



# Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología

<http://revistalatinoamericanadepsicologia.konradlorenz.edu.co/>



ORIGINAL

## Spanish adaptation of the Ambivalent Classism Inventory (ACI)

Mario Sainz <sup>a,b</sup>, Roberto M. Lobato <sup>c,\*</sup>, Gloria Jiménez-Moya <sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

<sup>b</sup> Centro de Estudios de Conflicto y Cohesión Social, Santiago, Chile

<sup>c</sup> Euro-Arab Foundation for Higher Studies, Granada, Spain

Received 17 May 2021; accepted 7 October 2021

### KEYWORDS

Classism attitudes, ambivalence, hostile classism, protective paternalism, complementary class differentiation, poverty

**Abstract Introduction:** Hostile and benevolent classism influence the derogation of poor people and groups, with negative consequences. The present study aims to adapt and validate the *Ambivalent Classism Inventory* (ACI) to obtain an adequate tool for expanding research on this topic among the Spanish-speaking population. **Method:** Toward this end, the researchers back-translated the ACI version originally developed for English speakers. Exploratory and confirmatory analyses verify the ACI's reliability and factor structure with a sample of Mexican participants. **Results:** The results demonstrated that the adapted scale's psychometric properties are acceptable. Its original and factor structure are similar to those of the original scale: hostile classism (12 items), protective paternalism (4 items), and complementary class differentiation (4 items). Furthermore, the study tests the convergent and divergent validity of the scale's sub-dimensions concerning other ideological and socioeconomic variables. **Conclusion:** The proposed ACI adaptation should contribute to understanding attitudes toward the poor as well as their consequences among Spanish speakers.

© 2021 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

### Adaptación del Inventario de Clasismo Ambivalente (ICA) para hispanohablantes

### PALABRAS CLAVE

Actitudes clasistas, ambivalencia, clasismo hostil, paternalismo protector, diferenciación de clases complementaria, pobreza

**Resumen Introducción:** El clasismo hostil y benevolente contribuye a la discriminación de las personas y grupos pobres, lo que implica consecuencias negativas para estos individuos. Este artículo tiene como objetivo adaptar y validar el Inventario de Clasismo Ambivalente (ACI) para obtener una herramienta adecuada que sea útil para expandir la investigación sobre este tema entre la población hispanohablante. **Método:** Con este fin, se tradujo al español la versión del ACI desarrollada originalmente para angloparlantes, y esta versión en español fue a su vez traducida al inglés. Tras la aplicación de la escala en español, se llevaron a cabo análisis exploratorios y confirmatorios para verificar la confiabilidad y la estructura factorial del ACI en una muestra de participantes mexicanos. **Resultados:** Los resultados demostraron que las propiedades psicométricas de la escala adaptada son aceptables. Su estructura original y factorial son similares a las de la escala original: clasismo hostil (12 ítems), paternalismo protector (4 ítems) y diferenciación de clases complementarias (4 ítems). Además, el estudio confirmó la validez convergente y divergente de las subdimensiones de la escala en relación con otras variables

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail: [romulobato@gmail.com](mailto:romulobato@gmail.com)

<https://doi.org/10.14349/rlp.2021.v53.18>

0120-0534/© 2021 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

ideológicas y socioeconómicas. **Conclusión:** La adaptación propuesta de ACI contribuirá a comprender las actitudes hacia los pobres y sus consecuencias entre los hispanohablantes.

© 2021 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la licencia CC BY-NC-ND (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

In 2018, 41.9% of the Mexican population was below the poverty line (CONEVAL, 2021). Against this background, public policies should seek to alleviate the plight of individuals who face scarcity. However, the population with high-status positions has rejected implementing social policies or redistribution measures, partially due to the depicted representation of poverty and attitudes of classism (Bullock et al., 2001; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Tagler & Cozzarelli, 2013). Due to the social relevance of this issue, the present study aims to adapt and verify the validity of the Ambivalent Classism Inventory (ACI; Jordan et al., 2021) in order to obtain an adequate tool for expanding research on this topic among the Spanish-speaking population.

### Ambivalent classism attitudes

Beliefs regarding poverty and the poor contribute to the maintenance and normalisation of socioeconomic differences (Bullock et al., 2003; Sainz, Martínez, et al., 2020). For instance, previous research on the attributional process shows that people tend to ascribe poverty to the lack of abilities or the misbehaviours of poor people (i.e., internal attributions of poverty), more than they do to structural barriers, such as discrimination and the lack of educational or working opportunities (i.e., external attributions of poverty; Cozzarelli et al., 2001). This narrative regarding the causes of poverty frequently relies on news media coverage that mostly depicts poor people as substance abusers, practicing inappropriate consumption or taking advantage of social benefits (Bullock et al., 2003; Hayward & Yar, 2006). Typical stereotypes of poor people are that they are incompetent (Durante & Fiske 2017) or less evolved (i.e., animal-like) than other socioeconomic status groups (i.e., animalistic dehumanisation; Loughnan et al., 2014; Sainz et al., 2019), which contributes to the maintenance and perpetuation of poverty (Sainz, Loughnan, et al., 2020).

