indecisiveness, career choice anxiety, and career decision self-efficacy). This is consistent with Fouad and Brown’s proposed relations of DSI to a number of aspects of vocational development. Difficulties with these three outcomes (having high levels of career indecision, high amounts of anxiety about making a career choice, and low self-efficacy for pursuing particular career paths) have been documented to thwart goal-directed behaviors toward a specific career path (e.g., Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996; Betz & Voyten, 1997; Chartrand & Robbins, 1990; Chartrand, Robbins, Morrill, & Boggs, 1990; Gianakos, 1999).

The Internalization of Supports and Barriers

In their 2000 examination of the role of supports and barriers in vocational development, Lent and colleagues pressed for future research investigating the process by which individuals make sense of, and respond to, what their environment provides. Specifically, the authors pointed to the need for future research examining the environmental opportunities, resources, and barriers that combine to influence an individual’s vocational development. Perhaps in response to this call, the influence of supports and barriers on an individual’s career development has been regaining attention in vocational psychology and is the focus of a number of recent theoretical and empirical
investigations (e.g., Blustein et al., 2002; Chaves et al., 2004; Kenny et al., 2003; Lent et al., 2002; Lent et al., 2003). Yet, the processes by which supports and barriers interrelate and affect the individual remains unclear.

Gaining a more sophisticated understanding of supports and barriers is proposed to be particularly important when addressing the vocational development processes for members of non-ordinant (i.e., non-majority) groups (e.g., McWhirter, 1997). It has been well-documented that members of non-ordinant groups may face barriers (conceptualized as representing both environmental and intrapersonal factors) to vocational development that influence their career exploration, career decision-making processes, and ultimate career choice (e.g., Arbona, 1995; Betz, 1995; Blustein et al., 2002; Croteau et al., 2000; Juntunen et al., 2001; Lucas, 1993). For example, experiences with cultural “isms” have been documented to have influential effects on the career development process for individuals from non-ordinant groups (e.g., Betz, 1994; Croteau et al., 2000; Lucas, 1993). Yet, Flores and Ali (2004) argued that much of the previous research on barriers faced by members of non-ordinant groups is limited by its reliance upon unidimensional components of an individual’s identity (e.g., race, sexual orientation, or sex) that fail to account for potential interactions among various aspects of an individual’s identity (e.g., their racial/ethnic group membership and social class).

Investigations have also focused on experiences with supports for members of non-ordinant groups (e.g., Aguilar & Williams, 1993; Betz, 1994; Blustein et al., 2002; Gloria & Ho, 2003; Gomez et al., 2001; Juntunen et al., 2001; Kenny et al., 2003). Indeed, supports have been demonstrated to be, in some cases, more influential than barriers when related to various aspects of an individual’s career development (e.g.,
Gloria & Ho, 2003; Kenny et al., 2003). Thus, the presence (or perception) of vocational supports may serve as a mitigating factor for some of the potentially detrimental effects of barriers on career development, particularly for members of non-ordinant groups. However, perhaps because of limitations in the scope of previous inquiries (e.g., studies often isolate specific groups in their examinations of supports and/or barriers [e.g., Mexican American women, McWhirter, 1997; engineering majors, Lent et al., 2003; urban adolescents, Kenny et al., 2003; Sirin et al., 2004]) as well as the qualitative nature of many of the studies, the specific mechanisms by which experiences (intrapersonally and environmentally) with supports and barriers may interrelate and relate to vocational outcomes remain unclear (Lent et al., 2000).

Fouad and Brown’s (2000) DSI may offer a framework from which to consider how persons’ experiences with, and perceptions of, environmental supports and barriers are internalized and thereby influence vocational outcomes; those experiences may be internalized as a percept of social status. Moreover, given that individuals who share the same social group in society are not uniformly affected by experiences with vocational supports or vocational barriers (Lent et al., 2000), it is important to understand in a more sophisticated manner how different individuals’ experiences with similar types of supports and barriers in their environment are actually internalized.

Existing empirical evidence demonstrates that individuals who share similar demographics may respond quite differently to experiences in the environment. For example, an individual from a lower social class background who is also a member of a racial/ethnic minority group may actually respond to environmental barriers by developing greater levels of persistence, resilience, and motivation (e.g., Gomez et al.,
Therefore, coping efficacy is included in the present investigation as an intrapersonal variable that may relate to learning experiences and internalized perception of social status. Specifically, one’s perceived coping efficacy (beliefs about one’s ability to manage or negotiate obstacles in their environments; Bandura, 1977) may moderate the relations among experiences with supports and barriers and internalized social status.

Summary and Statement of Purpose

For a number of years, vocational psychologists have called for greater attention to the role of social status in career development (e.g., Betz, 2001; Blustein et al., 2002; Fouad, 2001; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Subich, 2001). They also have called for a more sophisticated understanding of the process by which supports and barriers are internalized by the individual and subsequently influence career development (Lent et al., 2000). A review of the literature suggests that individuals’ experiences with supports and barriers, their internalization of social status identity, and the relation of these constructs to vocational outcomes merit further study (e.g., Ali et al., 2005; Blustein et al.; Chaves et al., 2004; Kenny et al., 2003; Liu et al., 2004).

The current study, then, answers the call of researchers (e.g., Blustein et al., 2002; Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Lent et al., 2000) to extend the literature examining the impact of experiences with supports and barriers on the internalization of status identity for the individual. In particular, this study seeks to use DSI as a framework by which to further understand the role of supports and barriers in an individual’s internalization of social status and subsequent career indecisiveness, career choice anxiety, and career decision self-efficacy (see Figure 1). As depicted in Figure 1,
DSI offers a new conceptual lens with which to consider simultaneously the relations among various supports and barriers (e.g., experiences with racism, experiences with classism, family/peer support, and coping efficacy) and an individual’s internalization of her or his status identity (e.g., access to economic resources, level of perceived social prestige, and level of perceived social power), and the relation of this internalization to career decision-making behaviors.
Figure 1

Proposed Model
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Vocational psychologists have recognized the need to further understand the role of contextual supports and barriers to vocational behavior and development and to extend the literature on the process by which these contextual affordances intersect and influence one’s perceived social status (Fouad & Brown, 2000). Because previous research has failed to understand in a multidimensional and integrative way the nature of social status and the influence of belonging to a particular status on the individual (Fouad & Brown), the current study seeks to answer the call of researchers (e.g., Flores & Ali, 2004; Liu et al., 2004) to expand our understanding of social status.

This chapter opens with an overview of the construct of Differential Status Identity (DSI) as a framework for conceptualizing one’s social status. Next, literature supporting the DSI framework is reviewed with specific focus on theoretical and empirical work that highlights the multidimensional nature of social status. A brief review of vocational literature that offers a framework for the model proposed in the present study (see Figure 1) is then presented. Then, an overview of barriers and supports expected to contribute to one’s internalization of his or her status is provided, as research has demonstrated the importance of considering the role of contextual supports and barriers on an individual’s internalized perception of personal power and subsequent
vocational behaviors. Next, literature on the interplay of supports and barriers in vocational development is reviewed, followed by a review of literature examining coping efficacy, with particular attention to how this construct may operate for individuals from diverse backgrounds. Finally, a summary of how the current study frames the internalization of social status in terms of experiences with contextual supports and barriers, and the relation of social status to traditional vocational outcomes, is presented. The chapter concludes with a review of the proposed and tested hypotheses.

**Differential Status Identity**

A number of years ago, psychologists began to recognize the importance of centralizing sociocultural variables such as race/ethnicity and social class in research (e.g., Argyle, 1994; Blustein et al., 2002; Brown et al., 1996). Yet, attention to the need to gain a more sophisticated understanding of the psychological meaning of social class to diverse groups of individuals occurred relatively recently (e.g., Flores & Ali, 2004; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Lindley, 2006; Liu et al., 2004; Ostrove & Cole, 2003) and psychologists have called for more attention to this contextual variable (e.g., Smith, 2005). In particular, researchers have suggested that a critical psychology of social class includes attention to the relationships among variables such as social class identity, racial/ethnic identity, attitudes, and experiences of discrimination (Ostrove & Cole).

Relatedly, in their 2000 chapter, Fouad and Brown highlighted the importance of considering race and social class as interrelated cultural constructs that influence individuals’ perceptions of themselves and others, as well as others’ perceptions of them. Race and class, according to Fouad and Brown’s DSI construct, are conceptualized as “dynamic variables that influence the way personal and social identities are constructed”
These variables are proposed to contribute to socialization and/or learning experiences that influence one’s cultural identity and internalized perception of standing in the social world in relation to others. Specifically, race and social class are hypothesized to be indirect influencers of developmental outcomes; these influences are expected to be mediated by an individual’s perception of how similar she or he is to others in society (i.e., her or his internalized status identity). Indeed, Fouad and Brown asserted that “race and class interact and constitute important features of one’s cultural context. They influence one’s perceived social status; this status is reflected in identity.” Thus, DSI was proposed to incorporate the psychological and psychosocial dimensions of race and class as perceived and internalized by the individual. It is intended to facilitate further insight into the psychological effects of race and social class, particularly for members of non-ordinant groups.

Anne Roe (1956) posited that the more an individual’s social and experiential background differs from that of the social majority, the more it determines vocational development. Drawing from her theory, in their conceptualization of DSI, Fouad and Brown proposed that an individual’s self-perception may be influenced by the social context in which he or she is operating, and that those aspects of the self that are non-ordinant are those likely to be the most salient and thereby have the greatest influence on psychological development for the individual. For example, according to DSI, race is proposed to be more salient as a component of identity and thereby to have greater impacts on development and behavior for an African American than for a European American in the United States given the social, political, and historical positioning of these two groups (e.g., Argyle, 1994). Similarly, social class is proposed to be more
salient as a component of identity (and thereby to have the greatest subsequent impact) for individuals from lower and upper social class backgrounds than for those from middle-class backgrounds (as characterized by traditional indices of social class such as education, income, and occupation) given the hierarchical nature of the United States’ society (e.g., Rossides, 1997). This salience is proposed to be particularly pronounced in social contexts in which the individual’s identity is different from the majority of those surrounding her or him. For example, an individual’s lower SES may be more salient when the individual is in higher education settings than when the same individual is with family and friends from similarly low SES backgrounds.

**Social Status as a Multidimensional Construct.** In their conceptualization of DSI, Fouad and Brown (2000) drew from Rossides’ earlier work that called for attention to three interrelated components (i.e., economic resources, social prestige, and social power) as aspects important to consider in a subjective (rather than objective and categorical) consideration of social status (1990, 1997). This multidimensional conceptualization of social status allows for the possibility that individuals who share the same income bracket may be treated differently by others, may perceive themselves differently, may have different opportunity structures because of their familial or other connections, and may engage in quite different political behavior (Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Rossides, 1990, 1997). Indeed, Rossides (1997) explicitly stated that the three dimensions were related, but independent of one another. He recognized that having a high-income level does not always entail high levels of prestige (e.g., an individual whose occupation is a lawyer but who is also a member of a racial/ethnic minority group or an individual whose well-paid occupation is trash collection).
More recently, in their review of the literature on social class in counseling psychology research, Liu and colleagues (2004) highlighted the limitations of previous research because of its sociological, as opposed to psychological, conceptualization of social class, its limited inclusion of this construct as a major variable of study, and lack of consistent language used to define this construct in research. In particular, these researchers highlighted problems inherent in intermixing terms such as social class (position within economic hierarchy determined by income, education level, and occupation) and socioeconomic status (position within economic hierarchy determined by lifestyle, prestige, power, and control of resources). Although the work of Liu et al. offered a needed critique of the literature, the authors continued to focus on a conceptualization of social class that is more economic and categorical in nature in their suggestions for future research, despite urging from other researchers to consider social status as a more multidimensional measure of social position (e.g., Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Rossides, 1990).

Therefore, the present study relied upon Fouad and Brown’s (2000) broader, multi-dimensional definition of social status according to DSI that accounts for the intersection of racial/ethnic group position and identity, access to economic resources and consumption of those resources, experiences of social power, and internalization of one’s position in the social (rather than strictly economic) hierarchy. This perspective of social status was chosen on the basis of previous empirical research that has demonstrated the importance of considering the intersection of various identities (e.g., Moradi & Subich,
calls from theorists to consider the interrelationships among social identities (e.g., Flores & Ali, 2004), and recent support for the importance of considering social status as a multidimensional construct (Thompson & Subich, 2006; 2007).

Empirical support for Rossides’ (1990; 1997) multidimensional conceptualization of social status and Fouad and Brown’s (2000) DSI as including elements of access to resources as well as race-based inequalities in U.S. society was demonstrated by Thompson and Subich (2007). Specifically, Thompson and Subich investigated the ability of Brown et al.’s (2002) Differential Status Identity Scale (DSIS) to account for both race/ethnicity and social class in its measurement of social status. Rossides’ (1990; 1997) multi-dimensional view of social standing served as the framework for the DSIS which purports to assess individuals’ perceptions of their economic resources, social power, and social prestige according to Rossides’ (1997) framework. Results from 104 African American and 102 European American college students demonstrated that the two groups differed significantly on three of the four DSIS factors (Economic Resources-Amenities, Social Power, and Social Prestige; in each case European Americans scored higher than did African Americans) even when controlling for self-reported social class standing (the groups did not differ on the Economic Resources-Basic Needs factor; Thompson & Subich, 2007). The DSIS, therefore, correlated as expected with more traditional indices of social class (e.g., household income level during childhood and self-identified social class standing) while also capturing and reflecting expected race-based social status differences in U.S. society (Argyle, 1994), thereby offering support for the multidimensional conceptualization of social status. Despite these promising findings,
Thompson and Subich (2007) highlighted the need to gain a more sophisticated understanding of the process by which social status is internalized by the individual and the socialization experiences that may impact this internalization.

In another investigation, further support for Rossides’ (1990; 1997) multidimensional conceptualization as a more global indicator of social status than traditional indices of social class was demonstrated. Specifically, Thompson and Subich (2006) assessed the relation of social status to career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) and career indecision for 221 college students (80% European American; 147 female). Results of their analyses (described in greater detail later in this chapter) also lent support to the DSIS as a multidimensional measure of social status that captured aspects of social status above and beyond traditional indices of social class (i.e., self-reported social class category and income during childhood). The results of this investigation highlight the need to continue to use a multidimensional conceptualization of status in future vocational research rather than relying upon more traditional, sociological indices. This analysis was limited, however, by its reliance on a predominantly European American sample and its focus on variables suspected to be outcomes of social status rather than socialization experiences that may operate as antecedents to individuals’ internalization of status (see Figure 1).

Taken together, results of previous investigations highlight the usefulness of relying upon a multidimensional conceptualization of social status that accounts for the intersection of race/ethnicity and social class. Thus, these results lend support to Fouad and Brown’s (2000) DSI construct in that cultural context (i.e., race and social class) is related to the internalization of status identity. Yet, although Fouad and Brown (2000)
highlighted the importance of considering the indirect relation of cultural context to subsequent identity formation and future behavior, as reviewed in Chapter 1, they offered few specific indications of which constructs relate to the internalization of status identity. Specifically, they posited that one’s cultural context shapes socialization (i.e., environmental learning experiences), which in turn contribute to identity development, but they failed to identify specific socialization experiences that may interrelate and influence the internalization of identity. Therefore, further work is needed to understand in a more sophisticated manner the relation of socialization experiences to identity.

*Social Status and Vocational Psychology.* For some time, vocational psychologists have pointed to the importance of considering the manner in which individuals internalize contextual affordances and experiences with supports and barriers in order to understand subsequent vocational development (e.g., Brown et al., 1996; Richardson, 1993). Indeed, contextual variables such as social class and race/ethnicity as well as learning experiences are an integral component of one of the dominant vocational theories of the day, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT: Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994; see Swanson & Gore, 2000, for a review).

More recently, however, vocational psychologists have called for attention to the internalization of multiple aspects of an individual’s identity (e.g., race/ethnicity, social class background, gender) and to the intersection of those identities in investigations of vocational development (e.g., Blustein, 2001; Brown, 2004; Flores & Ali, 2004). Indeed, in their review of the vocational literature, Whiston and Keller (2004) highlighted the limited theory-derived literature on social status, and others (e.g., Brown, 2004; Flores & Ali, 2004) have critiqued the overall body of vocational literature for not attending to the
intersection of various facets of identity. Specifically, in their review of 77 articles from
29 different journals published between 1980 and 2002 related to family of origin
influences on career development and occupational choice, Whiston and Keller
highlighted the important relations of family of origin variables to vocational
development constructs, including career development and maturity, occupational
exploration, vocational identity, assessment of career-related abilities, career commitment
or decidedness, and occupational selection. Further, in their critique of the existing
literature, these authors noted the relative lack of research related to social class and other
“family structure variables” (p. 560) and the lack of heterogeneity of samples included in
the existing literature. Additionally, Whiston and Keller pointed to the need to develop
more sophisticated and theory-derived work on the relation of social status to vocational
development.

Therefore, in response to the limitations noted in the existing body of research and
to answer the calls of others to begin to rely upon more sophisticated and multifaceted
indices of social status (e.g., Blustein et al., 2002; Brown et al., 1996), the present study
drew upon Fouad and Brown’s (2000) DSI and Rossides’ (1990; 1997) multidimensional
conceptualization of social status to investigate the relation among experiences with
supports and barriers and the internalization of social status identity and vocational
outcomes. Given that much of the vocational literature to date has conceptualized
experiences with supports and barriers in the environment as learning experiences, the
present investigation included a number of potential supports and barriers hypothesized
to contribute to one’s identity development and subsequent vocational behavior.
Social Status and Vocational Outcomes. Although not specifically relying on Rossides’ (1990; 1997) conceptualization of social status or Fouad and Brown’s DSI framework, a number of empirical investigations have provided support for the relation of contextual variables (i.e., race/ethnicity and social class background that are facets of Rossides’ more multidimensional construct, social status) and learning experiences (i.e., supports and barriers) to vocational development and therefore offer general support for the variables of focus in the proposed model (see Figure 1).

In a quantitative investigation, McWhirter, Hackett, and Bandalos (1998) highlighted the importance of considering sex, race/ethnicity, family support, and SES as predictors (directly or indirectly) of career and educational expectations. Specifically, McWhirter et al. explored the career expectations and educational plans of 282 Mexican American and 228 European American high school women and 247 Mexican American high school men. Results supported a sociocognitive model that included SES, perception of barriers (as measured using the Perceptions of Barriers Scale), parental and teacher support (measured by Farmer et al.’s 1981 Parental Support Scale and Teacher Support Scale), academic achievement, and acculturation as predictors of educational and career expectations. Results demonstrated that SES was an indirect influence on educational plans and career expectations and that father support predicted directly (and mother and teacher support predicted indirectly) the dependent variables. These results lend support to the call for further research examining multiple contextual characteristics simultaneously (e.g., race/ethnicity, SES), yet are restricted by the reliance upon parental
occupation to determine SES and by the limited amount of variance accounted for by the model (thus indicating that other variables may also be important to consider such as a more multifaceted measure of perceived social status).

Similarly, results of a qualitative investigation of 14 mid-career (aged 37-45) African American women highlighted the influential effects of race/ethnicity, social and family support, access to resources, and overcoming obstacles to career development. Specifically, Pearson and Bieschke (2001) used Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR) techniques to capture family influences on career development. Domains gleaned from semi-structured interview data included support from the African American church (communication and role modeling), economic resources (including motivation stemming from a lack of resources), education (focused on educational pursuits and achievement), extended family network, learned family values regarding work, perceptions of gender roles as flexible, nuclear family relationships (including parental expectations), tenacity in the face of racism, reaction to psychological stressors, social movements as a means of support, and social resources. The most salient variables identified by the women as being related to their career development included family emphasis on education, relationships with family members, and family’s social and economic resources. Thus, results highlighted the importance of examining the interrelationship between learning experiences and demographic characteristics that influence individuals’ vocational development in future research. Although the results strengthen our understanding of the career development process of these women, they are limited in their generalizability because of the use of only high achieving women and a limited sample size (due to the qualitative nature of the data collection).
Results from another qualitative investigation further highlighted the importance of considering the intersection of race/ethnicity, social class, barriers, and coping skills in the internalization of identity for individuals. Specifically, in their study designed to explore influential vocational factors in the lives of 20 (ranging in age from 34-60) notable Latinas in the United States, Gomez, Fassinger, Prosser, Cooke, Mejia et al. (2001) used qualitative interview data to identify themes. Participants’ mean childhood reported SES was lower middle class and mean adult SES was upper class. Results suggested that familial and cultural values were influential aspects of identity; relational supports were important (with extended family, spouses, role models, teachers, colleagues, and mentors); background variables (SES and educational experiences) influenced perceived identity and career directions; the career paths of participants tended to be unplanned and nonlinear; and participants relied upon optimism, persistence, passion, and cognitive reframing to cope with challenges. The challenges that were identified most frequently by the women included experiences with racism and sexism as well as financial limitations.

Similar to the findings of McWhirter et al. (1998) and Pearson and Bieschke (2001), Gomez et al. ’s (2001) results demonstrated the importance of gaining a complex understanding of a number of factors (e.g., learning experiences with supports and barriers as well as contextual affordances) when exploring career development, particularly for members of non-ordinant groups. Like Pearson and Bieschke’s results, Gomez and colleagues’ investigation is limited, however, by its inclusion of only Latina women who had been identified as “notable” in a published biographical directory of
notable Latinas in the United States. Therefore, it is important to extend our understanding of the intersection of these variables to more heterogeneous samples of individuals at earlier stages in the career development process.

A more recent investigation provided direct empirical support for the importance of using conceptualizations of social status that are more multidimensional in nature (such as Rossides’ 1990 conceptualization of social status) when investigating vocational constructs. Specifically, results from a quantitative investigation described previously (Thompson & Subich, 2006) demonstrated that DSIS scores accounted for more variance in Career Decision Self-Efficacy (CDSE) scores than did more traditional indices of social class (self-categorization of social class and annual household income during childhood) and that the relation of social status to vocational constructs would have been overlooked if traditional indices had been relied upon. Additionally, results demonstrated that social status’ (as measured by the DSIS) positive relation to career certainty was fully mediated by CDSE. Thus, these authors recommended future researchers consider social status as a multidimensional construct (as proposed by Rossides, 1990; 1997) that may have indirect effects on important vocational outcomes. Limitations of this study, however, include its investigation of constructs assumed to be vocational outcome variables associated with having a high or low internalized sense of social status (rather than potential antecedents of internalization of social status such as learning experiences, see Figure 1) and the lack of specific attention to race/ethnicity (because of the predominantly European American sample).
Taken together, results from these investigations highlight the need to consider the intersection of a variety of cultural contexts in relation to identity development and vocational outcomes. Based on previous research that demonstrated the relations of contextual factors (i.e., race/ethnicity, social class, and social status), barriers and supports, and coping strategies to a number of traditional vocational outcomes (e.g., outcome expectations, self-efficacy, career aspirations, and career expectations) as well as Fouad and Brown’s (2000) conceptualization of DSI, the following hypothesis was proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Greater perceived levels of social status relate to positive vocational outcomes of less career indecisiveness, less career choice anxiety, and greater career decision self-efficacy.

