

Journal of Interdisciplinary Graduate Research

Volume 5 *Current Volume of The Journal of Interdisciplinary Graduate Research*

Article 4

2020

Poverty Simulation

Jennifer Gray
jiur@southern.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/jigr>



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gray, Jennifer (2020) "Poverty Simulation," *Journal of Interdisciplinary Graduate Research*: Vol. 5 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/jigr/vol5/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer Reviewed Journals at Knowledge Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Interdisciplinary Graduate Research by an authorized editor of Knowledge Exchange. For more information, please contact jspears@southern.edu.

Poverty Simulation

Jennifer Gray

Southern Adventist University

Abstract

The School of Social Work at Southern Adventist University has been working alongside the Chattanooga Police Department studying the interactions between police and the communities they serve. This research has led to the question of how law enforcement officers (in Chattanooga) are treating impoverished people of color. Literature suggests that there are not any evidence based interventions to improve the way professionals treat individuals in such circumstances, especially in the law enforcement industry. In a few instances, poverty simulations have been shown to build more empathy and understanding for individuals. The School of Social Work has conducted three simulations that have provided data to aid in understanding the change of perception for those working with impoverished individuals overall, with an emphasis to people of color. **Methods:** Researchers conducted a pre-assessment with a quantitative survey and qualitative survey and a post-survey with a replica of the same questions on the quantitative survey and a question regarding change for the qualitative questions. **Measurements:** The quantitative data was entered into the most current SPSS licensure system. Qualitative data was coded based on popular themes for each question and assessed for common responses among different professions. **Results:** The results suggest that the poverty simulation can contribute quality understanding and greater empathy in law enforcement, social workers, and community members working with impoverished individuals and people of color. **Conclusions:** The poverty simulation can be an effective intervention, particularly useful for those working within the helping professions, to gain a better understanding of the realities and impediments for individuals living in poverty or living in low-income areas.

Poverty Simulation

Historically, poverty has primarily been discussed in academia within the social sciences and in a context related to statistics, causes, and barriers. There has been little information about how helping professionals should interact and deal with the difficult situations that often accompany poverty. The poverty simulation was created to provide education to those who work with individuals who have experienced poverty. Southern Adventist University (SAU) School of Social Work has partnered with community agencies to provide training and collect data using the poverty simulation in an effort to better understand how the community views poverty and to provide an intervention that will create more empathy and understanding for helping professionals.

In anticipation of the results that could be provided, the research team created a measurement tool to understand perceptions of poverty before and after the simulation. The measurement tool consists of a pre- and post-test that measures participant perceptions on a scale of 1 to 4 and qualitative questions that help understand why these perceptions exist. The group was able to collect research from three of seven simulations conducted from October 2018 to April 2019. While the project began with studying the perceptions of the Chattanooga Police Department and training of new cadets, there has been significant participation from other helping professionals as well, such as social workers, teachers, and administrative staff.

The poverty simulation is an experiential learning technique that provides an opportunity for participants to role-play a specific person in a family who lived in poverty. Each “family” is given a specific scenario that requires them to complete many transactions, such as mortgage, utilities, food, and loans, as well as the stress of getting their children to school and going to work, all over the course of four 15-minute weeks. Some of the families may have individuals in

jail or infants for whom they need to pay for childcare. Each scenario is unique and dealt with in different ways based on the participant's thought processes.

This study has allowed researchers to better understand how individuals perceive poverty before the simulation and understand the change that takes place after. The main questions that were asked during this research include:

1. Does the Poverty Simulation provide adequate training for providing empathy and understanding?
2. Are there implications that race contributes to poverty and arrests?

This paper also focuses on the issues related to poverty and the successfulness of the simulation. The research does suggest that the simulation provides sufficient empathy skills and better understanding regarding the complexities of poverty.

Literature Review

Stereotypes

Research has reported that there has been stereotypical connection between race, class, and gender, particularly among police officers across the United States (Dottolo & Stewart, 2008). Racism has changed over the years in such a way that communities have become partially blinded to the reality of racism (Ullucci, 2006). Some factors of this may include distorted ideas that present prejudiced behaviors as moral, a cultural understanding and belief that people are only attracted to people most similar to themselves, and an overarching narrative of black culture as instilling laziness and neediness across generations (Ullucci, 2006). Such ideas have created different avenues of racism and segregation even after the civil rights movement. For instance, American police tactics have produced practices such as "the rip" (selling drugs undercover to

catch criminals in low-income areas) and vehicular stops made on the basis of race and type of vehicle, and have promoted a broken justice system to inhibit unlawful arrests (Chambliss, 1994). This has resulted in a stagnant, disproportionate prison population. In 1994, though only 12% of the U.S. population was African American, 40% of the prison population was African American (Cooper, 2015).