Additionally, negative perceptions and beliefs regarding poverty are increasingly prominent among people who adhere to system justification ideologies (Hunt & Bullock, 2016). In this regard, the present study acknowledges that an orientation towards social dominance (i.e., SDO) and meritocratic or other system justification beliefs are associated with the tendency to justify the wealth gap. In line with this, classism attitudes also play a role in the understanding and justification of poverty. However, existing studies mostly conceptualise classism as negative or hostile attitudes or behaviours directed at the poor (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Liu, 2011; Yun & Weaver, 2010) without considering other possible manifestations. In this regard, recent approaches broaden the study on classism attitudes by expanding its definition and measuring its manifestations. This case is true of the scale developed by Colbow et al. (2016),

which evaluated attitudes averse to the poor (i.e., downward classism) but is also an independent factor that evaluates the attitudes and discrimination towards individuals belonging to the higher social classes (i.e., upward classism; e.g., Castillo & Rivera-Gutiérrez, 2018). Additionally, Jordan et al. (2021) propose a recent development in the concept of classism that addresses how classism attitudes towards the poor can lead to ambivalent manifestations, ranging from a thorough and explicit derogation of the poor to subtle and paternalistic manifestations.

Ambivalent classism attitudes (Jordan et al., 2021) rely on previous literature on the ambivalence of stereotype content (Fiske et al., 2002) and sexist attitudes (Glick & Fiske, 2001). On the one hand, the stereotype content model proposes that stereotypes typically include a combination of negative and positive traits (Fiske et al., 2002). For instance, Durante & Fiske (2017) emphasize that the poor are frequently stereotyped as incompetent. At the same time, however, they are considered warm and sociable. On the other hand, the ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 2001) posits that people can hold hostile or negative attitudes towards women (hostile sexism: the belief that women try to manipulate men). At the same time, they maintain more paternalistic and benevolent attitudes towards women (benevolent sexism: the belief that men should protect women). Thus, perceptions regarding disadvantaged groups rely on negative evaluations or beliefs and incorporate positive ones. As Jordan et al. (2021) point out, such ambivalence can be observed in people's attitudes concerning poverty and the poor. In this sense, people can hold a negative view of the poor as incompetent or untrustworthy (i.e., hostile classism [HC]) aside from a positive or condescending view of the group as friendly or honest (i.e., benevolent classism). Nevertheless, individuals can hold both attitudes at the same time. Most important, together they help to reinforce the maintenance of the *status quo*.

Specifically, the factor structure of the ACI differentiates among three subfactors. In terms of HC, Jordan et al. (2021) include items that measure the extent to which people hold negative representations of the poor as being inferior, lacking traits, or intending to take advantage of others for profit (e.g., "poor people often take advantage of charitable individuals and organisations"). The authors differentiate between protective paternalism (PP) and complementary class differentiation (CCD) to measure benevolent attitudes. PP refers to the belief that the poor are less likely to behave in an evolved manner and require constant guidance and external supervision (e.g., "charitable organisations should guide poor people to make better life choices"). Lastly, CCD is related to the belief that the poor possess certain traits that render them more humble or honest than people from other socioeconomic groups (e.g., "poor people are often more humble than non-poor people").

Identifying the different aspects of classism attitudes (i.e., from the hostile to the benevolent spectrum) may clarify the reason a proportion of the population tends to explicitly reject redistribution policies or welfare expenditure (i.e., autonomous help), yet simultaneously supports other assistance programmes that do not necessarily eradicate poverty and even promote the *status quo* (i.e., dependent help; Nadler & Halabi, 2006).

### Correlates of Ambivalent Classism Attitudes

Ambivalent classism attitudes are related to social and psychological variables that, when combined, lay the foundations for the justification of the plight of the poor. As previously discussed, a belief exists that certain groups are naturally prone to occupy a dominant position (i.e., SDO) and this predicts discrimination and even dehumanisation of social minorities (Hodson & Dhont, 2015; Jordan et al., 2021). This social dominance is frequently aligned with meritocratic beliefs with regards to how individuals and groups can overcome economic and social restraints only through their means to improve the quality of life (i.e., system justification beliefs; Jost & Van der Toorn, 2012). The ideological roots of people's understanding of socioeconomic differences largely influence their willingness to help the poor (Bullock et al., 2003).