Summary. As a whole, this body of empirical research documents that cultural context, in combination with experiences with supports and barriers in an individual’s environment influence her or his career development. Thompson and Subich’s (2006) study also highlights the usefulness of relying upon a multidimensional conceptualization of social status. Yet, to date an integrated understanding of how these factors may intersect with one another and be internalized by the individual in his or her perception of social status remains unclear. Although Fouad and Brown (2000) drew from Rossides’ (1990) earlier work and from multidisciplinary perspectives in their conceptualization of DSI (and subsequent creation of the DSIS), they offered little insight into the process by which internalization of social status occurs, factors that may contribute to one’s internalization of high/low social status, or specific mechanisms that may serve as buffers for some individuals with non-ordinant positions. Specifically, Fouad and Brown pointed
to the important implications that learning experiences may have for individuals, yet they failed to specify which experiences are most influential or to identify factors that may determine whether experiences are internalized as having positive or negative valence by different individuals. Thus, extending Fouad and Brown’s work to incorporate the role that specific experiences with supports and barriers in one’s environment may play in one’s internalization of status is needed.

Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to extend Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of DSI by examining environmental mechanisms that may relate to one’s internalization and perception of his or her social status. Included in this examination were variables previously identified in the vocational literature as supports and barriers for individuals. Specifically, I proposed a conceptual model whereby these supports and barriers contribute to one’s multifaceted conceptualization of social status and subsequent vocational outcomes (see Figure 1).

Bars and Supports

Similar to DSI, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) includes the role of both contextual variables (such as race and class) as background affordances and of environmental experiences as influencers of individuals’ career development. Indeed, the importance of considering vocational supports and barriers has been well-documented in the vocational literature (for a review, see Lent et al., 2000; Swanson & Gore, 2000). Barriers to career development have been identified as “events or conditions, either within the person or in his or her environment, that make… progress difficult” (Swanson & Woitke, 1997, p. 446) and supports to career
development have been identified as “environmental variables that can facilitate the formation and pursuit of individuals’ career choices” (Lent et al., 2000, p. 42).

Despite the attention that has been given to these constructs in previous research and theory, a sophisticated understanding of the mechanisms by which they operate simultaneously remains unclear, probably because of complications inherent in attempting to tease the two apart. Specifically, some barriers have been demonstrated to impede for some individuals, while acting for others as facilitators (Lent et al., 2000). In addition, the existence of both interpersonal and environmental supports and barriers contributes to the difficulty of assessing for and understanding the effects of experiences with barriers on the individual (Lent et al.). The presence of barriers and supports to vocational development may be especially important to consider when an individual is a member of one or more non-ordinant groups. Indeed, according to Fouad and Brown (2000), the psychological experience of social status is proposed to be influenced by socialization experiences that may be especially salient when an individual is a member of a non-ordinant group.

A number of constructs have been demonstrated empirically to function as supports and barriers to individuals’ career development processes. In general, the influential aspects of barriers on career development have been documented more consistently than have those of supports (Lent et al., 2000), although some recent research suggests that supports may be more important (e.g., Lent et al., 2002). Five of these constructs are highlighted in the following sections as potential barriers and supports that may relate to individuals’ internalization of social status and subsequent vocational development.
Racism and Classism as Barriers. The influential aspects of the perception of barriers on subsequent decision-making processes have been well-documented, particularly for members of non-ordinant cultural groups (e.g., Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Luzzo, 1996; Swanson & Tokar, 1991; Swanson & Woitke, 1997). Experiences with racism and classism are two types of barriers proposed to influence the internalization of social status and the subsequent vocational outcomes for individuals in the present investigation (see Figure 1). Given Moradi and Subich’s (2003) findings that sexism and racism had concomitant effects on psychological distress, experiences with racism and classism are similarly proposed to occur concomitantly.

Racism. Within psychology, the study of racism has received a great deal of attention and racism has been demonstrated to be related to a number of factors that influence the everyday lives of individuals (for reviews, see D’Andrea & Daniels, 2001; Smedley & Smedley, 2005). Specifically, racism is defined as

“resulting from the transformation of race prejudice and/or ethnocentrism through the exercise of power against a racial group defined as inferior, by individuals and institutions with the intentional or unintentional support of the entire culture” (Jones, 1997, p. 280)

and is embedded in culture. Its effects are evident in economic manifestations (banks, mortgage companies, salary policies), health and quality of life (poverty; mortality rates; health care; housing opportunities; participation in social, political, and economic mainstream culture), education (educational segregation continues to exist within U.S. culture), and mental health (traditional theories may be biased) within U.S. society (Smedley & Smedley). Moreover, racism has been demonstrated to be related to a number of psychological constructs and its effects may manifest themselves in the
following ways for individuals: race-related trauma, racism-related fatigue, anticipatory racism reactions, race-related stress-distress, racism-related frustration, and racism-related confusion (Utsey, Bolden, & Brown, 2001).

Indeed, everyday experiences with racism have been demonstrated empirically to be commonplace for African American college students. Specifically, in their 2003 study, Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, and Bylsma investigated experiences of racism for 27 African American women and 24 African American men at a predominantly European American college campus using a daily diary methodology. Themes identified via investigation of diary entries included verbal expressions of prejudice, bad service, staring or glaring, and difficulties in interpersonal exchanges. These experiences were common for both men and women and emanated from both strangers and intimates. Although the results from this analysis support the notion that experiences with racism are a common occurrence and highlight the need to further understand these experiences, this investigation was limited by its lack of attention to the intersection of other social identities (e.g., social class standing) with race for the participants.

Racism also has been posited to affect the vocational development of individuals from diverse backgrounds (e.g., Betz, 1994, 2002; Byars, 2001). Specifically, Betz (1994, 2002) called attention to the importance of considering racism/racial discrimination as a potential barrier to individuals’ career development. Indeed, the null environment, as posited by Betz (1989), is proposed to apply not only to women but also to individuals who are members of other non-ordinant groups as the environment fails to take into account differentiating external environments experienced by individuals from non-ordinant groups (Betz, 1994, 2002). Additionally, dealing with discrimination is
posited to create constant stress for the individual that may lead to poor learning environments for members of non-ordinant racial groups; this stress may be multiplied for the individual if she or he is a member of multiple minority groups (Byars, 2001). Further, the overrepresentation of racial/ethnic minority individuals in lower level positions and unskilled occupations within the labor market in the U.S. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002) has been proposed to limit individuals’ perceptions of opportunities available to them (e.g., Byars).

Racism also has been demonstrated empirically to affect the vocational development of individuals from a number of racial/ethnic minority groups. In a study designed to explore career goals, barriers, and need for vocational information, Lucas (1993) interviewed 75 African American and European American college students (88% African American; 69% female). Lucas used a 38-item problem checklist developed by Counseling Center staff at the university to determine the specific counseling service needs of individuals. Data from the sample of African American students were compared to data from a previously collected residence hall sample (331 college students, 87% European American). Results demonstrated that the African American students were significantly more likely to report concerns about “racial, sex, or other discrimination” getting in the way of their career plans than were European American students from the residence hall sample. Although the results of this investigation highlighted the need to consider discrimination as a potential barrier for students, it failed to examine the effects of the intersection of multiple types of experiences with discrimination (e.g., racism, classism, sexism).
Likewise, experiences of discrimination were identified as important by participants in a qualitative investigation on the meaning of career and vocational development to 18 Northern Plains American Indians (ages 21-59; 11 female). Specifically, CQR was used to code participant responses to semi-structured interviews into five themes: meaning of career, success as a collective experience, supportive factors, obstacles, and living in two worlds (Juntunen, Barraclough, Broneck, Seibel, et al., 2001). Meaning of career (the sense that success is not about personal happiness but about sharing traditions with future generations and pursuing a chosen goal) and success as a collective experience (the importance of contributing to the well-being of others and a desire to give back to the reservation community) were consistent themes across the entire sample (both those who had attended or completed college and those who had not attended or completed college).

The two subsamples, however, differed in their conceptualizations of the three remaining themes. Specifically, those participants who had attended or completed college were more likely to cite discrimination resulting from racism (9 of 11 participants who had attended college) and alienation from tribal community as obstacles, family influences as important supportive factors, and to have had the experience of moving between two worlds, whereas those who had not attended or completed college were more likely to cite lack of family support as an obstacle, family’s high value on education as a supportive factor, and a conceptualization of the two worlds as distinct and distant from one another. These results demonstrated that for those individuals who had attended or completed college, the experience of discrimination was more salient and perceived as a potential obstacle to vocational development. Although Native
Americans, as a group, typically have been categorized as having low SES (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990), Juntunen et al. did not specify how social class background or current access to resources may have intersected with participant conceptualizations of their vocational development.

Discrimination was demonstrated to operate as an important individual and structural barrier to future vocational and educational aspirations for urban youth in another qualitative investigation of 18 African-American, Cape Verdean, and Latino urban adolescents (Sirin, Diemer, Jackson, Gonsalves, & Howell, 2004). The researchers used Grounded Theory to classify data from focus groups, questionnaires, goal maps, and a group identity collage to construct a theoretical model of future aspirations. The person-in-context model gleaned from the data highlighted structural and individual barriers as influencing the future aspirations of urban adolescents. Specifically, the participants identified having an immediate time orientation and lack of social support as individual barriers and discrimination, violence, and gender socialization as structural barriers that influence their future aspirations. Participants also identified self-reliance, “getting serious,” having a future time orientation, and social support as resources at the individual level and a capacity for thinking systemically as a resource at the structural level. Thus, results from multiple sources of data highlighted the importance of considering supports and barriers (such as discrimination) that facilitate and impede career development aspirations for urban youth. These findings are limited, however, because of their reliance upon a small sample of perhaps restricted generalizability and their failure to differentiate between multiple types of discrimination that may influence vocational development.
Taken together, findings demonstrate that racism affects individuals at individual and structural levels, operates as a potential obstacle to vocational development, and is related to increased perceptions of vocational barriers. Further, results of research with individuals from ethnic minority groups (e.g., Lucas, 1993; Swim et al., 2003) demonstrate that experiences with racism occur on a regular basis and in a variety of forms. Discrimination as a result of racism, therefore, is a common experience for individuals from minority racial/ethnic groups in U.S. society and may be an important aspect of an individual’s socialization experiences. It is important to note, however, limitations in operationalizing an individual’s experiences with racism. For the present study, the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE: Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) was used to assess individuals’ perception of recent racist events by asking participants to rate the frequency at which they experience racism from a variety of sources. Although the SRE has been demonstrated to have strong psychometric properties and support exists for its ability to capture the experiences with racism for individuals from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups (David & Okazaki, 2006; Klonoff & Landrine, 1999; Moradi & Hasan, 2004), its ability to capture the essence of experiences with oppression [defined as the actual or intended exploitation or hindering of individuals’ pursuits of self-determination by others (Freire, 1970)] is limited. Despite these limitations, based on the results of previous research as well as on Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of DSI that suggests race-based inequalities present in U.S. society are learning experiences that affect an individuals’ internalization of social status, the following hypotheses were proposed.
Hypothesis 2a: Non-ordinant racial/ethnic group membership relates positively to greater numbers of reported experiences with racism as measured by the SRE.

Hypothesis 3a: Greater numbers of reported experiences with racism relate negatively to perceived social status as defined by the DSIS.

Classism. Classism is proposed to operate similarly to racism for the individual; however, little empirical literature on the role of classism or its relation to development exists (Liu, 2002; Liu et al., 2004; Ostrove & Cole, 2003). Some (e.g., Steedman, 1986) have proposed that individuals are expected to experience privilege or disadvantage based on their class membership, which may, like racial/ethnic group membership, shape how they see themselves in the world. Others (e.g., Lott, 2002; Moon & Rolison, 1998) have argued that one’s perception of social status as well as others’ perceptions of her or his social status lead to experiences of class-based discrimination.

Given the relative lack of a psychological understanding of classism, a number of authors recently have called for greater attention to this construct (e.g., Lott, 2002; Smith, 2005). In these calls, authors have pointed to psychologists’ inability and/or unwillingness to examine issues of classism in their research, theory, and practice (e.g., Liu, 2002; Smith, 2005; Sue & Lam, 2002). Indeed, in their 2002 review of psychotherapeutic treatment outcomes for diverse cultural and demographic groups, Sue and Lam concluded regarding members of less privileged socioeconomic groups: “It seems that there are still biases and stereotypes that psychologists have with regard to this population” (p. 414). These authors claimed that these biases were reflected in the fact that experiences with class and classism have been widely ignored in psychological research. Similarly, Smith (2005) recently proposed that psychotherapists have
attitudinal barriers that contribute to engaging in classist behaviors in practice. She echoed the calls of others to examine classism in future research and highlighted the importance of researchers and practitioners examining their own classist assumptions.

In response to these criticisms, some authors have attempted to delineate the nature of classism and how it may operate for the individual. Specifically, Smith (2005) highlighted the role of oppression in her definition of classism as “…prejudice plus power: It is an interlocking system that involves domination and control of social ideology, institutions, and resources, resulting in a condition of privilege for one group relative to the disenfranchisement of another” (p. 688). Thus, Smith contended that although classism can be experienced by individuals at the high and low end, only dominant groups in society have the cultural and institutional power to enforce prejudices via oppression.

Liu (2002), on the other hand, proposed that classism may be experienced by all individuals, regardless of their actual social class standing. His definition of classism is “prejudice and discrimination based on social class resulting from individuals from different perceived social classes” (Liu, 2001, p. 137). Specifically, Liu identified four different types of classism that may be experienced by individuals: (a) upward classism is prejudice and discriminatory behavior directed toward people believed to be of a higher social class than the perceiver; (b) downward classism is prejudice and discrimination directed toward those perceived to have a social class that is lower than the perceiver; (c) lateral classism is prejudice and discrimination that occurs among people perceived to be similar in social class and occurs in an effort to realign an individual’s social class worldview to be congruent with others in his or her perceived
economic culture; and (d) internalized classism is feelings of anger, frustration, depression, despair, disappointment, and anxiety when one is unable to meet and fulfill the social class expectations of one’s economic culture. In each case, experiences of classism are proposed to include both cognitive (schema) as well as affective (feelings of shame, guilt, depression, and anxiety) components.

Taken together, although theorists and researchers differ in their descriptions of classism, all have pointed to the need to examine more carefully the role of classism in the lives of individuals in future psychological research and practice. In line with DSI’s conceptualization of classism as everyday experiences in which the individual’s internalization of social status is salient because of its difference from the majority and its proposition that the psychological consequences of classism will be most salient for individuals with less access to economic resources, social prestige, and social power, the present study sought to understand individuals’ everyday experiences with classism according to Smith (2005) and as occurring via Liu’s (2002) category of downward classism. Further, given the existing literature supporting the examination of everyday experiences with racism for members of non-ordinant groups (i.e., using the Schedule of Racist Events; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), everyday experiences with downward classism were operationalized and assessed in a similar manner. Specifically, a new measure designed to tap individuals’ perceived experiences with classism was created to parallel the SRE (as described in Chapter 3). Similar cautions related to the operationalization and measurement of these experiences with discrimination should therefore be considered.
A recent qualitative investigation explored the nature of everyday experiences with classism in an attempt to begin to facilitate a more sophisticated psychological understanding of experiences with classism. In their study with 38 low-income (annual incomes fell below the national poverty line) undergraduate college students (28 were students at a state university and 10 were students from a community college), Ritz and Hyers (2005) used focus groups to investigate the extent to which individuals faced everyday experiences with classism on their college campus and to examine the nature of experiences identified by participants. Of the participants (76.3% female), 19 were European American, 14 were African American, 2 were Latin American, 2 were Asian American, and one was Biracial. The following five themes representing the most common experiences of classism described by participants were identified from transcripts of the focus groups using Grounded Theory: (a) middle-class assumptions emanating from peers, instructors, and administrative staff; (b) insensitive/classist comments; (c) bureaucratic hassles; (d) experiences with others who were flaunting their higher levels of social class; and (e) experiences of being excluded/avoided by others. Further, experiences with classism were described by participants as occurring on a regular basis and were perceived to be an integral part of their everyday lives. Indeed, experiences with classism described by participants included both blatant and subtle instances, were reported as emanating from both strangers and intimates, and reportedly occurred in both short and long interactions with others.

Additionally, Ritz and Hyers (2005) investigated the extent to which experiences with classism intersected with experiences of racism and/or sexism. Consistent with DSI’s conceptualization that experiences with racism and classism operate similarly but
uniquely as socialization experiences for the individual, results indicated that experiences with classism were described as being independent of racism and/or sexism for 60% of participants. Specifically, participants reported that their experiences of classism were separate from their experiences with sexism and/or racism and that the effects of these experiences were distinct from the effects of experiences with racism and/or sexism. Further, Ritz and Hyers concluded that three of the types of prejudicial incidents reported by the participants are similar to incidents reported in the everyday racism literature (e.g., Swim et al., 2003); whereas two types of incidents (flaunting and bureaucratic hassles) appear to be unique to individuals’ experiences with classism. Thus, results from these participants pointed to the need to consider experiences with classism as an important construct related to status identity.

Ritz and Hyers (2005) also highlighted college students’ affective reactions associated with being a member of a particular social class category. Specifically, participants identified that there is a certain stigma associated with being from a low social class background. For example, participants highlighted feelings of “missing out” on important social interactions, feelings of discomfort on their college campuses related to their income level, and internalized feelings that they did not belong on their campuses, which contributed to them wanting to drop out of school. On the other hand, some participants reported that they were affected positively by being from low-income backgrounds. In fact, some participants claimed that they internalized their low-income backgrounds and used negative experiences associated with it to provide them with motivation and the drive to succeed.
In summary, results from this empirical investigation highlight the pervasive effects that experiences with classism may have (at least temporarily) for individuals (particularly on college campuses where this identity is likely to be salient, according to DSI); delineate the importance of exploring experiences with classism in concert with, as well as separate from, experiences with other cultural -isms; and provide evidence that social class background may be internalized quite disparately for different individuals. Additionally, results from this study point to the need for a more sophisticated understanding of the mechanisms by which classism operates for individuals and the importance of extending our knowledge of individuals’ experiences with classism in future qualitative as well as quantitative research with larger and more generalizable samples.

Although not specifically intended to tap everyday experiences with classism, a series of studies by Ostrove and colleagues provide further support for the salience of social status in educational settings. Specifically, in their 1993 investigation of women from working-class backgrounds who attended Radcliffe College in the early 1960’s, Stewart and Ostrove collected questionnaire data from 82 women from the class of 1947 and the class of 1964. Results demonstrated that women from working-class backgrounds (as identified by parental occupation) were more likely to report feelings of alienation, stress related to financial pressures, feeling overwhelmed, and academic unpreparedness than were those from more privileged class backgrounds.

Likewise, in a retrospective two-part study, Ostrove (2003) demonstrated that social class was an important variable related to women’s recollections of their college experiences. For Study 1, 193 women who had attended Smith College in the 1960’s
completed written questionnaires assessing their social class background experiences and open-ended questions designed to explore recollections of their college experiences. Responses were analyzed for their fit into two themes: belongingness (and lack of belongingness, or alienation) and wanting (references to social mobility provided by attending Smith). Results indicated that women from working-class backgrounds scored significantly higher on alienation, described Smith as representing an opportunity for social mobility, and reported experiencing social segregation and continuous feelings of academic unpreparedness. In Study 2, Ostrove conducted follow-up interviews with seven of the women who participated in Stewart and Ostrove’s (1993) study. Of these seven women, none were from working-class backgrounds, five were from middle-class backgrounds, and two were from upper-class backgrounds. Results from the interviews demonstrated that even these women from middle and upper class backgrounds reported noticing class differences and described being keenly aware of who “belonged” throughout their college experience.

Results from the analyses of these two studies lend further support to the need to consider internal experiences of social status. They also demonstrate the salience of social class background and experiences of subtle classism for individuals on college campuses and highlight some potential implications of belonging to a particular class (e.g., feelings of alienation, lack of academic preparation, and support from extended family networks). Yet, they are limited by their reliance upon almost exclusively European American women who attended prestigious colleges in the 1940’s and 1960’s and therefore did not take into account potential intersections among identities for
individuals (e.g., race/ethnicity and class). Additionally, these studies relied upon parental occupation to classify individuals into social class categories and thus did not consider other elements of social status (e.g., social prestige and social power).

Taken together, the few studies on classism that do exist appear to align with Lott’s (2002) theorizing that classism may be categorized into institutional distancing (deliberate or obvious, subtle or direct discrimination in the educational system, housing opportunities, access to quality health care, access to legal assistance, opportunities for involvement in politics and public policy) or interpersonal distancing (suspiciousness of the poor, stigmatizing those who are poor). To date, no studies exist that examined specifically the relation of everyday experiences with classism to vocational behavior, despite the calls from theorists and researchers (e.g., Liu & Ali, 2005) to do so.

Nevertheless, as discussed in other sections in this chapter, some research has demonstrated that one’s social class or social status position is related to vocational behavior (e.g., Blustein et al., 2002; Chaves et al., 2004; Thompson & Subich, 2006).

In sum, the limited empirical research that does exist on the nature of classism has demonstrated the importance of including individuals’ experiences of class-based discrimination in future examinations of social status. Indeed, Ritz and Hyer’s (2005) qualitative investigation of low-income college students’ experiences with classism demonstrated that, similar to everyday experiences with racism, experiences with classism occur on a regular basis and in a variety of forms. Additionally, including experiences with classism as a potential learning experience that influences individuals’ internalization of social status is consistent with DSI. Therefore, based on the results of empirical investigations (e.g., Ritz & Hyers) as well as on Fouad and Brown’s
conceptualization of DSI that suggests class-based inequalities present in U.S. society are learning experiences that impact an individual’s internalization of social status, the following hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 2b: Non-ordinant social class group membership relates positively to greater numbers of reported experiences with classism as measured by the EWCS.

Hypothesis 3b: Greater numbers of reported experiences with classism relate negatively to perceived social status as defined by the DSIS.

*Family/Peer Support.* An empirical investigation demonstrated that supports may play a more important role in the career development of individuals than do barriers (Lent et al., 2002). In their qualitative study with 31 undergraduates (67% female, 58% European American) from either a state university (61%) or a technical college, Lent et al. interviewed participants about their perspectives on factors that had influenced their efforts to implement or pursue their preferred career options and strategies they used to cope with barriers encountered in implementing their goals. Data from the combined sample of students revealed contextual and personal themes. Specifically, barriers frequently identified by participants included contextual barriers (financial concerns, negative social/family influences, and role conflicts) as well as personal barriers (personal adjustment and multiple role concerns). Students also reported relying on contextual and intrapersonal supports to cope with barriers to their vocational development, the most salient of which was financial constraints. Specifically, contextual factors (family and social support and access to role models and mentors) and intrapersonal factors (personal strengths such as self-confidence, perseverance, and goal setting) were identified as important supports.
Moreover, supports were identified by the participants as playing (in the past) and being expected to play (in the future) a bigger role in their lives than barriers (Lent et al., 2002). Social support and access to facilitative role models and mentors were identified as two of the most important supports for individuals’ vocational development and participants cited direct and vicarious work experiences (e.g., modeling) as being somewhat less influential in determining expected choices. Although Lent and colleagues did include in their analyses an examination of differences between the two sites and noted that in general, the technical college participants reported encountering more barriers but also had more access to supports than did their university counterparts, they failed to consider race/ethnicity or SES (the researchers did not include any information related to SES in their description of their samples) in their analysis. Thus, this investigation is limited by its lack of attention to differences that may be operating for members of particular racial/ethnic groups or for individuals from various SES backgrounds.