De Facto Segregation

Studies have clarified the prevalence of de facto segregation (residential isolation of low-income blacks) in the United States (Rothstein, 2015). De facto segregation has historically created numerous barriers for success in the African American community. Families are subjected to living in high-crime and crime-controlled areas. In some of these areas, zero tolerance procedures have been implemented as a policing strategy, prominent in comparison to white, middle-class communities (Fabricant, 2011). In 1994, the budget for the criminal justice system increased by 150%, which allocated more money to the justice system than what was allocated for educational resources in these areas (Chambliss, 1994). Furthermore, there was not much progress to allow low income black communities to prosper in education (Rothstein, 2015). In addition to a lack of educational resources, there have been insufficient healthcare resources, which have affected overall health within low-income black communities (Rothstein, 2015).

Poverty Simulation as an Intervention

Kolb's experiential model has provided examples of educating communities and helping with the development of new skills (Steck, Engler, Ligon, Druen, & Crosgrave, 2011). There is not sufficient research, however, providing positive interventions to combat prejudicial behaviors

from police officers or other helping professionals. The only studies available have been in regard to the overall experience of participants in a poverty simulation. Nevertheless, these studies do suggest that the poverty simulation is an effective tool for providing a better understanding of poverty within health care settings. The poverty simulation is made up of a pre-packaged kit created by the Missouri Association for Community Action for the purpose of increasing awareness of poverty and the impediments faced by those who experience poverty every day (Link, Haughtigan, & Garret-Wright, 2019). Participants are given real-life roles of families who have been impacted by poverty. This type of experience is needed to teach individuals about social empathy and help create new policies and programs that can be effective for change in our future (Nickols & Nielsen, 2011).

Purpose

The purpose of this research is two-fold: (1) to better understand the perceptions of law enforcement regarding people of color living in low-income areas, and (2) to provide an evidence-based approach to real-life experience of what it is like to live in poverty in order to create more empathy and understanding within the helping professions. This simulation provides specific family roles for each person to role-play over the course of four 15-minute weeks. Volunteers staffed the specific vendors that each family had to face throughout the month. Most families had to maintain shelter (or gain shelter), utilities, health needs, nutritional items, education for children, work, and loans. The simulation also provided several services that could provide assistance if the need arose. After the third week, many vendors would then reduce or remove services provided if the family had not met the expected need or requirements to retain the services.

Methods

Participants

In preparation for the first simulation, SAU's School of Social Work invited any community organization that it had any prior relationship with through community networking. The first simulation had representation from several organization through offering continuing education credits for social workers in the community. Representatives registered online through SAU's School of Social Work website. After the first simulation, many participants took this information to their programs, which resulted in an influx of requests from the community to provide poverty simulations. The program has received requests from several nonprofit organizations, including social services, emergency response, educational, and church-related organizations. Once a request was made, the School of Social Work partnered with the organization in all important efforts including (but not limited to) food, location, audio, volunteer recruitment, and research.

Participants could consist of anyone high-school age or older based on the requests from the Chattanooga community. However, research was limited to those who were 18 years of age and older. Any given simulation could accommodate groups anywhere from 25 to 88 participants. Simulations were planned and carried out no closer than one month apart due to the extensive amount of time needed to plan and recruit volunteers. The simulations that were included in the research were those held on the following dates: October 3, 2018, February 18, 2019, and April 19, 2019. Each simulation varied in size and was conducted at a different time and location based on the need of the coordinating organization.

Materials and Procedures

The Missouri Association for Community Action bought and edited what is known as the Poverty Simulation kit to sell in order for schools and organizations to educate the community on the impacts of poverty. Each simulation kit contains packets for each volunteer vendor position, which includes the facilitator, banker, mortgage company, utility company, social services, case workers, school system, homeless shelter, child care, grocery store, employer, community action nonprofit, jail system, illegal activity person, quick cash, pawn shop, and health care. To run a successful simulation, 19 to 22 volunteers are needed. For the simulations conducted for this study, volunteers arrived one hour before the start of the simulation to receive hands-on training, to review their packets, and to have any questions about their role answered.

