

7

Racism- and Prejudice-Related Measures

7.1 AN OVERVIEW OF RACISM AND PREJUDICE

Although related, racism and prejudice reflect two different meanings. According to Allport (1954), *prejudice* is composed of generalized beliefs and attitudes that are inherently negative. While prejudice is formed through learned stereotypes, *racism* is a manifestation of prejudice. Specifically, racism is the differential treatment enacted by an individual, group, or organization on individuals based on assumptions of a group's phenotypic, linguistic, or cultural differences. Racism can occur at *institutional* (e.g., discriminatory laws and practices), *societal* (e.g., race hate groups), and *individual* (e.g., racial stereotyping by an individual) levels and be *overt* (i.e., old-fashioned) or *covert* (i.e., modern). Whereas overt racism reflects open hostility and acts of aggression toward a member or individuals from a minority group, covert racism is composed of the subtle behaviors that are influenced by prejudice. Covert racism also can be further understood as *intentional* and *unintentional* (Ridley, 1995). Intentional covert racism reflects subtle discriminatory behaviors that allow the perpetrator to act willfully and "hide" the intent of her or his behavior. Unintentional covert racism, also known as *aversive racism*, is unintentional acts that are discriminatory in nature.

Racism takes place in the context of power and thus reflects discriminatory behaviors that are supported by institutional or cultural practices. *Horizontal racism* denotes negative attitudes and prejudice minority group members might have toward one another (Wijeyesinghe, Griffin, & Love, 1997). The term acknowledges how individuals from minority groups may act on their prejudice toward other groups but do so without the power to institutionally influence the lives of others. *Internalized racism*, on the other hand, denotes how an individual from a marginalized group may incorporate into his or her own self-schema the dehumanizing messages of his or her own in-group made by others. This individual may, as an outcome of exposure to negative stereotypes, denigrate his or her own in-group and act to distance himself or herself from members of that group. In essence, regardless of the form, racism is the behavioral manifestation of held beliefs and attitudes of a group.

7.2 BRIEF HISTORY OF RACISM RESEARCH IN AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGY

According to Duckitt (1992), there are seven distinct stages in the psychological study of race evident from the early 1900s to the 1990s. Duckitt explained that the field emerged from studies in which the main focus of research was to examine racial differences. The findings

of these studies, interpreted within a widely held framework of White racial superiority, perpetuated held assumptions of the inferiority of other racial groups. The interpretation of empirical findings both reflected prejudice that was prevalent at that time and helped to support negative stereotypes of the intellectual ability and hypersexuality of African Americans. The focus of study during the 20th century was also analyzed by Dovidio (2001). In his analysis, Dovidio collapsed several of the periods identified by Duckitt into three “waves” of research.

According to Dovidio (2001), there are three overlapping waves of prejudice research. During the first wave, psychologists viewed prejudice as a form of individual psychopathology or as a result of a pathological personality or defense mechanism (e.g., displacement). For instance, theories implicating authoritarian personalities as more likely to hold prejudicial attitudes and beliefs emerged then (e.g., Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). This focus on individual-level psychopathology and shift away from *race theories*, in which White superiority was promoted, likely stemmed from historical events. Namely, Americans during this period needed to resolve their own racial prejudices with the anti-Semitism that fueled attempts of genocide in Europe during World War II (Duckitt, 1992). The second period emerged toward the end of the 1950s and considered prejudice as a normative process. The shift in views also reflected a change from an individual-level focus to a macro-level influence on prejudicial attitudes and beliefs. Toward the end of this period, researchers noted the importance of measuring aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), modern racism (McConahay, 1986), and symbolic racism (e.g., Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976). They argued that, as a result of the civil rights movement of the 1960s, White Americans became more hesitant to openly express their racial hostility. Scholars argued that many White Americans hold egalitarian attitudes but harbored racist ideology that manifested behaviorally in subtle forms. During the last period, which emerged in the 1990s, prejudice was

studied as a multidimensional process in which both the holder and target of prejudice are examined. Specifically, whereas the focus of attention in the first two waves was to understand the personality of prejudiced individuals and the contents of their attitudes, research in the last wave examines the cognitive process involved in stereotype formation and management *and* the psychological responses of racism by targets. Researchers not only continued to study the old and modern forms of racial prejudice and the strategies used to control them (e.g., Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Plant & Devine, 1998), they also studied the psychological effects of perceived racism on the psychological and physiological functioning of African Americans (Bynum, Burton, & Best, 2007; Fang & Myers, 2001; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; McNeilly et al., 1996; Utsey & Hook, 2007; Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Cancelli, 2000).

More recently, researchers have begun to seek to understand the relationships among racism, coping strategies, and psychological functioning of other targeted groups (see Brondolo, ver Halen, Pencille, Beatty, & Contrada, 2009). For instance, there has been an incredible growth in the body of literature addressing the psychological sequelae of racism on Asian Americans (e.g., Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006; Gee, Delva, & Takeuchi, 2006; Lee, 2003, 2005; Liang, Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2007; Liang & Fassinger, 2008; Noh & Kaspar, 2004; Yoo, Burrola, & Steger, 2010; Yoo & Lee, 2005). Researchers also have studied the racial experiences of Latino/a Americans (e.g., Alderete, Vega, Kolody, & Aguilar-Gaxiola, 1999; Cassidy, O’Conner, Howe, & Warden, 2004; Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Moradi & Risco, 2006) and have begun to explore discrimination encountered by Arab Americans (e.g., Moradi & Hasan, 2004). Shifting their attention from the formation of prejudicial attitudes among White Americans, researchers also have begun to understand the costs of racism to Whites (e.g., Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Aiding the proliferation of these studies has been the increased attention to the development of race-related measures (see Bastos, Celeste, Faerstein, & Barros, 2010; Kressin, Raymond, & Manze, 2008).

7.3 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Racism and prejudice research has been guided by theory. Studies with a focus on prejudice initially relied on psychodynamic perspectives (e.g., Adorno et al., 1950), but these studies with their focus on individual-level differences were acontextual and could not address institutional racism (Duckitt, 1992). Gordon Allport's seminal book, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Allport, 1954), also was highly influential in the study of prejudice as it served as the foundation for subsequent conceptualizations (i.e., social-cognitive and social identity; Dovidio, 2001). The social-cognitive perspective (Hamilton, 1981) has led to studies of people's cognitions as they relate to people, groups, or social situations. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) also has influenced studies of paths by which stigma influences a target's self-concept (e.g., Major & O'Brien, 2005; Steele & Aronson, 1995). Other studies of the effects of perceived racial discrimination on physical and psychological health (see Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003) have been influenced by transactional stress frameworks (Harrell, 2000; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and biopsychosocial models (see Brondolo, Gallo, & Myers, 2009; Myers, 2009).

In this review we identified four main categories of measures that cut across the last two waves identified by Dovidio (2001). The 37 measures summarized in this chapter fall into one of the following four categories: (1) Racial Attitudes and Prejudice; (2) Perceived Racial Discrimination; (3) Psychological Responses to Racism; and (4) Adolescent Experiences.

7.4 RACIAL ATTITUDES AND PREJUDICE

Racial attitudes and prejudice have been a major area of study in the psychology of race. Perhaps, as evidence of the importance and relevance of this field of study, Nelson (2009) recently published the *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination*, in which past research and theory are presented and synthesized. In this chapter, we identified 13 self-report measures of racial attitudes and prejudice to summarize. Within this category there were five subcategories. The Miville-Guzman

Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS; Miville et al., 1999) and the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000) comprised the first subcategory. These two instruments were designed to measure general attitudes regarding racial issues. The second subcategory consisted of four measures focused on attitudes held of specific groups. For instance, the Attitude Toward Black Males Scale (ATBM; Bryson, 1998), the Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale (SR2K; Henry & Sears, 2002), and Modern and Old Fashioned Racism Scale (MOFRS; McConahay, 1986) measure attitudes held of African Americans. The Scale of Anti-Asian Stereotypes (SAAS; Lin, Kwan, Cheung, & Fiske, 2005) was one instrument within this subcategory designed to measure the attitudes held of a group other than African Americans. The third subcategory was composed of three instruments that were designed to measure multiple targets of prejudicial attitudes and beliefs (e.g., women, racial minorities, etc.). They were the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto, Burkard, Rieger, Grieger, et al., 1995), the ISM scale (ISMS; Aosved, Long, & Voller, 2009), and the Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale (M-GRISMS; Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000). The fourth category is composed of the Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (IMRPS/EMPRS; Plant & Devine, 1998) and Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPRS; Dunton & Fazio, 1997), which reflects the recognition of the fact that prejudice is composed of automatic and controlled processes. The final two instruments reflect the need to also study privilege. The White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS; Pinteritis, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009) and the Privilege and Oppression Inventory (POI; Hays, Chang, & Decker, 2007) were developed to measure privilege attitudes.

7.5 PERCEIVED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Researchers have long proposed that there are psychological costs of racism to its targets (e.g., Allport, 1954). While some authors argued that individuals from

stigmatized groups experienced lower levels of self-esteem, a review of the literature actually indicated mixed support for this contention (see Crocker & Major, 1989). One potential explanation is that self-esteem may actually have served as a protective factor against discrimination. Another possible explanation is that membership in a marginalized group does not in and of itself indicate racial experiences as a member of that group. In order to address this gap, researchers studied the relationship between perceived discrimination on a number of psychological outcomes (see Williams & Mohammed, 2009). There has been great variability in the measurement of perceived racial discrimination in these studies (Bastos et al., 2010; Kressin et al., 2008; Williams et al., 2003). Several self-report measures ($n = 9$), however, have been identified and are summarized in three subcategories. Three measures of perceived racial discrimination designed specifically for use to understand racism experiences of African Americans comprise the first subcategory. They are the Perceptions of Racism Scale (PRS; Green, 1995), Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), and Perceived Racism Scale (PRS; McNeilly et al., 1996). As a way to extend the study of racism and its impact on other minority groups, the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ; Contrada et al., 2001), Experiences of Discrimination (EOD; Krieger, Smith, Naishadham, Hartman, & Barbeau, 2005), General Ethnic Discrimination Scale (GEDS; Landrine, Klonoff, Corral, Fernandez, & Roesch, 2006), and the Scale of Ethnic Experience (SEE; Malcarne, Chavira, Fernandez, & Liu, 2006) have been developed. Interestingly, the Intragroup Marginalization Inventory (IMI; Castillo, Conoley, Brossart, & Quiros, 2007) and Own-group Conformity Pressure Scale (OGCP; Contrada et al., 2001) have been developed to measure perceptions of within-group experiences of discrimination and acculturative stress.

7.6 PSYCHOLOGICAL RESPONSES TO RACISM

A natural extension to the study of perceptions of racism is to examine the psychological outcomes of those

experiences. As noted earlier, researchers have found mixed but largely consistent support for the negative effects of perceived racism on health (see Carter, 2007; Williams et al., 2003). In this category of race-related instruments, we identified two subcategories. In the first subcategory, eight instruments measuring intrapersonal stress or coping are summarized. They are the Hispanic Stress Inventory (HIS; Cervantes, Padilla, & de Snyder, 1991), Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale (SCCS; Contrada et al., 2001), Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS; David & Okazaki, 2006), Asian American Racism Related Stress Inventory (AARRSI; Liang, Li, & Kim, 2004), Race-Related Stressor Scale (RRSS; Loo et al., 2001), Africultural Coping Systems Inventory (ACSI; Utsey, Adams, & Bolden, 2000), Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996), Internalization of the Model Minority Myth Measure (IM-4; Yoo, Burrola, & Steger, 2010). In the second subcategory, two instruments measuring interpersonal as well as intrapersonal outcomes of racism were summarized. These were the Psychosocial Costs of Racism for Whites (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004) and the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI; Terrell & Terrell, 1981).

7.7 ADOLESCENT EXPERIENCES

The final category of race-related instruments addresses race-related experiences of adolescents, including those measures that address perceived discrimination as well as racial socialization, the process by which a family and/or community imbues lessons about race relations and cultural pride to younger generations. Stevenson (1994) argued that racial socialization protects individuals from the negative effects of racial discrimination. There were five instruments included in our summary. They were the Everyday Discrimination Scale—Modified (EDS-M; Clark, Coleman, & Novak, 2004), Racial Bias Preparation Scale (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000), Adolescent Discrimination Distress Index (Fisher et al., 2000), the Scale of Racial Socialization—Adolescents (SORS-A; Stevenson, 1994), and the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale (TERS; Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002).

7.8 FUTURE RESEARCH

The inception of the field of racism and prejudice research nearly 100 years ago has, over the past 25 years, grown considerably (Major & O'Brien, 2005). Aiding this development has been the building of theory and measurement. Physiological, neurological, and behavioral measures all serve to provide researchers with the tools necessary to understand different facets of prejudice and racism. The purpose of this chapter was to provide a summary of self-report measures that may be employed in research and which, because of their ease of use, have potential clinical utility. In the course of summarizing the process by which measures were developed, we noted several potential areas for instrument development.

1. All measures of perceived racism summarized here address the experiences of monoracial individuals. However, the growth of the multiracial population is significant enough to warrant the development of instruments to measure multiracial individuals' experiences of discrimination. These instruments should be grounded in existing theoretical or empirical literature.

2. The body of measures of perceived racism treats race as the primary (and only) dimension by which individuals experience discrimination. However, individuals are members of multiple targeted social identity groups and may experience discrimination for each. Members of multiple targeted groups also may experience discrimination based on their fused identities (Moradi & Subich, 2003). Heterosexual men of color, who are privileged with respect to their gender and sexual orientation, may experience discrimination based on their gender *and* race, e.g., "angry Black male," "effeminate Asian American male." Scholars have only recently begun to explore the intersectionality or fused nature of discrimination. Instruments developed to

detect these experiences are needed to more fully understand how discrimination may influence psychological and physiological health.