Lent et al.’s (2002) findings that vocational supports may be more influential than barriers was reinforced by Kenny, Blustein, Chaves, Grossman, and Gallagher (2003). In their two-part study, Kenny et al. surveyed 355 9th grade students from urban high schools (53% male; 37.5% Black Caribbean, 24.5% African American, 24% Latino, 10% European American, and 14% Other) in their attempt to explore experiences with supports and barriers in relation to levels of school engagement, aspirations, and expectations. Kenny and colleagues used the Perception of Barriers Scale (McWhirter,
1997) and the Perception of Educational Barriers Scale (McWhirter et al., 2000) to assess barriers and the Kinship Support Scale (Taylor, Casten, & Flickinger, 1993) and Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987) to assess supports.

Similar to Lent et al.’s (2002) findings, results from this study demonstrated that the variance accounted for by vocational supports (i.e., social/kinship support) was more robust than that accounted for by vocational barriers, pointing to the importance of gaining a more sophisticated understanding of vocational supports. In addition, results demonstrated social support was an important vocational support. Specifically, higher levels of kinship support and lower levels of perceptions of barriers were related to higher levels of school engagement, aspirations, and expectations. Additionally, higher levels of reported social support from both family and others were related to more positive attitudes about the value of school, perception of fit in the school environment, and likelihood of actively participating in school related tasks. Individuals with access to higher levels of social support were also likely to view work as important and aspire to leadership positions in their field. Although the participants represented an ethnically diverse group of individuals and the results are consistent with Lent et al., these authors failed to attend specifically to social class in their analyses thereby limiting our understanding of how various social identities may be intersecting for the individual.

Parental Support. Given the documented importance of supports to vocational development, psychologists have pointed to the value of differentiating among various types of supports. For example, a number of studies have examined specifically the role of parental support on an individual’s vocational behavior. In one study, the role of parental support as a facilitator of career development was documented in its relation to
math and science learning experiences and outcome expectations. Specifically, in their 2000 social cognitive examination of parental influences on math and science career-related vocational behavior, Ferry, Fouad, and Smith demonstrated that parental encouragement (as measured by 10 items created by the authors for the purposes of the study) significantly positively related to learning experiences (grades in math and science) of 791 undergraduate students (85% European American, 71% female). Further, parental encouragement was found to indirectly relate to self-efficacy and outcome expectations for math and science career-related pursuits through learning experiences. Although limited by its reliance upon unstandardized measures of latent constructs, a sample that was mainly European American, and its sole focus on math and science careers, results of this study highlight the important role that parental figures in an individual’s environment may have on the individual’s vocational development.

Another series of studies focused specifically on parental support for ethnic minority students. In one investigation, Flores and O’Brien (2002) included parental support and perceived barriers in their investigation of the applicability of SCCT for 364 Chicana high school students. Flores and O’Brien tested models with (among other social cognitive variables) parental support and perceived occupational barriers predicting career choice prestige, career choice traditionality, and career aspirations. Perceptions of barriers were assessed using McWhirter’s 1997 Perception of Barriers Scale and parental support was assessed using the Career Support Scale (CSS). Results demonstrated that the presence of parental support was related positively to career choice prestige and the presence of career aspirations, and fewer career barriers was related positively to career choice prestige. Yet, similar to other studies relying on the use of
McWhirter’s Perception of Barriers Scale, the small amount of variance accounted for by Flores and O’Brien’s model points to the need to consider other variables (e.g., experiences with racism and classism) as potential perceived barriers for individuals from underrepresented groups. Also, the internal consistency reliability of the CSS was somewhat low (.76) in this study, pointing to the possibility that other measures of parental support may be better indicators of this construct.

Similarly, in their investigation of contextual factors in relation to career development for urban African American high school students, Constantine, Wallace, and Kindaichi (2005) demonstrated a positive relationship between parental support and career certainty. Results of their analyses indicated that for 151 students (58% female), perceived parental support (as measured by an abbreviated version of the CSS) positively predicted career certainty and that those students who perceived more career barriers (as measured by the Perception of Barriers Scale) were more likely to have higher levels of career indecision. The results may be limited by the somewhat low Cronbach’s alpha for the CSS (.78) as well as the lack of inclusion of other aspects of identity (e.g., perceived social status, social class background) in the analyses.

Likewise, Leal-Muniz and Constantine (2005) highlighted the importance of parental supports in relation to vocational exploration and commitment for Mexican American undergraduates. Specifically, Leal-Muniz and Constantine investigated the extent to which perceived parental support (as measured by an abbreviated version of the CSS), perceived career barriers (as measured by an 8-item version of McWhirter’s 1997 Perceptions of Barriers Scale), and adherence to career myths would predict vocational exploration and commitment and tendency to foreclose. Results for 204 male (33%) and
female (67%) Mexican American undergraduates demonstrated that perceived parental support related significantly and positively to greater vocational exploration and commitment and significantly and negatively to a tendency to foreclose prematurely on career options. Additionally, perceived career barriers and adherence to career myths related significantly and positively to tendency to foreclose. Therefore, the data from the study support the importance of parental support for Mexican American undergraduates, but the study is limited by its reliance on an abbreviated version of the CSS with questionable psychometric properties as well as its inattention to the role of social status in combination with racial/ethnic group membership.

Some empirical evidence also exists that supports the importance of parental support for individuals from low social class backgrounds (e.g., Hill, Ramirez, & Dumka, 2003; Schoon, Parsons, & Sacker, 2004). For example, in their qualitative investigation of the role of social class in the school-to-work transition, Blustein and colleagues (2002) highlighted the differences in levels of parental support that existed for members of different social class groups. Based on the qualitative analysis of in-depth interviews with 20 individuals (10 from high social class backgrounds (5 females) and 10 from low social class backgrounds (5 females)), Blustein et al. concluded that class plays a critical role in individuals’ experiences related to vocational development. Their findings suggest that social class influences such things as access to educational resources and relational support, level of career adaptability, achievement of consistency between work and goals, and the ways that individuals make meaning of their work and find motivation for it. In particular, participants representing the high social class group identified few external barriers and more parental support as themes to their vocational development.
whereas participants representing the low social class group reported having more external barriers and fewer external resources and reported greater instances of nonagentic/nonsupportive parents. These results provide evidence for considering that individuals from different social class backgrounds may have different types of experiences and supports the positive role of parental support for some individuals, yet are limited by their reliance upon strictly sociological indices of social class (i.e., parental social class measured by parental occupations) in assigning individuals as either high or low social class.

The importance of parental support as a potential buffer for individuals from lower socioeconomic status backgrounds was demonstrated by Schoon, Parsons, and Sacker (2004). In a longitudinal study of 9,716 students (51% male) in Great Britain, archival data collected for the National Child Development Study (NCDS) was used to investigate the factors that led to resilience for those students who were identified as having significant socioeconomic adversity in their backgrounds. Specifically, the researchers created a composite socioeconomic adversity score for each participant by using the following information: parental occupation at birth, father’s education, mother’s education, housing tenure at age 16, overcrowding in the home at age 16, use of household amenities at age 16 (e.g., number of people she or he shared a bathroom with), receipt of state benefits at age 16, and car ownership at age 16. Results from the analyses demonstrated that socioeconomic adversity does pose a significant education failure risk and influences future work-related outcomes (job status at age 42), but that protective factors can counterbalance the potential of these risks. In particular, parental support was demonstrated to act as a protective factor for individuals with high levels of
socioeconomic adversity. Although these authors relied upon a multifaceted index to determine level of socioeconomic adversity, the results are limited by the reliance upon only one aspect of individual identity (socioeconomic resources) and by the retrospective nature of the data.

**Sibling, Family, and Peer Support.** To a somewhat lesser extent, the role of sibling, extended family, and peer support also have been examined empirically in relation to vocational behavior. Similar to parental support, the role of sibling support has been demonstrated to be an important facilitator of vocational development (Schultheiss, Palma, Predragovich, & Glasscock, 2002). Specifically, in their qualitative investigation designed to assess the manner by which sibling relationships influenced career exploration and decision-making, Schultheiss et al. conducted in-depth interviews with 13 college students (8 European American, 5 African American; 6 male). Results demonstrated that siblings play an important role in supporting the career development of individuals through a number of mechanisms, including role modeling, serving as a source of career information, providing emotional and esteem support, offering encouragement, and providing feelings of security throughout the process of career development. This work is important as it was one of the first that examined specifically the role of sibling support on the career development process, but it is limited by its lack of attention to the intersection of social identities; its sole focus on the role of sibling support (as opposed to parental, extended family, or peer support); and by its qualitative nature, which limits the generalizability of these findings to broader, more diverse groups.
The role of family support also has been demonstrated to operate as a vocational support for individuals. In a 2001 quantitative investigation, Torres and Solberg investigated a path model whereby self-efficacy, stress, family support, and social and faculty integration in the university setting predicted persistence intentions and health for 189 Latino (67) and Latina (112) college students. Results from their analysis demonstrated that self-efficacy was related directly to persistence intentions and related indirectly to health, social and faculty integration were not associated with persistence intentions, and family support was related positively to self-efficacy. In this analysis, family support was measured via an abbreviated 10-item version of the Social Provisions Scale, and, although the authors cite previous empirical investigations as a rationale for using a shortened version to assess only family support, the authors do not include any reliability information for the measure. Additionally, the 10 items assessing family support from the Social Provisions Scale do not appear to be directly related to support for vocational planning or behavior. Therefore, although the results do tend to support the inclusion of family support as an important predictor of self-efficacy and an indirect predictor of persistence (through self-efficacy) for Latino and Latina students, they may be limited by the psychometric properties of the measures and by the exclusion of other forms of support (e.g., peer support) in their model.

The role of family support also was demonstrated to be important for a group of African American students at predominantly European American universities. In a qualitative study examining factors that contributed to academic persistence in a science related field, 11 African American female (8) and male (3) undergraduate seniors in a biology degree program at a predominantly European American research institution were
interviewed (Russell & Atwater, 2005). Four primary themes emerged from the participants’ interviews, including parental influence, teacher influence, precollege experiences in science, and college science pipeline experience. Specifically, parental influence was identified by the participants as one of the most salient facilitators related to their persistence. Indeed, participants reported that their parents and families expected them to go to college, accepted and supported their interest in science related fields, and that their families and teachers encouraged them to be successful in their academic and career-related pursuits. Other elements of supportive factors that contributed to persistence identified by participants were a desire to make their parent(s) proud (this theme was particularly salient for those participants who acknowledged that parents had made sacrifices for their education), access to positive role models within the science field through their parents’ occupation(s), access to vicarious learning by watching older siblings being praised for valuing education, and good study habits learned from parents. As a whole, these results highlight the importance of family support as a contributor to persistence, but have limited generalizability because of the inclusion of only successful undergraduate seniors pursuing science-related degrees.

Increased parental and family support also has been demonstrated to be related negatively to perception of career barriers for low-income adolescents (Hill, Ramirez, & Dumka, 2003). Specifically, Hill et al. conducted a qualitative investigation of the career aspirations, career barriers, and perceived family support of 31 low-income adolescents from ethnically diverse backgrounds (7 European American, 9 African American, 8 Mexican American, and 7 Mexican immigrants; 16 female; ages 12-14). To be eligible to participate in the study, only those individuals who lived in public housing or whose
family incomes were less than $25,000 were included. Results across all participants indicated that higher levels of career aspirations were related to lower levels of perceptions of barriers and that those participants who reported greater levels of support from their parents and families were less likely to perceive career barriers. Additionally, some variations in themes were noted when examining between-group differences. Specifically, adolescents of Mexican descent were more likely to report that there were no barriers that would get in the way of reaching their goals and female adolescents of Mexican descent were more likely to aspire to gender traditional roles. Although Hill et al. highlighted the need to consider a number of aspects of one’s identity and the importance of family support, results of this study are limited by the reliance upon qualitative methods and therefore limited generalizability and the use of only sociological indices to classify individuals as low income.

In another investigation, Ali, McWhirter, and Chronister (2005) demonstrated the need to include measures of parental, sibling, and peer support in future investigations of vocational supports with low income groups. Specifically, the relation of socioeconomic status (as measured by parental education, occupation, and marital status) to vocational/educational self-efficacy and outcome expectations was explored for a sample of 114 low income, 9th grade youth (66 female; 77% European American). Results demonstrated that self-efficacy and outcome expectations for vocational planning behaviors correlated significantly with SES, but that SES did not contribute to prediction of either construct after other factors such as parental support (Parental Support Scale: Farmer et al., 1981), sibling support (Sibling Support Scale: Ali et al.), friend support (Friend Support Scale: Ali et al.), and barriers were considered. Further, peer and sibling
support predicted vocational/educational self-efficacy expectations, but mother support and father support did not. Greater levels of support from mother, father, and peers were, however, related to lower levels of perceptions of barriers. Although the results highlight the need to consider forms of support in addition to parental support (i.e., sibling and peer) and the importance of including supports (rather than focusing solely on barriers) in future investigations, these results are limited by their examination of nuclear rather than extended family and their reliance upon a traditional, sociological index of SES. Indeed, these authors suggested that future research on social class incorporate more sophisticated and theoretically derived indices of the construct, and should consider that effects of SES for the individual’s vocational development may be mediated through other variables.

Taken together, a number of empirical investigations have demonstrated the importance of vocational supports as important learning experiences for individuals. Specifically, access to parental support has been consistently demonstrated to have beneficial relations to individuals’ perceived vocational identity and a number of vocational outcomes. Empirical support for the relation of family and peer support has been demonstrated to have similar beneficial relations to a lesser extent. Therefore, on the basis of these findings and on Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of the importance of learning experiences (i.e., experiences with supports) to internalized status identity, the following hypothesis was proposed:

Hypothesis 4: Access to parental, sibling, and peer support relates positively to perceived social status.
Interplay of Barriers and Supports. Within psychology, criticisms have emerged around attempts to understand the career development processes for individuals from diverse ethnic/racial backgrounds (e.g., Brown, 2004; Flores & Ali, 2004). Specifically, some have critiqued the vocational psychology literature as operating from the assumption that all individuals from low social class backgrounds and/or from underrepresented racial/ethnic group backgrounds have numerous experiences with barriers and limited supports and therefore struggle in their career development (e.g., Liu & Ali, 2005). Given that a number of empirical investigations have highlighted that some individuals may internalize their cultural background and/or experiences with racism/classism/sexism as cultural strengths (e.g., Pearson & Bieschke, 2001), it is important for vocational psychologists to acknowledge that individuals from similar social groups in society may respond quite differently to learning experiences in their environments and that some may internalize their non-ordinant positions as strengths.

For example, in Aguilar and Williams’ (1993) exploratory and descriptive investigation of the factors that contributed to success in the vocational development of high achieving African American ($n = 160$) and Hispanic American ($n = 164$) women (age 20-60), over 50% of the women reported not being aware that they were members of minority groups while they were growing up and believed that they did not struggle as a result of their group membership. Participants cited a number of factors that contributed to their success, the most common of which were education, relying on personal strengths, having supportive role models, having satisfying jobs, attaining personal goals, and having ethnic-racial pride. Additionally, 73% of Latinas and 86% of African American women identified their families and parents as supports who encouraged them
to pursue their career goals, and the majority of respondents (60%) reported that their
religion/religious beliefs facilitated their success. Finally, a number of the women
reported viewing their experiences with racism as a cultural strength. Although the results
suggest the need to consider experiences with adversity as potential strengths and provide
valuable information about Latina’s and African American women’s career development,
they are limited by the fact that the sample was selected via snowball sampling and the
women were all identified as “successful” by their colleagues.

In another study, resilient adolescents from high-risk backgrounds (defined as
adolescents who had successfully adapted in the face of significant threats to their
development based on childhood SES) scored similarly over time to their low-risk,
competent peers and better than their high-risk, non-resilient peers on dimensions of
intelligence and psychological adjustment (Masten, Hubbard, Gest, Tellegen, et al.,
1999). Specifically, Masten and colleagues used 10-year longitudinal data collected on a
group of 205 elementary school children (114 females; 73% European American) to
investigate resilience in the face of adversity. Data were collected through multiple
informants (i.e., teacher ratings, parent interviews, academic records, child/adolescent
interviews, peer interviews, adolescent and parent self-report questionnaires) and results
supported four conclusions: (a) the presence of psychological resources is related
positively to higher levels of competence (defined as academic achievement, conduct,
and peer social competence); (b) access to resources is related negatively to growing up
in environments with high levels of adversity; (c) individuals who have access to
reasonably good resources retain generally high levels of competence, even in the face of
severe stressors; and (d) those adolescents who are maladaptive tend to have a history of
adversity, minimal access to resources, and relatively low levels of competence.

Although a longitudinal design and multiple sources of data supported evidence of resilience in the face of environmental barriers, results are limited by the relatively small sample size, which prevented Masten et al. from using structural equation modeling techniques to examine proposed hypotheses and prevented a separate analysis of individuals from ethnic minority groups and low SES groups simultaneously. Further, traditional, sociological indices of SES were relied upon in the study, so analyses were limited in their inclusion of other dimensions of social status such as social power and social prestige.

Relatedly, a recent qualitative investigation of the career development process for eight Latino lesbian (3) and gay (5) adolescents (ages 18-20) further supports the notion that some individuals view their non-majority identity as a positive experience (Adams, Cahill, & Ackerlind, 2005). Specifically, a number of the participants described themselves as experiencing greater self-efficacy for career related tasks as a result of their perceptions that they were not like others around them and therefore would not be susceptible to the same failures as were others. Other themes that emerged from the data included knowing that they are different, experiences of within-group prejudice and discrimination (from fellow Latino peers), perceiving no restrictions to potential career paths, viewing career development and identity and/or relationship development as linked, and contradictory behaviors surrounding whether to reveal one’s sexual orientation in work-related settings.
Therefore, as a whole, the rich data gleaned through qualitative methods from this series of studies allow a sophisticated understanding of the themes involved in the vocational development of these diverse groups. These findings, however, have yet to be examined in a more quantitative way with a larger and more generalizable sample of participants. Additionally, although results of these interviews highlight the need to consider non-ordinant group membership as a potential protective factor related to vocational development, the role of social status was not examined.

In summary, as demonstrated through this body of qualitative research, even in the face of perceived barriers and non-majority group membership, some members of underrepresented racial/ethnic and social class groups still possess high career goals and feel confident in their ability to attend to career decision tasks. Similarly, in their conceptualization of DSI, Fouad and Brown (2000) pointed to the notion that individuals from similar social groups may actually perceive and internalize their group membership and environmental experiences quite differently. Indeed, Fouad and Brown cautioned researchers and practitioners to consider individuals’ perception and internalization of their racial/ethnic group membership, social class standing, and experiences with supports and barriers rather than assuming that individuals from similar social groups internalize demographic characteristics and learning experiences in a uniform manner. Therefore, on the basis of the results of these qualitative investigations and Fouad and Brown’s (2000) conceptualization of DSI, the following hypothesis was proposed:

Hypothesis 5: Experiences with supports (i.e., family/peer support) moderate the relation between experiences with barriers (racism and classism) and perceived social status.
Role of Coping Efficacy in Vocational Behavior. An intrapersonal factor that may influence how individuals respond to their social group positioning and experiences with supports and barriers is coping efficacy. Indeed, individuals’ self-efficacy for coping with barriers has been demonstrated to be important to consider in relation to vocational behavior, particularly for members of non-ordinant groups. Coping efficacy is defined as “the degree to which an individual possesses confidence in her or his ability to cope with or manage complex and difficult situations” (Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001, p. 62) and may determine whether individuals will attempt to, and will successfully, overcome barriers to career development (Albert & Luzzo, 1999; Bandura, 1977; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Lent et al., 2000). Those who possess relatively high levels of confidence in their ability to overcome barriers have been proposed to be more likely to overcome those barriers (e.g., Corbiere, Mercier, & Lesage, 2004). Further, for members of non-ordinant groups, “strong efficacy for coping with obstacles and barriers can result in successful performance despite expectations of barriers and impediments such as racism and discrimination” (Hackett & Byars, 1996, p. 329).

In one of the first investigations of coping efficacy, McWhirter (1997) demonstrated that confidence to overcome barriers may be important to include in investigations of the relation of various barriers to vocational outcomes. Specifically, McWhirter examined the perception of career barriers and levels of competence for coping with those barriers for a group of 1,139 Mexican American (n = 595; 293 female) and European American (n = 555; 266 female) high school juniors and seniors (11 participants were dropped from analyses because of their sophomore status). McWhirter used the Perceptions of Barriers Scale (POB) which assessed individuals’ perceptions
that they would face potential educational and career barriers (i.e., sex discrimination, ethnic discrimination, family problems, lack of interest, money problems). Included within this measure, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statement: “In general, I think that I will be able to overcome any barriers that stand in the way of achieving my career goals” as a preliminary measure of individuals’ perceived ability to overcome identified barriers. Results demonstrated that women perceived a greater number of barriers than did men, Mexican American students were more likely to perceive future barriers to their educational and career goals than were their European American counterparts, and Mexican American students were significantly more likely to agree that they would be able to overcome barriers than were their European American counterparts (although the majority of students tended to view most barriers as unlikely to affect them overall). Unfortunately, this initial attempt to include competence for overcoming barriers was limited by its reliance upon one item of the POB scale to assess for potential coping efficacy.

McWhirter and Luzzo (2001) subsequently expanded upon this earlier work and highlighted the need to consider perceptions of coping efficacy, particularly for individuals who are members of underrepresented racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, McWhirter and Luzzo investigated gender and ethnic differences in coping efficacy for 168 female and 118 male (89% European Americans, 7% African Americans, 2% Native Americans, 1% Asian Americans, and <1% Hispanic Americans) undergraduates in their first year of college. McWhirter and Luzzo used a modified version of the Perception of Barriers Scale to assess potential barriers perceived by the individuals and the Coping With Barriers (CWB) Scale developed for this study to assess coping efficacy.
Results of this investigation supported their hypotheses that women perceived significantly more career-related barriers than did men, and that ethnic minority students perceived significantly more educational and career-related barriers than did their European American counterparts. Additionally, ethnic minority students reported significantly lower levels of coping efficacy than did European American students. Based on these findings, the authors suggested that further attention must be devoted to increasing the perceived coping efficacy of members of ethnic minority groups; however, it is important to note the relatively small number of ethnic minority students \((n = 32)\) used for these analyses. Similarly, reliance upon the POB scale as a measure of perceived barriers limits the interpretations that can be gleaned from the analyses because the POB scale does not specifically address discrimination resulting from social status position.

A more recent investigation demonstrated the potential for high levels of coping efficacy to act as a mediator of the relation between perceived barriers and vocational outcomes. Specifically, in their 2004 investigation, Perrone, Civiletto, Webb, and Fitch examined the relation of perceptions of career barriers to career coping efficacy, perceived levels of social support, and career outcome expectations for 113 college graduates (41 male; age 30-32 years). Results of their path model revealed that perception of career barriers (as measured by the POB) was related negatively to career outcome expectations, coping efficacy mediated the relation between career barriers and career outcome expectations (a vocational outcome), and social support (as measured by a six-item short form of the Social Support Questionnaire; Sarason, Sarason, Shearin, & Pierce, 1987) was not related to career barriers or to career outcome expectations.
Although results of the mediation analyses provide further evidence for the buffering role of having high coping efficacy, this investigation was limited by a number of factors, including the use of only academically talented individuals, the failure of the authors to report racial/ethnic background of participants, its reliance on only one item from McWhirter’s 1997 CWB scale to measure coping efficacy, and its reliance upon a social support scale not specific to vocational behavior.