Furthermore, such ideological positions are related to right-wing ideologies (Chambers et al., 2014) that encourage the dismissal of the negative consequences of economic inequality and the tolerance of high levels of economic disparities (García-Castro et al., 2021; Wiwad et al., 2019). In this regard, classism attitudes could increase tolerance of inequality by way of the perception that inequality is less harmful to those struggling their entire lives (Cheek & Shafir, 2020). In addition to these variables, previous research also underscores that the tendency to dehumanise the poor triggers an internal attribution of poverty or perceptions of the poor as wasting their income (Sainz, Loughnan, et al., 2020; Sainz, Martínez, et al., 2020). This tendency to dehumanise and blame the poor for their plight may be related to HC attitudes. Finally, previous research addresses how socioeconomic status may be related to classism attitudes (Jordan et al., 2021). This evidence signalises that ideological positioning and socioeconomic status are not necessarily correlated because both processes are deemed independent.

### Overview

This study aims to adapt and validate the ACI among Spanish speakers. The resulting project is implemented in Mexico, a highly unequal country with alarming rates of poverty in which people discriminate against individuals or groups based on economic standing (Campos-Vazquez et al., 2019). The study back-translates the ACI originally developed for English speakers by Jordan et al. (2021). Then, the researchers conduct exploratory and confirmatory analyses to verify the reliability and factor structure of the ACI by means of a sample of Mexican participants. Last of all, the study provided correlations of the sub-dimensions of the scale with well-established variables in the literature.

## Method

### Adaptation of ACI items into Spanish

The study translated the original scale (ACI), which comprised 20 items along three subfactors (i.e., HC, PP, and CCD), using the back-translation design of Hambleton (2005). Two translators with mastery of English and Spanish independently translated the original items from the source language (English) to the target language (Spanish). The authors then compared and discussed both versions to reach a consensual adaptation of each item. During this process, the authors acknowledged cultural discrepancies in the understanding of the item "By and large, if you give poor people an inch, they'll take a mile." This discrepancy was resolved by modifying the colloquial expression into an equivalent idiomatic expression in the source language: "En general, si le das la mano a las personas pobres, ellos te tomarán el brazo." Afterwards, the two translators back-translated the items (from Spanish to English) and compared them with the original scale to ensure the quality and accuracy of the translation process. The authors made adjustments based on the consensual version of items when necessary.

Finally, a panel of experts composed of three scholars with expertise in scale construction and knowledge of the construct under evaluation (i.e., classism), evaluated the items (Carretero-Dios & Pérez, 2007). The experts evaluated the wording for each item, the representation of the construct measured by the items, and the sub-factor to which each item belonged. The authors made final modifications based on expert evaluation (see Online supplementary information for a full disclosure of the materials). Table 1 presents the final items of the ACI in Spanish.

Table 1. Translated ACI items

Hostile classism	
1	Las personas pobres requieren de una supervisión cercana por parte de otras personas que no sean pobres.
2	Sin supervisión, es probable que las personas pobres se gasten todo su dinero en drogas o alcohol.
3	Las personas pobres no saben comportarse de forma que contribuyan a la sociedad.
4	No puedes confiar en que las personas pobres tomen decisiones importantes en su vida por sí mismas.
5	Muchas personas pobres carecen de las habilidades necesarias para poder cuidarse por sí mismas.
6	Las personas pobres, por lo general, son malas tomando decisiones que les permita tener éxito en la vida.
7	La mayoría de las personas pobres son más vagas que el resto de personas que no son pobres.
8	Las personas pobres carecen de la iniciativa necesaria para salir adelante.
9	En general, si le das la mano a las personas pobres, ellos te tomarán el brazo.
10	En general, las personas pobres esperan mucho de las otras personas y las organizaciones benéficas.

(Continued)

11	Las personas pobres, en ocasiones, se aprovechan de otras personas y de las organizaciones benéficas.
12	Muchas personas pobres acaban manipulando a aquellas personas que tratan de ayudarles.
<b>Protective paternalism</b>	
13	Las organizaciones benéficas deberían dar a las personas pobres consejos sobre cómo manejar de manera inteligente sus finanzas.
14	Las personas pobres deberían recibir ayuda adicional para tomar buenas decisiones en relación a su salud.
15	Las organizaciones benéficas deberían ayudar a las personas pobres a administrar las ayudas sociales de manera inteligente.
16	Las organizaciones benéficas deberían guiar a las personas pobres para que tomen mejores decisiones vitales.
<b>Complementary class differentiation</b>	
17	Muchas personas pobres afrontan su vida de manera sencilla pero honesta.
18	Las personas pobres son más amigables que el resto de personas que no son pobres.
19	Las personas pobres son más humildes que el resto de personas que no son pobres.
20	Las personas pobres son más duras y aguantan más que el resto de personas que no son pobres.