Each volunteer packet goes into detail about how to run the vendor location for each 15-minute week. The simulation can manage up to 88 participants divided into family units of varying size—anywhere from one- to five-person units. Each family unit is made up of different scenarios taken from real-life situations of families who have been in poverty—such as a homeless elderly widow, a young-adult college student raising young siblings, blended families of five, and families with single parents raising young children and caring for elderly parents.

At the beginning of each of the simulations in this study, the facilitator would run through the rules and layout of the simulation. Rules included the necessity of transportation passes to travel to each location (with the exception of the state school), making sure to be at work within the first minute of each week, being able to pay all bills, and following through with requests made on the “luck of the draw” card, if received. Participants were asked to play their role in the family. The families were given 10 minutes to review their packets and strategize about how to survive poverty over the four 15-minute weeks. In extreme situations, where families became

stranded in their scenario, the facilitator was given the flexibility to provide immediate relief to allow the family to continue participation. At the conclusion of the simulation, participants were given a 10-minute break to regroup from the events that occurred during the simulation.

Participants would then reconvene in a large group for a one-hour discussion to process the experience of poverty and the effectiveness of the simulation. The facilitator's role consisted of not only running and controlling time for the simulation, but also training all volunteers, answering all questions, and settling any difficult disputes for frustrated participants, if needed.

Data Collection

Before participants were divided into families, each participant was given the option of whether to participate in the research. They were given a number, a consent form, and a numbered pretest that corresponded with their given number. The pretest consisted of several quantitative questions that assessed the participant's understanding and perception of poverty. The pretest also included a few qualitative questions regarding perceptions of poverty and the amount of training each person has received for working with impoverished populations. As a follow-up, to help understand the effect of the simulation, each participant was also asked to complete a post-test with their assigned number. The quantitative questions were the same on the post-test as the pretest; however, the qualitative questions were changed to consider the overall impact the simulation had on each participant. Because of a change in the quantitative questions after the October 3, 2018, simulation, the research group decided to remove all quantitative data for this the first group of participants; however, as the qualitative questions did not undergo a change, their responses have been included in the qualitative data.

Quantitative

The SPSS statistical analysis program was used to determine the average perceptions across each question and to compare law enforcement with other professionals' opinions and change in understanding. As discussed, there were significant changes made to the quantitative surveys from the 2018 to 2019 simulations. Therefore, there are only a total of 73 respondents (31.5% law enforcement and 68.5% other professionals): 64% were white, 11% were black, 13% were categorized as a different race, and 11% chose not to specify. Each question was analyzed to understand any differences in perception from before the simulation to after the simulation. Quantitative responses were measured with an ordinal structure consisting of 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, and 4=strongly agree. All data was entered into SPSS and pulled for review and analysis. Due to the nature of surveys, there were a total of 63 to 67 respondents for each question on the pre-survey, and a total of 54 to 58 respondents on the post-survey.

Qualitative

The pre-survey had five questions, with a high response of 147 respondents and a low response of 64 (on question 5, which was not included in the 2018 survey pool). The post-test had 116 total respondents. Each question was coded based on popular theme by multiple reviewers and compared to determine the most common themes among respondents. Question 1 of the pre-survey was left out of the analysis because it is not pertinent to the results of the research. Altogether, 56 respondents attended for work, 20 for school, 21 for knowledge, 17 for perspective change, and 10 for personal growth. The majority of participants did not have any formal training regarding poverty. Twenty-eight respondents considered learning to treat others

equally as an independent training that should be included when working with individuals in poverty.

Results

Quantitative

Participant responses for several of the 13 quantitative questions suggested a significant change in perception due to the simulation. After the simulation, there was a 13% increase (from 69% to 82%) of participants who believed that those in poverty do not get the help they deserve and may not be solely responsible for their situation. In addition, after the simulation, a total of 85% of respondents believed that the private sector contributes to disparities in poverty. About 90% of participants agreed that there are emotional costs associated with poverty after completing the simulation. (See Table 1 for a frequency chart of responses related to emotional costs of poverty in the United States.)