3. More attention to within-group discrimination is needed. For instance, measures of *colorism*, the differential treatment among African Americans based on skin color, may be one direction for researchers to take.

4. While studies indicating a link between perceived discrimination and health indicate that there is great potential clinical utility of these measures, little work has been done to translate these instruments for use in clinical settings. For instance, some measures may be too long to administer or may require more advanced reading levels than may be found in community mental health settings. Thus, further work to reduce the cost (i.e., time) of administering instruments and greater attention to readability of racism measures is needed.

5. Since many of these measures are relatively new, more scrutiny of their psychometric properties is needed (see Chapter 2).

6. The study of attitudes and prejudice has a longer history than that of perceived discrimination. The field of study has made incredible advances from learning about the content of attitudes and the personality of prejudiced individuals to understanding the cognitive processes involved in developing beliefs and managing behaviors (Schneider, 2004). However, Stangor (2009) has argued that while much has been learned, psychologists have done little in real-world settings. He suggests greater efforts to link theory and research findings to social policy and educational practice. In line with the recommendations offered by Stangor, we call for the use of theory and measures of prejudice in real-world settings to help reduce intergroup conflict.

7.9 RACIAL ATTITUDES AND PREJUDICE

7.9.1 Name of the Measure	Intolerant Schema Measure ISM
Primary Reference	Aosved, A. C., Long, P. J., & Voller, E. K. (2009). Measuring sexism, racism, sexual prejudice, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance: The Intolerant Schema Measure. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39</i> , 2321–2354.
Purpose	The ISM is designed to measure intolerance toward others based on gender, race, sexual orientation, age, social class, and religious affiliation.
Description	<p>The ISM is a 54-item self-report inventory. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The ISM is composed of six subscales: (1) Sexual Prejudice; (2) Classism; (3) Sexism; (4) Racism; (5) Ageism; and (6) Religious Intolerance.</p> <p>Finding a lack of a single instrument designed to measure intolerance of multiple dimensions of difference, the authors combined established measures with items they created to form a 146-item version of the Intolerant Schema Measure. The existing measures included the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973), Neosexism Scale (NS; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995), the religious intolerance items from the Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM scale (M-GRISM; Godfrey, Richman, & Withers, 2000), Modern Homophobia Scale (MHS; Raja & Stokes, 1998), Modern and Old-Fashioned Racism Scale (MOFRS; McConahay, 1986), Economic Beliefs Scale (EBS; Stevenson & Medler, 1995), and the Frabroni Scale of Ageism (FSA; Frabroni, Saltstone, & Hughes, 1990). A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded a six-factor solution. Two separate confirmatory factor analyses indicated a similar factor structure. Goodness-of-fit indices were not reported.</p>
Samples	<p>The measure was established using three samples. The first sample, composed of 523 college students (325 females, 198 males) attending a university in the Midwest of the United States, ranged in age from 18–55 ($M = 20.5$ years, $SD = 3.5$). This sample was composed of White Americans ($n = 432$), African Americans ($n = 16$), Latino/a Americans ($n = 9$), Native Americans ($n = 25$), and Asian Americans ($n = 28$). Thirteen individuals reported “other.” With respect to sexual orientation, 98% reported being heterosexual. A majority of the participants were Protestants ($n = 358$), Catholic ($n = 71$), Buddhist, Muslim, or Hindu ($n = 15$), Agnostic or Atheist ($n = 17$), Wiccan ($n = 1$), nonaffiliated ($n = 43$), and other ($n = 17$).</p> <p>A second independent sample was composed of 475 college students (181 females; 294 males), in the Midwest of the United States, who ranged in age from 18–54 ($M = 19.8$ years, $SD = 2.9$). The sample was composed of White Americans ($n = 403$), African Americans ($n = 10$), Latino/a Americans ($n = 19$), Asian Americans ($n = 25$), and “other” ($n = 5$). Ninety-eight percent reported being heterosexual. A majority of the participants were Protestants ($n = 313$), Catholic ($n = 60$), Buddhist, Muslim, or Hindu ($n = 6$), Agnostic or Atheist ($n = 15$), Wiccan ($n = 1$), Jewish ($n = 1$), nonaffiliated ($n = 54$), and other ($n = 24$).</p>

	<p>A third sample ($N = 115$) of college students (84 female, 30 male, 1 not reported) was recruited from undergraduate psychology and sociology courses at a small west coast university. These participants ranged in age from 18–55 ($M = 22.0$ year, $SD = 6.2$). This sample was composed of Latino/a Americans ($n = 47$), White Americans ($n = 38$), African Americans ($n = 15$), Native Americans ($n = 2$), Asian Americans ($n = 3$), biracial ($n = 6$), and “other” ($n = 4$). Ninety-six percent of the sample reported being heterosexual. A majority of the participants were Protestants ($n = 37$), Catholic ($n = 45$), Buddhist, Muslim, or Hindu ($n = 4$), Agnostic or Atheist ($n = 10$), Jewish ($n = 1$), nonaffiliated ($n = 13$), and other ($n = 3$).</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the subscales of the ISM is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sexual Prejudice: 9 items Classism: 9 items Sexism: 9 items Racism: 9 items Ageism: 9 items Religious Intolerance: 9 items Total ISM: 54 items <p>Scoring the ISM consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items in the specific subscale. Higher scores indicate more intolerant belief systems. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>The range in Cronbach’s alpha for the scores on the total and subscales were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sexual Prejudice: Alpha = .89–.92 Classism: Alpha = .80–.85 Sexism: Alpha = .82–.84 Racism: Alpha = .78–.83 Ageism: Alpha = .78–.82 Religious Intolerance: Alpha = .70–.80 Total ISM: Alpha = .93 <p>Two week test-retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sexual Prejudice: $r = .91$ Classism: $r = .84$ Sexism: $r = .85$ Racism: $r = .86$ Ageism: $r = .78$ Religious Intolerance: $r = .72$ Total ISM: $r = .90$

(Continued)

(Continued)

Validity	<p>Criterion-related validity was established by examining the correlations between the ISM subscale scores and the full original score from which items were derived. Each subscale was correlated strongly and positively to the original score. All subscale scores (except for Sexual Prejudice) were inversely correlated with social desirability. Social dominance (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) also was found to be significantly positively correlated with each subscale score.</p> <p>Known-groups validity also was established. Specifically, ethnic minorities reported greater racial tolerance than did White Americans. Men also reported higher levels of gender intolerance than did women. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual men and women reported less sexual prejudice than did heterosexual individuals.</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Allison Aosved Pacific Islands Health Care System 459 Patterson Road Honolulu, HI 96819</p>

7.9.2 Name of the Measure	Attitudes Toward Black Males Scale ATBM
Primary Reference	Bryson, S. (1998). Relationship between race and attitudes toward black men. <i>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development</i> , 26, 282–293.
Purpose	The ATBM is intended to measure an individual's attitudes toward Black men.
Description	<p>The ATBM is a 47-item self-report inventory. The measure utilizes a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = I Agree Very Much to 6 = I Disagree Very Much.</p> <p>The ATBM is composed of eight subscales: (1) Intellectual Ability; (2) Criminal Justice; (3) Expectations of Preferential Treatment; (4) Personality; (5) Sociability; (6) Employment; (7) Self-Confidence; (8) Global Characteristics.</p> <p>Along with other professionals, the author of the instrument examined the Attitudes Toward the Disabled Person Scale (ATDS; Yunker, Block, & Campbell, 1962) for appropriateness for use as a measure of attitudes toward Black males. Nearly all of the items of the ATDS were retained, with the word <i>Disabled</i> replaced with <i>Black males</i>. Additional items also were included based on a review of the professional literature. This process generated 80 items but was reduced to 68 after a review by a panel of three experts.</p> <p>A principal components analysis with varimax rotation and an examination of a scree plot yielded eight factors. Items were retained if they met the author's .30 criterion. A 55-item measure resulted from this process. Reliability analysis indicated an improved Cronbach reliability coefficient through the deletion of eight items. Thus, the final measure contains 47 items.</p>
Samples	Initial validation of the measure was established using a sample of 694 graduate (19%) and undergraduate college (81%) students (59% women; 41% men) attending a large comprehensive research university in the Midwest. Data from 630 participants from this sample were used to compare differences between White American and African American students. Of these participants, 187 (30%) were African American and 442 (70%) are White American.
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the subscales of the ATBM is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intellectual Ability: 2 items Criminal Justice: 3 items Expectations of Preferential Treatment: 6 items Personality: 11 items Sociability: 6 items Employment: 4 items

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>Self-Confidence: 5 items Global Characteristics: 10 items Total ATBM = 47</p> <p>Some items, which are worded in the positive direction, required recoding. Scoring the ATBM consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicated more agreement with negative stereotypes. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the total scale and its subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Intellectual Ability: Alpha = .72 Criminal Justice: Alpha = .62 Expectations of Preferential Treatment: Alpha = .69 Personality: Alpha = .81 Sociability: Alpha = .65 Employment: Alpha = .29 Self-Confidence: Alpha = .76 Global Characteristics: Alpha = .84 Total ATBM: Alpha = .94</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity was determined through significant relationships in the expected direction with measures of Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and Subtle Prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).</p> <p>Concurrent validity was established through the use of <i>t</i>-tests and chi-square analysis. Results indicated significant differences between White and Black participants on 5 of the 8 subscales (i.e., intellectual ability, criminal justice, sociability, self-confidence, and global characteristics) and the total score, such that White participants held more negative attitudes toward Black men than did their Black counterparts.</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Seymour Bryson Southern Illinois University, Carbondale 110 Anthony Hall Carbondale, IL 62901-4341 (618) 453-2350 Email: Bryson@siu.edu</p>

7.9.3 Name of the Measure	Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale MCPRS
Primary Reference	Dunton, B. C., & Fazio, R. H. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i> , 23, 316–326.
Purpose	The MCPRS is designed to measure factors that contribute to controlling immediate negative racial attitudes toward Blacks.
Description	<p>The MCPRS is a 17-item self-report inventory. Each item is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: -3 = Strongly Disagree and +3 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The MCPRS is composed of a two subscales: (1) Concern With Acting Prejudiced; (2) Restraint to Avoid Dispute.</p> <p>Based on a review of literature on prejudice, the authors developed 19 statements measuring participants' desire to control appearing prejudiced to others, distaste for negative reactions that they may have in their interactions with Blacks, and avoidance of conflict. Two of the initial 19 items were removed after reliability analysis demonstrated that they did not contribute to the internal consistency of the measure. This analysis resulted in a 17-item measure.</p> <p>A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded five factors. However, the authors indicated that these factors were not stable across their three samples. Instability also was evident when the authors attempted to force a four- and three-factor solution. A two-factor solution did yield a stable factor structure. The authors reported using Everett's (1983) factor comparability coefficient procedure to directly determine that two factors should be retained.</p>
Samples	Validation of the measure was established using three pooled samples. The first sample was composed of 418 undergraduate students. The second sample was composed of 429 undergraduate students. The final sample was composed of 207 individuals who responded to an advertisement in local and campus newspapers. The demographic background of the participants was not reported.
Scoring	The number of items for each subscale was not reported. A number of items require reverse scoring. It appears that scoring the MCPRS consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate more desire to control prejudiced reactions. Means were not reported. No transformations are required.
Reliability	Cronbach's alpha for the full scale score ranged from .75 to .77.

(Continued)

(Continued)

Validity	Criterion validity was established through significant inverse correlations with the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986) and self-reported prejudiced attitudes toward African Americans.
Related References	Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44</i> , 164–172. Muraven, M. (2008). Prejudice as self-control failure. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38</i> , 314–333.
Language Versions	English
Contact	Russell H. Fazio Department of Psychology 1835 Neil Avenue Ohio State University Columbus, OH 43210–1287 (614) 688–5408 Email: fazio.11@osu.edu

7.9.4 Name of the Measure	Modified Godfrey-Richman ISM Scale M-GRISMS-M
Primary Reference	Godfrey, S., Richman, C. L., & Withers, T. N. (2000). Reliability and validity of a new scale to measure prejudice: The GRISMS. <i>Current Psychology, 19</i> , 3–20.
Purpose	The M-GRISMS-M was designed to measure cognitions, actions, and behaviors associated with racism, sexism, and heterosexism.
Description	<p>The M-GRISMS-M is a 33-item self-report inventory that utilizes multiple response formats: yes/no, rankings, and Likert-type ratings.</p> <p>The authors describe the M-GRISMS-M as being composed of the following three or four subscales: Racism, Sexism, and Heterosexism. A religion subscale was found to not have strong internal consistency. Factor analysis, however, indicates that the M-GRISMS is composed of 10 factors: (1) Violations of Social Roles; (2) Anti-Jewish; (3) Religious Morality; (4) Social Morality; (5) True Male Behaviors; (6) Power Motive; (7) Self-Centered; (8) Stereotypical Character Flaws; (9) Male Aggression vs. Affection; and (10) Competence.</p> <p>An initial 90-item measure composed the original GRISMS. Fifty of those items were selected for further study. Based on interitem correlations and response scale, some items were deleted before data from the M-GRISMS were submitted for factor analysis. This deletion process yielded a 33-item M-GRISMS-M measure. With an oblimin extraction method, factor analysis with data from the Attitudes toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) and the M-GRISMS-M yielded 10 factors.</p>
Samples	Validation of this measure was established using a sample of 131 college students (71 women, 60 men) who ranged from 18 to 23 years of age. The sample was composed mostly of White American individuals (93%). African Americans (5%) and Asian and Native Americans (2%) also were represented in the sample. The sample primarily identified as Christian in faith (92%). The sample also was composed of Agnostic or Atheist (5%). All but 1% of the sample identified as heterosexual in sexual orientation.
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale of the M-GRISMS-M is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Violations of Social Roles: 5 items Anti-Jewish: 3 items Religious Morality: 3 items Social Morality: 3 items True Male Behaviors: 4 items Power Motive: 4 items Self-Centered: 3 items Stereotypical Character Flaws: 3 items

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>Male Aggression vs. Affection: 3 items</p> <p>Competence: 2 items</p> <p>Total M-GRISMS: 33 items</p> <p>A score on the M-GRISMS-M subscales or total scale may be computed by including a sum of all items of the subscale or by excluding items that are reflective of that group.</p>
Reliability	<p>Reliability coefficients were calculated for the proposed subscales and for the total scale but not for the factors that emerged from factor analysis.</p> <p>Racism Subscale: Alpha = .64</p> <p>Sexism Subscale: Alpha = .52</p> <p>Heterosexism Subscale: Alpha = .72</p> <p>Religion Subscale: Alpha = .40</p> <p>Total M-GRISMS-M: Alpha = .82</p> <p>8-Week Test-retest reliability coefficients also were presented:</p> <p>Racism Subscale: $r = .80$</p> <p>Sexism Subscale: $r = .77$</p> <p>Heterosexism Subscale: $r = .81$</p> <p>Religion Subscale: $r = .75$</p> <p>Total M-GRISMS-M: $r = .89$</p>
Validity	<p>Construct validity was established through a significant relationship found between measures of racism (McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981), heterosexism (Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980), and sexism (Spence et al., 1973).</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	The full scale can be found in Godfrey et al. (2000).