## Participants and procedure

The study recruited participants through a professional recruiting service called Prolific Academic (each participant is compensated with 1£ for a four-minute study). The total sample consisted of 548 Mexican citizens (females = 221, males = 331, others = 6;  $M_{\text{age}} = 25.64$ ,  $SD = 6.64$ ), native Spanish speakers, and currently residing in Mexico. The study randomly split the sample into two subsamples for exploratory and confirmatory analyses, respectively. The first subsample included 274 participants (females = 104, males = 168, others = 2;  $M_{\text{age}} = 25.35$ ,  $SD = 6.59$ ), whereas the second included 274 participants (females = 107, males = 163, others = 4;  $M_{\text{age}} = 25.93$ ,  $SD = 6.70$ ). After the provision of consent, the researchers presented the following scales.

**Ambivalent Classism Inventory (ACI).** The Spanish version comprised 20 items for measuring HC (12 items, “Many poor people cannot be trusted to make important life decisions for themselves.”), PP (4 items; “Charitable organisations should help poor people use their food stamps wisely.”), and CCD (4 items; “Poor people are often more humble than non-poor people.”). The participants rated the items using a seven-point scale (1 = *completely disagree*; 7 = *completely agree*).

**Support for Economic Inequality Scale.** The study assessed the participants’ levels of tolerance to economic inequality by including five items (e.g., “Economic inequality is causing many of the world’s problems” [reverse coded];  $\alpha = .73$ ) from Wiwad et al. (2019). The participants rated the items using the seven-point scale.

**Social Dominance Orientation (SDO).** The study included eight items from Ho et al. (2015) to assess two subfactors, namely, SD (“Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups of people;”  $\alpha = .66$ ) and anti-egalitarianism

(AE, “Group equality should not be our ideal;”  $\alpha = .80$ ). The participants rated the items using the seven-point scale.

**System Justification (SJ).** The study measured the participants’ system justification (Jost & Van der Toorn, 2012) by including seven items (“If people work hard, they almost always get what they deserve;”  $\alpha = .84$ ) from a scale adapted for Spanish speakers by Jaume et al. (2012). The participants rated the items using the seven-point scale.

**Poor People’s Humanity (HUM).** The researchers measured the blatant dehumanisation of the poor using the Ascent of Man scale (Kteily et al., 2015). Participants rated the extent to which they consider the poor as less evolved (i.e., animal-like) or more evolved (i.e., human-like). The participants rated the items using a slider that ranges from 0 = *least evolved* to 100 = *most evolved*.

**Political Orientation (PO).** The participants evaluated their political positioning by answering one item using a seven-point scale (1 = *extreme left-wing*; 7 = *extreme right-wing*).

**Subjective Socioeconomic Status (SSC).** The participants responded to the 10-step MacArthur ladder by Adler et al. (2000). The researchers instructed the participants to place themselves and their families on a ten-rung ladder representing the social display of groups within the society. The participants rated the items from 1 = *low-SES* to 10 = *high-SES*.

**Objective Socioeconomic Status (OSC).** The participants reported their monthly household net income and the number of individuals living in their households. As in previous research (Kraus & Keltner, 2009), the study split income among household members to compute the objective SES score.

Last of all, the participants finished the questionnaire by providing demographic information (i.e., gender, age, nationality, and language).

## Results

### Exploratory factor analysis

The study performed exploratory factor analysis on the first subsample of participants to test the scale’s factor structure. First, we confirmed the adequacy of the data. The results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample adequacy test ( $KMO = .89$ ) and Bartlett’s sphericity test ( $\chi^2 = 69.86$ ,  $p < .000$ ) indicated that the data were well-suited for factor analysis. Moreover, parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) indicated a three-factor solution as in the original scale.

Second, the study performed exploratory factor analysis using the maximum likelihood estimation with Promax rotation and selected an oblique rotation due to the expectation that the ACI factors would correlate. The results were similar to those of the original scale (Jordan et al., 2021; Table 2) with three distinct factors that accounted for 58% of the total variance of data with HC (12 items), PP (4 items), CCD (4 items) explaining 32%, 12%, and 14%, respectively. Specifically, the descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis) fell within normal ranges. Moreover, the item-total correlation did not exceed 0.80. However, a very slight variation occurred in internal consistency reliability regarding the reliability of

**Table 2.** Mean, standard deviation, item-total correlation, and Cronbach's Alpha if the Item is eliminated, factor loading, and communality