Table 1

Pre- (top) and post- (bottom) survey frequencies for quantitative question 6

Q6: There are emotional costs associated with being poor in America.				
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	51	0.70	0.76	67
Somewhat Agree	11	0.15	0.69	16
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	0.00	5
Strongly Disagree	5	0.07	0.07	5
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf

Strongly Agree	47	0.64	0.81	58
Somewhat Agree	5	0.07	0.09	11
Somewhat Disagree	2	0.03	0.03	6
Strongly Disagree	4	0.05	0.07	4

Qualitative

There were 129 total responses in regard to whether there is a correlation between poverty and race. There were three major responses: present correlation (33%), discrimination (18%), and no apparent correlation between race and crime rates (18%). A total of 19 law enforcement professionals expressed a concern of a present correlation, along with 24 other helping professionals. Discrimination was another highly rated component, included in about 18% of responses. However, the majority of these responses came from other professionals in the community, such as social workers. (See Table 2 for select responses regarding the correlation between poverty and race.)

Table 2

Select responses for qualitative question 2

Q2: Explain the perception you have regarding low-income people of color and crime rates.	
Theme	Quote
Correlation	<p>“It is a direct relationship between all three.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet</p> <p>“People of low income have higher crime rates because they are more expected to commit crime and grow up with it from a young age.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet</p> <p>“They are high, unjust, and tie in with each other.” – Other professional</p>

<p>Discrimination</p>	<p>“People of color are treated poorly due to perceived biases and stereotypes.” – Other professional</p> <p>“The amount of African Americans currently incarcerated in our country is modern day racism and slavery. Our system is absurd and African Americans/people of color are discriminated against the most.” – Other professional</p>
<p>No Correlation</p>	<p>“Regardless of skin color, you can work hard and save money. Committing crimes is a choice.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet</p> <p>“Certain people may commit crimes, but it’s unfair to assume all low-income people of color commit crimes. Personal responsibility is big. You don’t have to be a criminal.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet.</p>

Two primary themes were reported by 137 participants related to educational barriers for people of color living in low-income areas: a lack of equity (37%), and a lack of resources and opportunities (25%). The problem of equity refers to the quality of education that people of color in the Chattanooga area receive. There were many participant responses (from both police cadets and other professionals) that suggest an equity issue in the Chattanooga education system (see Table 3).

Table 3

Select responses for qualitative question 3

<p>Q3: When you think of low-income people of color and education in general, what comes to your mind?</p>	
<p>Theme</p>	<p>Quote</p>
<p>Equity</p>	<p>“Low income = low education – not well informed, school system failed them.”</p> <p>“Starting in primary education, low-income people of color are in schools with less funding. They are not receiving proper or basic education needed to succeed.”</p>

Lack of Resources	“Lower income individuals probably did not get the opportunity to get an extended education or they may have dropped out of school.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet
-------------------	--

Approximately one-third of participants (136 respondents) who discussed disparities between people of color and whites in low-income areas reported that they believed these people of color were primarily a product of their environment (31%). Many (41%) also reported that racism and discrimination were major factors of disproportionate arrests. (See Table 4 for select responses regarding disparities between people of color and whites in low-income areas.)

Table 4

Select responses for qualitative question 4

Q4: When looking at who gets arrested in America, a higher number of African Americans in low-income areas get arrested compared to whites. Why do you think this is the case?	
Theme	Quote
Product of Environment	“It is due to those individuals committing crimes. Those areas are then more heavily policed. So, more criminals are caught. It again goes to have a two-parent household is a great way for people to not go to jail. It is a great idea to have personal responsibility and to not decide to commit crimes.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet
Racism and Discrimination	“It’s ‘easier’ in our country to arrest them than actually care to give them therapeutic services or ways to recovery and a healthy life. The history of segregation is still prevalent in our country.” – Other Professional

There were a total of 113 responses regarding how the poverty simulation affected participants’ perceptions of poverty (see Table 5). Responses included the following: increased compassion/empathy (38 responses, or 33%), increased knowledge (10 responses, or 8%), changed perspective/open-mindedness (16 responses, or 14%), increased awareness (37

responses, or 33%), neutral/no impact (17 responses, or 15%), and changed values (7 responses, or 6%). The most frequent responses were increased empathy/compassion and awareness, which make up a third of what was reported, and which are both suggested and desired outcomes for the simulation.