7.9.5 Name of the Measure	Privilege and Oppression Inventory POI
Primary Reference	Hays, D. G., Chang, C. Y., & Decker, S. L. (2007). Initial development and psychometric data for the Privilege and Oppression Inventory. <i>Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development</i> , 40, 66–79.
Purpose	The POI is designed to measure an individual’s awareness of privilege and oppression around issues of race, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and religion.
Description	<p>The POI is a 16-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The POI is composed of 4 subscales: (1) White Privilege Awareness; (2) Heterosexism Awareness; (3) Christian Privilege Awareness; and (4) Sexism Awareness.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through several steps. An initial pool of 107 items was created based on data from two qualitative studies, a review of research literature regarding multicultural counseling competencies, multicultural assessment, social advocacy, and privilege and oppression in counseling. Six multicultural experts reviewed the items for clarity and appropriateness of content. This resulted in an 83-item instrument.</p> <p>Sampling adequacy was first established. Principal axis extraction with promax oblique rotation was then conducted and yielded nine factors of eigenvalues greater than 1.0. A four-factor solution was selected as most interpretable. Items with structure coefficients loadings of .30 or greater on only one factor were retained. All other items were deleted. This resulted in a 39-item POI. Confirmatory factor analysis, using AMOS (Arbuckle, 1999), was used to test for stability of the factor structure. Their data fit a four-factor solution best.</p>
Samples	A sample of 428 diverse trainees (81.5% women) attending a counseling-related program with a median age of 27 years. A second sample of 206 trainees from eight counseling programs also was used. Their mean age was 31 years. The first sample was composed of 70% White Americans, 19% African Americans, 5% Multiracial/Biracial Americans, 3% Asian Americans, 2% Latino/a Americans, and 1% Native Americans. These two samples were combined for the study of the validity and structure of the POI. Data from a subsample (not used in the EFA) of the original sample were submitted to a confirmatory factor analysis.

(Continued)

(Continued)

Scoring	<p>The number of items for each of the four subscales of the POI is as follows:</p> <p>White Privilege Awareness: 13 items Heterosexism Awareness: 10 items Christian Privilege Awareness: 8 items Sexism Awareness: 8 items Total POI: 39 items</p> <p>Two items require reverse scoring. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher experience of the psychosocial costs of racism. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores ranged from .63–.78.</p> <p>White Privilege Awareness: Alpha = .92 Heterosexism Awareness: Alpha = .81 Christian Privilege Awareness: Alpha = .86 Sexism Awareness: Alpha = .79</p> <p>Two-week test-retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>White Privilege: $r = .89$ Heterosexism Awareness: $r = .86$ Christian Privilege Awareness: $r = .84$ Sexism Awareness: $r = .79$</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of POI subscales was established through expected positive correlations with M-GUDS (Fuertes et al., 2000), and the QDI (Ponterotto, Potere, & Johansen, 2002) and a negative correlation with social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Danica Hays Educational Leadership and Counseling 110 Education Building Old Dominion University Norfolk, VA 23529 Email: dhays@odu.edu</p>

7.9.6 Name of the Measure	The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale SR2KS
Primary Reference	Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. <i>Political Psychology</i> , 23, 253–283.
Purpose	The SR2KS is designed to measure the racial attitudes of White Americans and members of other racial groups toward African Americans.
Description	<p>The SR2KS is an 8-item Likert-type self-report inventory. Most of these items are rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree. One item included a 4-point scale with different anchors (i.e., “trying to push very much too fast,” “going too slowly,” and “moving at about the right speed”). Other items were measured on a 3-point scale that included options such as “A Lot,” “Only Some,” and “Not Much at All” or “All of It,” “Most,” “Some,” “Not Much at All.”</p> <p>The SR2KS is composed of two subscales: (1) Traditional Racial Attitudes and (2) Political Predisposition.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through several steps. Items were constructed based on a review of the symbolic, subtle, aversive, and modern racism literature and upon previous iterations of the Symbolic Racism Scale.</p> <p>The authors submitted data, gathered from three previous studies, to an exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotation. This analysis yielded a two-factor solution. The first factor, traditional racial attitude, included themes of “work ethic and responsibility for outcomes” and “excessive demands.” The second factor, political predisposition, included “denial of continuing discrimination” and “underserved advantage.” Data from other previous studies were submitted for confirmatory factor analysis. The authors reported using a principal axis method with oblique rotation.</p>
Samples	Data from five studies involving 647, 694, 145, 142, and 702 college students were used to establish and test the psychometric properties of this measure. The sample included 887 White Americans, 512 Latino/a Americans, 496 Asian Americans, and 186 African Americans with 248 individuals reporting a multiracial background or who did not specify. Data presented below reflect analyses involving White American participants.
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the two subscales is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional Racial Attitudes: 4 items Political Predisposition: 4 items Total SR2KS: 8 items <p>Several items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of negative attitudes toward African Americans. No transformations are required.</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

Reliability	The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the total score ranged from .59 to .79 across the samples.
Validity	<p>Predictive validity was established through significant correlations between conservative political predispositions and opposition to racial policy preferences.</p> <p>Known-groups validity also was demonstrated through one-way analysis of variance procedures, which indicated that African Americans scored lower on this measure than did other groups.</p>
Related References	Green, E. G. T., Staerkle, C., & Sears, D. O. (2006). Symbolic racism and Whites' attitudes toward punitive and preventive crime policies. <i>Law and Human Behavior, 30</i> , 435–454.
Language Versions	English
Contact	http://condor.depaul.edu/~phenry1/SR2Kinstructions.htm

7.9.7 Name of the Measure	Scale of Anti-Asian American Stereotypes SAAAS
Primary Reference	Lin, M. H., Kwan, V. S. Y., Cheung, A., & Fiske, S. T. (2005). Stereotype content model explains prejudice for an envied outgroup: Scale of Anti-Asian American stereotypes. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i> , 31, 34–47.
Purpose	The SAAAS is intended to measure an individual's stereotypic attitudes toward Asian Americans.
Description	<p>The SAAAS is a 25-item self-report inventory. The measure utilizes a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 0 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The SAAAS is composed of two related subscales: (1) Competence and (2) (Un)sociability.</p> <p>Seventy-six undergraduate students developed a list of stereotypes of Asian Americans. This list was content analyzed and revealed three major areas of stereotypes (i.e., [un]sociability, competence, and foreignness). This process led to an initial 131-item measure.</p> <p>A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded three factors. Items were retained if they met the authors' .50 criterion. None of the items correlating with the third factor met this criterion. Items with a high structure coefficient on a second factor also were not retained. Through this process, the SAAAS was shortened to 25 items. An unweighted least-square factor analysis with oblique rotation determined the eventual two-factor structure of the SAAAS. Additional analyses using LISREL VIII (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) with two samples confirmed that data fit a two-factor solution better than a one-factor model.</p>
Samples	Initial validation of the measure was established using three samples of undergraduate college students from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The first sample was composed of 296 individuals (237 women, 59 men) who received extra credit for their participation. This sample was composed of 231 White Americans, 32 non-Asian people of color, 27 Asian Americans, and 6 individuals who did not indicate their racial background. The remaining two samples involved White American students enrolled in lower-level undergraduate psychology courses. The first of these two samples was composed of 429 students (248 women, 178 men, and 3 unspecified).
Scoring	<p>The number of items on the subscales are as follows:</p> <p>Competence: 12 items</p> <p>(Un)sociable: 13 items</p> <p>Total SAAAS: 25 items</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

	Seven of the items are negatively worded. Scoring the SAAAS consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicated more prejudice. No transformations are required.
Reliability	Cronbach's alpha for the total and subscale scores were as follows: Sociability: Alpha = .91 Competence: Alpha = .92 Total SAAAS: Alpha = .94
Validity	Convergent validity was determined through significant relationships in the expected direction with measures of Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and Subtle Prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Concurrent validity also was established through the use of one-way multivariate analysis of variance. Results indicated a significant effect of prejudice level on self-reported everyday interactions with Asian Americans. Specifically, individuals with high levels of prejudice reported less effort to socialize with Asian Americans, have less active exposure to Asian American culture, overestimate the percentage of Asian Americans on campus, and have fewer Asian American acquaintances than those with low levels of prejudice. Individuals with lower levels of prejudice against Asian Americans also were more likely to choose to have an Asian American roommate, have read literature with Asian American authors, and be more curious about Asian Americans than those with higher levels of prejudice. Correlation analyses in a separate study supported these findings. Further evidence of concurrent validity was established in another study. Individuals who held high levels of attitudes of Asian Americans as (un)sociable had negative impressions of an Asian American confederate. Individuals who held high levels of attitudes of Asian Americans as sociable did not perceive the Asian American confederate in a negative or positive manner. Individuals who viewed Asian Americans as less sociable also were found to make more mistakes on a recall task. Specifically, they made more mistakes recalling what the Asian American confederate announced.
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	Susan T. Fiske Department of Psychology Princeton University Princeton, NY 08544-1010 Email: Sfiske@princeton.edu

7.9.8 Name of the Measure	Modern and Old Fashioned Racism Scale MOFRS
Primary Reference	McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), <i>Prejudice, discrimination, and racism</i> (pp. 91–125). New York: Academic Press. McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. <i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i> , 25, 563–579.
Purpose	The MOFRS is designed to measure the cognitive component of racial attitudes of White Americans toward African Americans.
Description	The MOFRS is a 12-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. The MOFRS is composed of two subscales: (1) Modern Racism and (2) Old Fashioned Racism. The instrument was developed through several steps. First, items were constructed based on a review of the racism literature, the literary definition of symbolic racism, and the theory of modern racism. A series of factor analyses have been conducted to test the structure of the MOFRS. In these studies, maximum likelihood methods with oblique rotations were used to extract factors. Results indicated a two-factor solution, with Modern Racism and Old Fashioned Racism being distinct and correlated.
Samples	Three samples of White American adults or White American college students were used in one of three studies. In the first sample, 875 White American adults from Kentucky were used. The second study was composed of 709 White American adults, also from Kentucky. In the third sample, 167 White American college students from private university in the south were used. Gender was not reported.
Scoring	The number of items for the two subscales of the MOFRS is as follows: Old Fashioned Racism (OFRS): 6 items Modern Racism (MRS): 6 items Total MOFRS: 12 items Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher levels of old fashioned and modern racism. No transformations are required.
Reliability	A Cronbach coefficient alpha of .82 was reported for the score of the Modern Racism Scale and .75 to .79 for score on the Old Fashioned Racism Scale.

(Continued)

(Continued)

Validity	<p>Convergent validity of MOFRS subscales was established through expected findings of significant negative correlations with attitudes toward busing (McConahay, 1982), positive correlations with preference for a White American candidate in an election (Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976), and positive associations with sympathetic identification with the underdog (McConahay & Hough, 1976) and anti-Black feelings as measured by the Feeling Thermometer (Campbell, 1971).</p> <p>Construct validity was established through a series of experiments in which results indicated that individuals reported lower levels of Old Fashioned Racism when the test administrator was African American than in cases in which the test administrator was a White American. In this same experiment, as predicted, responses to Modern Racism were unaffected by the racial background of the test administrator. A second study employing similar research methodology found similar results. In another study, individuals with more positive attitudes toward African Americans also were more likely to have positive attitudes toward hiring them.</p>
Related References	<p>Goff, P. A., Steele, C. M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94</i>, 91–107.</p> <p>Lun, J., Sinclair, S., Whitchurch, E. R., & Glenn, C. (2007). (Why) Do I think what you think? Epistemic social tuning and implicit prejudice. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93</i>, 957–972.</p> <p>Sabnani, H., & Ponterotto, J. (1992). Racial/ethnic minority-specific instrumentation in counseling research: A review, critique, and recommendations. <i>Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 24</i>, 161–187.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	The items of the MOFRS may be found in McConahay (1986).