Items	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>	<i>R</i> IT-c	$\alpha$ without item	Subfactors			<i>h</i> <sup>2</sup>
						HC	PP	CCD	
1	2.87 (1.59)	0.54	-0.59	0.54	0.87	<b>0.58</b>	-0.03	0.06	0.36
2	3.00 (1.78)	0.53	-0.81	0.70	0.87	<b>0.71</b>	-0.03	0.13	0.57
3	2.41 (1.51)	0.89	-0.13	0.65	0.87	<b>0.84</b>	-0.09	-0.08	0.69
4	2.20 (1.57)	1.43	1.32	0.65	0.87	<b>0.78</b>	0.00	-0.05	0.59
5	2.84 (1.82)	0.73	-0.61	0.55	0.87	<b>0.65</b>	-0.11	0.02	0.44
6	3.02 (1.80)	0.52	-0.82	0.66	0.87	<b>0.76</b>	-0.05	0.02	0.58
7	2.32 (1.61)	1.05	0.07	0.66	0.87	<b>0.82</b>	0.12	-0.16	0.63
8	2.56 (1.73)	0.93	-0.21	0.66	0.87	<b>0.80</b>	0.11	-0.14	0.61
9	2.54 (1.58)	0.84	-0.11	0.64	0.87	<b>0.77</b>	0.02	-0.07	0.57
10	3.77 (1.97)	0.11	-1.25	0.70	0.87	<b>0.64</b>	0.12	0.12	0.49
11	3.51 (1.89)	0.21	-1.11	0.70	0.87	<b>0.66</b>	-0.01	0.16	0.51
12	2.88 (1.67)	0.51	-0.78	0.66	0.87	<b>0.69</b>	-0.02	0.08	0.51
13	5.19 (1.50)	-0.67	-0.10	0.22	0.88	-0.12	<b>0.51</b>	0.22	0.38
14	4.23 (1.67)	-0.18	-0.48	0.29	0.88	0.04	<b>0.89</b>	-0.11	0.74
15	4.62 (1.70)	-0.42	-0.45	0.28	0.88	0.02	<b>0.88</b>	-0.09	0.73
16	4.70 (1.77)	-0.49	-0.55	0.33	0.88	0.03	<b>0.69</b>	0.08	0.51
17	5.51 (1.66)	-1.00	0.04	0.51	0.88	0.09	-0.03	<b>0.74</b>	0.57
18	5.49 (1.53)	-0.88	0.04	0.34	0.88	-0.11	0.02	<b>0.71</b>	0.49
19	5.55 (1.52)	-0.96	0.26	0.44	0.88	-0.11	-0.09	<b>0.97</b>	0.86
20	5.44 (1.51)	-0.78	-0.17	0.51	0.88	0.02	-0.01	<b>0.81</b>	0.67
% of variance explained						32%	12%	14%	

**Note.** The highest loads in each factor are in bold.

the total scale ( $\alpha = .88$ ) when each item was dropped. Likewise, internal consistency reliability was acceptable for each subscale (HC:  $\alpha = .93$ ; PP:  $\alpha = .87$ ; CCD:  $\alpha = .83$ ). In succession, the coefficients exceeded 0.40 and loaded at least twice on the target factor because the next highest loading factor did not load more than 0.30 on multiple factors, whereas communalities exceeded 0.20 (Child, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014).

### Confirmatory factor analysis

The study conducted confirmatory factor analysis using the Lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) for R (R Core Team, 2008) on the second subsample to confirm the scale's previously identified structure. As the data demonstrated multivariate skewness (Mardia's normalised coefficients of 529.91), the researchers opted to use maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors and test statistics (Yuan & Bentler, 2000). The authors tested three models following those used by Jordan et al. (2021): (1) a one-factor model with all items loading onto a unidimensional classism factor, (2) a two-factor model with all benevolent and hostile items loading onto unidimensional first-order benevolent and HC factors, and (3) a three-factor model with a unidi-

mensional first-order HC factor and two distinct first-order benevolent classism factors (Table 3). The results indicated that the three-factor model presented a better fit than the other models and so its fit was acceptable (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Kline, 2016). The CFI and TLI values failed to reach optimal values ( $> .95$ ), although the values of the general population were similar during the development of the original scale (Jordan et al., 2021). Also, the internal consistency reliability was acceptable for each subscale (HC:  $\alpha = .94$ ; PP:  $\alpha = .89$ ; CCD:  $\alpha = .83$ ).