Table 5

Select responses for qualitative question 5

Q5: How has the simulation impacted your views and how you handle situations that include low-income individuals (particularly those of color)?	
Theme	Quote
Increased empathy/compassion	<p>“It has shown me that no one’s situation is the same, and it’s unfair to treat people as such.” – Chattanooga Police Department Cadet</p> <p>“This has taught me more empathy – I will have more understanding and patience for those impacted by low-income/Poverty living situations.” – Other Professional</p> <p>“I will continue to be respectful, understanding, patient, and caring. Always showing compassion.” – Other Professional</p>
Awareness	<p>“Everyone can’t control what happens to them.”</p> <p>“It has shown me that no one’s situation is the same, and it’s unfair to treat people as such.”</p> <p>“It showed me that they (poor people) have to work constantly just to stay out of jail.”</p> <p>“I already felt I understand poverty’s stressor. But this deepened my appreciation of how hard being in poverty can be.”</p>

Discussion

Quantitative

The quantitative research did provide some important data suggesting that the poverty simulation was an effective tool for educating community professionals about poverty and increasing empathy of participants who work with impoverished communities. However, due to the structure of the quantitative data, there was little information to explain why perceptions changed for some of the questions but not others. The questions that saw the most significant changes in perception were related to the idea and understanding that those in poverty do not receive the help they deserve and that there are emotional costs with living in poverty. This understanding is imperative when working with low-income communities.

Another factor that was measured but did not show a significant change in perception was the implication of race being a factor in the treatment of impoverished individuals. The simulation does not allow effective implementation of the idea that poverty is more stringent on people of color. There is some research regarding disproportionate poverty and arrests among the African American population in low-income areas in Chattanooga (Statistical Atlas, 2018). This component was particularly difficult, however, because of the fact that there was not a way to anonymously assign black roles or to have the police officers in the simulation ethnically target individuals. Such an encounter would skew the results of the simulation and create a bias in the research. Therefore, while race seems to be a significant factor of poverty and arrest rates in Chattanooga, the simulation has not, thus far, presented a significant understanding of these relations.

Qualitative

The qualitative survey provided significant insight into participants' perceptions related to poverty, race, the education system, and the justice system. The surveys also provided information as to what, if any, type of training participants received prior to the simulation. The majority of participants reported that there have been failures within the community system related to racism, discrimination, lack of equity for all, lack of opportunities, and lack of resources for low-income families and low-income families of color. Some participants reported that they believed that poverty is a cycle and that individuals in these situations are products of their environment.

About a third of respondents reported that race had nothing to do with the poverty cycle. The other 70% indicated in some way that race and discrimination were factors in their perceptions. All participants were in the helping professions within the Chattanooga community. Chattanooga police cadets seemed to express the same concerns at almost the same rate as other professionals.

Lastly, the qualitative research suggested that the poverty simulation had a significant impact on developing the knowledge, understanding, and empathy of participants for those in poverty. Only 17% of participants reported no impact from the simulation, primarily due to the fact that they grew up in poverty conditions. The other 85% of participants reported that they gained greater empathy, understanding, awareness, and open-mindedness during the poverty simulation. The majority of participants also reported that they had not received any training related to poverty and its effects prior to the experience.

Limitations

The study had several limitations. First, there were consistently fewer respondents in the post-survey compared to the pre-survey due to participants not recording their number on the post-survey or not responding at all. Some surveys contained unanswered questions as well. Second, some professionals were required to take part in the simulation, which may or may not have created bias toward what the researchers wanted to hear rather than the participant's actual beliefs or practices out in the field. The third limitation is the measurement change, which decreased the analysis pool for the quantitative portion of the study. Furthermore, some individuals have more understanding and experience in poverty due to personal training, education, or personal experience compared to others. One of the things that is suggested for continued research and education is to better calculate the impact of the simulation on specific perceptions for each question and response (for those in law enforcement vs. other professions, for example). This would also allow for more data to be assessed and to be applied outside of the Chattanooga community. A fourth limitation was that there was not a race component added into the simulation. The simulation was created to avoid bias regarding race or ethnicity; therefore, it was hard to measure perceptions regarding race. Nevertheless, some education was provided regarding the severity of racial issues in the Chattanooga area and statistics were given for the disproportionality relating to people of color in poverty and incarceration rates.

Conclusion

Overall, research from the poverty simulation does show a positive change in participants' responses regarding their perception of those in poverty. While there was not a great deal of quantitative data, some perception change was evident between pre- and post-survey responses. Furthermore, responses to the qualitative questions indicate that only 15% of participants reported no change in perception or impact on their knowledge and understanding of

poverty. Given the number of positive responses regarding a change in perception toward those in poverty (85% of respondents), the poverty simulation can be considered a sufficient and impactful intervention to educate professionals and the community about poverty. Overall, 66% of respondents specifically reported increased empathy and/or a change in awareness after completing the poverty simulation. These positive results indicate that the poverty simulation is a valuable training tool for law enforcement and other helping professions. Further research should be conducted to control for the impact this has in the actual practice of policing.