Taken together, the body of literature on protective factors in vocational development and coping efficacy provides evidence that some individuals internalize their experiences with environmental barriers in a positive way. Further, results from studies examining coping efficacy demonstrate that ethnic minority individuals may experience lower levels of coping efficacy and that high levels of coping efficacy can serve as a buffer for individuals. Despite the strong empirical evidence for the role of supports and barriers in relation to vocational development, to date, much of the research that examines perception of barriers does not take into account efficacy for coping with those barriers nor does it examine in a sophisticated manner how coping efficacy operates in concert with supports and barriers for individuals (Lent et al., 2003). Therefore, the present study includes coping efficacy in the model as a potential moderator of the relation between supports and internalization of status identity and as a potential moderator of the relation between barriers and internalization of status identity. Specifically, in the present investigation, coping efficacy is included as a moderator because it is likely that the relations between supports/barriers and internalized status depend, in part, on an individual’s perceived self-efficacy for coping. Thus, on the basis
of these findings, the calls for more attention to the role of coping efficacy, and DSI’s focus on individuals’ internalization of learning experiences, the following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 6a: Coping efficacy moderates the relation between supports (i.e., parental, sibling, peer support) and perception of social status.

Hypothesis 6b: Coping efficacy moderates the relation between barriers (i.e., experiences with racism and classism) and perception of social status.

Summary and Hypotheses

Taken together, results of both qualitative and quantitative investigations have demonstrated the importance of considering the role of supports and barriers in the career development of members of racial/ethnic minority and majority groups and of individuals from various socioeconomic backgrounds. Yet, to date, no studies have considered the intersection of racism, classism, family supports, and peer support on individuals’ internalization of status identity and subsequent vocational behavior. Additionally, the role of coping efficacy in relation to these variables has yet to be examined. Therefore, the present study sought to address this gap in the literature by extending our understanding of the process by which supports, barriers, and coping efficacy are internalized as status identity by the individual, and relate to vocational outcomes.

In so doing, the current study extended Fouad and Brown’s DSI framework by testing a model that accounts for the intersection of race/ethnicity and social class, the role of supports and barriers, and the relation of coping efficacy to the internalization of social status (see Figure 1). Based on a review of the relevant research, the following hypotheses were proposed.
Hypothesis 1: Greater perceived levels of social status relates to positive vocational outcomes of less career indecisiveness, less career choice anxiety, and greater career decision self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 2a: Non-ordinant racial/ethnic group membership relates positively to greater numbers of reported experiences with racism as measured by the SRE.

Hypothesis 2b: Non-ordinant social class group membership relates positively to greater numbers of reported experiences with classism as measured by the EWCS.

Hypothesis 3a: Greater numbers of reported experiences with racism relate negatively to perceived social status as defined by the DSIS.

Hypothesis 3b: Greater numbers of reported experiences with classism relate negatively to perceived social status as defined by the DSIS.

Hypothesis 4: Access to parental, sibling, and peer support relates positively to perceived social status.

Hypothesis 5: Experiences with supports (i.e., family/peer support) moderate the relation between experiences with barriers (i.e., racism and classism) and perceived social status.

Hypothesis 6a: Coping efficacy moderates the relation between supports (i.e., parental, sibling, peer support) and perception of social status.

Hypothesis 6b: Coping efficacy moderates the relation between barriers (i.e., experiences with racism and classism) and perception of social status.

Hypothesis 7: The model proposed in Figure 1 is supported by the totality of the data.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Undergraduate students were recruited from psychology courses and the Student Union at a large open enrollment Midwestern University where the graduation rate for Bachelors degrees is around 35%. Potential participants were approached by the researcher who requested their participation in the study. Fully one-third of students at the university attend part-time, many students are first generation college students, and 70% of students receive financial aid. Two hundred and ninety-nine students (203 F, 95 M, and one missing) participated in the study. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 50 years with a mean age of 21.04 (SD = 5.04) years. Overall, 48.8% of the students self-identified as being in their first year, 26.4% as being in their second year, 13% as being in their third year, 8% as being in their fourth year, and 3% as being in their fifth year or beyond (two students did not report their year in school). Most students (86.6%) reported that they had declared their major and a full range of majors was represented; the most commonly reported majors, however, were psychology and nursing.

Of the 299 participants, 55.9% identified as European American, 29.1% identified as African American, 5.7% identified as Biracial, 2% identified as Asian American, 2% identified as Hispanic American, 1.7% identified as “International Student”, 1.3%
identified as “Other”, 1% identified as Native American, and 1% identified as East Indian (13 students did not indicate their race/ethnicity). Eighty-nine percent of participants identified as Exclusively or Mostly Heterosexual. Of the participants, 15 self-identified as belonging to the lower class, 70 identified as belonging to the lower-middle class, 131 identified as belonging to the middle class, 71 identified as belonging to the upper-middle class, and 10 identified as belonging to the upper class (two students did not indicate a social class category). Sixty percent of participants indicated that they were first generation college students.

*Instruments*

The measures were presented to participants in the order listed below. The ordering choice was made based on the overall length of the survey and the hypothesized relevance of the instruments to the purpose of the present study. Specifically, barriers measures were presented first, followed by the measure of differential status identity and the three support measures along with the hypothesized moderator of coping efficacy. Next, the vocational outcome measures were presented. Finally, the demographic questionnaire was presented last. Psychometric data for all measures are included in Chapter 4.

*The Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).* The SRE is an 18-item self-report scale that was designed to assess the frequency of experiences of perceived racist events for African Americans. Responses are made on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from “the event never happened” to “the event happened almost all of the time (more than 70% of the time).” For each item, participants are asked to rate the frequency of the racist event within their lifetime (SRE-Lifetime), the frequency of the
The SRE also has been adapted to assess the frequency of experiences of reported racist events for other racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Arab Americans; Moradi & Hasan, 2004; Filipino Americans; David & Okazaki, 2006) as well as to assess the frequencies of
experiences of sexist events for women (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). The SRE was modified in the present study to assess experiences with racism for all racial/ethnic groups. Therefore, original items on the SRE were modified to make the SRE applicable to members of diverse racial/ethnic groups by replacing the words “Black” with “your race/ethnicity” for appropriate items. For example, the item, “How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are Black?” was changed to “How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because of your race/ethnicity?” Also, additional racial slurs against various racial/ethnic groups used in previous studies (e.g., David & Okazaki) were added to an abbreviated set of racial slurs against African Americans for one item. Specifically, in line with previous research using the SRE with other ethnic groups (e.g., Moradi & Hasan; David & Okazaki) the words “terrorist, towel head, fresh off the boat, foreigner, jungle bunny, and coon” were used. The revised SRE items are presented in Appendix A.

Experiences with Classism Scale (EWCS). The EWCS is a self-report scale designed to assess the frequency of experiences of reported classist events for college students. In particular, the EWCS was designed to tap experiences with downward classism (Liu, 2001). The EWCS was created for the purposes of the present study because a thorough literature search revealed no existing measures of individuals’ experiences with classism. Specifically, the scale was constructed to parallel the SRE, but also to include items designed to assess the two everyday experiences of classism themes that were demonstrated to be different from everyday experiences with racism (i.e., flaunting and bureaucratic hassles) according to Ritz and Hyers’ (2005) qualitative
investigation. Initial items to assess these domains were generated by reviewing participant responses provided to Ritz and Hyers in their in-depth interviews. A list of 28 potential items was generated to tap the five dimensions of classism. After being reviewed by the researcher and her advisor, the items were reviewed by a group of three counseling psychology faculty members and one counseling center psychologist. Next, the items were reviewed by two current undergraduate students to assess for readability and the adequacy of the items to capture experiences with classism. After each round of reviews, only minor changes in the wording of items were made. In addition, five open-ended questions were included to allow participants to identify any other experiences with classism not included in the existing items and to allow participants to describe their feelings related to experiences with classism on campus.

Item responses for the EWCS are made on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Items include: “How often do you feel like you have been treated differently in the past year on the basis of your physical appearance (clothing, type of bag/purse you carried, shoes)?” and “How often have you felt frustrated with all of the steps that you had to take with the financial aid office or banks in order to have access to money for school?” Psychometric data and the results of an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) for the EWCS are presented in Chapter 4. The EWCS items are presented in Appendix B.

*Differential Status Identity Scale (DSIS; Brown, D’Agruma, Brown, Sia, et al., 2002).* Participants’ perceptions of their level of each of the four dimensions of social status relative to “the average U.S. citizen” were measured using the Differential Status Identity Scale (DSIS). The DSIS was developed to assess the three facets of social status (economic resources, social power, and social prestige) initially proposed by Rossides
(1990, 1997) and consists of 60 items comprising four subscales: Economic Resources-Basic Needs, Economic Resources-Amenities, Social Power, and Social Prestige. Item responses are obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from -2 (very much below average for the Economic Resources and Social Power subscales or much less for the Social Prestige subscale) to +2 (very much above average or much more). For analysis purposes, scores are transformed to a 1-5 scale and items are summed for each of the three scales. Higher scores reflect greater perceived levels of social prestige, social power, and economic resources.

Exploratory Factor Analysis supported a four factor solution for the DSIS (Thompson & Subich, 2007) for a sample of 454 college students. Specifically, the Economic Resources-Amenities subscale consists of 15 items measuring a person’s perceived material possessions and leisure activities such as home, cars, investments, travel, shopping at upscale department stores, ability to secure a financial future, and connections with rich and powerful persons as “compared to the average U.S. citizen.” The Social Power subscale includes 15 items that ask individuals to comment on their perceived ability to gain high-profile positions of employment, have an influence on public policy, and have access to a fair trial as compared with the “average U.S. citizen.” The Economic Resources – Basic Needs subscale consists of 14 items that assess a person’s perceived ability to meet basic needs such as: education, exercise, medical care, access to insurance, and personal possessions (e.g., appliances). Finally, the Social Prestige subscale’s 16 questions ask individuals to identify to what extent they feel valued as compared to the “average U.S. citizen” in terms of their ethnic group, physical abilities, and neighborhood in which they live.
The internal consistency reliability of the DSIS total score has been demonstrated to be .97 (Thompson & Subich, 2007). Alphas for the four subscales of the DSIS were also high in the previous investigation: .95 for the Economic Resources - Amenities subscale, .95 for the Economic Resources - Basic Needs subscale, .94 for the Social Power subscale, and .92 for the Social Prestige subscale. Subscale intercorrelations ranged from .61 to .68, suggesting moderately high relations among the four subscales. Convergent validity has been demonstrated by the DSIS’ relation with more traditional, sociological measures of social class such as self-reported social class category and annual income level during childhood (.32 to .56). Discriminant validity has been demonstrated by the DSIS’ lack of significant relation to Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (-.07 to -.08) and Campbell’s (2004) Psychological Entitlement Scale (.01 to .07) (Thompson & Subich, 2007).

Criterion-related validity evidence for the DSIS has been demonstrated through an examination of differences between African American (104) and European American (102) subsamples. Specifically, univariate analyses yielded significant group effects for Economic Resources-Amenities, $F(1, 203)=8.02, p<.01$, Social Power, $F(1, 203)=8.00, p<.01$, and Social Prestige, $F(1, 203)=15.73, p<.001$ (in all cases, European Americans scored higher than their African American counterparts), but not for Economic Resources-Basic Needs, $F(1, 203)=.33, p>.05$, thus demonstrating the DSIS’ ability to capture and reflect expected race-based social status differences in U.S. society (Thompson & Subich, 2007). The DSIS items are presented in Appendix C.
Coping With Barriers Scale (CWB; McWhirter, 2001). The CWB is a 28-item scale designed to measure college students’ efficacy for coping with barriers to their career and educational goals. It contains two subscales: Career-Related Barriers (7 items) and Education Related Barriers (21). For the first seven items, respondents are asked to rate their degree of confidence for overcoming a list of career barriers (e.g., “Negative comments about my racial/ethnic background [insults, jokes]”, “Difficulty getting time off when my children are sick”). For the following 21 items, respondents rate their degree of confidence for overcoming potential education barriers (e.g., “Money problems,” “Not being prepared enough,” “Lack of support from friends”). Respondents indicate their degree of confidence in being able to overcome barriers on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (highly confident) to 5 (not at all confident). Total scores range from 7 to 35 for the Career-Related Barriers subscale and from 21 to 105 for the Educational Barriers subscale, with higher scores indicating less perceived ability to overcome barriers (i.e., less coping efficacy).

Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) was reported as .88 for the Career-Related Barriers subscale and .93 for the Educational Barriers subscale for the initial validation sample of 286 first year undergraduate students (59% female; 89% European American). Test-retest reliabilities over a 2-month period for a subsample of 55 randomly selected participants from that sample were moderate and ranged from .49 for the Educational Barriers subscale to .55 for the total scale (Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001). Luzzo and McWhirter demonstrated that students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups reported lower career-related coping beliefs than did their European American counterparts and that women and men did not differ in their scores on the CWB. The
CWB has also been demonstrated by Lopez and Ann-Yi (2006) to have high internal consistency reliabilities across samples of European American, African American, and Latina women for the Career-Related Barriers subscale (.89, .90, and .88, respectively) and the Educational Barriers subscale (.93, .93, and .92, respectively). Items for the CWB are presented in Appendix D.

*Primary Caregiver Support Scale (Adapted from the Parental Support Scale: PSS; Farmer et al., 1981).* Participants’ perceptions of support received from their primary caregiver(s) was assessed using the PSS. The PSS is a 26-item measure designed to assess students’ perceptions of academic support received from their mother (13 items) and father (13 items). The items ask participants to rate their perceived level of support from their mother and father using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly discouraging; 5 = strongly encouraging). Sample items include: “Your mother’s attitudes toward you choosing an occupation that requires you to leave the state” and “Your father’s attitude toward you completing your homework each night.” Total scores range from 13 to 65 for both the mother and father subscales, with higher scores reflecting a higher degree of parental support.

Through Exploratory Factor Analysis, McWhirter et al. (1998) demonstrated that the PSS contains two factors (Father Support and Mother Support). Validity evidence for the PSS also was demonstrated by McWhirter et al. (1998); the Father Support subscale correlated significantly with the criterion item “My father has strongly influenced my decisions about my future” ($r = .39$) and the Mother Support subscale correlated significantly with the criterion item “My mother has strongly influenced my decisions
about my future” \((r = .29)\). Furthermore, internal consistency reliabilities for the measure have been demonstrated to range .85 to .88 for the Mother Support subscale, and .89 to .95 for the Father Support subscale (Farmer et al., 1981; McWhirter et al.).

For the present investigation, the PSS was adapted to be reflective of families in which the primary caretaker was not the mother or father, as is becoming increasingly more common in U.S. society. For example, the item “In the past my mother/father encouraged me to do well in science or math courses” was changed to “In the past my primary caretaker(s) encouraged me to do well in science or math courses.” The present version of the PSS contained 13 items and these items are presented in Appendix E.

*Sibling Support Scale (SSS; Ali, McWhirter, & Chronister, 2005).* Participants’ perceptions of the degree to which they experience support from their siblings (i.e., perceived support for educational and vocational activities, ideas, and plans) was assessed using the 17-item SSS. The first item on the measure asks participants to “Circle the letter that best describes the brother or sister that influences you the most.” The remaining items ask participants to rate their perceived level of support from the sibling identified using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly discouraging; 5 = strongly encouraging). Sample items include: “This Brother’s or Sister’s attitude toward you choosing an occupation that gives you job security” and “This Brother’s or Sister’s attitude toward you getting grades in school.” Total scores range from 17 to 85, with higher scores indicating greater levels of perceived support.

The SSS is relatively new, and therefore limited data on the psychometric properties of the instrument are available. The SSS has been demonstrated to be positively correlated with participants’ ratings of two questions designed to assess for
validity in the initial validation sample of 114 low-income adolescents. Specifically, the SSS correlated moderately ($r = .56$) with the composite of the two validity items “my siblings are supportive of my future career plans” and “my siblings are interested in my future” (ranked on a 5-point Likert-type Scale). Internal consistency reliability for the SSS was demonstrated to be .91 in the initial sample of 114 ninth grade adolescents. Items of the SSS are presented in Appendix F.

Friend Support Scale (FSS; Ali, McWhirter, & Chronister, 2005). Participants’ perceptions of the degree to which they experience support from their closest friends with respect to their educational and vocational activities, ideas, and plans were assessed using the FSS. The FSS is a 16-item measure and is similar to the SSS. Participants are asked to think about their closest friends and rate their perceptions of the support received from them. The items ask participants to rate their perceived level of support from their friends using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly discouraging; 5 = strongly encouraging). Sample items include: “Your friend’s attitudes toward you choosing an occupation that requires you to go to college” and “Your friend’s attitude toward you studying for your exams.” Total scores range from 16 to 80, with higher scores corresponding to higher levels of perceived support.

The FSS is relatively new, and therefore limited data on the psychometric properties of the instrument are available. The FSS has been demonstrated to be correlated moderately with participants’ ratings of two questions designed to assess its validity in the initial validation sample of 114 adolescents. Specifically, the correlation coefficient for the FSS and the composite of the two validity items “My friends are supportive of my future career plans” and “My friends are interested in my future”
(ranked on a 5-point Likert-type Scale) was $r = .48$. Internal consistency reliability for the FSS was demonstrated to be .88 in the initial sample of 114 ninth grade adolescents. Items for the FSS are presented in Appendix G.

*Career Decision Self-Efficacy – Short Form (CDSE-SF; Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996).* Self-efficacy in relation to career decision-making was assessed using the CDSE-SF. The 25-item short form of the CDSE Scale developed by Taylor and Betz (1983) was used to evaluate an individual’s confidence in completing career decision-making tasks. Respondents use a 10-point Likert-type scale, ranging from no confidence (0) to complete confidence (9). Total scores range from 0 to 250, with higher scores indicating higher confidence levels in making vocational decisions.

The CDSE-SF has high internal consistency reliability coefficients (alphas) ranging from .92 to .97 (Nilsson, Schmidt, & Meek, 2002) and considerable evidence for the validity of the CDSE and CDSE-SF exists (see Betz & Taylor, 2001, for a review). For example, the concurrent validity of the CDSE scale has been assessed using the Career Decision Scale (CDS) and My Vocational Situation Scale (MVS). The intercorrelation between the CDSE and the CDS was -.40 (i.e., more self-efficacy is associated with less indecision) and the intercorrelations between the CDSE and the two subscales of the MVS were .28 (Planning) and .40 (Goal Setting) (Betz & Taylor, 2001). The CDSE-SF also has been demonstrated to be related negatively to career indecision (Betz et al., 1996). Items of the CDSE-SF are presented in Appendix H.

*Career Factors Inventory (CFI; Chartrand, Robbins, Morrill, & Boggs, 1990).* The Career Factors Inventory is a 21-item scale designed to assess career indecision in both personal-emotional and informational content areas. Specifically, the CFI contains
four subscales: career choice anxiety (6 items), generalized indecisiveness (5 items), need for career information (6 items), and need for self-knowledge (4 items). Only the career choice anxiety and generalized indecisiveness subscales were used in the analyses. Participants respond to items on a 5-point Likert-type scale in which higher scores indicate higher levels of career indecision and higher levels of career choice anxiety. Sample items include: “For me, decision making seems: (1) clear … (5) hazy,” “Before choosing or entering a particular career area I still need to seek advice from others regarding my choice: (1) strongly agree … (5) strongly disagree,” and “Before choosing or entering a particular career area I still need to attempt to answer ‘who am I’: (1) strongly agree … (5) strongly disagree.”

Two-week test-retest reliability estimates for the four subscales range from .79 to .84 for a sample of 88 college students and internal consistency estimates for the four subscales range from .73 to .86 (Chartrand et al., 1990). Construct validity has been demonstrated through Factor Analysis with a sample of 740 college students (Chartrand et al.). Correlations between the CFI and instruments such as the Goal Instability Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the State-Trait Anxiety Scale, and the Career Decision Scale have supported convergent and discriminant validity (Chartrand et al., 1994; Chartrand & Robbins, 1990). Items of the CFI are presented in Appendix I.

**Demographic data.** Participants were asked to provide demographic information regarding age, sex, gender, race/ethnicity, annual income during childhood, current college major (if chosen), primary language spoken in the home, and sexual orientation.
Participants also were asked to self-identify as belonging to a particular social class: lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle, and upper. These items are presented in Appendix J.

Procedure

The Experiences with Classism Scale and the Schedule of Racist Events were piloted on a sample of 109 college students (76.1% female; 80.7% European American; 77% identified as middle class or upper middle class; ages ranged from 17 to 43 years, \( M = 22.39, \ SD = 4.97 \)) to assess the psychometric properties of these new and revised scales. Results from the pilot data indicated that both the SRE and the EWCS appeared to have strong psychometric properties (alphas were .90 and .91, respectively). Further, pilot results indicated that the EWCS correlated (albeit weakly) in the expected directions with two relevant demographic variables: self-reported social class category and reported income level (\( r = -.09, \ p > .05 \) and \( r = -.21, \ p > .05 \)). Finally, in their open-ended responses, participants suggested that the EWCS captured most aspects of their personal experiences with classism and did not offer suggestions that warranted the inclusion of additional items.

In the full data collection, after consent was given, participants completed the series of paper-and-pencil surveys. Upon completing the questionnaires at their leisure (typical time to complete the surveys ranged from 25-45 minutes), participants were provided with debriefing information and were given the opportunity to contact the researchers with any questions pertaining to the study. Participants either received course credit or were paid $5 for participation in the study.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The present chapter summarizes the results of the current study. It begins with an overview of results from analyses conducted on the psychometric properties of the EWC. Next, a discussion regarding the treatment of missing data, outliers, and presentation of descriptive statistics and correlations is presented. Then, data to support the scale development of the EWC are presented. Next, hypotheses 1 through 6 are discussed and the hypothesized model (Hypothesis 7) is presented. Finally, following the discussion of hypothesis testing, exploratory analyses are presented.

Experiences With Classism Scale Development

Given the novelty of the EWCS and the lack of an a priori empirical basis for specifying the number of factors or items’ patterns of factor loadings (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999), Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to identify underlying latent factors from the 28 items in the EWCS so as to evaluate its construct validity. Analyses were conducted using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) with an oblimin rotation (given the assumption that any set of latent factors would reflect different aspects of the superordinate construct of experiences with classism). Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to be extracted for the final factor solution: eigenvalues
greater than 1.0 (Kaiser Criterion), Cattell’s scree test, and the interpretability of the solution, using a factor loading cutoff of .32 (as suggested by Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Four factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0, and together they accounted for 63.13% of the variance. After inspecting the scree plot, the two and three factor solutions were studied. Initial eigenvalues and percentage of variance accounted for by each of the first three factors were: Factor 1 (eigenvalue = 11.96, 44.29% of variance); Factor 2 (eigenvalue = 2.44, 9.04% of variance); Factor 3 (eigenvalue = 1.39, 5.14% of variance). Ultimately, it was determined that the two-factor solution was more interpretable than the three factor solution and yielded a simpler factor structure. Parallel analysis confirmed two factors are appropriate given the number of items and the sample size (Lautenschlager, 1989). Therefore, the factor solution for two factors was rotated using oblimin rotation to examine the underlying structure of the items; inspection of the intercorrelations among the two factors revealed a moderately high relation, (.56), thereby supporting the use of an oblimin rotation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Three items were dropped from the EWCS because these three items cross loaded on the two factors to a greater extent than the factor loading cutoff of .32 suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell.