### Evidence of validity

The study collapsed both subsamples ( $N = 548$ ) and computed Pearson's bivariate correlations (Table 4) to test the ACI's validity. In terms of intercorrelations between the inventory subfactors, PP is weakly in positive correlation with CCD and HC, whereas it did not display a significant correlation between CCD and HC. Moreover, the results highlighted that HC maintained a consistent and expected relationship with other ideological variables. In other words, higher HC was positively related to support for inequality, social dominance orientation, system justification, a lower ascription of humanity to poor people,

**Table 3.** Confirmatory factor analysis fit statistics and model comparisons

	<i>df</i>	$\chi^2$	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	TLI	RMSEA [90% IC]	SRMR
One-factor	170	1308.26***		.62	.57	.17 [.16, .18]	.15
Two-factor	169	778.73***	61.14***	.79	.76	.12 [.11, .13]	.10
Three-factor	167	446.47***	194.47***	.90	.89	.08 [.07, .09]	.06

Note. \* $p < .05$ .

and right-wing political orientation. However, PP exhibited a less consistent relationship with other ideological variables. Moreover, it showed only positive relationships with system justification and right-wing orientation but a negative relationship with tolerance to inequality. The scale is unrelated to the blatant dehumanisation scale. Finally, CCD was negatively related to many ideological variables, except for its positive relationship with system justification. The study further observed that neither SSC or OSC were related to the main variables.

**Table 4.** Descriptive statistics and Pearson's bivariate correlations

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. ACI	3.63	0.97				
2. HC	2.69	1.29	.90***			
3. PP	5.42	1.40	.58***	.28***		
4. CCD	4.68	1.33	.40***	.06	.27***	
5. SEIS	2.05	0.93	.24***	.38***	-.09*	-.13**
6. SD	2.70	1.22	.39***	.50***	.08	-.13**
7. AE	2.43	1.13	.32***	.46***	-.02	-.15***
8. SJ	3.89	1.24	.60***	.58***	.29***	.15***
9. HUM	59.04	22.17	-.22***	-.27***	-.05	.05
10. PO	3.68	1.11	.32***	.35***	.15***	-.02
11. SSC	5.85	1.42	.03	.03	.04	-.02
12. OSC	8432.23	8973.97	-.01	.01	.02	-.08

Note. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## Discussion

The project aims to adapt and validate the ACI developed by Jordan et al. (2021) to obtain an adequate tool for analysing classism attitudes and their consequences on the population of Spanish speakers. In general, the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses illustrated that the psychometric properties of the adapted scale were acceptable and that the factor structure was similar to the original scale. In this sense, the analysis identified the originally proposed ACI factors, namely, HC (12 items), PP (4 items), and CCD (4 items). Further, the three-factor structure presented a better fit than other alternate models (one- and two-factor models). Thus, the study found that the proposed factor structure for native English speakers seems adequate for native speakers of Spanish. This finding indicated that classism attitudes differentiate between hostile and benevolent attitudes towards the poor. Moreover, the

results demonstrated that the factors positively correlated with one another, except for HC and CCD. Compared with the original scale, the study considered that the strength of the correlations between variables was similar to those reported by English speakers. The biggest discrepancy between the scales then seemed to be the lack of correlation between HC and CCD, which also exhibited a weak and negative correlation in Jordan et al. (2021). This finding suggested that, at least for the Mexican sample, perceptions of complementary traits or behaviours between poor and rich groups (CCD) do not necessarily reflect a depiction of the poor (HC) but more of a paternalistic perception (e.g., poor but happy or honest; Kay & Jost, 2003). Thus, future research is needed to explore whether this difference is found only among Mexican individuals or whether it can be applied to other Spanish-speaking populations.

In addition, the ACI displayed a consistent pattern of relationships with the scales used by the present study to test the validity of the subfactors. Specifically, the results showed that system justification ideologies, the attribution of humanity to the poor, and the participants' political orientation are more consistently related to HC than they are to other subfactors. This pattern of results may be due to the explicit and blatant nature of several variables, such as the Ascent of Man scale used to evaluate the humanity of the poor (Kteily et al., 2015) even when Sainz, Loughnan, et al. (2020) and Sainz, Martínez, et al. (2020) demonstrated that the Ascent of Man scale is an adequate tool for understanding the tendency to dehumanise the poor and its consequences. However, this measure's blatant and explicit nature was conceptually closer to hostile attitudes than to other dimensions of the scale. In this sense, future studies should aim to understand the possible relationships between subtle or implicit scales and hostile or paternalistic attitudes regarding poverty and the poor (Shor, 2019).

Furthermore, the participants' subjective and objective socioeconomic statuses failed to indicate any relationship with the ACI subfactors. This finding is in line with those of Jordan et al. (2021), who found that the ACI is uniquely and weakly related to socioeconomic status. This notion underscores how the participants' economic positioning and ideological standing do not necessarily relate to each other, considering the independence of both processes. Nevertheless, this hypothesis should be tested in-depth (e.g., increase the variability of the participants' socioeconomic status in the sample). Previous research also identified a certain relationship between these factors (Horwitz & Dovidio, 2017).