7.9.9 Name of the Measure	Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale M-GUDS
Primary Reference	Miville, M. L., Gelso, C. J., Pannu, R., Liu, W., Touradji, P., Holloway, P., & Fuertes, J. (1999). Appreciating similarities and valuing differences: The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i> , 46, 291–307.
Purpose	The M-GUDS is designed to measure an individual's awareness and acceptance of similarities and differences in others.
Description	<p>The M-GUDS is a 45-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree. The M-GUDS is composed of 3 subscales: (1) Diversity of Contact; (2) Relativistic Appreciation; and (3) Sense of Connection (or Comfort with Differences).</p> <p>The initial 45-item instrument was developed to measure behavioral, cognitive, and affective components of a Universal-Diverse orientation. These items were based on a review of racism and prejudice literature. Five counseling psychology doctoral students provided feedback regarding the appropriateness and clarity of the initial pool of 78 items and their proposed subscales. A pilot study to examine the item-subscale total-score correlations was conducted. Thirty-three items were deleted as a result of these processes. Initial exploratory factor analysis indicated that the M-GUDS was best conceptualized as a unidimensional measure UDO with behavioral, cognitive, and affective components. Subsequent factor analysis provided support for the originally hypothesized three-factor structure of UDO (see Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000).</p>
Samples	Study of the psychometric properties of the M-GUDS included multiple samples. Miville et al. (1999) provided evidence for validity based on four separate samples ($N_s = 93, 111, 153, \text{ and } 135$). Fuertes et al. (2000) examined the factor structure of the M-GUDS using a separate sample ($N = 335$). All samples included male and female college students recruited from nonclinical settings. For all but one study, the samples were ethnically diverse and were recruited from predominantly White institutions. Two additional samples were recruited to establish a short version of the M-GUDS (the M-GUDS-S). One sample was composed of students from a public university ($N = 206$). The other sample was composed of students from a private university ($N = 186$).
Scoring	<p>The number of items for the subscales of the M-GUDS and M-GUDS-S are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity of Contact: 15 items Relativistic Appreciation: 15 items Sense of Connection (or Comfort with Differences): 15 items Total M-GUDS: 45 items <p>M-GUDS Short (M-GUDS-S)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity of Contact: 5 items Relativistic Appreciation: 5 items Sense of Connection (or Comfort with Differences): 5 items Total M-GUDS-S: 15 items

(Continued)

(Continued)

	Three items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of each subscale. No transformations are required.
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the score of total full scale was as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total M-GUDS: Alpha = .92</p> <p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscales scores on the Short version were as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Diversity of Contact: Alpha = .82</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Relativistic Appreciation: Alpha = .59</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Sense of Connection (or Comfort with Differences): Alpha = .92</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total M-GUDS-S: Alpha = .77</p> <p>2-Week Test-Retest reliability for the total full scale score was: $r = .94$.</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of M-GUDS was established through expected correlations with White racial identity attitudes (Helms & Carter, 1990), homophobia (Hansen, 1982), dogmatism (Troidahl & Powell, 1965), perspective taking (Davis, 1983), and healthy narcissism (Goldman & Gelso, 1997). Discriminant validity was established through the lack of correlation with SAT scores and through mixed findings with a measure of social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964).</p> <p>Contrary to expectations, no significant correlations were found between the M-GUDS and fantasy or personal distress (Davis, 1983) or defensive narcissism (Goldman & Gelso, 1997).</p> <p>For the M-GUDS-S, convergent validity was demonstrated through significant correlations, in the expected directions, with single items centered on diversity-related issues. Results also indicate no significant effect of race on the M-GUDS-S or its subscales.</p>
Related References	<p>Fuertes, J. N., Miville, M. L., Mohr, J. J., Sedlacek, W. E., & Gretchen, D. (2000). Factor structure and short form of the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. <i>Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development</i>, 33, 157–169.</p> <p>Spanierman, L. B., Todd, N. R., & Anderson, C. J. (2009). Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Understanding patterns among university students. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i>, 56, 239–252.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Marie L. Miville Teachers College Columbia University Counseling and Clinical Psychology 525 West 120th Street Box 73 New York, NY 10027–6696 (212) 678–3343 Email: miville@exchange.tc.columbia</p>

7.9.10 Name of the Measure	Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale CoBRAS
Primary Reference	Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i> , 47, 59–70.
Purpose	The CoBRAS is intended to measure the cognitive aspects of color-blind racial attitudes.
Description	<p>The CoBRAS is a 20-item self-report inventory. The measure utilizes a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The CoBRAS is composed of three subscales: (1) Racial Privilege; (2) Institutional Discrimination; and (3) Blatant Racial Issues.</p> <p>The initial 17 items of the CoBRAS were developed based on current definitions of color-blind racial attitudes, interdisciplinary literature, consultation with scholars of racial attitudes, and discussions with diverse graduate and undergraduate students as well as with individuals from the community. These items were written by a team of researchers from diverse backgrounds. In order to assess content validity, a panel of five experts rated the items for appropriateness and clarity. This panel rated two items as inappropriate or unclear. These items were deleted. Seven items were reworded and 11 items were added. These 26 items were rated for clarity and appropriateness by the original team of researchers. Four items were reworded for greater clarity based on the ratings of clarity and appropriateness by individuals from the community.</p> <p>Using a computer software program, the scale was rated to be appropriate for individuals with more than a 6th-grade reading level.</p> <p>A principal components analysis resulted in five factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00. Using both oblique and orthogonal rotations, data were reanalyzed for a five-, four-, three-, two-, and one-factor solution. Using an equimax rotation, a three-factor solution was found to be the most interpretable. Six items were deleted from this process. Confirmatory factor analysis provided support for this three-factor solution.</p>
Samples	<p>The psychometric properties of this measure were established over the course of five studies. The first sample involved 302 college students and community members from the Midwest and West Coast. Participants' ages ranged from 17–52 ($M = 20.57$; $SD = 8.56$). With respect to gender, women ($n = 212$) constituted the majority of this sample. There also are 86 men in the sample, leaving 4 individuals who did not report their gender. A majority of the sample was White Americans ($n = 256$), with 24 African Americans, 3 Native Americans, 10 Asian Americans, and 9 Latino/a Americans. Four percent of the sample either did not indicate a race or reported "other."</p> <p>The second sample was composed of 594 college students or community members from the Midwest and West Coast. The sample was more evenly composed of women ($n = 304$) and men ($n = 289$). One participant did not report gender.</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>Participants' ages ranged from 14–88 ($M = 22.78$; $SD = 9.14$). Sixty-seven percent of the sample identified as White American, nearly 20% identified as African American, 5% as Chicano/a American, 2% as Asian American, and 1% as Native American. The remaining 6% did not specify a racial or ethnic classification.</p> <p>The third sample was composed of 102 college students (74 women; 28 men) attending a predominantly White university in the Midwest. Ninety percent of the sample identified as White American. Eighty-three percent of the sample was undergraduate students.</p> <p>The fourth sample was composed of 89 women, 55 men, and one individual who did not indicate his or her gender. These participants were college students and community members from the Midwest and West Coast. Their ages ranged from 18–85 ($M = 31.37$; $SD = 16.88$). Seventy percent of the sample identified as White Americans.</p> <p>In the fifth study, 28 undergraduate students at a major West Coast university (21 women; 7 men). The mean age was 19.57 years ($SD = 1.50$). With respect to racial background, the sample was composed of 7 African American, 7 Asian Americans, Latino/a American or 5 Latino/a American or Chicano/a Americans, 3 White Americans, 1 Native American, and 5 multiracial individuals.</p>
Scoring	<p>There are a total of 20 items on the measure.</p> <p>Racial Privilege: 7 items Institutional Discrimination: 7 items Blatant Racial Issues: 6 items Total CoBRAS: 20 items</p> <p>Half of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the CoBRAS consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicated higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the scores on the total and subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Racial Privilege: Alpha = .71 to .83 Institutional Discrimination: Alpha = .73 to .81 Blatant Racial Issues: Alpha = .70 to .76 Total CoBRAS: Alpha = .84 to .91</p> <p>Two-week test-retest reliability coefficients for the total and subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Racial Privilege: $r = .80$ Institutional Discrimination: $r = .80$ Blatant Racial Issues: $r = .34$ Total CoBRAS: $r = .68$</p> <p>Guttman split-half reliability coefficient:</p> <p>Total CoBRAS: $r = .72$</p>

<p>Validity</p>	<p>Convergent validity was determined through significant relationships in the expected direction with measures of Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and Subtle Prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).</p> <p>Concurrent validity was established through significant correlations between each of the three CoBRAS subscales and the two subscales of the Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991), the Multidimensional Belief in a Just World Scale (MBJWS; Furnham & Procter, 1988), the Quick Discrimination Index (Ponterotto et al., 1995), and the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986).</p> <p>Criterion validity was established through the use of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to compare responses from the different racial groups on the three CoBRAS subscales. In one study, MANOVA indicated that Black individuals reported lower scores on the Institutional Discrimination subscale than did Latino/a American and White American participants. White American participants reported significantly lower scores on the Blatant Racism subscale than did Black participants. Latino/a participants reported significantly lower Racial Privilege and Blatant Racial Issues subscales than did Black American and White American participants. In a second study, White American participants were found to have higher Institutional Discrimination subscale scores than did an aggregated “racial minority” group.</p> <p>MANOVA also was used to test for significant differences based on gender. Results from several MANOVA did not indicate a consistent pattern of expected differences. In two of the three studies, women were found to have significantly lower CoBRAS scores than did men. No significant effect of gender on the three CoBRAS scores was found in a third study.</p> <p>Discriminant validity was demonstrated through lack of significant correlations between the three CoBRAS subscales and Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale–Short (Reynolds, 1982).</p>
<p>Related References</p>	<p>Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Beer, A. M., & Armstrong, P. I. (2006). Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Exploring patterns through cluster analysis. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53</i>, 434–441.</p> <p>Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial ethnic group membership and college students’ perceptions of campus climate. <i>Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1</i>, 8–19.</p>
<p>Language Versions</p>	<p>English</p>
<p>Contact</p>	<p>Helen A. Neville Educational Psychology 188f Education 1310 S. Sixth M/C 708 Champaign, IL 61820 Email: hneville@illinois.edu</p>

7.9.11 Name of the Measure	The White Privilege Attitudes Scale WPAS
Primary Reference	Pinteritis, E. J., Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2009). The White Privilege Attitudes Scale: Development and initial validation. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56</i> , 417–429.
Purpose	The WPAS is designed to measure the cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions of an individual's White privilege attitudes.
Description	<p>The WPAS is a 28-item Likert-type self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The WPAS is composed of four subscales: (1) Willingness to Confront White Privilege; (2) Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege; (3) White Privilege Awareness; and (4) White Privilege Remorse.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through several steps. An initial pool of 111 items was created based on a review of research literature regarding White privilege and a consideration of the tripartite models of attitudes that include cognitive, behavioral, and affective components. The authors also consulted leading scholars in the area of critical Whiteness studies. In the first phase, five faculty and four graduate students with experience in multicultural counseling, White attitudes toward race, and the study of racism generated 160 items. The authors then consulted five scholars of White privilege who rated each item for appropriateness and clarity. This resulted in 111 items.</p> <p>Experts in scale construction then edited items that were double-barreled and deleted redundant items. This resulted in 81 items, of which 15 were reverse coded.</p> <p>The authors first tested their data to ensure their sample was appropriate for factor analysis. An exploratory factor analysis, using maximum likelihood extraction with oblique rotation, was used. Items correlating with multiple factors with values of .25 or greater and those with structure coefficients less than .45 were deleted. This resulted in a 28-item measure with four factors. Confirmatory factor analysis, using LISREL 8.7 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006), was used to test for stability of the factor structure. Their data fit a four-factor solution best.</p>
Samples	A sample of 501 White Americans was recruited from several colleges and universities from across the United States. The sample was split into two in order to explore and confirm the structure of the WPAS and establish validity. In the first sample of 250 individuals, 78% were undergraduate students, 18% were graduate students, with 4% not indicating their school standing. In terms of gender, 65% of the sample identified as women, 34% were men, and one individual identified as transgender. With respect to age, the sample ranged in age from 18–70 years ($M = 22.45$; $SD = 7.43$). In the second study, which was designed to confirm the factor structure of the WPAS, 251 individuals participated. This sample's composition was nearly identical to the first sample.