Examination of the two factors and the items associated with each supports that the two factors corresponded to the construction of the questionnaire. Specifically, the 18 items that loaded onto Factor 1 included 17 of the 18 items originally adapted from the SRE, plus one additional item that tapped experiences with being treated unfairly by friends. The eight items that loaded onto Factor 2 included seven of the 10 items
developed to assess the everyday systemic experiences of classism that were themes derived from Ritz and Hyers’ (2005) qualitative investigation (i.e., flaunting and bureaucratic hassles). Thus, the two factors were named personalized experiences of classism (EWC-personal) and systemic experiences of classism (EWC-systemic). The total amount of variance accounted for by this two-factor solution was 54.23%. The number of items loading on each factor at greater than .32 was 18 and 7 (See Table 1), respectively. In subsequent analyses, these 25 items are used to assess classism and the two factors are examined as distinct dimensions of classism (See Appendix K for final version of the EWCS).
Table 1  
Exploratory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWC1</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC2</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC3</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC4</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC5</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC6</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC7</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC8</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC9</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC10</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC11</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC12</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC13</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC14</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC15</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC16</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC17</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC19</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC20</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC21</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC23</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC24</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC25</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC26</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC27</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PAF with Oblimin Rotation.  
Items’ strongest factor loading is in bold.
The internal consistency reliability (alpha) of the EWCS total score was .95. Alphas for the two subscales of the EWCS identified through the present factor analysis were also high: .95 for the EWC-personal subscale and .85 for the EWC-systemic subscale.

Data Cleaning

The data were cleaned using item-level mean imputation when less than 10% of item responses for any given subscale were missing. In total, less than 1% of all responses were missing and therefore changed using mean imputation. Further, participants who were missing data on more than 10% of items from any one measure were left as missing (See Table 2 for total number of persons missing for each subscale). Mahalonobis distance statistic and Cooke’s D were used to screen the data for potential outliers. These analyses did not reveal any of the data points to be considered outliers or influential points.
Table 2
Descriptive Information for Primary Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRE</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>14.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>7.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECT</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>18.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.65</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.45</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.44</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSI</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184.03</td>
<td>41.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.12</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.93</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.47</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.26</td>
<td>19.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SRE = Schedule of Racist Events; EC1 = Personal Experiences with Classism; EC2 = Systemic Experiences with Classism; ECT = Total Experiences with Classism; AM = Economic Resources-Amenities; BN = Economic Resources-Basic Needs; POW = Social Power; SOC = Social Prestige; DSI = Differential Status Identity; PSS = Parental Support Scale; SSS = Sibling Support Scale; FSS = Friend Support Scale; CSE = Career Decision Self-Efficacy; ANX = Career Choice Anxiety; DEC = Career Indecisiveness; CWB = Coping With Barriers.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Mean values and standard deviations for the observed scale scores for the primary variables are also presented in Table 2. Bivariate correlations and internal consistency reliabilities (on the diagonals) for the observed scale score variables are presented in Table 3. All scales exhibited acceptable reliabilities (Nunally, 1978) and were consistent with prior reported alphas (e.g., Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Nilsson, Schmidt, & Meek, 2002; Thompson & Subich, 2007), except for the PSS, SSS, and FSS which all demonstrated higher alphas than those reported previously (Ali, McWhirter, & Chronister, 2005).
### Table 3
Correlations among Primary Variables

|     | 1 SRE | 2 EC1 | 3 EC2 | 4 ECT | 5 AM  | 6 BN  | 7 POW | 8 SOC | 9 DSI | 10 PSS | 11 SSS | 12 FSS | 13 CSE | 14 ANX | 15 DEC | 16 CWB |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1   | (.95) | .81+  | .54+  | .81+  | .04   | -.01  | .09   | -.17+ | -.02  | -.10  | -.01  | -.10  | -.16+ | .04   | -.00  | -.22+ |       |
| 2   | (.95) | .55+  | .94+  | .06   | .01   | .14*  | -.10  | .02   | -.15+ | -.05  | -.18+ | -.18+ | .02   | .02   | -.22+ |       |
| 3   | (.85) | .79+  | -.28+ | -.26+ | -.18+ | -.26+ | -.28+ | -.06  | .01   | -.09  | .11   | .09   | -.19+ |       |       |       |
| 4   | (.95) | -.07  | -.10  | .03   | -.18+ | -.10  | .04   | -.14* | -.04  | -.13* | -.17+ | .06   | .05   | -.24+ |       |
| 5   | (.93) | .87+  | .75+  | .63+  | .93+  | .08   | .01   | .12*  | -.14+ | -.20+ | .09   |       |       |       |       |
| 6   | (.94) | .68+  | .64+  | .91+  | .24+  | .07   | .06   | .18+  | -.15* | -.16+ | .09   |       |       |       |       |
| 7   | (.95) | .64+  | .85+  | .17+  | .11   | .02   | .11   | -.15+ | -.27+ | .04   |       |       |       |       |
| 8   | (.93) | .81+  | .13*  | .08   | .07   | .13*  | -.07  | -.13* | .10   |       |       |       |       |       |
| 9   | (.98) | .23+  | .12   | .07   | .18+  | -.13* | -.20+ | .01   |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 10  | (.87) | .58+  | .55+  | .33+  | .02   | .05   | .15*  |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 11  | (.90) | .59+  | .26+  | -.09  | -.07  | .10   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 12  | (.91) | .36+  | .05   | .01   | .05   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 13  | (.94) | -.37+ | -.33+ | -.32+ |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 14  | (.80) | .41+  | -.15* |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 15  | (.79) |       | -.30+ |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 16  | (.95) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

Note: * = p < .05; + = p < .01; SRE = Schedule of Racist Events; EC1 = Personal Experiences with Classism; EC2 = Systemic Experiences with Classism; ECT = Total Experiences with Classism; AM = Economic Resources-Amenities; BN = Economic Resources-Basic Needs; POW = Social Power; SOC = Social Prestige; DSI = Differential Status Identity; PSS = Parental Support Scale; SSS = Sibling Support Scale; FSS = Friend Support Scale; CSE = Career Decision Self-Efficacy; ANX = Career Choice Anxiety; DEC = Career Indecisiveness; CWB = Coping With Barriers.
Correlations were calculated to examine relations among the variables. Overall, the observed relations among the variables of interest may be summarized as weak, albeit in the hypothesized direction. Specifically, more reported experiences with racism were related to less perceived efficacy to cope with barriers ($r = -.22, p < .01$) and less career decision self-efficacy ($r = -.16, p < .01$). Likewise, more reported experiences with classism (personal) were related to less perceived efficacy to cope with barriers ($r = -.22, p < .01$) and less career decision self-efficacy ($r = -.18, p < .01$). More reported experiences with systemic classism were related to less perceived efficacy to cope with barriers ($r = -.19, p < .01$) but were not related significantly to career decision self-efficacy ($r = -.09, p > .05$). The three support measures (i.e., primary caregiver support, sibling support, and friend support) all correlated positively with career decision self-efficacy ($r = .33, r = .26$, and $r = .36$, respectively, all $p$’s $< .01$), whereas only primary caregiver support related significantly to greater perceived efficacy to cope with barriers ($r = .15, p < .05$). Perceived social status correlated significantly and negatively with experiences with systemic classism ($r = -.28, p < .01$), significantly and positively with primary caregiver support and career decision self-efficacy ($r = .23, p < .01$ and $r = .18, p < .01$, respectively), and significantly and negatively with career choice anxiety and career indefiniteness ($r = -.13, p < .05$ and $r = -.20, p < .01$). Finally, the outcome variables of career choice anxiety, career indefiniteness, and career decision self-efficacy correlated in the expected directions. Specifically, career decision self-efficacy was related negatively to career choice anxiety and career indefiniteness ($r = -.37, p < .01$ and $r = -.33, p < .01$) and career choice anxiety was related positively to career indefiniteness ($r = .41, p < .01$).
Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 stated that level of perceived social status (as measured by the DSIS) correlates positively with career decision self-efficacy and correlates negatively with career indecisiveness and career choice anxiety. As hypothesized, the DSIS total score and career decision self-efficacy score were related positively ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), the DSIS total score and career indecisiveness score were related negatively ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$), and the DSIS total score and career choice anxiety score were related negatively ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2a stated that being a member of a non-ordinant racial/ethnic group relates positively to greater numbers of experiences with racism (as measured by the SRE). To test this hypothesis, data were combined across the classifications of African American, Biracial, Asian American, Native American, Hispanic American, East Indian, “International Student,” and “Other.” This method has been used in previous research (e.g., Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001) in order to allow researchers to evaluate potential differences between European American college students and members of other ethnic groups. Despite the common use of this method, it is obviously limited by grouping individuals from different cultural backgrounds into one group. It is therefore important to point out that it is not assumed that members of ethnic minority groups share the same experiences. Results from a t-test demonstrated that there is indeed a difference in the prevalence of experiences with racism for those who are members of ethnic minority groups and those who are not ($t(296) = 11.92$, $p < .01$). More specifically, these differences were in the expected direction with underrepresented racial/ethnic group members reporting significantly greater numbers of experiences with racism ($M = 41.82$,
$SD = 16.09$) than their European American counterparts ($M = 24.82, SD = 7.97$). To test for differences between the only two individual racial groups with large enough numbers of participants, African Americans and European Americans, a second t-test was completed. Results from this t-test supported the prior test and demonstrated that there is indeed a difference in the prevalence of experiences with racism for African Americans and European Americans ($t(252) = 13.31, p < .01$). More specifically, these differences were in the expected direction with African Americans reporting significantly greater numbers of experiences with racism ($M = 44.83, SD = 16.00$) than their European American counterparts ($M = 24.82, SD = 7.97$).

Hypothesis 2b stated that being a member of a non-ordinant social class group relates positively to greater numbers of experiences with classism. Similar to the combination method used for Hypothesis 2a, data were combined along the classifications of social class such that individuals from non-ordinant social class groups (i.e., lower class and lower middle class) were combined and individuals from ordinant social class groups (i.e., middle class, upper middle class) were combined. Results from a t-test demonstrated that there is indeed a difference in the prevalence of personal experiences with classism for those who are from non-ordinant social class backgrounds and those who are from ordinant social class backgrounds ($t(283) = 2.03, p < .05$). More specifically, these differences were in the expected direction with individuals from lower and lower middle class backgrounds reporting significantly greater numbers of personal experiences with classism ($M = 31.63, SD = 13.26$) than individuals from middle and upper middle class backgrounds ($M = 28.21, SD = 12.86$). Results from a second t-test demonstrated that there is also a difference in the prevalence of systemic experiences
with classism for those who are from non-ordinant social class backgrounds and those who are from ordinant social class backgrounds ($t(283) = 3.14, p < .01$). More specifically, these differences were in the expected direction with individuals from lower and lower middle class backgrounds reporting significantly greater numbers of experiences with systemic classism ($M = 17.97, SD = 6.77$) than individuals from middle and upper middle class backgrounds ($M = 15.11, SD = 7.13$).

Hypothesis 3a stated that persons’ experiences with racism relate negatively to perceived social status. Given that results from previous research (Thompson & Subich, 2006; 2007) have demonstrated that individuals from various racial and social class backgrounds report differing levels of perceived social status (as measured by the DSIS), race and self-reported social class category were controlled in order to more accurately assess this relation. To test this hypothesis, therefore, a regression analysis was computed. Specifically, race (dummy coded as non-European American = 1, European American = 2 as described above) and self-identified social class standing (i.e., lower class, lower middle class, middle class, upper middle class, and upper class) were entered as covariates in Step 1. When SRE total score was entered in a second step, it contributed ($\beta = .17$) incrementally to the variance explained in the DSIS total score ($\Delta R^2 = .02, \Delta F(1, 294) = 7.96, p < .01$; See Table 4). Although these results support the relation of experiences with racism to perceived social status after controlling for race and self-reported social class category, it is important to note that these results indicate that the relation is not in the hypothesized direction. Specifically, it appears that experiences with racism are related positively (rather than negatively) to perceived social status; Hypothesis 3a therefore was not supported.
Table 4
Regression for relation of Barriers to Differential Status Identity Scale (DSIS)

### Regression for relation of SRE to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>61.222</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>61.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>44.435</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>7.962**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regression for relation of EWC1 to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>63.083**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC1</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>45.345</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>7.200**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regression for relation of EWC2 to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>63.083</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>63.083**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC2</td>
<td>-.122*</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>44.591</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>5.618*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hierarchical Regression for relation of EWCS subscales to DSIS

#### Step 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>63.083</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWC1</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>45.345</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Step 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWC2</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>41.168</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hierarchical Regression for relation of EWCS subscales to DSIS

#### Step 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>63.083</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWC2</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>44.591</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Step 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWC1</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>41.168</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p ≤ .05 and ** p ≤ .01. Betas in table are from final analysis; SRE = Schedule of Racist Events; EWC1 = Personal Experiences with Classism; EWC2 = Systemic Experiences with Classism; DSIS = Differential Status Identity Scale.
Hypothesis 3b stated that persons’ experiences with classism relate negatively to perceived social status. Given the need to control for race and social class in order to more accurately assess this relation, a series of regression analyses were computed to test this hypothesis. Specifically, consistent with the analyses above, race and self-identified social class standing were entered as covariates in Step 1. When the EWC1 score (personal experiences with classism) was entered in the second step, it contributed ($\beta = .14$) incrementally to the variance explained in DSIS total score ($\Delta R^2 = .02, \Delta F(1, 292) = 7.20, p < .01$; See Table 4). Further, when the EWC2 score (systemic classism experiences) was entered in the second step of a separate analysis, it also contributed ($\beta = -.12$) incrementally to the variance explained in DSIS total score ($\Delta R^2 = .01, \Delta F(1, 292) = 5.62, p < .05$; See Table 4).

Although this combination of results supports the relation of experiences with classism to perceived social status after controlling for race and self-reported social class category, it is important to note that these results only partially support the hypothesis that greater numbers of experiences with classism are related to lower levels of perceived social status. Namely, it appears that experiences with classism at an institutional or systemic level are related negatively to perceived social status whereas, similar to the results for experiences with racism at a personal level, experiences with classism at a personal level are related positively to perceived social status. Hypothesis 3b therefore was only partially supported.

Finally, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed in order to determine whether each of the EWCS subscales accounted for additional variance in the DSIS total score above and beyond that accounted for by the other EWCS subscale. Specifically, for
the first analysis, race and social class were entered as covariates into Step 1, EWC1 was entered at Step 2, and EWC2 was entered at Step 3. Results indicated that EWC2 (β = - .25) added unique variance to the prediction of DSI total score above and beyond EWC1 (Final ΔR² = .04, ΔF(1, 291) = 19.85, p < .01; See Table 4). For the second analysis, race and social class were entered as covariates into Step 1, EWC2 was entered at Step 2, and EWC1 was entered at Step 3. Results indicated that EWC1 (β = .27) added unique variance to the prediction of the DSIS total score above and beyond EWC2 (Final ΔR² = .05, ΔF(1, 291) = 21.50, p < .01; See Table 4). Thus, results from the two analyses confirmed that each of the individual EWCS subscales accounted for unique variance in DSIS total scores beyond the other subscale, providing evidence that indicates the two subscales represent unique constructs and should be considered independently in subsequent analyses.

Hypothesis 4 stated that one’s access to primary caregiver, sibling, and peer support relates positively to perceived social status. Consistent with Hypotheses 3a and 3b, to test this hypothesis, a series of regression analyses was computed (See Table 5). Specifically, race and self-identified social class standing were entered as covariates in Step 1. When the Primary Caregiver Support Scale score was entered in a second step, it contributed (β = .13) incrementally to the variance explained in the DSIS total score (ΔR² = .02, ΔF(1, 291) = 7.29, p < .01). When Sibling Support Scale score was entered in the second step of a similar regression analysis, however, it did not contribute (β = .10) incrementally to the variance explained in the DSIS total score (ΔR² = .01, ΔF(1, 244) = 3.06, p > .05). Similarly, when the Friend Support Scale score was entered in the second
step of a comparable regression analysis, it did not contribute ($\beta = .03$) incrementally to the variance explained in the DSIS total score ($\Delta R^2 = .00, \Delta F(1, 293) = .42, p > .05$).

Hypothesis 4 therefore was only partially supported.
Table 5
Regression for relation of Supports to Differential Status Identity Scale (DSIS)

### Regression for relation of PSS to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>64.242</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>64.242**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 2  |       |        |       |         |     |        |
| PSS     | .132**| .323   | 46.181| .316    | .017| 7.291**|

### Regression for relation of SSS to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>48.174</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>48.174**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 2  |       |        |       |         |     |        |
| SSS     | .095  | .291   | 33.408| .282    | .009| 3.064  |

### Regression for relation of FSS to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>61.22</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>61.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 2  |       |        |       |         |     |        |
| FSS     | .032  | .295   | 40.875| .288    | .001| .422   |

*Note: *p ≤ .05 and ** p ≤ .01. Betas in table are from final analysis; PSS = Primary Caretaker Support; SSS = Sibling Support; FSS = Friend Support; DSIS = Differential Status Identity Scale.*
For Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7, to reduce multicollinearity between the interaction term and the main effects when testing for moderator effects, centered variables were used (i.e., mean deviation scores) as suggested by Aiken and West (1991).

Hypothesis 5 stated that experiences with supports moderate the relation between experiences with barriers (i.e., racism and classism) and perceived status identity. Given the results from Hypothesis 4, only primary caregiver support was examined as a potential moderator of the relations between experiences with barriers and the DSIS. Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guidelines for assessing moderation were used to examine whether the relation between experiences with barriers and internalized status is moderated by primary caregiver support. Specifically, an interaction term was created by calculating the product of each of the experiences with barriers measures (Schedule of Racist Events: SRE; Personal Experiences with Classism: EWC1; and Systemic Experiences with Classism: EWC2) with the moderator (Primary Caregiver Support: PSS). That is, the three interaction terms were PSS*SRE, PSS*EWC1, and PSS*EWC2. Three separate regression analyses were carried out, one for each type of barrier. In each analysis, the covariates of race and social class were entered into the first block of the regression equation with perceived status as the dependent variable. Then, the predictor (SRE, EWC1, or EWC2) was entered into the second block and the moderator variable (primary caregiver support) was entered into the third block of the regression. Finally, the relevant interaction variable (PSS*SRE, PSS*EWC1, or PSS*EWC2) was entered into the fourth block of the regression.
Results did not support evidence of a moderating effect for SRE ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 289) = .04, p > .05$), EWC1 ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 288) = .33, p > .05$), or EWC2 ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 288) = .01, p > .05$); in every case, the interaction term did not contribute significantly to the prediction of the DSIS total score (See Table 6). Hypothesis 5, therefore, was not supported.
### Table 6
Moderation of Barriers

#### Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of SRE to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>64.242</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>64.242**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>46.391</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>7.729**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>37.741</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>8.300**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS*SRE</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>30.102</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of EWC1 to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>66.316</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>66.316**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC1</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>47.500</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>7.091**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>37.930</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>6.511*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS*EWC1</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>30.340</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of EWC2 to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>66.316</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>66.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC2</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>46.354</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>4.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>36.396</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>4.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS*EWC2</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>29.018</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p ≤ .05 and **p ≤ .01. Betas in table are from final analysis; PSS = Primary Caretaker Support; SRE = Schedule of Racist Events; EWC1 = Personal Experiences with Classism; EWC2 = Systemic Experiences with Classism; DSIS = Differential Status Identity Scale.*
Hypothesis 6a stated that coping efficacy moderates the relation between supports and perception of social status. Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guidelines for assessing moderation were again used to examine whether the relation between primary caregiver support and internalized status is moderated by coping efficacy. Specifically, an interaction term was created by calculating the product of the primary caregiver supports measure with the moderator (coping efficacy; CWB). That is, the interaction term was PSS*CWB. Then, the covariates (race and social class) were entered into the first block of the regression equation with perceived status as the dependent variable. Next, the predictor (primary caregiver support) was entered into the second block and the moderator variable (coping efficacy) was entered into the third block of the regression. Finally, the interaction variable (PSS*CWB) was entered into the fourth block of the regression. Contrary to Hypothesis 6a, results did not support evidence of a moderating effect ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 287) = .33, p > .05$; See Table 7).
### Table 7
Coping With Barriers as a Moderator of Relation of Supports and Barriers to Social Status

#### Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of PSS to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>65.654</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>65.654**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>65.654</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>65.654**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>46.999</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>6.982**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>35.132</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB*PSS</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>28.108</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of SRE to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>62.569</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>62.569**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>62.569</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>62.569**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>44.033</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>5.173*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>32.963</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE*CWB</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>28.453</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of EWC1 to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>64.431</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>64.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>64.431</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>64.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC1</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>44.698</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>3.933*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>33.458</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB*EWC1</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>26.685</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (Continued)
Coping With Barriers as a Moderator of Relation of Supports and Barriers to Social Status

Hierarchical Regression for moderation of relation of EWC2 to DSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>64.431</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>64.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EWC2</td>
<td>-.714*</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>46.844</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>8.395**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>-.211*</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>35.037</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CWB*EWC2</td>
<td>.568*</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>29.239</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>4.399*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p ≤ .05 and ** p ≤ .01. Betas in table are from final analysis; PSS = Primary Caretaker Support; SRE = Schedule of Racist Events; EWC1 = Personal Experiences with Classism; EWC2 = Systemic Experiences with Classism; CWB = Coping With Barriers; DSIS = Differential Status Identity Scale.
Hypothesis 6b stated that coping efficacy moderates the relation between barriers and perception of social status. Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guidelines for assessing moderation were again used to examine whether the relation between experiences with barriers and internalized status is moderated by coping efficacy. Specifically, an interaction term was created by calculating the product of each of the experiences with barriers measures (SRE, EWC1, and EWC2) with the moderator (coping efficacy). That is, the three interaction terms were CWB*SRE, CWB*EWC1, and CWB*EWC2. Then, three separate regression analyses were carried out; one for each barrier. In each, the covariates (race and social class) were entered into the first block of the regression equation with perceived status as the dependent variable. Then, the predictor (SRE, EWC1, or EWC2) was entered into the second block and the moderator variable (coping efficacy) was entered into the third block of the regression. Finally, the relevant interaction variable (CWB*SRE, CWB*EWC1, or CWB*EWC2) was entered into the fourth block of the regression.

Results did not support evidence of a moderating effect for SRE ($\Delta R^2 = .00, \Delta F(1, 289) = .60, p > .05$) or EWC1 ($\Delta R^2 = .00, \Delta F(1, 288) = .04, p > .05$), but did support evidence of a moderating effect for EWC2 ($\beta = .568, t = 2.10, p < .05; \Delta R^2 = .01, \Delta F(1, 288) = 4.40, p < .05$; See Table 6). Specifically, the negative relationship between experiences with systemic classism and perceived social status was stronger for individuals with lower levels of perceived coping efficacy (See Figure 2). Hypothesis 6b, therefore, was only partially supported.
Note. CWB = Coping with Barriers.