Limitations apply to the present study. First, the researchers carried out an adaptation among Spanish-speaking participants from one country. Given the diversity of the Spanish-speaking population across countries

and continents, testing the performance and structure of the Spanish version of the ACI in samples from other countries may be interesting. Second, the study implemented the scale by focusing on classism attitudes toward the poor. Jordan et al. (2021) provided evidence of the cognition of the target population when answering the scale (e.g., homeless, afro-descendants and refugees), which indicates that lay representations of poverty include several groups. Thus, demonstrating the applicability of ambivalence classism attitudes to other groups, such as indigenous people, who are widely discriminated against in several countries in Latin America, could be another interesting avenue (Campos-Vazquez et al., 2019). Finally, by implementing the Spanish adaptation of the scale in several countries, future research will test measurement invariance. The test results may verify whether the instrument measures the construct in the same manner across samples and corroborate whether possible differences are due to changes in the operationalisation of the construct within these samples instead of being due to differences in psychometric properties (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Lobato et al., 2020).

Moreover, future studies might aid in the understanding of the antecedents of classism attitudes and how contextual factors shape this attitudinal variable. Hence, the possibility exists that the quality and quantity of contact with poor people, status anxiety, perception of social mobility, and other variables cited in the literature on prejudice will elucidate the appearance of classism (Hodson & Dhont, 2015). Additionally, structural variables, such as economic inequality, the development of a country, or even poverty rates within countries, may influence classism attributes. Future cross-cultural studies should compare how country-level differences in these variables can modify the extent to which people develop more hostile or paternalistic attitudes towards the poor.

In other words, the current study provides evidence that the Spanish adaptation of the ACI can present adequate psychometric properties, which is a factor structure similar to the original scale and verifies convergent and divergent validity regarding related constructs in the literature. This ambivalent classism scale should contribute to understanding attitudes towards the poor and their consequences among Spanish speakers.

### Disclosure statement

We would like to declare that there is no conflict of interest.

### Data availability statement

Data and materials pertaining to this project can be found online: <https://osf.io/6k457/>

### Acknowledgement

We acknowledge support from the Centre for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies - COES (ANID/FONDAP/15130009).

This research was funded by Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo - ANID through the programme FONDECYT Postdoctorado 2020 [Project number 3200031].

### References

- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy white women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 586-592. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Bullock, H. E., Fraser Wyche, K., & Williams, W. R. (2001). Media images of the poor. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(2), 229-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00210>
- Bullock, H. E., Williams, W. R., & Limbert, W. M. (2003). Predicting support for welfare policies: The impact of attributions and beliefs about inequality. *Journal of Poverty, 7*(3), 35-56. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J134v07n03\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1300/J134v07n03_03)
- Campos-Vazquez, R. M., & Medina-Cortina, E. M. (2019). Skin color and social mobility: Evidence from Mexico. *Demography, 56*(1), 321-343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0734-z>
- Carretero-Dios, H., & Pérez, C. (2007). Standards for the development and review of instrumental studies: Considerations about test selection in psychological research. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 7*(3), 863-882.
- Castillo, J. C., & Rivera-Gutiérrez, M. (2018). Dimensiones comunes a las atribuciones de pobreza y riqueza. *Psykhe, 27*(2). <https://doi.org/10.7764/psykhe.27.2.1152>
- Chambers, J. R., Swan, L. K., & Heesacker, M. (2014). Better off than we know: Distorted perceptions of incomes and income inequality in America. *Psychological Science, 25*(2), 613-618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613504965>
- Cheek, N. N., & Shafir, E. (2020). The thick skin bias in judgments about people in poverty. *Behavioural Public Policy, 26*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2020.33>
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 9*(2), 233-255. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5)
- Child, D. (2006). *The essentials of factor analysis*. A&C Black.
- Colbow, A. J., Cannella, E., Vispoel, W., Morris, C. A., Cederberg, C., Conrad, M., Rice, A. J., & Liu, W. M. (2016). Development of the classism attitudinal profile (CAP). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 63*(5), 571-585. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000169>
- CONEVAL (2021). *Medición multidimensional de la pobreza en México 2018-2020*. Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social. <https://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Pobreza-2018.aspx>
- Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A. V., & Tagler, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward poor people and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(2), 207-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00209>
- Durante, F., & Fiske, S. T. (2017). How social-class stereotypes maintain inequality. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 18*, 43-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.07.033>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 878-902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>
- García-Castro, J. D., García-Sánchez, E., Montoya-Lozano, M., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2021). The perception of economic inequality in everyday life: My friends with the most and least money. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* [Advance online publication]. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12476>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109-118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109>