Scoring	<p>The number of items in each subscale of the WPAS is as follows:</p> <p>Willingness to Confront White Privilege: 12 items</p> <p>Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege: 6 items</p> <p>White Privilege Awareness: 4 items</p> <p>White Privilege Remorse: 6 items</p> <p>Total WPAS: 28 items</p> <p>Four of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher levels of cognitive, affective, or behavioral dimensions of White privilege attitudes. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores were as follows:</p> <p>Willingness to Confront White Privilege: Alpha = .95</p> <p>Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege: Alpha = .81</p> <p>White Privilege Awareness: Alpha = .84</p> <p>White Privilege Remorse: Alpha = .91</p> <p>Two-week Test-retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>Willingness to Confront White Privilege: $r = .83$</p> <p>Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege: $r = .70$</p> <p>White Privilege Awareness: $r = .87$</p> <p>White Privilege Remorse: $r = .78$</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of WPAS subscales was established through expected findings of significant correlations with subscales of the Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale (Neville et al., 2000), Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986), Psychological Costs of White Racism Scale (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), and Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).</p> <p>Discriminant validity was established through the lack of significant correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale—Form C (Reynolds, 1982).</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>E. Janie Pinteritis Department of Counseling Psychology and Community Services University of North Dakota 290 Centennial Drive Stop 8255 Grand Forks, ND 58202-8255 Email: Janie.pinterits@und.edu</p>

7.9.12 Name of the Measure	Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale IMS and EMS
Primary Reference	Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 75, 811–832.
Purpose	The IMS and EMS were designed to measure individuals' internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. Internal motivation to respond without prejudice reflects nonprejudiced standards that are internalized. External motivation to respond without prejudice reflects motivations that result from societal pressure.
Description	<p>The 10-item measure is rated on a Likert-type self-report inventory. Each item is rated on a 9-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The IMS and EMS are two distinct scales: (1) Internal Motivation Scale, (2) External Motivation Scale.</p> <p>Based on a review of literature on prejudice, the authors developed an initial 19-item instrument to measure external and internal motivations to respond without prejudice. Principal components analysis with oblimin rotation resulted in a 15-item, two-factor measure. Using LISREL 7, confirmatory factor analysis indicated that a two-factor solution provided the best fit to their data. Confirmatory factor analysis also resulted in the deletion of 5 additional items, resulting in a 10-item, two-factor measure.</p>
Samples	Validation of the measure was established using three samples. The first sample was composed of 135 introductory psychology undergraduate students. The second sample included 247 introductory psychology undergraduate students and a separate additional sample of 119 students. The final sample was composed of 1,363 introductory psychology students. The first sample was composed primarily of females (76%) and White Americans students (94%). The second sample was similarly composed primarily of females (74%) and White Americans students (84%). The additional sample of 119 students also was composed primarily of females (62%) and White Americans (90%). A majority of the final sample were females (60%) and primarily White Americans (85%).
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each subscale is as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Internal Motivation: 5 items</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">External Motivation: 5 items</p> <p>One of the items on the Internal Motivation Scale requires reverse scoring. Scoring the scales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores on each of these scales indicate higher levels of that type of motivation. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for each of the scales were as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Internal Motivation Scale: Alpha = .81 to .85</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">External Motivation Scale: Alpha = .76 to .80</p>

	<p>Nine-week test-retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>Internal Motivation Scale: $r = .77$</p> <p>External Motivation Scale: $r = .60$</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity for the IMS was established through significant inverse correlations with the Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay, 1986) and the Anti-Black Scale (ABS; Katz & Hass, 1988) and positively correlated with Attitudes Toward Blacks (ATB; Brigham, 1993), the Pro-Black Scale (PBS; Katz & Hass, 1988), Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism Scale (HE; Katz & Hass, 1988), and concern with acting prejudiced (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). The IMS also was established through negative correlations with Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1981), Protestant Ethic Scale (PE; Katz & Hass, 1988), and restraint to avoid dispute (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). The EMS was found to be positively correlated with the MRS and negatively correlated with the ATB. A significant small positive correlation between EMS and RWA was also found. Finally, a modest positive correlation was found with concern with acting prejudiced and restraint to avoid dispute.</p> <p>Discriminant validity was demonstrated through the lack of significant relationships between the IMS and EMS with social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) and self-monitoring (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). The IMS also was not significantly related to fear of negative self-evaluation (FNE; Leary, 1983; Watson & Friend, 1969) and social anxiety (IAS; Leary, 1983). The EMS only was modestly correlated with the FNE and the IAS.</p> <p>Predictive validity was established such that large discrepancies between what a person's own beliefs about what one should (i.e., self-standards) and would do was associated with feelings of guilt and self-criticism for individuals who reported being more internally motivated to respond without prejudice. Large discrepancies between what one would do and perceptions of other-standards were associated with threatened affect for individuals who were highly externally motivated to respond without prejudice.</p>
Related References	Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2009). The active control of prejudice: Unpacking the intentions guiding control efforts. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 96, 640–652.
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Ashby Plant A2500 University Center Florida State University B332 PDB Tallahassee, FL 32306 (850) 644–5533 Email: plant@psy.fsu.edu</p>

7.9.13 Name of the Measure	Quick Discrimination Index QDI
Primary Reference	Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., et al. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). <i>Educational and Psychological Measurement</i> , 55, 1016–1031.
Purpose	The QDI is a measure of the cognitive component of attitudes toward women and racial minorities and the affective component of attitudes regarding comfort in interpersonal interactions with racially diverse populations.
Description	<p>The QDI is a 30-item, Likert-type self-report inventory. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. The QDI is composed of a total score on three subscales: (1) Cognitive Racial Attitudes; (2) Affective Racial Attitudes; (3) Cognitive Gender Attitudes.</p> <p>After an intensive literature review on discrimination, prejudice, and racism, the authors developed 40 statements measuring cognitive and affective components of prejudicial attitudes. Twelve items were removed after a review (by the authors) of those statements for redundancy and clarity. The remaining 28 items were then reviewed by a panel of five experts for clarity and appropriateness. This resulted in a final pool of 25 items. A focus group was then facilitated to learn the reactions of participants to the measure. Based on the results of initial item and factor analyses, the authors reworded two items and added five new items to refine Factor 2 and 3. These procedures resulted in a 30-item measure.</p> <p>A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded seven factors. However, a scree test indicated up to three factors. Using orthogonal and oblique rotations, a three-factor solution was found to have the best fit.</p> <p>Analyses using the Lix Readability Index (Anderson, 1983) indicate that a 9th-grade reading level is needed.</p>
Samples	<p>Initial validation of the 30-item measure was established using two samples. The first sample, composed of 220 participants, ranged in age from 16–58 years of age ($M = 22$, $SD = 9.3$). Fifty-nine percent of the sample was female, 41% was male. Educational levels were as follows: 33% in high school, 23% held a high school diploma, 1% held a high school equivalency degree, 2% held an associate's degree, 19% held a bachelor's degree, 7% held a master's degree, and 1% held a doctoral degree. The racial and ethnic composition of the sample was 60% White American, 23% Latino/a American, 10% African American, 4% Asian American, and 4% "Other."</p> <p>The second sample, composed of 333 participants from the New York City metropolitan area, ranged in age from 16 to 63 years ($M = 26.9$, $SD = 10.0$). With respect to gender, women composed 79% of the sample and men, 21%. Educational levels were as follows: 33% high school, 23% held a high school diploma, 1% held a high school equivalency, 2% held an associate's degree, 19% a bachelor's degree, 7% a master's degree, and 1% a doctoral degree. The racial and ethnic composition of the sample was 76% White American, 8% Latino/a American, 5% African American, 5% Asian American, and 6% were "Other."</p> <p>The measure has been utilized in samples comprised of White American individuals (e.g., Green, Kiernan-Stern, & Baskind, 2005), Asian Americans (Lam, 2008; Liu, 2002;</p>

	Liu, Pope-Davis, Nevitt, & Toporek, 1999), and African Americans (Fujioka, 2005). Reliability coefficients have been adequate.
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each of the three subscales of the QDI are as follows:</p> <p>Cognitive Racial Attitudes: 9 items Affective Racial Attitudes: 7 items Cognitive Gender Attitudes: 9 items Total QDI: 30 items</p> <p>Half of the items are negatively worded, which requires reverse scoring. Scoring the QDI consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items in the specific subscale. Higher scores indicate more positive affective and cognitive attitudes toward women and racial minorities. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores ranged from .76 to .83.</p> <p>Cognitive Racial Attitudes: Alpha = .80 Affective Racial Attitudes: Alpha = .83 Cognitive Gender Attitudes: Alpha = .76 Total QDI: Alpha = .88</p> <p>Fifteen-week test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from .65 to .96 across three different groups.</p> <p>Cognitive Racial Attitudes: $r = .82, .92, \text{ and } .96$ Affective Racial Attitudes: $r = .65, .95, \text{ and } .87$ Cognitive Gender Attitudes: $r = .82, .78, \text{ and } .84$</p>
Validity	<p>Criterion-related validity was evidenced through the significant main effect for gender, race, geographic region, and political affiliation on QDI scores. Convergent validity was evidenced through significant correlations with the New Racism Scale (Jacobson, 1985) and the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (Ponterotto et al., 1993).</p> <p>Evidence for discriminant validity was demonstrated through nonsignificant correlations with the Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).</p>
Related References	<p>Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1999). Further factorial validity assessment of scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). <i>Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59</i>, 325–335.</p> <p>Ponterotto, J. G., Potere, J. C., & Johansen, S. A. (2002). The Quick Discrimination Index: Normative data and user guidelines for counseling researchers. <i>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30</i>, 192–206.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Joseph G. Ponterotto Graduate School of Education Fordham University Division of Psychological and Educational Services 113 West 60th Street, RM 1016D New York, NY 10023</p>

7.10 PERCEPTIONS OF DISCRIMINATION

7.10.1 Name of the Measure	Intragroup Marginalization Inventory IMI
Primary Reference	Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., Brossart, D. F., & Quiros, A. E. (2007). Construction and validation of the Intragroup Marginalization Inventory. <i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13</i> , 232–240.
Purpose	The IMI is designed to measure an individual's awareness of interpersonal distancing between self and family, friends, and own-ethnic group community.
Description	<p>The IMI is a 42-item Likert-type self-report inventory grounded in social identity theory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The IMI is composed of 3 scales: (1) Family Scale (four factors); (2) Friends Scale (five factors); and (3) Ethnic Group Scale (four factors).</p> <p>The instrument was developed through several steps. An initial pool of 14 items was created based on a review of research literature regarding acculturation and the personal experiences of the research team members. These items were then reviewed by a panel of six experts, who suggested the addition of 22 more items and edited 14. A focus group of 31 undergraduate students then reviewed the items for their clarity and appropriateness. Based on their feedback, two items were removed. This resulted in a 34-item measure. Two additional faculty members then reviewed the document for grammatical errors and clarity.</p> <p>Three exploratory factor analyses with promax rotation were conducted to estimate the number of factors in each predetermined scale (i.e., family, friends, own ethnic group). The authors reported that the selection of items was based on (a) items correlating high on only one factor; (b) items being logically related to other items on the same factor; and (c) each factor having at least three items. The authors, however, did not define what constituted a structure coefficient. On more than half of the items that appear to have to been retained, structure coefficients above .40 were observed on more than one factor. Confirmatory factor analytic strategies were employed to provide further evidence of construct validity. Using AMOS 5.0 (Arbuckle, 2003), the authors found that their data fit their hypothesized model well.</p>
Samples	A sample of 386 racial/ethnic minority college students was recruited through introductory psychology courses and through Web-based technology. The sample was composed of 224 females and 160 males. The ethnic composition of the sample was as follows: 196 Latino/a American, 85 Asian/Asian American, 75 African American, 9 Native American, and 21 Biracial. The sample ranged in age from 17–49 years ($M = 20.8$; $SD = 4.6$).

Scoring	<p>The IMI is composed of three scales, each with 4 to 5 subscales. The number of items for each subscale is as follows:</p> <p>Family Scale: 12 items Friend Scale: 17 items Ethnic Group Scale: 13 items Total IMI: 42 items</p> <p>The items on the Ethnic Group Scale require reverse scoring. No other items are reverse worded. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the subscale. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the scores on the subscales ranged from .80 to .92:</p> <p>Family Scale: Alpha = .82 Friend Scale: Alpha = .80 Ethnic Group Scale: Alpha = .82 Total IMI: Alpha = .92</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of the Family Scale was established through expected positive correlations with the scale and acculturation (Tropp, Erkut, García-Coll, Alarcón, & Vásquez-García, 1999), acculturative stress (Fuertes & Westbrook, 1996), family conflict (Lee, Cho, Kim, & Ngo, 2000), and negative social interactions (Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991). Convergent validity for the Friend Scale was significantly and positively correlated with acculturative stress. Furthermore, no significant correlation between Friend Scale and social desirability (Reynolds, 1982) was found. The Ethnic Group Scale was found to be related to acculturative stress. No significant correlations were found between scores on the Ethnic Group Scale and social desirability.</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Linda G. Castillo Department of Educational Psychology Texas A & M University College Station, TX 77843-4225 Email: lcastillo@tamu.edu</p>

7.10.2 Name of the Measure	Own-Group Conformity Pressure Scale OGCPS
Primary Reference	Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., Ewell, K., Goyal, T. M., & Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31</i> , 1775–1820.
Purpose	The OGCPS is designed to measure an individual's perceptions that members of their own ethnic group do not approve of them or their behavior over the past 3 months.
Description	<p>The OGCPS is a 12-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Not at all Pressured to 7 = Quite a Bit Pressured.</p> <p>The OGCPS is composed of two subscales: (1) Style/Interests and (2) Social Relations. The instrument was developed through the findings of a pilot study involving a sample of college students from diverse backgrounds who described both the prescriptions and proscriptions of being a member of their ethnic group expressed by members of their ethnic group.</p> <p>The factor structure of an initial 16-item measure was then examined. The results of factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded a five-factor solution that was deemed to be unsatisfactory. Items were deleted and data were reanalyzed. This resulted in an interpretable 12-item, two-factor solution.</p>
Samples	A sample of 361 first-year undergraduate college students from a university in the Northeastern portion of the United States was recruited to establish validity and explore the factor structure of the OGCPS. The sample was composed entirely of students fulfilling a requirement for their Introduction to Psychology course. Twenty-eight participants did not indicate their gender or ethnicity and, as a result, were not included in subsequent analyses. Of these 333 participants (91 male; 242 female), 208 were White American, 34 were African American, 31 were Latino/a American, and 60 were Asian American or Pacific Islander. The sample ranged in age from 16 to 29 years ($M = 17.9$).
Scoring	<p>The total number of items for each subscale of the OGCPS is as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Style/Interests: 7 items</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Social Relations: 5 items</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total OGCPS: 12 items</p> <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher concerns over conforming to known stereotypes of own ethnic group. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the scores of ethnic minorities were as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Style/Interests: Alpha = .89</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Social Relations: Alpha = .84</p>