Figure 2

The Interactive Effect of Experiences with Systemic Classism and Coping Efficacy on Perceived Status Identity.
Finally, Hypothesis 7 stated that the data would support a proposed path model. Path analysis, using maximum likelihood estimation was used to test the hypothesized model (see Figure 1) and was performed in MPlus v. 3.12 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2005). Race and self-reported social class category were included as control variables in the model. According to Kline’s (2005) guidelines for a 20:1 ratio between the number of cases to the number of free parameters in the model, an adequate sample size for the proposed model was 240 participants, thereby indicating the present sample size of 299 participants is adequate for the following analyses. All paths (direct and indirect) were modeled and fit of the data to the model was assessed using a variety of fit indices, including Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA < .08 suggests reasonable fit), Comparative Fit Index (CFI > .90 suggests reasonably good fit), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR < .10 suggests favorable fit) (Kline).

To deal with missing data on a scale level, the current study used a full information maximum likelihood estimation (FIML) to test the relations in the following path models. This missing data technique assumes that

“missing values on a variable X are conditionally dependent on other observed variables in the data, and incorporating vectors of partially complete data in the individual-level likelihood functions… implies probable values for the missing data during the parameter estimation process” (Enders, 2001, p. 714).

This method assumes that the data are missing at random (MAR) and therefore is less restrictive than approaches that assume that data are missing completely at random (MCAR). Researchers have suggested that even when data do not meet this assumption, FIML produces less biased estimates than do other conventional approaches to dealing with scale level missing data (Schafer & Graham, 2002; Sinharay, Stern, & Russell,
FIML, therefore, is favored over other, more conventional methods for dealing with missing data, particularly for SEM applications (Allison, 2003; Little & Rubin, 2002; Raykov, 2007).

In each of the models discussed below, SRE, EWC1, EWC2, PSS, DSIS, CWB, CDSE, ANX, and DEC total scores were used as single indicators of Experiences with Racism, Experiences With Classism-Personal, Experiences With Classism-Systemic, Primary Caregiver Support, Perceived Differential Status Identity, Coping With Barriers, Career Decision Self-Efficacy, Career Choice Anxiety, and Career Indecision, respectively. Race/ethnicity was dummy-coded into two variables (0 = non-ordinant racial/ethnic background, 1 = ordinant racial/ethnic background) and included as a control variable in each of the models. Self-reported social class category (i.e., lower class, lower middle class, middle class, upper middle class, and upper class) was also included as a control variable in each of the models.

Figure 3 presents the hypothesized model with standardized path estimates. The hypothesized model did not fit the data well (See Table 8). Modification indices indicated that fit might be improved if a direct link between career decision self-efficacy and primary caregiver support was added. Because this modification made conceptual sense (i.e., individuals who perceive high levels of support from their primary caretakers should feel more efficacious about making career decisions regardless of perceived social status) and past empirical research has demonstrated a positive relationship between primary caretaker support and self-efficacy (Ali et al., 2005), it was included in a modified
hypothesized model (see Figure 4). This modified model fit better than the original hypothesized model, but the fit was still not good ($\chi^2 = 96.55$, df = 41, CFI = .84, SRMR = .045, RMSE = .067; See Table 8).
Figure 3

Hypothesized Model
Figure 4

Modified Hypothesized Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized</td>
<td>134.96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>96.55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>55.857</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploratory Analyses

One alternate model was examined as an exploratory analysis in order to arrive at a well-fitting model that makes conceptual sense. The alternate model was developed based on past empirical work as well as inspection of the modification indices from the original hypothesized model. First, past empirical research has demonstrated that career decision self-efficacy fully mediates the relation between perceived social status (DSI) and career indecision (Thompson & Subich, 2007). Therefore, CDSE was included in an alternate model as a mediator of the relation between DSIS and IND and ANX (See Figure 5). Second, results of tests of Hypotheses 6a and 6b as well as inspection of the betas of the hypothesized and trimmed models demonstrated that the paths including coping efficacy as a moderator in the relation of the exogenous variables to DSIS scores were non-significant. However, bivariate correlations and modification indices from the first two models suggested that coping efficacy was indeed related to perceived social status as well as the three dependent variables included in the model (career decision self-efficacy, career choice anxiety, and career indecisiveness). Because the modification indices suggesting that paths corresponding to coping efficacy should be included in the final model make conceptual sense (i.e., the relations between individuals’ perceptions of their social status and career decision self-efficacy may depend upon their perceived ability to cope with barriers), coping efficacy was included as a moderator in the relation proposed above between DSI and CDSE.
Figure 5

Alternative Model
The path loadings for alternative model therefore suggested the following relations: experiences with racism, experiences with personal and systemic classism, and support from primary caregivers relate to perceived social status; support from caregivers relates directly to career decision self-efficacy; coping efficacy moderates the relation between perceived social status and career decision self-efficacy; and perceived social status relates to career choice anxiety and career indecisiveness directly as well as indirectly, through career decision self-efficacy. Results of testing this alternative model demonstrated good fit. In particular, the fit indices for this model met Hu and Bentler’s (1999) two-index presentation strategy indicating a good model fit ($\chi^2 = 55.857$, df = 23, CFI = .90, SRMR = .041; RMSEA = .069; See Table 8).

The standardized path coefficients (corresponding to direct effects) for the second alternate model are presented in Figure 5. Consistent with the original hypotheses, as shown in the figure, race/ethnicity and self reported social class category had significant and positive relations to DSIS (higher social class category and being European American were positively related to higher perceived social status; $\beta = .45, p < .01$ and $\beta = .15, p < .01$, respectively). Even when controlling for the impact of these two constructs (race and self reported social class), however, experiences with classism (systemic) significantly and negatively related to perceived social status ($\beta = -.29, p < .01$). Contrary to hypotheses, experiences with classism (personal) significantly and positively related to perceived social status ($\beta = .19, p < .05$) and experiences with racism were not significantly related to perceived social status ($\beta = .17, p > .05$). Further, support from primary caretakers had significant and direct effects on career decision self-efficacy ($\beta = .26, p < .01$) and perceived social status ($\beta = .16, p < .01$).
Consistent with the original hypotheses and the results of previous research (e.g., Thompson & Subich, 2007), a significant direct effect was demonstrated for DSIS leading to Career Indecisiveness (higher perceived status was negatively related to career indecisiveness; $\beta = -.13, p < .05$). Not consistent with the original hypotheses, however, DSIS had no significant direct effect on Career Choice Anxiety ($\beta = -.06, p > .05$).

Further, as expected, CDSE had significant and direct effects on Career Indecisiveness (higher levels of career decision self-efficacy was negatively related to career indecisiveness; $\beta = -.32, p < .01$) and Career Choice Anxiety ($\beta = -.38, p < .01$).

Examination of the proposed moderation by Coping With Barriers for the relation of perceived social status to Career Decision Self-Efficacy demonstrated that Coping With Barriers does moderate this relation ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$). Specifically, the positive relationship between perceived social status and career decision self-efficacy was stronger for those with higher levels of coping efficacy than for those with lower levels of coping efficacy. Finally, examination of the indirect effects revealed that the relation between DSIS and Career Choice Anxiety was fully mediated by Career Decision Self-Efficacy whereas the relation between DSIS and Career Indecisiveness was only partially mediated by Career Decision Self-Efficacy.

Summary

Table 9 presents a summary of the results pertaining to each hypothesis in this study. Overall, support for the proposed hypotheses was mixed. More specifically, consistent support was found for the following relations among the proposed antecedents of perceived status: negative relation between experiences with systemic classism and perceived status, positive relation between experiences with personal classism and
perceived status, positive relation between primary caregiver support and status, positive relation between social class category and perceived status, and European Americans as having greater reported levels of perceived status than individuals from non-majority racial/ethnic groups. Further, coping efficacy was demonstrated to moderate the relation between systemic experiences with classism and perceived social status but did not moderate the relations between experiences with personal classism or experiences with racism and perceived status. Finally, greater levels of internalized status were related positively to career decision self-efficacy and negatively to career indecisiveness and career choice anxiety.

Although the proposed path model (Hypothesis 7) was not supported by the totality of the data, results of the exploratory alternative path model provided support for a number of relations among the primary variables of interest in the present study. Specifically, the following relations were supported: experiences with personal and systemic classism and support from primary caregivers relate significantly to perceived social status after controlling for race and self-reported social class category; support from caregivers relates significantly to career decision self-efficacy; coping efficacy moderates the relation between perceived social status and career decision self-efficacy; perceived social status relates to career indecisiveness directly as well as indirectly, through career decision self-efficacy; and perceived social status relates to career choice anxiety indirectly, through career decision self-efficacy.
Table 9
Summary of Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1</strong>: Greater perceived levels of social status relates to positive vocational outcomes of less career indecisiveness, less career choice anxiety, and greater career decision self-efficacy.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2a</strong>: Non-ordinant racial/ethnic group membership relates positively to greater numbers of experiences with racism as measured by the SRE.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2b</strong>: Non-ordinant social class group membership relates positively to greater numbers of experiences with classism as measured by the EWCS.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3a</strong>: Greater numbers of reported experiences with racism relate negatively to perceived social status as defined by the DSIS.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3b</strong>: Greater numbers of reported experiences with classism relate negatively to perceived social status as defined by the DSIS.</td>
<td>Partial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4</strong>: Access to parental, sibling, and peer support relates positively to perceived social status.</td>
<td>Partial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5</strong>: Experiences with supports (i.e., family/peer support) moderate the relation between experiences with barriers (i.e., racism and classism) and perceived social status.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6a</strong>: Coping efficacy moderates the relation between supports (i.e., parental, sibling, peer support) and perception of social status.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6b</strong>: Coping efficacy moderates the relation between barriers (i.e., experiences with racism and classism) and perception of social status.</td>
<td>Partial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7</strong>: The model proposed in Figure 1 is supported by the totality of the data.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter begins by presenting an overview of the purpose of the current study. Next, results of the study, integrated with the extant literature, are presented. Then, limitations of the present pattern of findings are discussed. Implications of the findings for practice and policy are presented next. Finally, directions for future research and theory development are offered.

Overview of the Current Study

Over the past two decades, vocational theorists and researchers have increasingly recognized the importance of attending to demographic and contextual variables that may act as supports and/or barriers to an individual’s vocational development (e.g., Argyle, 1994; Blustein et al., 2002; Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Lent et al., 2000; Liu et al., 2004). More recently, researchers (e.g., Thompson & Subich, 2007) have begun to examine social status in a more sophisticated manner and have pressed for greater exploration of social status and its relation to individuals’ career decision-making processes. The purpose of the present study, therefore, was to use Differential Status Identity (DSI; Fouad & Brown, 2000) as a framework by which to further understand the relation of experiences with supports and barriers to an individual’s internalization of social status identity and subsequent vocational development.
Differential Status Identity offers a multidimensional framework from which to further understand the process by which contextual variables (i.e., race and social class) intersect and are internalized by the individual. According to the framework, the manner in which one internalizes such experiences will have implications for the vocational and educational development of the individual. Although Fouad and Brown (2000) drew from a body of theoretical and empirical literature (e.g., Brown et al., 1996; Cross, 1971; Helms, 1999) in their conceptualization of DSI, these authors offered relatively limited insight into the specific mechanism(s) by which one internalizes one’s perceived social status. The present study therefore extends the existing theoretical and empirical vocational literature related to social status by: (a) relying on a multidimensional measure of social status that accounts for the intersection of one’s social class and racial/ethnic group memberships, (b) exploring the potential interplay of experiences with environmental barriers and supports as they relate to the internalization of status, and (c) testing an overall model that includes hypothesized antecedents and outcomes of internalized status identity for the individual.

Two-hundred and ninety-nine undergraduate students (68% Female) from a Midwestern university agreed to participate in the present study, which involved completing a series of questionnaires. Participants ranged in age (17 to 50 years), academic year, and race/ethnicity (55.9% identified as European American, 29.1% as African American, 5.7% as Biracial, 2% as Asian American, 1.7% as “International Student”, 2% as Latin American, 1% as Native American, 1% as East Indian). Eighty-nine percent of participants identified as Exclusively or Mostly Heterosexual. Of the participants, 15 self identified as belonging to the lower class, 70 identified as belonging
to the lower-middle class, 131 identified as belonging to the middle class, 71 identified as belonging to the upper-middle class, and 10 identified as belonging to the upper class (two students did not indicate a social class category). Sixty percent of participants indicated that they are first generation college students.

Results of the Current Study

Overall, findings from the analysis of the data from this study demonstrated mixed support for the hypothesized relations. The following sections situate the current results within the existing psychological literature.

Experiences with Classism Scale development. Although not included as a central hypothesis in the present investigation, one of the contributions of this study was its development and exploration of a new measure of persons’ experiences with classism, the EWCS. The EWCS was created after a thorough literature review revealed no existing measure intended to tap these experiences. This measure was developed in an attempt to extend prior qualitative work (i.e., Ritz & Hyers, 2005) that highlighted the need to consider experiences with classism in the lives of undergraduate students as well as to answer the calls of others (e.g., Blustein, 2005; Blustein et al., 2002; Brown et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Liu et al., 2004) to attend to the psychological impact that these experiences may have on individuals’ vocational development processes.

Results from pilot data as well as from the full data collection demonstrated that the EWCS is a promising measure of undergraduate students’ experiences with classism. Specifically, the EWCS was demonstrated to have high internal consistency reliability, to have a stable factor structure, and to have captured the nature of experiences with classism for participants. In particular, responses to a series of open-ended questions that
followed the presentation of the quantitative items contained in the EWCS revealed that participants thought that their experiences with classism had been captured by the quantitative items.

Results from an EFA highlighted the existence of two subscales, which is consistent with the initial development of the scale. The initial items of the EWCS were developed by adapting items from the SRE to reflect experiences with classism. Most of these items loaded onto the first factor, which is best described as experiences with classism at a personal level. The development of the second set of items was guided by results from Ritz and Hyers (2005), which revealed that two types of experiences with classism were different from experiences with racism as conceptualized and measured in the existing literature related to everyday experiences with racism (i.e., flaunting and bureaucratic hassles). The two factors revealed by the EFA, therefore, make both conceptual and empirical sense. Further, results related to the main hypotheses of interest in the present study (reviewed below) support the usefulness of considering these two subscales as representing distinct types of experiences with classism.

Proposed path model. In order to extend previous literature, this study used DSI as a framework by which to further understand the role of supports and barriers in an individual’s internalization of social status and subsequent career indecisiveness, career choice anxiety, and career decision self-efficacy. In particular, Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of DSI provided a new conceptual lens from which to consider simultaneously the relations of various supports and barriers (e.g., experiences with racism, experiences with classism, family/peer support, and coping efficacy) to an individual’s internalization of her or his status identity (e.g., access to economic
resources, level of perceived social prestige, and level of perceived social power), and the relation of this internalization to vocational outcomes. On the basis of Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of DSI and a body of empirical research examining relations among a few of the variables, a path model was proposed and examined. Overall, the hypothesized model was not supported by the present data. Some of the hypothesized relations, however, were supported. The following sections provide an overview of the meaningful interpretations that can be gleaned from these analyses.

Relation of differential status identity to vocational outcomes. Previous research demonstrated that contextual variables such as race and social class are related to important components of vocational behavior and the career decision-making process for individuals. Specifically, SES has been demonstrated to influence educational plans and career expectations (McWhirter, Hackett, & Bandalos, 1998), educational expectations of family members (Hanson, 1994), parental involvement in education (Sewell & Shah, 1968), educational opportunities afforded to individuals (Lindsay & Knox, 1984), and the ways that individuals make meaning of their work and find motivation for it (Blustein et al., 2002). Similarly, race has been demonstrated to be related to such variables as perceptions of career barriers (Pearson & Bieschke, 2001), career aspirations, interests, perception of opportunities (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005), access to positive role models (Zirkel, 2002), and access to career development resources (Diemer, 2002). Taken collectively, this body of literature supports the important relations between elements of social status (i.e., race and class) and a variety of vocational constructs.
Results from the present investigation corroborate this body of findings. In particular, the present investigation demonstrated further support for the relation of contextual variables to the following vocational constructs: coping efficacy, career decision self-efficacy, career choice anxiety, and career choice indecision. These findings also extend previous literature by relying upon a multidimensional conceptualization (i.e., the intersection of race and class) rather than a unidimensional conceptualization of social status. Although not included as a primary research question for the present study, results supported previous literature which demonstrated the usefulness of relying upon this multidimensional conceptualization of social status rather than relying strictly on demographic variables to account for vocational outcomes (Thompson & Subich, 2006). Specifically, it appears that the direct relations of racial/ethnic group membership or self-identified social class category to the vocational constructs examined herein are not particularly compelling (i.e., the correlations among these variables are weak), but that the relation of these characteristics make a difference when funneled through one’s perceived status identity.

**Barriers to vocational development.** In recent years, the examination of potential intrapersonal and contextual barriers to vocational development has garnered significant theoretical and empirical attention within the vocational psychology literature (e.g., Lent et al., 2000; Swanson & Gore, 2000). In particular, a number of authors have demonstrated the need to consider such experiences for members of non-ordinant cultural groups (e.g., Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Luzzo, 1996; Swanson & Woitke, 1997). Therefore, self-reported experiences with racism and classism were included as two potential barriers that would relate to internalized status identity in the present study.
A body of previous research has demonstrated that individuals who are members of non-ordinant racial groups in the U.S. report experiencing racism in various forms on an everyday basis (e.g., Swim et al., 2003). The present positive relation of being a member of a non-ordinant racial/ethnic group and greater numbers of experiences with racism is therefore consistent with this research. A body of research also has demonstrated the relation of experiences with racism to a number of vocational outcomes. For example, racism has been demonstrated to operate as a potential obstacle to vocational development for college students from different racial backgrounds and to function on an individual as well as a structural level (Juntenen et al., 2001; Lucas, 1993; Sirin et al., 2004). The present investigation demonstrated that experience with racism was related negatively and directly to career decision self-efficacy and coping with barriers.

More recent research efforts to understand differential status identity as a construct inclusive of race and class have demonstrated that this construct indeed captures elements of both race and social class (e.g., Thompson & Subich, 2006; 2007). One extension of this research in the present investigation was the examination of its relation to experiences with racism and experiences with classism for individuals. Contrary to expectations, persons’ experiences with racism in the present investigation were not significantly negatively related to perceived social status. Although surprising, this finding may fit within a broader body of research using the SRE to tap experiences with racism. Specifically, results from previous investigations have demonstrated mixed findings related to the SRE. For example, inconsistent with previous research that demonstrated significant relations between experiences with racism and indices of mental
health, Fischer and Shaw (1999) demonstrated that the SRE was not related to mental health. Results from their study with African American women and men suggested that individual differences may influence the way that African American students internalize experiences with racism. Taken collectively, these findings may point to the need to examine further the usefulness of the SRE in tapping various individuals’ experiences with racism.

More recently, psychologists (e.g., Blustein, 2007; Liu, 2002; Liu et al., 2004; Smith, 2007) have called for attention to individuals’ experiences with classism (which is proposed to operate similarly to experiences with racism). To date, however, little empirical evidence exists regarding the relation of classism to development. The results of a recent qualitative investigation with 38 low-income undergraduate students (Ritz & Hyers, 2005) corroborated Swim and colleagues’ (2003) findings related to everyday experiences with racism. In particular, these researchers demonstrated that individuals report experiencing classism on an everyday basis and in multiple forms. Additionally, findings revealed that three types of experiences with classism reported are similar to incidents reported in the everyday racism literature, whereas two types of incidents (i.e., flaunting and bureaucratic hassles) appear to be somewhat distinct from everyday experiences with racism. Consistent with expectations and the results of research on everyday experiences of racism, being a member of a non-ordinant social class group was related to a greater number of reported experiences with classism in the present investigation. Although the results of t-tests comparing the number of self-reported experiences with classism on the EWCS were statistically significantly different for individuals who self-identify as belonging to a specific class category, these results
should be interpreted with caution. In particular, the actual differences between means were quite small for the experiences with personal classism (Means = 31.63 and 28.21, respectively) and experiences with systemic classism (Means = 17.97 and 15.11, respectively).

Although previous literature supports the relation of social class or social status position to various vocational constructs (e.g., Blustein et al., 2002; Chaves et al., 2004; Thompson & Subich, 2007), to date, a thorough literature search demonstrated that no studies directly assessing the relation of experiences with classism to vocational development exist. Thus, the present examination answered the calls of theorists and researchers (e.g., Blustein, 2007; Liu & Ali, 2005) to examine experiences with classism more specifically in relation to vocational constructs. Results from the present investigation demonstrated that experiences with classism were related negatively to career decision self-efficacy and coping efficacy.

The present study also extended our understanding of the relation of experiences with classism and one’s self reported differential status identity. Specifically, persons’ experiences with classism on a systemic level were related negatively to perceived social status. Unexpectedly, persons’ experiences with classism on a personal level were related positively to perceived social status. These results were surprising in lieu of Fouad and Brown’s (2000) conceptualization of DSI that suggests that class-based inequalities in the U.S. are learning experiences that impact an individuals’ internalization of social status. These findings, however, are consistent with those related to the SRE presented above (therefore providing further support for the need to examine the SRE more closely). Indeed, given that the majority (i.e., 17 out of 18) of the items
demonstrated to load on the personal experiences with classism subscale were those created to parallel SRE items, it is perhaps not surprising that the SRE and EWC-personal subscale were similarly related to perceived status identity.

Alternatively, this unexpected pattern of findings may have occurred because individuals who experience racism and classism at a more personal level are unaffected or positively affected by these experiences. Specifically, consistent with previous work that has demonstrated that some barriers facilitate rather than impede (Lent et al., 2000) and with literature that suggests that individuals may internalize experiences with “isms” as cultural strengths (e.g., Pearson & Bieschke, 2001), experiences with classism and racism at a more personal level may have little negative impact on the individual or may relate positively to one’s perception of herself or himself. The present results indicate that experiences with classism on a more systemic level, however, operate differently for the individual. In particular, it may be that individuals are able to adapt to experiences with racism and classism on a personal level quite well, but have a more difficult time adapting to experiences with classism on a more systemic level. New measures designed to intentionally tap experiences with racism on a more systemic level are needed in order to determine if such experiences operate similarly to the manner in which experiences with classism at a systemic level operated in the present investigation.

Supports to vocational development. Recent research has suggested that supports may play a more influential role in the career development processes of individuals than do vocational barriers (e.g., Kenny et al., 2003; Lent et al., 2002). Indeed, a mounting body of literature, though still limited, has highlighted the beneficial aspects of support
from a variety of sources (e.g., Ali et al., 2005; Schultheiss et al., 2002). Primary caretaker support, friend support, and sibling support were therefore included in the present investigation as potential facilitators of career development.

Support from parental figures consistently has been demonstrated to be related to positive vocational outcomes for individuals from varying racial/ethnic (e.g., Ferry et al., 2000; Flores & O’Brien, 2002; Constantine et al., 2005; Leal-Muniz & Constantine, 2005) as well as social class (Hill et al., 2003; Schoon et al., 2004) backgrounds. To a much lesser extent, support from siblings, extended family, and friends also have been demonstrated to be related positively to career development for individuals from varying cultural backgrounds (e.g., Russell & Atwater, 2005; Schultheiss et al., 2002).

Results from the present investigation suggest that support from primary caretakers is the type of support that is the most strongly related to perceived social status and to career decision self-efficacy. The positive relation of primary caretaker support to perceived status is consistent with previous literature (e.g., Constantine et al., 2005; Flores & O’Brien, 2002) and Fouad and Brown’s (2000) conceptualization that access to primary caregiver support operates as a positive learning experience and would be related positively to perceived status identity. Contrary to the results of the limited previous research assessing sibling and peer support (e.g., Ali et al., 2005), results demonstrated that access to peer support and sibling support was not related significantly to perceived social status.