- Hambleton, R. K. (2005). Issues, designs, and technical guidelines for adapting tests into multiple languages and cultures. In R. Hambleton, P. Merenda & S. Spielberger (Eds.), *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment* (pp. 3-38). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hayward, K., & Yar, M. (2006). The “chav” phenomenon: Consumption, media and the construction of a new underclass. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 2(1), 9-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659006061708>
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., Foels, R., & Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO7 scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(6), 1003-1028. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000033>
- Hodson, G., & Dhont, K. (2015). The person-based nature of prejudice: Individual difference predictors of intergroup negativity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 1-42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2015.1070018>
- Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 30(2), 179-185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447>
- Horwitz, S. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2017). The rich—Love them or hate them? Divergent implicit and explicit attitudes toward the wealthy. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 20(1), 3-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430215596075>
- Hunt, M. O., & Bullock, H. E. (2016). Ideologies and beliefs about poverty. In M. O. Hunt & H. E. Bullock (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the social science of poverty* (pp. 93-116). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaume, L., Etchezahar, E., & Cervone, N. (2012). La justificación del sistema económico y su relación con la orientación a la dominancia social. *Boletín de Psicología*, 106, 81-91.
- Jordan, J. A., Lawler, J. R., & Bosson, J. K. (2021). Ambivalent classism: The importance of assessing hostile and benevolent ideologies about poor people. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 43(1), 46-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2020.1828084>
- Jost, J. T., & Van der Toorn, J. (2012). System justification theory. In P. A. M. van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 313-343). Sage Publications.
- Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of “poor but happy” and “poor but honest” stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 823-837. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.823>
- Kline, R. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Kraus, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2009). Signs of socioeconomic status: A thin-slicing approach. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02251.x>
- Kteily, N. S., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(5), 901-931. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000048>
- Liu, W. M. (2011). *Social class and classism in the helping professions: Research, theory, and practice*. Sage Publications.
- Lobato, R. M., Sainz, M., & García-Sánchez, E. (2020). Adaptation and validation of the Self-Censorship Orientation (SCO) scale into Spanish. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(2), 310-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2020.1723367>
- Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., Sutton, R. M., & Spencer, B. (2014). Dehumanization and social class: Animality in the stereotypes of “White Trash,” “Chavs,” and “Bogans”. *Social Psychology*, 45(1), 54-61. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000159>
- Nadler, A., & Halabi, S. (2006). Intergroup helping as status relations: Effects of status stability, identification, and type of help on receptivity to high-status group’s help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(1), 97-110. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.97>
- R Core Team. (2008). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. <http://softlibre.unizar.es/manuales/aplicaciones/r/fullrefman.pdf>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling and more. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1-36.
- Sainz, M., Loughnan, S., Martínez, R., Moya, M., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2020). Dehumanization of socioeconomically disadvantaged groups decreases support for welfare policies via perceived wastefulness. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 33(1), 1-13. <http://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.414>
- Sainz, M., Martínez, R., Moya, M., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2019). Animalizing the disadvantaged, mechanizing the wealthy: The convergence of socioeconomic status and humanity attributions. *International Journal of Psychology*, 54(4), 423-430. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12485>
- Sainz, M., Martínez, R., Sutton, R. M., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., & Moya, M. (2020). Less human, more to blame: Animalizing poor people increases blame and decreases support for wealth redistribution. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 23(4), 546-559. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219841135>
- Shor, R., Cattaneo, L., & Alexander, L. (2019). Assessing implicit and explicit attitudes about classism. *Journal of Poverty*, 23(6), 487-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875549.2019.1616035>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Tagler, M. J., & Cozzarelli, C. (2013). Feelings toward the poor and beliefs about the causes of poverty: The role of affective-cognitive consistency in help-giving. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 147, 517-539. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2012.718721>
- Wiwad, D., Mercier, B., Maraun, M. D., Robinson, A. R., Piff, P. K., Akinin, L. B., & Shariff, A. F. (2019). The support for economic inequality scale: Development and adjudication. *PLoS ONE*, 14(6), e0218685. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0218685>
- Yuan, K. H., & Bentler, P. M. (2000). 5. Three likelihood-based methods for mean and covariance structure analysis with non-normal missing data. *Sociological Methodology*, 30(1), 165-200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0081-1750.00078>
- Yun, S. H., & Weaver, R. D. (2010). Development and validation of a short form of the attitude toward poverty scale. *Advances in Social Work*, 11(2), 174-187. <https://doi.org/10.18060/437>