	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the scores of White Americans were as follows:</p> <p>Style/Interests: Alpha = .87</p> <p>Social Relations: Alpha = .79</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of OGCPs was established through significant relationships, in the expected direction, with measures of generic life stress (Crandall, Preisler, & Aussprung, 1992), global self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), negative mood (Usala & Hertzog, 1989), life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).</p> <p>Known-groups validity also was demonstrated through a significant main ethnic group effect on the OGCPs.</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Richard J. Contrada Department of Psychology Rutgers University 53 Avenue E Piscataway, NJ 08854-8040 (732) 445-3195 Email: contrada@rci.rutgers.edu</p>

7.10.3 Name of the Measure	Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire PEDQ
Primary Reference	Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., Ewell, K., Goyal, T. M., & Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31</i> , 1775–1820.
Purpose	The PEDQ is designed to measure individuals' perceptions of seven forms of discrimination over a period of 3 months.
Description	<p>The PEDQ is a 17-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Never to 7 = Very Often.</p> <p>The PEDQ is composed of four subscales: (1) Devaluing Action; (2) Threat and Aggression; (3) Verbal Rejection; (4) Avoidance.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through conceptual analysis, journalistic descriptions, qualitative analysis, and the use of a pilot study involving a sample of college students from diverse backgrounds who shared descriptions of their earliest, worst, and most recent experiences of ethnic discrimination.</p> <p>The factor structure of an initial 22-item measure was then examined. This resulted in the deletion of 5 items. Specifically, the results of factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded a four-factor solution.</p> <p>In a follow-up paper, Brondolo et al. (2005) developed the PEDQ-Community Version (PEDQ-CV) based on the PEDQ for use with community individuals. A brief version of the PEDQ-CV also was reported by Brondolo et al.</p>
Samples	A sample of 361 first-year undergraduate college students from a university in the northeastern portion of the United States was recruited to establish validity and explore the factor structure of the PEDQ. The sample was composed entirely of students fulfilling a requirement for their Introduction to Psychology course. Twenty-eight participants did not indicate their gender or ethnicity and, as a result, were not included subsequent analyses. Of these 333 participants (91 male; 242 female), 208 were White, 34 were Black, 31 were Latino/a, and 60 were Asian American or Pacific Islander. The sample ranged in age from 16 to 29 years ($M = 17.9$).
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale of the PEDQ is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devaluing Action: 6 items Threat and Aggression: 5 items Verbal Rejection: 3 items Avoidance: 3 items Total PEDQ: 17 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher experience of each form of racism. No transformations are required.</p>

Reliability	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the subscale scores for ethnic minorities are as follows:</p> <p>Disvaluing Action: Alpha = .90 Threat and Aggression: Alpha = .85 Verbal Rejection: Alpha = .77 Avoidance: Alpha = .73</p> <p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the subscale scores for White Americans are as follows:</p> <p>Disvaluing Action: Alpha = .71 Threat and Aggression: Alpha = .78 Verbal Rejection: Alpha = .75 Avoidance: Alpha = .65</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of PEDQ subscales was established through significant relationships, in the expected direction, with measures of generic life stress (Crandall, Preisler, & Aussprung, 1982), global self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), negative mood (Usala & Hertzog, 1989), life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), depressive symptoms (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961), and physical symptoms (Jenkins, Kreger, Rose, & Hurst, 1980). Known-groups validity also was demonstrated through a significant main ethnic group effect on each of the scales of the PEDQ.</p>
Related References	<p>Brondolo, E., Kelly, K. P., Coakley, V., Gordon, T., Thompson, S., Levy, E., Cassells, A., Tobin, J. N., Sweeney, M., & Contrada, R. J. (2005). The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire: Development and preliminary validation of a community version. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, 35, 335–365.</p>
Language Versions	<p>English</p>
Contact	<p>Richard J. Contrada Department of Psychology Rutgers University 53 Avenue E Piscataway, NJ 08854–8040 (732) 445–3195 Email: contrada@rci.rutgers.edu</p>

7.10.4 Name of the Measure	Perceptions of Racism Scale PRS
Primary Reference	Green, N. L. (1995). Development of the Perceptions of Racism Scale. <i>Journal of Nursing Scholarship</i> , 27, 141–146.
Purpose	The PRS is a measure of the cognitive component of attitudes toward women and racial minorities and the affective component of attitudes regarding comfort in interpersonal interactions with racially diverse populations.
Description	The PRS is a 20-item self-report inventory that utilizes a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree). The PRS is composed of one total score of perception of racism. Items regarding the perceptions of health and racism were developed through interviews with eight African American women. Contents of these interviews were subjected to domain analysis (Spradley, 1979). Items regarding general perceptions of racism were based on items appearing on the Business Week/Harris Poll (Jackson & Collingswood, 1988). The contents of the scale were reviewed for appropriateness and clarity by a group of six African American nurse-midwives and one teacher. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded one interpretable factor.
Samples	Initial validation of the 20-item measure was established using a sample of 165 African American women. The age of the sample ranged from 18–39 ($M = 24.4$ years; $SD = 5.24$). The women completed between 8–18 years of education ($M = 13.55$; $SD = 1.78$).
Scoring	The PRS is composed of 20 items. Nine of the items require reverse scoring. Scoring the PRS consists of summing the items. Higher scores indicate more perceptions of racism. No transformations are required.
Reliability	Cronbach's coefficient alpha for full scale score was .91.
Validity	Concurrent validity was established through a significant relationship with a measure of stress.
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	The PRS is presented in Green (1995).

7.10.5 Name of the Measure	Experience of Discrimination EOD
Primary Reference	Krieger, N., Smith, K., Naishadham, D., Hartman, C., & Barbeau, E. M. (2005). Experiences of discrimination: Validity and reliability of a self-report measure for population health research on racism and health. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i> , 61, 1576–1596.
Purpose	The EOD is a measure of self-reported exposure to racial discrimination.
Description	<p>The EOD is an 11-item self-report inventory. The measure uses several response formats. <i>Experience of Discrimination</i> is scored by counting the number of situations in which a participant reported having experienced racial discrimination. <i>Frequency</i> is measured through participant self-report of number of occurrences of an event (i.e., 0 = “never,” 1 = “once,” 2.5 = “2–3 times,” and 5 = “4 or more times.” <i>Response to unfair treatment</i> items were scored based on one of the two following response choices: “Accept It as a Fact of Life” or “Try to Do Something About It”; “Talk to Other People About It” or “Keep It to Yourself.”</p> <p>The EOD is composed of items assessing for (1) Discrimination Situation, (2) Frequency of Occurrence, and (3) Response to Unfair Treatment.</p> <p>The EOD questionnaire is based on closed-format questions previously developed by Krieger (1990). Results of structural equation modeling indicated excellent fit of the data to the hypothesized model.</p>
Samples	The sample was composed of 616 participants, who ranged in age from 25–64 years. The authors reported the gender composition of ethnic groups separately. The racial and ethnic composition of the sample was 208 White Americans (57.2% women), 249 Latino/a Americans (44.9% women), 159 African Americans (40% women).
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response to Unfair Treatment: 2 items Experiences of Discrimination: 9 items Frequency of Discrimination: Dependent on number of affirmative responses to Experiences of Discrimination items. <p>No reverse scoring is required. Responses to Unfair Treatment scores are based on the combination of the response types provided by the participant. Specifically, a score of “2” or “Engaged” is given to individuals who responded with “Try to Do Something About It”/“Talk to Others”; a score of “1” or “Moderate” is given to participants who responded with either “Try to Do Something About It”/“Keep to Self” or “Accept It as a Fact of Life”/“Talk to Other People About It”; a score of “0” or “Passive” is given to participants who “Accept It as a Fact of Life”/“Keep it to Yourself.”</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>Situation score is derived by summing the number of situations in which a participant reported experiencing racial discrimination.</p> <p>Frequency score is obtained by summing across the number of items.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha were as follows:</p> <p>Response to Unfair Treatment: Alpha = .56</p> <p>EOD Situation: Alpha = .81</p> <p>EOD Frequency: Alpha = .86</p> <p>Test-retest reliability coefficients for African American and Latino/a American participants was reported to be .69 or higher.</p>
Validity	<p>Suggesting criterion validity, EOD was statistically significantly associated with psychological distress such that higher levels of EOD were related to poorer psychological health. EOD also tended to be associated with cigarette smoking.</p> <p>Suggesting discriminant validity, EOD was not statistically significantly related to social desirability.</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English and Spanish
Contact	The measure can be found in Krieger et al. (2005).

7.10.6 Name of the Measure	Schedule of Racist Events SRE
Primary Reference	Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The Schedule of Racist Events: A measure of racial discrimination and a study of its negative physical and mental health consequences. <i>Journal of Black Psychology</i> , 22, 144–168.
Purpose	The SRE is designed to measure the frequency of perceived race-based discrimination experienced by African Americans.
Description	<p>The SRE is an 18-item self-report inventory. The first 17 items assess the frequency of specific occurrences of race-based discrimination encountered by African Americans. Respondents answer these questions with respect to frequency of experiences during the past year and entire life, respectively. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Never Happened; 2 = Once in a While (less than 10% of the time); 3 = Sometimes (10–25% of the time); 4 = A Lot (26–49% of the time); 5 = Most of the Time (50–70% of the time); and 6 = Almost all of the Time (more than 70% of the time). Respondents also are asked to report how stressful they perceived the event to be on a scale (1 = Not at all to 6 = Extremely). The final question of the SRE measures how different a respondent perceives his or her life to be now had it not been for race-based discrimination experiences during the past year and entire life, respectively.</p> <p>The SRE is composed of three subscales: (1) Recent Racist Events; (2) Lifetime Racist Events; and (3) Appraised Racist Events.</p> <p>The authors developed items on their measure based upon a review of the literature on racism and grounded their scale on stress and coping theory. The scale was modeled after the PERI-Life Events Scale (Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978), the Hassles Frequency Scale (Kanner, Coyne, Schaeffer, & Lazarus, 1981), and the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).</p> <p>Klonoff and Landrine (1999) also conducted a factor analysis, using principal components analysis with orthogonal rotation, on each of the three subscales of the SRE. Analysis of eigenvalues and scree plot indicated that items correlated with their respective subscales strongly.</p> <p>The measure has been adapted for use with other groups. For example, Moradi and Hasan (2004) adapted the measure for use in a study involving Arab Americans. In their study, the word “Black” was replaced with “Arab.”</p>
Samples	<p>Initial validation of the 18-item measure was established using a sample composed of 153 African American participants who ranged in age from 15 to 70 years of age ($M = 30.14$, $SD = 11.66$). The participants were recruited at a meeting of University’s Black Student Union and as a meeting of the Black Faculty and Staff Organization.</p> <p>Eighty-three of the participants were women, 66 are men, with four choosing not to disclose their gender. Educational levels were as follows: 22.8% held a high school diploma, 44.3% were college students, 25.5% had college degrees, and 7.4% held master’s or doctorate degrees.</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>Follow-up validation studies involved 520 African Americans (277 women, 243 men) who ranged in age from 18 to 79 years ($M = 28.2$ years, $SD = 10.01$). Their educational levels were as follows: 11.5% had not completed high school; 28.2% graduated high school; 47.3% had some college classes; 12.5% had earned a college degree or higher. Participants were recruited through in-person contact in four randomly selected middle and working class census tracts in San Bernardino County, California.</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale of the SRE is as follows:</p> <p>Recent Racist Events: 18 items Lifetime Racist Events: 18 items Appraised Racist Events: 17 items</p> <p>Items do not need to be reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores on the first two subscales indicate more frequent experiences with racism in the recent past and during one's lifetime. Higher scores on the remaining subscale, Appraised Racist Events, indicate higher levels of stress appraised to the event.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores ranged from .94 to .95.</p> <p>Recent Racist Events: Alpha = .95 Lifetime Racist Events: Alpha = .95 Appraised Racist Events: Alpha = .94</p> <p>Split-half reliability for the subscales ranged from .91 to .93.</p> <p>Recent Racist Events: $r = .93$ Lifetime Racist Events: $r = .91$ Appraised Racist Events: $r = .92$</p> <p>Test-Retest reliability for the subscales ranged from .95 to .96.</p>
Validity	<p>Concurrent validity was established through significant relationships with symptoms of psychological distress. Specifically, each of the three subscales was found to be significantly correlated with symptoms associated with obsessive-compulsive disorder, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, and somatization.</p> <p>Multivariate analysis of variance also indicated a significant effect of recent racist events, lifetime racist events, and appraised racist events on smoking behavior. Smokers were found to report having experienced significantly more racist events and appraised these events as more stressful than did non-smokers.</p> <p>Cluster analysis also indicated traditional African Americans, as measured by the African American Acculturation Scale (Landrine & Klonoff, 1994), reported significantly more experiences with racist events in their recent past and lifetime than did more acculturated African Americans. Traditional African Americans also appraised events of racial discrimination as more stressful than acculturated African Americans.</p>

	Klonoff and Landrine (1999) presented further validation of concurrent validity. They found significant positive correlations between SRE subscales and the total score on the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-59 (Derogatis et al., 1974).
Related References	<p>Fischer, A. R., & Shaw, C. M. (1999). African Americans' mental health and perceptions of racist discrimination: The moderating effects of racial socialization experiences and self-esteem. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46</i>, 395-407.</p> <p>Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, E. (1999). Cross-validation of the Schedule of Racist Events. <i>Journal of Black Psychology, 25</i>, 231-254.</p> <p>Moradi, B., & Hasan, N. T. (2004). Arab American persons' reported experiences of discrimination and mental health: The mediating role of personal control. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51</i>, 418-428.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Hope Landrine American Cancer Society 250 Williams Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 329-4425 Email: Hope.Landrine@cancer.org</p>