References

- Chambliss, W. J. (1994). Policing the ghetto underclass: The politics of law and law enforcement. *Social Problems, 41*(2), 171–194.
- Cooper, H. L. F. (2015). War on drugs policing and police brutality. *Substance Use & Misuse, 50*, 1188–1194. doi: 10.3109/10826084.2015.1007669
- Dottolo, A. L., & Stewart, A. J. (2008). “Don’t Ever Forget Now, You’re a Black Man in America”: Intersections of race, class, and gender in encounters with the police. *Sex Roles, 59*, 350–364. doi: 10.1007/s/11199-007-9387-x
- Fabricant, M. C. (2011). War crimes and misdemeanors: Understanding “Zero-Tolerance” policing as a form of collective punishment and human rights violation. *Drexel Law Review, 3*, 373–414.
- Link, K. A., Haughtigan, K. S., Garrett-Wright, D. (2019). Using a poverty simulation exercise in mental health nursing. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 40*(3), 165–167. doi: 10.1097/01.NEP.0000000000000360
- Nickols, S. Y., & Nielsen, R. B. (2011). “So Many People are Struggling”: Developing social empathy through a poverty simulation. *Journal of Poverty, 15*, 22–42. doi: 10.1080/10875549.2011.539400
- Rothstein, R. (2015). The racial achievement gap, segregated schools, and segregated neighborhoods a constitutional insult. *Race Social Problems, 7*, 21–30. doi:

10.100/s12552-014-9134-1

Steck, L. W., Engler, J. N., Ligon, M., Druen, P. B., & Cosgrove, E. (2011). Doing poverty:

Learning outcomes among students participating in the community action poverty

simulation program. *American Sociological Association*, 39(3), 259–273. Retrieved from

<http://ts.sagepub.com>

Statistical Atlas. (2018). Race and ethnicity in Avondale, Chattanooga, Tennessee. *Cedar Lake*

Ventures, Inc. Retrieved from

<https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Tennessee/Chattanooga/Avondale/Race-and-Ethnicity>

Ullucci, K. (2006, September). [Review of the book *Racism without racists: Color-blind*

racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States, by Eduardo

Bonilla-Silva]. *Urban Education*, 41(5), 533–540.

Appendix A

Southern Adventist University IRB Confirmation

Principal Investigator: Kristie Wilder

Research Project: Poverty Simulation

IRB Tracking Number: 2018-2019-012

Appendix B

Informed Consent Survey

The purpose of the Poverty Simulation research is to assess perception changes from before to after the simulation in which you will be participating. We are measuring how participants perceive low-income individuals (particularly those of color). In order to best collect tangible data, we ask that you fill out the pre and post survey. The research will help identify current perceptions of those who are in poverty and of color. The post survey will allow us to measure the change from before to after the simulation. The research is a part of a larger initiative sponsored by the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) and the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP).

Your confidentiality is very important to the researchers. We will do everything in our power to mitigate the chances of breaching confidentiality.

Participants will fill out surveys anonymously. Digital data will be stored on secure computers and surveys will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the office of the researcher.

_____ **By checking this section, I agree to participate in the research study. I understand the purpose and nature of this study and I am participating voluntarily. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without any penalty or consequences.**

Risk and Discomfort

Some of the questions the researchers ask may make you uncomfortable. If you do not wish to answer a question, you may decline. If you do not wish to participate you can stop at any point.

Participant's Signature

Date

This research has been approved by the University's Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in the research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact Dr. Cynthia Gettys, the Chair of the Institutional Review Board at (423) 236-2285.

Appendix C

Quantitative Frequency Tables

Q1: The community provides adequate services to help families with low income and people of color.

Q1 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	3	0.04	0.04	67
Somewhat Agree	31	0.42	0.46	64
Somewhat Disagree	17	0.23	0.25	33
Strongly Disagree	16	0.22	0.23	16
Value	f	rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	7	0.10	0.12	57
Somewhat Agree	18	0.25	0.31	50
Somewhat Disagree	17	0.23	0.29	32
Strongly Disagree	15	0.21	0.26	15

Q2: People with low income and who are of color do not have to work as hard because of all of the services available to them.