This unexpected pattern of findings may indicate that one’s access to primary caregiver support is the type of support most strongly related to perceived status identity, and this is consistent with previous work that demonstrated the important buffering role
that parental support may play in the development of individuals from diverse racial and social class backgrounds (e.g., Flores & O’Brien, 2002; Schoon et al., 2004). It may be that one’s access to peer support and friend support are not as influential in one’s perceived identity as access to primary caregiver support or that the variance captured by these forms of support is actually encapsulated in reports of support from primary caregivers.

Alternatively, given the newness of the SSS and FSS and the limited existing data related to their psychometric properties, it is also possible that the measures themselves do not fully tap these two forms of support or that access to support may be better addressed by exploring more specific types of support from different individuals. For example, it may be that individuals are more likely to report receiving financial support from primary caregivers and support for getting involved in extracurricular activities or greater flexibility of career options from friends or siblings. Additionally, in future investigations, it seems necessary to gather more information about an individual’s family composition when interpreting results from these three measures of support. Specifically, it may be that first generation college students are less likely to receive support around studying for exams, taking college entrance exams, or getting good grades in school from their families than their counterparts who are not the first in their families to attend college. Likewise, it may be that individuals from more collectivistic backgrounds may receive less support from siblings, peers, or primary caretakers to take a job that requires them to leave the state than individuals from more traditionally individualistic backgrounds.
Finally, it is important to point out that the three support measures (PSS, SSS, and FSS) each contain very similar items. It therefore seems plausible that participants responded most accurately to the PSS because it was presented first. Participants may have become fatigued or believed that the items from the FSS or PSS were repetitive, and therefore been less apt to carefully consider the similarities and differences in the specific types of support they receive from the three different sources.

Examination of data provided on the demographic questionnaire may also offer some insight into the interpretation of this pattern of findings. Specifically, one item asked individuals to identify their primary sources of support and were provided with a list of 13 potential choices as well as an “Other: Please List” category. Exploration of participant responses revealed that support from mothers and fathers were indeed the two types of support endorsed by a majority of participants (59.2% and 38.5%, respectively), which is consistent with the aforementioned pattern of findings. Further inspection of responses to this item, however, revealed that the following forms of support were also endorsed by more than 10% of participants as being those that were the most influential: friends, sisters, teachers, partners, grandmothers, and brothers. These findings corroborate previous research that has demonstrated the importance of considering various sources of support as being potentially influential for specific individuals (e.g., Ali et al., 2005; Schultheiss et al., 2002) and suggest that further attention to better assessing for support from a variety of sources is needed.

Taken collectively, then, two potential explanations for this pattern of findings are offered. First, it is possible that support from primary caregivers (most commonly support from mother and father) is the type of support that is most salient for a majority
of individuals. Second, it is possible that further research is needed in order to better assess for quality of support from a variety of individuals rather than quantity of support from a number of different individuals. Future research is therefore needed to better understand the relation of access to support for individuals.

Interplay of barriers and supports. In response to recent critiques of the vocational psychology literature of operating from the assumption that individuals from underrepresented and/or low social class backgrounds have numerous experiences with barriers and few supports and therefore struggle in their career development (e.g., Liu & Ali, 2005), the present investigation examined the potential interrelationship among barriers and supports as they relate to perceived status identity. Specifically, the present study sought to investigate the potential moderating role that access to support from primary caretakers plays in the relation between experiences with barriers and internalized social status. Contrary to expectations, experiences with primary caretaker support did not moderate the relation between experiences with barriers and perceived status. A potential explanation for this finding is that the specific barriers examined in the present research were racism and classism, and individuals may not have interpreted their experiences with classism and racism as “barriers” in the traditional sense. Indeed, as mentioned above, individuals may actually develop resilience as a result of these experiences and that resilience may buffer any potential negative impacts.

Another proposed reason for these findings may be due, in part, to the nature of the way that these constructs were measured. Unlike previous literature summarized above (e.g., Aguilar & Williams, 1993), individuals’ experiences with supports and barriers were measured using Likert-type scale responses as opposed to in-depth
qualitative interviews. The present results, therefore, may be a product of their reliance upon traditional quantitative assessment instruments that potentially fail to capture the most salient aspects of individuals’ experiences with and access to various environmental and intrapersonal supports and barriers. Further research aimed to tease apart the nature of the interplay among experiences with differing barriers and supports is therefore needed.

*Role of coping efficacy.* Consistent with the research cited above suggesting that protective factors in the environment may buffer potential negative effects of barriers (e.g., Adams et al., 2005; Aguilar & Williams, 1993; Pearson & Bieschke, 2001), coping efficacy was included in the present investigation as an intrapersonal protective factor. Coping efficacy has been demonstrated to mediate the relation between perception of career barriers and outcome expectations related to particular occupational domains (Perrone et al., 2004). Contrary to expectations, however, coping efficacy did not moderate the relation between primary caregiver support and perceived status nor did it moderate the relations between experiences with racism or experiences with personal forms of classism and perceived status. Although unexpected, these findings are consistent with, and perhaps are explained similarly as, the prior findings that experiences with racism and classism at a more personal level were not negatively related to perceived status identity.

Coping efficacy did, however, moderate the relation between experiences with systemic classism and perceived social status. Specifically, the relationship between experiences with systemic classism and perceived status depends on an individual’s perceived level of coping efficacy. The negative relationship between experiences with
systemic classism and perceived social status was stronger for individuals with lower levels of perceived coping efficacy. For example, a person with low coping efficacy and numerous experiences with classism on a systemic level is more likely to internalize a lower sense of perceived status identity than a person who has high coping efficacy and numerous experiences with systemic forms of classism. It therefore appears that coping efficacy indeed acts as a safeguard between negative experiences and one’s internalized status identity, which is consistent with previous work demonstrating that coping efficacy can act as a buffer (Hackett & Byars, 1996; Perrone et al., 2004).

*Exploratory path analysis of relation among constructs.* Although results of the proposed path analysis demonstrated that the data did not fit the model well overall, results of the alternative model demonstrated support for a number of the relationships among the constructs included in the present investigation. This alternative model was developed based on the findings reviewed in the original path analysis above as well as on the basis of previous empirical work. Specifically, based on previous research demonstrating that career decision self-efficacy fully mediated the relation between perceived social status and career indecision (Thompson & Subich, 2006), CDSE was included as a mediator rather than an outcome in the exploratory model of the relations between DSI and career indecisiveness and DSI and career choice anxiety. Consistent with this previous research, CDSE partially mediated the relation between perceived status and a measure of career indecisiveness, and, as an extension of previous research, demonstrated that CDSE fully mediated the relation between perceived status and career choice anxiety.
Additionally, given the likelihood that coping efficacy could operate as a moderator of the relation of experiences with barriers and internalized identity or as a moderator of the relation of internalized identity to career decision self-efficacy, this exploratory model included coping efficacy as a potential moderator of the relation between perceived status and career decision self-efficacy. Results demonstrated support for the moderating role of coping efficacy in the relation between perceived status and CDSE. The positive relation between perceived status and career decision self-efficacy therefore depends, in part, on an individual’s level of efficacy for coping with barriers. In particular, individuals with low perceived status and high coping efficacy are more likely to report higher levels of career decision self-efficacy than those with low perceived status and low coping efficacy. Although this relation has not been examined previously, it is consistent with literature that has demonstrated the capacity of coping efficacy to act as a buffer in the relation between perceived barriers (as assessed using a global measure of perceptions of career barriers) and vocational outcomes (Perrone et al., 2004).

Further, results from this exploratory model support the relations demonstrated in the hypotheses reviewed previously. For example, experiences with systemic classism were related significantly and negatively to perceived status whereas experiences with personal classism were related significantly and positively to perceived status and experiences with racism were not related significantly to perceived status (although this relation was also positive). Additionally, access to primary caretaker support was related positively to perceived status and to higher levels of career decision self-efficacy. Taken collectively, although correlational in nature, the results support experiences with classism, demographic variables, and access to supports as potential antecedents that
influence an individual’s perceived status identity. They also support the mediating role of perceived status in the relation of these antecedents to subsequent vocational outcomes. In combination, the present results support Fouad and Brown’s conceptualization of DSI and the usefulness of relying upon multidimensional, rather than categorical, indicators of social status. The results also provide initial empirical support for their proposed framework which highlighted the need to consider socialization experiences that comprise an individual’s learning history and contribute to internalization of status.

Limitations

Despite its strengths and several interesting findings, the interpretations of the data must be made in light of a number of limitations. These limitations center on the ability to generalize the results, the correlational nature of the data, issues of measurement, and overall length of the survey.

First, a number of issues related to the sample limit the generalizability of the results. For example, all participants in the present study were undergraduate college students and therefore represented a sample that is upwardly mobile. The decision to use a college sample rather than a high school sample for the present study was based on the potential that high school students may not be developmentally able to recognize and articulate experiences with racism and classism. And, an undergraduate sample seemed most appropriate given that many of the measures used in the present investigation were normed on undergraduate samples. Yet, it is important to note that these findings cannot necessarily be extended to non-college student samples, which is a concern given that one of the primary purposes of the study was to gain a more sophisticated understanding of experiences of individuals from diverse racial/ethnic and social class backgrounds.
Similarly, although the present sample was diverse in terms of gender, racial background, and self-reported social class category as well as by the fact that 60% of the present sample reported being first generation college students, it was still limited by its overrepresentation of women and men who reported being from middle class backgrounds. Further data are therefore needed from individuals who represent greater variability in terms of social class standing (Lee & Dean, 2004; Liu et al., 2004) and from populations that are not inherently upwardly mobile. Finally, the technique used to group individuals from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds together for analyses in the present study is of concern. Future research with larger samples of individuals from a variety of racial/ethnic groups is needed in order to better understand potential between group differences among members of differing groups.

Second, the correlational nature of the data warrants further attention. Specifically, it is important to note that the hypothesized antecedents to internalized status identity supported by the data in the path analysis cannot necessarily be interpreted as causal relationships. This study represents a first attempt to delineate some of the relations proposed by Fouad and Brown’s (2000) Differential Status Identity framework, but further research is needed using longitudinal designs in order to gain a more sophisticated understanding of the nature of the interrelationships among supports and barriers and their relation to perceived social status. Additionally, it is important to highlight the relatively small amounts of variance captured in the outcome variables in the original path analysis (i.e., .02 to .04) as well as in the revised model (.14 to .15). In particular, it is important to consider other factors not included in the present study (e.g., racial/ethnic identity development, acculturation level) in future investigations.
Third, the interpretations of the present data are limited by the nature of the measures used in this investigation. For example, the exclusive reliance upon self report is of concern. Although the EWCS, SRE, and DSIS are intended to tap one’s perceptions of her or his experiences with classism, racism, and social status, future investigations may benefit from the inclusion of other sources of data (e.g., family/friend/teacher ratings) or more behaviorally based indices when further investigating these relations. An additional concern with the measures relates to the reliance upon traditional vocational outcome measures to tap an individual’s career development. Specifically, concerns have been raised regarding the extent to which such measures actually tap components of career development relevant to individuals from various backgrounds (e.g., Fouad & Brown, 2000). Thus, the present measures of career decision self-efficacy, career choice anxiety, and career indecisiveness are likely insufficient markers of vocational development.

Fourth, the overall length of the survey may have contributed to fatigue. It is important to point out that the final measure included in the set of surveys before the demographics questionnaire, the Career Factors Inventory, was the only measure (aside from the Sibling Support Scale which participants with no siblings were advised to skip) that had significant amounts of missing data at a scale level. It may be that participants became fatigued at this point and therefore chose not to complete these items. It is also possible, however, that participants did not understand how to respond to these items and therefore chose to skip them. In particular, the questionnaire construction asks participants to circle an asterisk between two anchors that they believe best describes how they rate themselves (e.g., one item asks participants to rate themselves on a
continuum between “Dry” and “Wet”). This explanation seems plausible given that only one participant of the total sample of 299 did not complete the demographics questionnaire (which followed the CFI).

**Implications**

Despite its limitations, this study contributes to the existing literature examining the relations of barriers, supports, and perceived status to vocational behavior. Further, the findings have a number of implications for practice, education, and research that are reviewed below.

**Implications for practice.** Taken as a whole, the findings from the present study confirm the importance of attending to the phenomenological worldview of clients who present for counseling. In particular, results demonstrate the need to consider experiences with supports and barriers that clients may have experienced, and the potential relations of these experiences to perceived status identity and career decision-making processes. Results also highlighted the possibility that individuals may receive support from various sources (e.g., caregiver, teacher, counselor) and that assessing for a variety of sources of supports for each individual may be useful in an attempt to identify the most influential sources for that particular individual.

This study also points to the importance of attending to social status identity as an aspect of a client’s phenomenological worldview. When engaging in career counseling, counselors, educators, and practitioners must consider an individual’s contextual affordances. For example, when interpreting assessment results, it may be important to consider that low scores on specific constructs (e.g., competencies, values, interests) may reflect an individual’s limited access to the economic resources needed to gain relevant
learning experiences (e.g., experiences working with computer software programming) or
an individual’s experiences with discrimination from teachers, peers, or others that may
deter an individual from pursuing relevant learning experiences. Furthermore, as
suggested by Rossides (1990, 1997), there is a need to consider the client’s perception of
her or his social class standing when attempting to understand more deeply her or his
career exploratory behavior rather than solely relying on traditional, objective indices of
social class. An individual’s actual access to education (e.g., quality of schools attended)
may be adequate, but if it is perceived by the person as inferior to others’ access,
potential benefits of that education may not be maximized. Ideally, actual and perceived
access to economic resources, social prestige, and social power should be considered in
conjunction with one another. Individuals’ perceptions of, and actions toward, career
options are likely to be influenced not only by their actual resources or experiences with
discrimination but by their judgment of how those resources and experiences compare to
others in society and/or by how valued they feel as individuals.

Results also highlighted the need to consider experiences with classism, racism,
and other societal “isms” as unique, but perhaps interrelated, experiences that occur on
personal as well as systemic levels. It is therefore important to assess for such
experiences in a comprehensive manner. For example, using the ecological model
(Cook, Heppner, & O’Brien, 2002) or the Culturally Appropriate Career Counseling
Model (Fouad & Bingham, 1995) with clients who may have had experiences with
discrimination offers a way to help the client to conceptualize their experiences within an
environmental framework. A number of other specific interventions have been suggested
for use when working with clients who have experienced oppression. Exploring family
relationships using a career genogram focused specifically on multicultural components may allow the client to gain further insight into how her or his socialization experiences may be related to her or his beliefs related to vocational development (Sueyoshi, Rivera, & Ponterotto, 2001). Literature has also pointed to the importance of working with clients to identify positive role models from whom they can receive mentoring via personal conversations, job shadowing, or networking (Spanierman, 2002).

Exploring spiritual or religious beliefs and incorporating church and community into counseling also has been suggested as a mechanism by which facilitate empowerment in the face of adversity (Brown & Pinterits, 2001). Additionally, asking specific questions related to experiences with discrimination that may otherwise be ignored in the context of treatment communicates to clients that the practitioner is open to exploring topics that may otherwise seem “off limits” for the client. For example, “What do your peers expect from you to maintain your status with them?” (see Liu & Ali, 2008, p. 169, for a review). Practitioners may also play an instrumental role in working with clients to “depathologize” internalized messages of racism by acknowledging to the client that “feelings of anger, sadness, and anxiety are justified in the context of modern racism” (Spanierman, 2002, p. 333).

When working with clients, practitioners also should be careful not to assume that experiences with environmental barriers automatically are internalized negatively by individuals or that their career development is thwarted as a result. As noted above, it is possible that individuals may internalize some of these experiences as fostering cultural
strengths that translate into positive outcomes for the individual. Practitioners, therefore, need to attend to and work with the client to identify personal strengths to draw upon in the midst of environmental experiences with oppression (Spainierman, 2002).

On a more systemic level, these results may be extended to the development of new interventions designed to increase an individual’s access to experiences demonstrated to facilitate the development of internalized status identity, coping efficacy, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. For example, group programs could be designed to offer individuals the opportunity to hear about the career development process of role models who are perceived as similar to themselves in an effort to instill hope and confidence. Additionally, individuals could be exposed to vicarious learning opportunities in which they are educated by peers in an attempt to increase perceptions of competence and connections with others. In combination, exposure to these experiences may increase an individual’s perception of internalized status, ability to cope with barriers, and confidence in making decisions related to his or her career which may provide a buffer for individuals who have experiences with a number of environmental barriers and increase her or his perception of available future educational and occupational options.

Implications for education. One of the important contributions of this research is its attention to experiences with classism, which has been studied very limitedly in the psychological literature to date (Blustein, 2007). As a whole, the present results demonstrate that experiences with classism at a systemic level may have important implications for individuals’ internalized identity and subsequent vocational decision-making processes. Psychologists and educators, therefore, should be aware of students’
experiences with classism on college campuses and within classrooms. For example, a student may have difficulty being successful in her or his classes because she or he does not have access to a computer to complete online homework assignments outside of class or may not be permitted to enroll in classes ahead of time because she or he is waiting for funds to come in through financial aid. Indeed, these difficulties may contribute to the existing disparities in graduation rates for persons from ethnic minority and lower social class backgrounds (Fouad & Brown, 2000).

Although not unique to this study, the results of this investigation further highlight the need to continue to attend to other forms of discrimination (e.g., racism) that occur in educational institutions and have an impact on the ability of individuals to navigate their educational experiences and vocational development processes. Just as students who do not have economic resources to assist them in their classes may have difficulty with their courses, students who experience racism from peers, educators, and staff may struggle academically and socially as a result. Educators should therefore become sensitive to their own assumptions and biases regarding the educational experiences of individuals from various racial/ethnic and social class backgrounds. Finally, results from this investigation point to the need to attend to increasing awareness of faculty and staff surrounding the importance of family support for students. Psychologists and educators may therefore attempt to engage in activities designed to connect students with limited family support to other support networks on campus and may offer programming for family members to educate them about the importance of this support in the educational and vocational development of the student.
Implications for future research. In combination, the results of the current study and the limitations highlighted above point to several areas that should be addressed in future research. First, the present results offer empirical support for Fouad and Brown’s (2000) DSI framework and their conceptualization of the importance of social status as a psychological construct. Consistent with previous research (Thompson & Subich, 2007), the DSIS appeared to capture individuals’ experiences as social beings who occupy ordinant and non-ordinant positions and was related to a number of proposed vocational outcomes. Future research is, however, needed to further assess the relations of individuals’ experiences with environmental barriers and supports and their internalized status identity. Specifically, qualitative data would provide useful information for a more in depth understanding of the relation of supports and barriers to perceived status identity. In addition, quantitative research using a broader range of potential experiences with barriers and supports (e.g., experiences with sexism, experiences with heterosexism, access [or lack of] to similar role models) would be useful.

As noted above, the EWCS appears to be a promising new measure of experiences with classism that may have a number of potential psychological implications. Additional research is needed to establish the psychometric properties of the measure more fully and to examine its relation to a number of other psychological constructs (e.g., overall psychological well-being, self-esteem, distress). The findings from the EWCS and the SRE, in combination, also highlighted the need to consider the possibility that individuals may internalize experiences with various types of racism (i.e., personal versus systemic) in very different ways. Future research, therefore, is needed to more clearly delineate the nature of these experiences and scale development studies are
needed to better assess these incidents. Additionally, in line with previous literature that has examined the nature of sexism and racism concomitantly (e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2003), research is needed to examine whether the effects of experiences with racism and classism for the individual are additive or multiplicative.

Third, the present pattern of findings points to the need to consider the relation of other psychological constructs not included in the present investigation. For example, a growing body of literature has explored implications of occupying various stages of racial identity development (e.g., Atkinson & Thompson, 1992; Cokley, 2002; Helms, 1995; Kerwin et al., 1993). It seems important, therefore, to consider how one’s stage of racial identity development may affect the relations observed in the present investigation. For example, it is possible that individuals who occupy later stages of racial identity development would respond to and interpret differently experiences with racism, and would differ in their internalized status identity from those who occupy earlier stages of racial identity development. Additionally, further theoretical and empirical work that considers the possibility of stages of social class or, more broadly, social status identity development is needed.

Fourth, results from the present investigation suggest that it may be beneficial to devise ways to better identify and assess for individuals’ access to supports. Consideration should be given to the fact that specific sources of supports may be more or less salient for particular individuals. In addition, research is needed to better understand differences in the quality versus the quantity of support as well as examine overall access to supports. Finally, future theoretical and empirical work is needed to attend to concerns related to traditional, existing measures of vocational outcomes. These
investigations may include mechanisms that allow researchers to more fully examine markers of career development that are empirically demonstrated to be linked to actual career development progress of the individual. Specifically, it may be that reliance upon traditional measures such as the Career Factors Inventory may actually provide relatively little information that is indicative of the career development process, progress toward future goals, or overall well-being for individuals. Instead, vocational psychologists may benefit from pressing to develop more sophisticated mechanisms by which to assess an individual’s process of career development and thereby intervene more effectively.
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APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE OF RACIST EVENTS

We are interested in your experiences with racism. As you answer the questions below, please think about the PAST YEAR. For each question, please circle the number that best captures the things that have happened to you.

Circle 1 = If this has NEVER happened to you
Circle 2 = If this has happened ONCE IN A WHILE (less than 10% of the time)
Circle 3 = If this has happened SOMETIMES (10-25% of the time)
Circle 4 = If this has happened A LOT (26%-49% of the time)
Circle 5 = If this has happened MOST OF THE TIME (50%-70% of the time)
Circle 6 = If this has happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

1. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by teachers and professors because of your race/ethnicity?

2. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employers, bosses, and supervisors in the past year because of your race/ethnicity?

3. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your coworkers, fellow students, and colleagues in the past year because of your race/ethnicity?

4. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (store clerks, waiters, bartenders, bank tellers, and others) in the past year because of your race/ethnicity?

5. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by strangers because of your race/ethnicity?

6. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by people in helping jobs (doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, social workers, and others) because of your race/ethnicity?

7. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by neighbors because of your race/ethnicity?

8. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by institutions (schools, universities, law firms, the police, the courts, the Department of Social Services, the Unemployment Office and others) because of your race/ethnicity?

9. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by people that you thought were your friends because of your race/ethnicity?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How many times have you been accused or suspected of doing something wrong (such as stealing, cheating, not doing your share of the work, or breaking the law) in the past year because of your race/ethnicity?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How many times have people misunderstood your intentions and motives in the past year because of your race/ethnicity?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How many times did you want to tell someone off for being racist but didn’t say anything in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>How many times have you been really angry about something racist that was done to you in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some racist thing that was done to you in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>How many times have you been called a racist name like terrorist, towel head, fresh off the boat, foreigner, coon, or other names in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something racist that was done to you or done to somebody else in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because of your race/ethnicity in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>How different would your life be now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a racist and unfair way in the past year?</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

EXPERIENCES WITH CLASSISM – ORIGINAL

We are interested in your experiences with classism (prejudicial or discriminatory experiences due to being from a particular social class background).

As you answer the questions below, please think about the PAST YEAR. For each question, please circle the number that best captures the things that have happened to you.