7.10.7 Name of the Measure	General Ethnic Discrimination Scale GEDS
Primary Reference	Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., Corral, I., Fernandez, S., & Roesch, S. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring ethnic discrimination in health research. <i>Journal of Behavioral Medicine</i> , 29, 79–94.
Purpose	The GEDS is an instrument intended to measure perceived ethnic discrimination experienced among a general group of racial or ethnic minorities.
Description	<p>The GEDS is an 18-item self-report inventory. On the first 17 items, respondents rate the frequency of perceived racist events during the past year and entire life, respectively. Recent and life events of racism are rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Once in a While; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = A Lot; 5 = Most of the Time; and 6 = Almost All the Time. Respondents also indicate their appraisal of stress on a 6-point scale with 1 = Not at All Stressful to 6 = Extremely Stressful. The last item measures how different one perceives his or her life to be had he or she not been treated in a racist manner. Respondents indicate their response for Recent Racist Events and Lifetime Racist Events on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = The same as it is now; 2 = A little different; 3 = Different in a few ways; 4 = Different in a lot of ways; 5 = Different in most ways; and 6 = Totally different.</p> <p>A maximum likelihood estimation procedure in EQS was used to estimate the goodness of fit of their data to their model. Results indicated good fit of their data to the model.</p> <p>Confirmatory factor analysis was used to test whether the factor structure of the GED was similar to the SRE, the measure upon which it is based. The structure coefficients of each subscale ranged from .77 to 1.0 for four of the groups (African American, Asian American, White American, Latino/a American). Confirmatory factor analysis also indicated that the structure coefficients of each subscale were equally strong and significant for community and college-student samples.</p> <p>The GEDS is composed of three unidimensional subscales: (1) Recent Discrimination; (2) Lifetime Discrimination; (3) Appraised Discrimination.</p> <p>Landrine, Klonoff, Corral, Fernandez, and Roesch (2006) indicated that the GEDS is modeled on the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). The SRE was chosen as a model because of its theoretical grounding in the stress-coping literature. The GEDS is a slightly modified version of the SRE that can be employed with diverse groups of ethnic minorities.</p>
Samples	<p>Initial validation of the 18-item measure was established using a sample of 1,569 adults who ranged in age from 18 to 86 years ($M = 30.24$, $SD = 11.66$). The sample was composed of 1,133 women (72.2%). The remaining participants are men. The sample included undergraduate and graduate students (55.3%) who were in classrooms, libraries, or student union buildings and community adults (44.7%) who were recruited while shopping, waiting for a bus, or at a bank.</p> <p>The racial and ethnic composition of the sample was 49.7% White American, 25.9% Latino/a American, 11.1% African American, 6% Asian American, and 6.1% “Other.”</p>

Scoring	<p>There are a total of 18 items on the measure. Each of the first 17 items requires a response for Recent, Lifetime, and Appraised Discrimination. The remaining item requires only a response for Recent and Lifetime Discrimination.</p> <p>Recent Discrimination: 18 items Lifetime Discrimination: 18 items Appraised Discrimination: 17 items</p> <p>None of the items are negatively worded. Scoring the GEDS consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores on the Recent Discrimination and Lifetime Discrimination subscales indicate more frequent encounters with discrimination in the past 12 months and lifetime, respectively. Higher scores on the Appraised Discrimination subscale indicate greater levels of stress associated with those events. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Recent Discrimination: Alpha = .94 Lifetime Discrimination: Alpha = .94 Appraised Discrimination: Alpha = .94</p> <p>Split-half reliability coefficients for the subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Recent Discrimination: $r = .91$ Lifetime Discrimination: $r = .91$ Appraised Discrimination: $r = .91$</p>
Validity	<p>Concurrent validity was established through the use of this procedure, which indicated the latent construct of perceived discrimination was related to the latent construct of psychiatric symptoms (Hopkins Symptoms Checklist-58; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974) in the expected direction. Multiple group analysis indicated that data fit the model well across different racial groups.</p> <p>Concurrent validity also was established through three stepwise logistic regression analyses. Results indicated that individuals experiencing moderate and high levels of lifetime discrimination were more likely to smoke than those who experienced lower levels of lifetime discrimination. Results of these analyses did not indicate similar patterns for recent events or appraised events.</p>
Related References	<p>Hwang, W., & Goto, S. (2008). The impact of perceived racial discrimination on the mental health of Asian American college students. <i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14</i>, 326-335.</p>
Language Versions	<p>English</p>
Contact	<p>Hope Landrine American Cancer Society 250 Williams Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 329-4425 Email: Hope.Landrine@cancer.org</p>

7.10.8 Name of the Measure	Scale of Ethnic Experience SEE
Primary Reference	Malcarne, V. L., Chavira, D. A., Fernandez, S., & Liu, P.-J. (2006). The Scale of Ethnic Experience: Development and psychometric properties. <i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i> , 86(2), 150–161.
Purpose	The SEE is designed to measure multiple aspects of ethnicity-related cognitive constructs across diverse ethnic groups.
Description	<p>The SEE is a 32-item self-report inventory. These items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. The SEE is composed of four factors: (1) Ethnic Identity, (2) Perceived Discrimination, (3) Mainstream Comfort, and (4) Social Affiliation.</p> <p>Two focus groups, composed of diverse undergraduate and graduate students, were conducted. Approximately 100 items were developed from the contents of the focus groups, a review of literature, and expert consultation. Focus group members then reviewed the items for content clarity, relevance, and wording. As a result of this process, 73 items were included in the pilot version of the measure. The 73-item version was administered to two separate groups of undergraduate psychology students from San Diego State University. Data from the first sample were submitted to a principal components analysis (PCA) using promax rotation. Items with structure coefficients greater than or equal to .45 that did not correlate with any other factor at .45 or above were retained. Fifty-seven items were retained through this process. A PCA with promax rotation for the total second sample, as well as by ethnic group, was then performed. Items were retained if their structure coefficient, across the total sample and the ethnic specific samples was equal to or greater than .40 and did not correlate with any other factor at .30 or above. Twenty-five items were dropped as a result of this process. This resulted in a final 32-item, four-factor SEE. Confirmatory factor analysis, which was then performed on a separate sample, indicated that data fit the model well.</p>
Samples	<p>Four samples of undergraduate psychology students participated in three studies of the psychometric properties of the SEE. The first sample ($N_1 = 638$; 60% women) was composed of African Americans (13%), White Americans (44%), Filipino/a Americans (15%), and Mexican Americans (28%). The mean age was 20.12 years ($SD = 4.35$). A second sample was ($N_2 = 1,727$; 66% women) with a mean age of 18.73 years ($SD = 2.38$). This sample was composed of African Americans (12%), White Americans (52%), Filipino/a Americans (14%), and Mexican Americans (22%). A third sample ($N_3 = 228$) was used to assess the temporal stability of the SEE. The gender composition of the sample was not reported. With respect to ethnic background, the sample was composed of African Americans (12%), White Americans (24%), Filipino/a Americans (36%), and Mexican Americans (28%). In the final sample ($N_4 = 940$; 72% women), the mean age was 18.68 ($SD = 1.09$). This sample was composed of African Americans (8.7%), White Americans (46.9%), Filipino/a Americans (18.0%), and Mexican Americans (25.4%).</p>

Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale is as follows:</p> <p>Ethnic Identity: 12 items Perceived Discrimination: 9 items Mainstream Comfort: 6 items Social Affiliation: 5 items Total SEE: 32 items</p> <p>Twelve items require reverse scoring. Scoring the SEE consists of summing the scores of items on each subscale and dividing by the number of items for the corresponding subscale. Higher scores indicate higher levels of ethnic identity, perceptions of discrimination, comfort with the dominant culture, and comfort with members of one's own group. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores ranged across several studies. They were as follows:</p> <p>Ethnic Identity: Alpha = .81 to .91 Perceived Discrimination: Alpha = .76 to .91 Mainstream Comfort: Alpha = .76 to .87 Social Affiliation: Alpha = .81 to .84</p> <p>Six-Week Test-retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>Ethnic Identity: $r = .86$ Perceived Discrimination: $r = .82$ Mainstream Comfort: $r = .81$ Social Affiliation: $r = .77$</p>
Validity	<p>Evidence for concurrent validity was demonstrated through statistically significant relationships between the ethnic identity, mainstream comfort, and/or social affiliation subscales of the SEE with ethnic identity and other group orientation (Phinney, 1992) and scores on acculturation measures for African Americans (Klonoff & Landrine, 2000), Mexican Americans (Cuellar et al., 1980), and Filipino/a Americans (Suinn et al., 1987).</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Vanessa L. Malcarne Department of Psychology College of Sciences San Diego State University 6363 Alvarado Court, Suite 103 San Diego, CA 92120-4913 Phone: (619) 594-6495 Fax: (619) 594-6780 Email: malcarne@psychology.sdsu.edu</p>

7.10.9 Name of the Measure	Perceived Racism Scale PRS
Primary Reference	McNeilly, M. D., Anderson, N. B., Armstead, C. A., Clark, R., Corbett, M., Robinson, E. L., Pieper, C. F., & Lepisto, E. M. (1996). The Perceived Racism Scale: A multidimensional assessment of the experience of White racism among African Americans. <i>Ethnicity & Disease</i> , 6, 154–166.
Purpose	The PRS is designed to measure both the frequency of perceived experiences of multiple forms of racism among African Americans as well as their emotional and behavioral coping responses used in those events.
Description	<p>The PRS is a 51-item self-report inventory with multiple response formats. On the first 43 items, respondents report their own perceived exposure to racist events and statements during the past year and during their lifetime. These items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (0 = Not Applicable, 1 = Almost Never, 2 = Several Times a Year, 3 = Several Times a Month, 4 = Several Times a Week, and 5 = Several Times a Day). Respondents utilize a 5-point Likert-type scale (0 = Not at All, 3 = Moderately, 5 = Extremely) to indicate how they feel (i.e., Angry, Hurt, Frustrated, Sad, Powerless, Hopeless, Ashamed, Strengthened) during an encounter with a racist event in four different domains (i.e., On the Job, Academic Settings, Public Realm, Racism Statements). Respondents also are instructed to mark behaviors they engage in in response to racist events or statements. An affirmative response, indicated by a checkmark, is coded as “1” while a “0” indicates a no response.</p> <p>The PRS is composed of five factors for frequency: (1) On the Job; (2) In Academic Settings; (3) Overt Racism in Public Settings; (4) Subtle Racism in Public Settings; (5) Exposure to Racist Statements; and nine factors of emotional and behavioral coping responses: (1) Anger/Frustration; (2) Depressed Affect; (3) Feeling Strengthened; (4) Working Harder/Trying to Change Things; (5) Avoiding/Ignoring; (6) Praying; (7) Forgetting It; (8) Getting Violent; and (9) Speaking Up.</p> <p>The items making up the measure were constructed based on instructions made up of 190 college students and community members to list the types of personal experiences of racism they encountered as well as their feelings and coping responses. These responses were content analyzed into four domains (on the job, in academic settings, in the public realm, and exposure to racist statements). Items showing the highest frequency were included in the measure. Twenty African American individuals, selected for a pilot study of the measure, provided feedback for content, wording, response format, and instructions.</p> <p>Principal component, analyses with both oblique and orthogonal rotations were performed on a sample of college students and individuals from the community. The scale was divided into two portions based on question type (frequency; emotional and coping responses). The result of principal components analysis using oblique rotation reportedly was nearly identical to one using an orthogonal rotation. These analyses yielded five factors for items addressing frequency and nine factors concerning emotional coping responses.</p>

Samples	The factor structure of the 51-item measure was established using a sample of 273 participants (67 males, 123 females) across two studies from the university and the community. The range of ages for the two samples of university students and the community was 18 to 35 years ($M = 21.2$; $SD = 2.9$), 18 to 38 years ($M = 21.6$; $SD = 4.17$), and 18 to 39 years ($M = 21.6$; $SD = 4.17$), respectively. With respect to gender, 75 were male and 198 were female. Data from 67 participants were not included in the final sample.
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale is as follows:</p> <p>Factors for Frequency of Exposure to Racism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Racism on the Job: 9 items Racism in Academic Settings: 9 items (overt) Racism in Public Settings: 9 items (subtle) Racism in Public Settings: 4 items Racist Statements: 7 items <p>Factors for Emotional Responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anger/Frustration: 8 items Depressed Affect: 16 items Feeling Strengthened: 4 items <p>Factors for Behavioral Coping Responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working Harder/Trying to Change Things: 8 items Avoiding/Ignoring: 7 items Praying: 4 items Forgetting It: 4 items Getting Violent: 3 items Speaking Up: 4 items <p>Scoring the PRS consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate more frequent exposure to racism and more experiences of specific emotional responses or behavioral coping strategies. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores ranged from .64 to .95.</p> <p>Factors for Frequency of Exposure to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Racism on the Job: Alpha = .91 Racism in Academic Settings: Alpha = .93 (overt) Racism in Public Settings: Alpha = .84 (subtle) Racism in Public Settings: Alpha = .84 Racist Statements: Alpha = .89 Total Frequency of Exposure: Alpha = .96