Q2 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	1	0.01	0.01	66
Somewhat Agree	10	0.14	0.15	65
Somewhat Disagree	11	0.15	0.16	55
Strongly Disagree	44	0.60	0.66	44
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	1	0.01	0.1	58
Somewhat Agree	8	0.11	0.13	57
Somewhat Disagree	14	0.19	0.24	49
Strongly Disagree	35	0.48	0.60	35

Q3: People get enough money to survive from welfare, food stamps, and other special programs.

Q3 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	3	0.04	0.04	67
Somewhat Agree	19	0.26	0.28	64
Somewhat Disagree	15	0.21	0.22	45
Strongly Disagree	30	0.41	0.44	30

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of Respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	2	0.03	0.03	58
Somewhat Agree	12	0.16	0.20	56
Somewhat Disagree	17	0.23	0.29	44
Strongly Disagree	27	0.37	0.46	27

Q4: People are generally responsible for whether they are poor – they get what they earned/deserve.

Q4 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	2	0.03	0.03	65
Somewhat Agree	14	0.19	0.21	63
Somewhat Disagree	23	0.32	0.35	49
Strongly Disagree	26	0.36	0.40	26

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	3	0.04	0.05	58
Somewhat Agree	7	0.10	0.12	55
Somewhat Disagree	17	0.23	0.29	48
Strongly Disagree	31	0.42	0.53	31

Q5: The private sector has no role in improving the situation for people who are of color and live in low income.

Q5 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	2	0.03	0.03	65
Somewhat Agree	14	0.19	0.22	63
Somewhat Disagree	23	0.32	0.35	49
Strongly Disagree	26	0.36	0.40	26
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondent	cf
Strongly Agree	3	0.04	0.05	58
Somewhat Agree	7	0.10	0.12	55
Somewhat Disagree	17	0.23	0.29	48
Strongly Disagree	31	0.42	0.53	31

Q6: There are emotional costs associated with being poor in America.

QTable 6 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	51	0.70	0.76	67
Somewhat Agree	11	0.15	0.69	16
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	0.00	5
Strongly Disagree	5	0.07	0.07	5
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	47	0.64	0.81	58
Somewhat Agree	5	0.07	0.09	11
Somewhat Disagree	2	0.03	0.03	6
Strongly Disagree	4	0.05	0.07	4

Q7: There are emotional costs associated with being black in America.

Q7 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	37	0.51	0.55	67
Somewhat Agree	16	0.22	0.24	30
Somewhat Disagree	8	0.11	0.12	14
Strongly Disagree	6	0.08	0.09	6

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	32	0.44	0.55	58
Somewhat Agree	14	0.19	0.24	26
Somewhat Disagree	7	0.10	0.12	12
Strongly Disagree	5	0.07	0.09	5

Q8: The financial pressures faced by people who are of color and with low income are no different than the financial pressures faced by other Americans.

Q8 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	4	0.05	0.06	67
Somewhat Agree	10	0.14	0.15	63
Somewhat Disagree	24	0.33	0.36	53
Strongly Disagree	29	0.40	0.43	29

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	4	0.05	0.07	58
Somewhat Agree	10	0.14	0.17	54
Somewhat Disagree	21	0.29	0.36	44
Strongly Disagree	23	0.32	0.40	23

Q9: Poor people in this country have it great compared to poor people in other countries.

Q9 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	9	0.12	0.13	67
Somewhat Agree	23	0.32	0.34	58
Somewhat Disagree	23	0.32	0.34	35
Strongly Disagree	12	0.16	0.18	12
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Disagree	10	0.14	0.18	57
Somewhat Disagree	15	0.21	0.26	47
Somewhat Disagree	23	0.32	0.40	32
Strongly Disagree	9	0.12	0.16	9

Q10: Poor people are lazy.

Q10 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	63
Somewhat Agree	11	0.15	0.17	63
Somewhat Disagree	22	0.30	0.35	52
Strongly Disagree	30	0.41	0.48	30
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	2	0.03	0.04	54
Somewhat Agree	6	0.08	0.11	52
Somewhat Disagree	16	0.22	0.30	46
Strongly Disagree	30	0.41	0.56	30

Q11: Poor people spend too much money on Junk Food and Fast Food.

Q11 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	3	0.04	0.04	67
Somewhat Agree	20	0.27	0.30	64
Somewhat Disagree	22	0.30	0.33	44
Strongly Disagree	22	0.30	0.33	22

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	2	0.03	0.03	58
Somewhat Agree	11	0.15	0.19	56
Somewhat Disagree	26	0.36	0.45	45
Strongly Disagree	19	0.26	0.33	19

Q12: The poverty rates in this country impact people of color more than white Americans.