Circle 1 = If this has NEVER happened to you
Circle 2 = If this has happened ONCE IN A WHILE (less than 10% of the time)
Circle 3 = If this has happened SOMETIMES (10-25% of the time)
Circle 4 = If this has happened A LOT (26%-49% of the time)
Circle 5 = If this has happened MOST OF THE TIME (50%-70% of the time)
Circle 6 = If this has happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

1. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by teachers and professors because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employers, bosses, and supervisors in the past year because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your coworkers, fellow students, and colleagues in the past year because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (store clerks, waiters, bartenders, bank tellers, and others) in the past year because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by strangers because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by people in helping jobs (doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, social workers, and others) because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by neighbors because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by institutions (schools, universities, law firms, the police, the courts, the Department of Social Services, the Unemployment Office and others) because of your social class? 1 2 3 4 5 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by people that you thought were your friends because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How many times have you been accused or suspected of doing something wrong (such as stealing, cheating, not doing your share of the work, or breaking the law) in the past year because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How many times in the past year have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How many times did you want to tell someone off for being classist but didn’t say anything in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How many times have you been really angry about something classist that was done to you in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some classist thing that was done to you in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How many times have you been called a name like poor, welfare recipient, hobo, poor white trash, ghetto, or other names in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something classist that was done to you or done to somebody else in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because of your social class in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How many times in the past year have you felt that your teachers, counselors, and/or coaches assumed that you were from a middle-class background? (for example, instructors may have required you to go to extra-curricular events that cost money or instructors may have asked “Why don’t you have a laptop?”)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How often do you feel like you have been treated differently in the past year on the basis of your physical appearance (clothing, type of bag/purse you carried, shoes)?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How often, in the past year, do you feel like you have had service persons (e.g., waiters/waitresses, cashiers, etc.) treat you differently when paying your bill based on what you purchased?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How many times have you been treated differently in the past year by your friends because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How often in the past year do you feel like you have been treated differently by friends, classmates, colleagues, bosses, and service workers because of your possessions (for example, type of car you drive, type of cell phone you have or do not have)?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>How often in the past year have you had difficulty getting everything you needed for school in place because you were waiting for financial aid to provide you with your check? (for example, you were unable to buy used books at the bookstore because by the time your financial aid check came, all of the used copies were sold out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>How often have you felt frustrated with all of the steps that you had to take with the financial aid office or banks in order to have access to money for school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>How often in the past year have you felt that your social class was easily identifiable because of steps you were required to take on campus? (for example, having to stand in a separate line for those needing financial aid or waiting for financial aid checks or paying dues required to be involved in a sorority or fraternity on campus)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>How often in the past year did you feel that friends, roommates, and/or classmates “showed off” their ability to buy nice things, go on vacations, and drive nice cars?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>How often in the past year did you feel that you were treated differently because you brought your lunch to school/work rather than buying it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How different would your life be now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a classist and unfair way in the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same As now</th>
<th>A little different</th>
<th>Different in a few ways</th>
<th>Different in a lot of ways</th>
<th>Different in most ways</th>
<th>Totally different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short Answer Questions:

How much does your social class affect how you experience college?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

How much does your social class affect your desire to stay in college?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

How much does your social class affect your comfort level on campus and in classes?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Are there safer spaces for you where income seems less of an issue?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

What other experiences with social class and/or discrimination because of your social class background have you had that were not included in any of the questions above?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
**APPENDIX C**

**DIFFERENTIAL STATUS IDENTITY SCALE**

Compare yourself to what you think the average citizen of the United States is like. Please indicate how you compare to the average citizen in terms of the items below using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much Below</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very Much Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if you believe you are equal to the average U.S. citizen in terms of the financial resources needed to pursue a high-quality university education, you would mark “0” to item 1 below.

1. Ability to give your children (now or in the future) additional educational experiences like ballet, tap, art/music classes, science camp, etc.
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

2. Ability to afford to go to the movies, restaurants, and/or the theater on a regular basis
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

3. Ability to join a health club/fitness center
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

4. Ability to afford regular dental visits
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

5. Ability to afford dry cleaning services on a regular basis
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

6. Ability to travel recreationally
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

7. Ability to travel overseas for business and/or pleasure
   
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2
8. Ability to shop comfortably in upscale department stores, such as Saks Fifth Avenue
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

9. Potential for receiving a large inheritance
   -2   -1   0   +1   +2

10. Ability to secure loans with low interest rates
    -2   -1   0   +1   +2

11. Ability to hire professional money managers
    -2   -1   0   +1   +2

12. Ability to go to a doctor or hospital of your own choosing
    -2   -1   0   +1   +2

13. Ability to hire others for domestic chores (e.g. cleaning, gardening, child care, etc.)
    -2   -1   0   +1   +2

14. Ability to afford prescription medicine
    -2   -1   0   +1   +2

15. Ability to afford elective surgeries and/or high-cost medical examinations, such as MRIs or CAT scans
    -2   -1   0   +1   +2
Compare what is available to you in terms of type and/or amount of resources to what you believe is available to the average citizen of the United States. Please indicate how you compare to the average citizen in terms of the type and amount of resources listed below using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much Below Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very Much Above Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if you believe you are equal to the average U.S. citizen in home(s), you would mark “0” for item 1 below.

1. Home(s) -2 -1 0 +1 +2
2. Land -2 -1 0 +1 +2
3. Stocks and Bonds -2 -1 0 +1 +2
4. Money -2 -1 0 +1 +2
5. Cars -2 -1 0 +1 +2
6. Computers -2 -1 0 +1 +2
7. New Appliances (Washers, Dryers, Refrigerators, etc.) -2 -1 0 +1 +2
8. Amount of Education -2 -1 0 +1 +2
9. Quality of High School(s) Attended -2 -1 0 +1 +2
10. Life Insurance -2 -1 0 +1 +2
11. Quality of Health Insurance -2 -1 0 +1 +2
12. Savings -2 -1 0 +1 +2
13. Maids or Cooks -2 -1 0 +1 +2
14. Close Connections to the Rich and Powerful -2 -1 0 +1 +2
15. Quality of Health Care -2 -1 0 +1 +2
Compare yourself to what you think the average citizen of the United States is like. Please indicate how you compare to the average citizen in your ability to do the things below using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much Above Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Equal Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very Much Above Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if you believe you are equal to the average U.S. citizen in your ability to be respected and heard by others in your community, you would mark “0” to item 1.

1. Contact people in high places for a job or position.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

2. Contact people who can help you get out of legal problems.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

3. Start in a high-profile position of responsibility.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

4. Get information and services not available to the general public.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

5. Control how your group is represented in history, media, and the public.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

6. Receive a fair trial.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

7. Become a millionaire by legal means.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

8. Control the type and amount of work of others.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

9. Control the salary and compensation of others.
   -2 -1 0 +1 +2

10. Influence the laws and regulations of your state or city/town.
    -2 -1 0 +1 +2

11. Influence state or federal educational policies.
    -2 -1 0 +1 +2

12. Influence the policies of a corporation.
    -2 -1 0 +1 +2
13. Influence where and when stores are built and operated. 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

14. Influence where and when waste treatment facilities are built and operated. 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

15. Influence the decision-making of foundations, charities, hospitals, museums, etc. 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

Compared to how society values or appreciates the average U.S. citizen, how does society value or appreciate your . . . ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much Less</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Much More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ethnic/racial group 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

2. Socioeconomic group 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

3. Nationality 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

Compared to how society values or appreciates the average U.S. citizen, how does society value or appreciate the . . . ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much Less</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Much More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Neighborhood in which you live 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

2. Type of home you live in 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

3. Places where you shop 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

4. Places where you relax and have fun 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

5. Type and amount of education you have 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

6. Type of car you drive 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

7. Position you hold in society 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

Compared to how society values or appreciates the average U.S. citizen, how does society value or appreciate your . . . ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much Less</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Much More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Physical appearance 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

2. Occupational success 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

3. Financial success 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

4. Physical abilities 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2

5. Economic background 
   
   -2  -1  0  +1  +2
APPENDIX D

COPING WITH BARRIERS

Please rate your degree of confidence that you could overcome each of the potential career barriers listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Discrimination due to my gender.</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Discrimination due to my ethnicity.</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Negative comments about my sex (insults, jokes).</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Negative comments about my racial/ethnic background (insults, jokes).</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Difficulty finding quality daycare.</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Difficulty getting time off when my children are sick.</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Difficulty finding work that allows me to spend time with my family.</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your degree of confidence that you could overcome each of the potential educational barriers listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Money problems...</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Family problems...</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Not being smart enough...</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Negative family attitudes about college...</th>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A     B     C     D     E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Not fitting in at college...  
6. Lack of support from teachers...  
7. Not being prepared enough...  
8. Not knowing how to study well...  
9. Not having enough confidence...  
10. Lack of support from friends...  
11. My gender...  
12. People's attitudes about my gender...  

Please rate your degree of confidence that you could overcome each of the potential educational barriers listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Confident</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. My ethnic background...  
14. People's attitudes about my ethnic background...  
15. Childcare concerns...  
16. Lack of support from my "significant other"...  
17. My desire to have children...  
18. Relationship concerns...  
19. Having to work while I go to school...  
20. Lack of role models or mentors...  
21. Lack of financial support...
Finally, please indicate your level of agreement with the following four statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;In general, I think that...&quot;</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. ...there are many barriers facing me as I try to achieve my <em>educational</em> goals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ...I will be able to overcome any barriers that stand in the way of achieving my <em>educational</em> goals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ...there are many barriers facing me as I try to achieve my <em>career</em> goals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ...I will be able to overcome any barriers that stand in the way of achieving my <em>career</em> goals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

PRIMARY CAREGIVER SUPPORT SCALE

Circle the number that best describes your primary caretaker’s (for example, mother, father, grandfather, grandmother, legal guardian) reactions to you pursuing the following activities.

Example: My primary caretaker’s attitude toward me dyeing my hair purple. If you feel that your primary caretaker would be strongly discouraging of this activity, you would circle 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Discouraging</th>
<th>Discouraging</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
<th>Strongly Encouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Primary Caretaker’s attitude toward you choosing an occupation that…
1. pays you a lot of money
2. gives you job security
3. requires you to go to college
4. requires you to leave the state
5. she/he believes you will succeed in

Your PRIMARY CARETAKER’S attitude toward you doing the following activities…
6. Getting good grades in school
7. Making decisions about what to do after high school
8. Choosing classes that fit your interests
9. Deciding upon a career path and then working to become a leader in that field
10. Studying for your exams
11. Getting involved in extracurricular activities (such as academic clubs or athletics)
12. Getting a full time job rather than going to college after high school
13. Taking entrance exams for college or the military or certification in a trade
14. Completing your homework each night  
   1  2  3  4  5

15. Completing advanced training or schooling after high school  
   1  2  3  4  5

16. Please indicate the amount of financial assistance that you believe that your primary caretaker would be willing to provide to fund your future vocational or educational plans (paying for college or moving away to start a new job).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Less than Half</th>
<th>Half</th>
<th>More than Half</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Rate as best you can your primary caretaker’s attitudes toward helping you get alternative funding sources for your future vocational or educational plans (example: getting scholarships for college, G.I. Bill assistance, part-time employment, small business loans).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Discouraging</th>
<th>Discouraging</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
<th>Strongly Encouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

SIBLING SUPPORT SCALE

Now think about the brother or sister that has the most influence on you. This might be the brother or sister that talks to you the most or who you admire the most. You decide.

**Circle the letter that best describes the brother or sister you that influences you the most.**
- a) younger brother
- b) younger sister
- c) older brother
- d) older sister
- e) I have no brothers or sisters (SKIP this page: go directly to next page)
- f) My brothers or sisters are too young to be influential (SKIP this page: go directly to next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This BROTHER’S OR SISTER’S attitude toward you choosing an occupation that…</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. pays you a lot of money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. gives you job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. requires you to go to college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. requires you to leave the state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. he/she believes you will succeed in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This BROTHER’S OR SISTER’S attitude toward you doing the following activities…</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Getting good grades in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Making decisions about what to do after college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Choosing classes that fit your interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deciding upon a career path and then working to become a leader in that field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Studying for your exams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Getting involved in extracurricular activities (such as academic clubs or athletics)  

12. Getting a full time job rather than going to college after high school  

13. Completing your homework each night  

14. Taking entrance exams for the college or military or certification in a trade  

15. Completing advanced training or schooling after high school  

16. IF your most influential brother or sister is working at this time, please circle the amount of financial assistance that he or she would be willing to provide to fund your future vocational or educational plans (paying for college or moving away to start a new job). If your brother or sister is not working please go to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Less than Half</th>
<th>Half</th>
<th>More than Half</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Rate (as best you can) your brother’s or sister’s attitudes toward helping you get alternative funding sources for your future vocational or educational plans (example: getting scholarships for college, part-time employment, small business loans).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Discouraging</th>
<th>Discouraging</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
<th>Strongly Encouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

FRIEND SUPPORT SCALE

Now think about your closest friends. Please circle the letter that best represents these friends’ reactions to the activities listed.

Your FRIENDS’ attitudes toward you choosing an occupation that…
1. pays you a lot of money 1 2 3 4 5
2. gives you job security 1 2 3 4 5
3. requires you to go to college 1 2 3 4 5
4. requires you to leave the state 1 2 3 4 5
5. he/she believes you will succeed in 1 2 3 4 5

Your FRIENDS’ attitude toward you doing the following activities…
6. Getting good grades in school 1 2 3 4 5
7. Making decisions about what to do after college 1 2 3 4 5
8. Choosing classes that fit your interests 1 2 3 4 5
9. Deciding upon a career path and then working to become a leader in that field 1 2 3 4 5
10. Studying for your exams 1 2 3 4 5
11. Getting involved in extracurricular activities (such as academic clubs or athletics) 1 2 3 4 5
12. Getting a full time job rather than going to college after high school 1 2 3 4 5
13. Completing your homework each night 1 2 3 4 5
14. Taking entrance exams for the college or military or certification in a trade 1 2 3 4 5
15. Completing advanced training or schooling after high school 1 2 3 4 5
16. Rate (as best you can) your friends’ attitudes toward helping you get alternative funding sources for your future vocational or educational plans (example: getting scholarships for college, part-time employment, small business loans).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Discouraging</th>
<th>Discouraging</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
<th>Strongly Encouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

CAREER DECISION SELF-EFFICACY SCALE – SHORT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: For each statement below, please read carefully and indicate how much confidence you have that you could accomplish each of these tasks by marking your answer according to the key, Mark your answer by filling in the correct circle on the answer sheet.

1. Find information in the library about occupations you are interested in.
   1 2 3 4 5
2. Select one major from a list of potential majors you are considering.
   1 2 3 4 5
3. Make a plan of your goals for the next five years.
   1 2 3 4 5
4. Determine the steps to take if you are having academic trouble with an aspect of your chosen major.
   1 2 3 4 5
5. Accurately assess your abilities.
   1 2 3 4 5
6. Select one occupation from a list of potential occupations you are considering.
   1 2 3 4 5
7. Determine the steps you need to take to successfully complete your chosen major.
   1 2 3 4 5
8. Persistently work at your major or career goal even when you get frustrated.
   1 2 3 4 5
9. Determine what your ideal job would be.
   1 2 3 4 5
10. Find out the employment trends for an occupation over the next ten years.
    1 2 3 4 5
11. Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle.
   1 2 3 4 5

12. Prepare a good resume.
   1 2 3 4 5

13. Change majors if you did not like your first choice.
   1 2 3 4 5

   1 2 3 4 5

15. Find out about the average yearly earnings of people in an occupation.
   1 2 3 4 5

16. Make a career decision and then not worry whether it was right or wrong.
   1 2 3 4 5

17. Change occupations if you are not satisfied with the one you enter.
   1 2 3 4 5

18. Figure out what you are and are not ready to sacrifice to achieve your career goals.
   1 2 3 4 5

19. Talk with a person already employed in a field you are interested in.
   1 2 3 4 5

20. Choose a major or career that will fit your interests.
   1 2 3 4 5

21. Identify employers, firms, and institutions relevant to your career possibilities.
   1 2 3 4 5

22. Define the type of lifestyle you would like to live.
   1 2 3 4 5

23. Find information about graduate or professional schools.
   1 2 3 4 5

24. Successfully manage the job interview process.
   1 2 3 4 5

25. Identify some reasonable major or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice.
   1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX I

CAREER FACTORS INVENTORY

Directions: Please circle the asterisk (*) that best corresponds with where you would rate yourself on the following items in relation to the scales provided below:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When I think about actually deciding for sure what I want my career to be I feel:</td>
<td>Frightened * * * * Fearless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry * * * * Wet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tense * * * * Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loose * * * * Tight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worried * * * * Carefree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jittery * * * * Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For me, decision making seems:</td>
<td>Hard * * * * Easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear * * * * Hazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frustrating * * * * Fulfilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. While making most decisions, I am:</td>
<td>Quick * * * * Slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certain * * * * Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 4. Before choosing or entering a particular career area I still need to talk to people in one or more various occupations | Strongly Disagree * * * * Strongly Agree |
| 5. Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to gain practical knowledge of different jobs through as much part-time and summer work as possible | Strongly Disagree * * * * Strongly Agree |
| 6. Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to find out what present and predicted job opportunities are like for a certain career area or areas | Strongly Disagree * * * * Strongly Agree |
| 7. Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to use my free time and school courses to help determine what type of career I might enjoy and do well in | Strongly Disagree * * * * Strongly Agree |
| 8. Before choosing or entering a career | Strongly * * * * Strongly |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to seek advice from others regarding my choice.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to attempt to answer “who am I?”</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to answer “what are my personal values?”</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to attempt to answer “what type of person would I like to be?”</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Before choosing or entering a career area I still need to attempt to answer “what things are the most important to me?”</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age ______

2. Gender (circle one) Male Female Transgender

3. Race/ethnicity (circle all that apply)
   - Black/African American
   - Native/First American
   - Other (Please Specify): __________________
   - Asian American
   - White/European American
   - Hispanic American
   - International Student

4. Sexual Orientation (circle one)
   - Exclusively Homosexual
   - Mostly Homosexual
   - Bisexual
   - Mostly Bisexual
   - Exclusively Heterosexual
   - Mostly Heterosexual
   - Exclusively International Student

5. Number of Brothers and/or Sisters that you have (circle one)
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6 or more

6. Student Standing (circle one)
   - First Year
   - Second Year
   - Third Year
   - Fourth Year
   - Fifth Year
   - Sixth Year & Beyond

7. Have you declared a major (circle one)
   - Yes
   - No

8. Intended career path/direction ________________________________
9. Which of the following people have had the most influence on your education and career plans?

Mother  Father  Grandmother  Grandfather  Partner or Spouse
Brother  Sister  Friend  Step-Parent  Other (please list):
Teacher  Aunt  Uncle  Legal Guardian

10. Relationship Status (circle one)

Single  Widowed
Married  Partnered
Divorced

11. Number of Children of your own ___________

12. Highest Education received by persons who raised you (circle one)

**PERSON #1**

- No high school education
- Some high school
- GED
- High School Diploma
- Technical Certificate
- Associates Degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Masters Degree
- JD/MD/PhD or other advanced degree

**PERSON #2**

- No high school education
- Some high school
- GED
- High School Diploma
- Technical Certificate
- Associates Degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Masters Degree
- JD/MD/PhD or other advanced degree

**PERSON #3**

- No high school education
- Some high school
- GED
- High School Diploma
- Technical Certificate
- Associates Degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Masters Degree
- JD/MD/PhD or other advanced degree
11. What is the combined annual income of the persons who raised you in your home (circle one)

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000-19,999
- $20,000-$29,999
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999

12. If you are no longer living in the family in which you were raised, what is your current annual income in the household in which you are now living (circle one)

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000-19,999
- $20,000-$29,999
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999

13. In thinking about your past and present experiences, which label best describes your perceived social class (circle one)

- Lower Class
- Lower Middle Class
- Middle Class
- Upper Class
- Upper Middle Class

14. How do you pay for your college education? (please circle the MAIN source of money used to pay for college)

- My parents pay for it
- Another family member pays for it
- A friend pays for it
- My partner and I pay for it
- I have scholarships
- I pay for it
- I am taking out loans to pay for it
- Other (please describe): ________________________

15. Are you a first generation college student (the first in your immediate family other than siblings to have attended college)?

- Yes
- No
APPENDIX K

EXPERIENCES WITH CLASSISM – FINAL

We are interested in your experiences with classism (prejudicial or discriminatory experiences due to being from a particular social class background).

As you answer the questions below, please think about the PAST YEAR. For each question, please circle the number that best captures the things that have happened to you.

Circle 1 = If this has NEVER happened to you
Circle 2 = If this has happened ONCE IN A WHILE (less than 10% of the time)
Circle 3 = If this has happened SOMETIMES (10-25% of the time)
Circle 4 = If this has happened A LOT (26%-49% of the time)
Circle 5 = If this has happened MOST OF THE TIME (50%-70% of the time)
Circle 6 = If this has happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by teachers and professors because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employers, bosses, and supervisors in the past year because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your coworkers, fellow students, and colleagues in the past year because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (store clerks, waiters, bartenders, bank tellers, and others) in the past year because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by strangers because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by people in helping jobs (doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, social workers, and others) because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by neighbors because of your social class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by institutions (schools, universities, law firms, the police, the courts, the Department of Social Services, the Unemployment Office and others) because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been treated unfairly in the past year by people that you thought were your friends because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been accused or suspected of doing something wrong (such as stealing, cheating, not doing your share of the work, or breaking the law) in the past year because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times in the past year have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times did you want to tell someone off for being classist but didn’t say anything in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been really angry about something classist that was done to you in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some classist thing that was done to you in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been called a name like poor, welfare recipient, hobo, poor white trash, ghetto, or other names in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something classist that was done to you or done to somebody else in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because of your social class in the past year?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel like you have been treated differently in the past year on the basis of your physical appearance (clothing, type of bag/purse you carried, shoes)?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often, in the past year, do you feel like you have had service persons (e.g., waiters/waitresses, cashiers, etc.) treat you differently when paying your bill based on what you purchased?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been treated differently in the past year by your friends because of your social class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often in the past year have you had difficulty getting everything you needed for school in place because you were waiting for financial aid to provide you with your check? (for example, you were unable to buy used books at the bookstore because by the time your financial aid check came, all of the used copies were sold out)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you felt frustrated with all of the steps that you had to take with the financial aid office or banks in order to have access to money for school?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. How often in the past year have you felt that your social class was easily identifiable because of steps you were required to take on campus? (for example, having to stand in a separate line for those needing financial aid or waiting for financial aid checks or paying dues required to be involved in a sorority or fraternity on campus)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. How often in the past year did you feel that friends, roommates, and/or classmates “showed off” their ability to buy nice things, go on vacations, and drive nice cars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. How often in the past year did you feel that you were treated differently because you brought your lunch to school/work rather than buying it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX L

THOMPSON HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL FORM

Ms. Thompson:

Your protocol entitled "The Relation of Supports and Barriers to Different Status Identity and Subsequent Vocational Behavior" (#20061109) has been approved and the approval letter is in the mail to you.

This protocol has received exempt approval, which means it does not require annual review. However, if any change is made to the protocol, please contact the IRB first (x7666) to discuss the change prior to implementation. Changes that increase the risk to subjects and/or include activities that do not qualify for exemption will require the submission of a continuation application for IRB review.

Upon completion of your research, please submit the Final Report.

Please call if you have questions. (330-972-7666). Thank you.

Mary Samartgedes, IRB Secretary
Research Services & Sponsored Programs
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325-2102
Phone: 330-972-7666
FAX: 330-972-6281