Q12 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	16	0.22	0.24	66
Somewhat Agree	27	0.37	0.41	50
Somewhat Disagree	12	0.16	0.18	23
Strongly Disagree	11	0.15	0.17	11

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	22	0.30	0.38	58
Somewhat Agree	12	0.16	0.21	36
Somewhat Disagree	16	0.22	0.28	24
Strongly Disagree	8	0.11	0.14	8

Q13: People of color just need more budgeting skills to learn how to stretch a dollar.

Q13 Pre (Top) and Post (Bottom) Frequencies

Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	1	0.01	0.02	65
Somewhat Agree	12	0.16	0.18	64
Somewhat Disagree	20	0.27	0.31	52
Strongly Disagree	32	0.44	0.49	32
Value	f	Rel f over all	Rel f of respondents	cf
Strongly Agree	1	0.01	0.02	56
Somewhat Agree	9	0.12	0.16	55
Somewhat Disagree	17	0.23	0.30	46
Strongly Disagree	29	0.40	0.52	29

Appendix D
Pre Test

Pre-Survey: February 28, 2019

Circle One: CPD Employee Social Worker Student Other: _____

Instructions: Read the statement below carefully and respond based on your belief.

Definitions:

People of Color: Individuals of darker skin tones other than white.

This is your personal assessment of yourself; therefore, there is not any right or wrong answers.

Question	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The community provides adequate services to help families with low income and people of color live.	1	2	3	4
People with low income and who are of color do not have to work as hard because of all of the services available to them.	1	2	3	4
People get enough money to survive from welfare, food stamps, and other social programs.	1	2	3	4
People are generally responsible for whether they are poor- they get what they earned/deserve.	1	2	3	4
The private sector has no role in improving the situation for people who are of color and live in low income.	1	2	3	4
There are emotional costs associated with being poor in America.	1	2	3	4
There are emotional costs associated with being black in America.	1	2	3	4
The financial pressures faced by people who are of color and with low income are no different than the financial pressures faced by other Americans.	1	2	3	4

Poor people in this country have it great compared to poor people in other countries.	1	2	3	4
Poor people are lazy.	1	2	3	4
Poor people spend too much money on junk food and fast food.	1	2	3	4
The poverty rates in this country impact people of color more than White Americans	1	2	3	4
People of color just need more budgeting skills to learn how to stretch a dollar.	1	2	3	4

What was your reason for attending today?

Explain the perceptions you have regarding low-income people of color and crime rates.

When you think of low income people of color and education in general, what comes to your mind?

When looking at who gets arrested in America, a higher number of African Americans in low income areas get arrested compared to whites. Why do you think this is the case?

White Americans report being more comfortable interacting with law enforcement than African Americans; why do you think this is the case?

What tactics/training have you received (if any) that will help you preform your role with low income people of color?

Appendix E
Post Test

Post-Survey: February 28, 2019

Circle One: CPD Employee Social Worker Student Other: _____

Instructions: Read the statement below carefully and respond based on your belief.

Definitions:

People of Color: Individuals of darker skin tones other than white.

This is your personal assessment of yourself; therefore, there is not any right or wrong answers.

Question	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The community provides adequate services to help families with low income and people of color live.	1	2	3	4
People with low income and who are of color do not have to work as hard because of all of the services available to them.	1	2	3	4
People get enough money to survive from welfare, food stamps, and other social programs.	1	2	3	4
People are generally responsible for whether they are poor- they get what they earned/deserve.	1	2	3	4
The private sector has no role in improving the situation for people who are of color and live in low income.	1	2	3	4
There are emotional costs associated with being poor in America.	1	2	3	4
There are emotional costs associated with being black in America.	1	2	3	4
The financial pressures faced by people who are of color and with low income are no different than the financial pressures faced by other Americans.	1	2	3	4

Poor people in this country have it great compared to poor people in other countries.	1	2	3	4
Poor people are lazy.	1	2	3	4
Poor people spend too much money on junk food and fast food.	1	2	3	4
The poverty rates in this country impact people of color more than White Americans	1	2	3	4
People of color just need more budgeting skills to learn how to stretch a dollar.	1	2	3	4

Were your expectations met?

If not, what could be better?

How has the simulation impacted your views and how you handle situations that include low income individuals?