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>Factors for Emotional and Behavioral Coping Responses</p> <p>Anger/Frustration: Alpha = .95</p> <p>Depressed Affect: Alpha = .90</p> <p>Feeling Strengthened: Alpha = .85</p> <p>Working Harder/Trying to Change Things: Alpha = .82</p> <p>Avoiding/Ignoring: Alpha = .79</p> <p>Praying: Alpha = .91</p> <p>Forgetting It: Alpha = .77</p> <p>Getting Violent: Alpha = .64</p> <p>Speaking Up: Alpha = .70</p> <p>Total Emotional and Coping Responses: Alpha = .94</p> <p>Test-retest coefficients ranged from .50–.80.</p>
Validity	
Related References	Moody-Ayers, S. Y., Stewart, A. L., Covinsky, K. E., & Inouye, S. K. (2005). Prevalence and correlates of perceived societal racism in older African-American adults with Type 2 diabetes mellitus. <i>Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 53</i> , 2202–2208.
Language Versions	English
Contact	Maya D. McNeilly Box 3003 Duke University Medical Center Durham, NC 27710

7.11 PSYCHOLOGICAL RESPONSES TO RACISM

7.11.1 Name of the Measure	Hispanic Stress Inventory HIS
Primary Reference	Cervantes, R. C., Padilla, A., & de Snyder, N. S. (1991). The Hispanic Stress Inventory: A culturally relevant approach to psychological assessment. <i>Psychological Assessment</i> , 3, 438–447.
Purpose	The HSI is designed as a measure of the occurrence and cognitive appraisal of psychosocial stress experienced by immigrant or U.S.-born Latino/a Americans.
Description	<p>The HSI-Immigrant version is a 73-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Not at all Stressful, 2 = Somewhat Stressful, 3 = Moderately Stressful, 4 = Very Stressful, 5 = Extremely Stressful.</p> <p>The HSI-Immigrant version is composed of 5 subscales: (1) Occupational/Economic Stress, (2) Parental Stress, (3) Marital Stress, (4) Immigration Stress, and (5) Cultural/Family Conflict.</p> <p>The HSI-U.S. Born version is a 59-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 5-point scale with the following anchors 1 = Not at all Stressful, 2 = Somewhat Stressful, 3 = Moderately Stressful, 4 = Very Stressful, 5 = Extremely Stressful.</p> <p>The HSI-U.S. Born version is composed of 4 subscales: (1) Occupational/Economic Stress, (2) Parental Stress, (3) Marital Stress, and (4) Cultural/Family Conflict.</p> <p>Items of HSI were developed based on the contents of semistructured interviews with a sample of 105 Latino/a American individuals who could trace their family history to Mexico or countries in Central America. Interview questions were designed to elicit responses regarding stress in five domains (marital stress, family stress, occupational stress, discrimination stress, and acculturation stress). Based upon the contents of the responses, 176 statements reflecting acute and chronic stress experiences of U.S.-born and immigrant Latino/a Americans were composed.</p> <p>Five Latino/a American judges familiar with Latino/a American mental health issues then were instructed to categorize these statements into one of six categories. These judges also provided feedback regarding the appropriateness and clarity of wording in the items. This resulted in 133 items. Items were then subjected to back translation procedures (Brislin, 1986).</p> <p>Additional procedures for item refinement were engaged for U.S. Born and Immigrant Latino/a American samples separately. For example, items not yielding a mean score more than 2.0 or reported by less than 5% of the entire subsample were eliminated.</p> <p>Factor analysis with oblique rotation was then conducted on data from immigrant Latino/a Americans and U.S.-born Latino/a Americans separately. Based on eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and scree-test procedures, these factor analyses yielded a final five-factor solution for the immigrant Latino/a American sample and a four-factor solution</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

	<p>for the U.S.-born sample. Items were retained if their structure coefficients was greater than .30. These procedures resulted in a 73-item measure for immigrant Latino/a Americans and a 59-item measure for U.S.-born Latino/a Americans.</p> <p>The measure has been adapted for use to assess social stressors experienced specifically by Latina American women (Goodkind, Gonzales, Malcoe, & Espinosa, 2008). A shortened version for use with immigrants has been developed (Cavazos-Rehg, Zayas, Walker, & Fisher, 2006).</p>
Samples	<p>This measure was developed based on studies involving samples of Latino/a American immigrants ($n = 305$; 58.0% male, 42% female) and U.S.-born Latino/a Americans ($n = 188$; 41.5% male, 58.5% female). The mean age of the immigrant group and U.S.-born group was 24.3 years and 21.6 years, respectively.</p> <p>The participants were recruited from adult community schools or a community college located in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale of each version of the HSI are as follows:</p> <p>Immigrant Version</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupational/Economic Stress: 13 items Parental Stress: 13 items Marital Stress: 16 items Immigration Stress: 18 items Cultural/Family Conflict: 13 items HSI-Immigrant: 73 items <p>U.S.-Born Version</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupational/Economic Stress: 14 items Parental Stress: 9 items Marital Stress: 14 items Cultural/Family Conflict: 22 items HIS-U.S. Born: 59 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing items on the subscale. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>The Cronbach alpha coefficients have been reported for the scores on the immigrant and U.S. born versions. They were as follows:</p> <p>Immigrant Version</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupational/Economic Stress: Alpha = .91 Parental Stress: Alpha = .88 Marital Stress: Alpha = .86 Immigration Stress: Alpha = .85 Cultural/Family Conflict: Alpha = .77

	<p>Two-Week Test-Retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>Occupational/Economic Stress: $r = .79$</p> <p>Parental Stress: $r = .73$</p> <p>Marital Stress: $r = .61$</p> <p>Immigration Stress: $r = .80$</p> <p>Cultural/Family Conflict: $r = .86$</p> <p>U.S. Born Version</p> <p>Occupational/Economic Stress: Alpha = .90</p> <p>Parental Stress: Alpha = .88</p> <p>Marital Stress: Alpha = .85</p> <p>Cultural/Family Conflict: Alpha = .85</p>
Validity	<p>Criterion-related validity was established through significant correlations between the subscales of the HSI immigrant version and measures of self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965) as well as depression, anxiety, somatization (Derogatis, 1977).</p> <p>Other evidence for criterion-related validity was established through the authors' failure to find an interpretable factor structure of the HSI with data from a sample of 141 White American participants.</p>
Related References	<p>Cavazos-Rehg, P. A., Zayas, L. H., Walker, M. S., & Fisher, E. B. (2006). Evaluating an abbreviated version of the Hispanic Stress Inventory for Immigrants. <i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i>, 28, 498–515.</p> <p>Goodkind, J. R., Gonzales, M., Malcoe, L. H., & Espinosa, J. (2008). The Hispanic Women's Social Stressor Scale: Understanding the multiple social stressors of U.S.- and Mexico-born Hispanic women. <i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i>, 30, 200–229.</p>
Language Versions	English and Spanish
Contact	<p>Richard C. Cervantes Behavioral Assessment, Inc. 291 South La Cienega Blvd, Suite 305 Beverly Hills, CA 90211 (310) 652-6449 Email: cervantes@bai-eval.com</p>

7.11.2 Name of the Measure	Stereotype Confirmation Concern Scale SCCS
Primary Reference	Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., Ewell, K., Goyal, T. M., & Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31</i> , 1775–1820.
Purpose	The SCCS is designed to measure individuals' experience of having concern over confirming stereotypes during the past three months.
Description	<p>The SCCS is an 11-item Likert-type self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Never to 7 = Always.</p> <p>The SCCS is composed of one total scale score.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through a review of the research literature on stereotypes and stereotype threat and the use of a pilot study involving a sample of college students from diverse backgrounds who shared description of their concerns over conforming to a stereotype of their ethnic group.</p> <p>The factor structure of an initial 11-item measure was then examined. The results of factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded a two-factor solution that lacked conceptual clarity. Examination of the scree plot indicated one single interpretable factor.</p>
Samples	<p>A sample of 361 first-year undergraduate college students from a university in the Northeastern portion of the United States was recruited to establish validity and explore the factor structure of the SCCS. The sample was composed entirely of students fulfilling a requirement for their Introduction to Psychology course.</p> <p>Twenty-eight participants did not indicate their gender or ethnicity and, as a result, were not included subsequent analyses. Of these 333 participants (91 male; 242 female), 208 were White American, 34 were African Americans, 31 were Latino/a American, and 60 were Asian American or Pacific Islander. The sample ranged in age from 16 to 29 years ($M = 17.9$).</p>
Scoring	<p>There are 11 items in the SCCS.</p> <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the scale consists of summing the scale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher concerns over conforming to known stereotypes of own ethnic group. No transformations are required.</p> <p>The Mean scores for SCCS for African Americans, Latino/a Americans, Asian Americans, and White Americans, respectively, were as follows: 2.34, 1.81, .207, and 1.48.</p>

Reliability	Cronbach's alpha for the total SCCS scale score for ethnic minorities was .91. Cronbach's alpha for the SCCS scale score for White Americans was .89.
Validity	Convergent validity of SCCS was established through significant relationships, in the expected direction, with measures of generic life stress (Crandall, Preisler, & Ausprung, 1982), global self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), negative mood (Usala & Hertzog, 1989), life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Known-groups validity also was demonstrated through a significant main ethnic group effect on the SCCS.
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	Richard J. Contrada Department of Psychology Rutgers University 53 Avenue E Piscataway, NJ 08854-8040 (732) 445-3195 Email: contrada@rci.rutgers.edu

7.11.3 Name of the Measure	Colonial Mentality Scale CMS
Primary Reference	David, E. J. R., & Okazki, S. (2006). The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) for Filipino Americans: Scale construction and psychological implications. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i> , 53, 241–252.
Purpose	The CMS is designed to be a measure of internalized oppression among Filipino/a Americans.
Description	<p>The CMS is a 36-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree. The CMS is composed of 5 subscales: (1) Within-Group Discrimination; (2) Physical Characteristics; (3) Colonial Debt; (4) Cultural Shame and Embarrassment; and (5) Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority.</p> <p>The principal author developed an initial 53-item instrument to measure colonial mentality based on a review of the literature on internalized oppression of Filipino/a Americans. A research assistant reviewed these items and provided feedback regarding the measure's clarity and readability.</p> <p>An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with direct oblimin rotation was conducted on data from 292 cases. The EFA resulted in 13 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00. Examination of scree plot indicated a six-factor solution. A one-, two-, three-, four-, five-, and six- factor solution were forced to indicate the best factor structure for the measure. The authors chose a five-factor solution because it produced the least amount of cross-correlated items and was consistent with theory. This resulted in a 36-item CMS.</p> <p>Confirmatory factor analysis was performed using AMOS 5.0 (Arbuckle, 2003). The five-factor solution proved to fit their data best. Organization of the five factors into three types of colonial mentality also was supported.</p>
Samples	<p>The factor structure of the CMS was explored, confirmed, and validated based on data collected from one large national sample of Filipino/a Americans ($N = 603$) recruited through the use of email snowball sampling. This sample was split into two smaller samples of 292 and 311 Filipino/a Americans for exploratory and confirmatory analyses, respectively.</p> <p>The sample was composed of 397 women and 206 men. The sample ranged in age from 18 to 72 years ($M = 28.90$; $SD = 10.43$). With respect to generational status, 371 reported being second generation, 220 first generation, 6 third generation, and 1 fourth generation. Thirty-eight percent of the sample held college degrees.</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each of the subscales of the CMS are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within-Group Discrimination: 11 items Physical Characteristics: 8 items Colonial Debt: 7 items Cultural Shame and Embarrassment: 5 items Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority: 5 items Total CMS: 36 items

	<p>The authors also argue that the subscales can be categorized into three general types of manifestations of colonial mentality: Cultural Shame and Internalized Inferiority, Within-Group Discrimination and Physical Characteristics, and Colonial Debt.</p> <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of Colonial Mentality. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscales were as follows:</p> <p> Within-Group Discrimination: Alpha = .89</p> <p> Physical Characteristics: Alpha = .89</p> <p> Colonial Debt: Alpha = .87</p> <p> Cultural Shame and Embarrassment: Alpha = .78</p> <p> Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority: Alpha = .81</p> <p>Gutman split-half reliability of .80 also was reported.</p>
Validity	<p>Discriminant validity was established through the lack of significant correlation between the Colonial Debt subscale and self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965).</p> <p>Concurrent validity of CMS subscales was established through expected significant negative correlations with a measure of personal self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), collective self-esteem (Luthanen & Crocker, 1992), and acculturation (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). The CMS subscales also were found to be positively correlated with a measure of depression (Radloff, 1977). The subscale of Colonial Debt also was found to be negatively correlated with the perception and appraisal of racist events (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>E. J. R. David Department of Psychology University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 603 East Daniel Street Champaign, IL 61820 Email: edavid@psyc.uiuc.edu</p>

7.11.4 Name of the Measure	Asian American Racism-Related Stress Inventory AARRSI
Primary Reference	Liang, C. T. H., Li, L. C., & Kim, B. S. K. (2004). The Asian American Racism-Related Stress Inventory: Development, factor analysis, reliability, and validity. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51</i> , 103–114.
Purpose	The AARRSI is designed to be a multidimensional measure of racism-related stress experienced by Asian Americans.
Description	<p>The AARRSI is a 29-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = This Event has Never Happened to Me or Someone I know; 2 = This Event Happened but Did Not Bother Me; 3 = This Event Happened and I Was Slightly Bothered; 4 = This Event Happened and I Was Upset; 5 = This Event Happened and I Was Extremely Upset.</p> <p>The AARRSI is composed of 3 subscales: (1) socio-historical racism; (2) general racism; and (3) perpetual foreigner.</p> <p>Items were initially developed based on a review of interdisciplinary literature on Asian American experiences, stress and coping theory, the psychological literature regarding racism, and the contents of a focus group of eight Asian American university students enrolled in Asian American Studies courses. Redundant items were deleted. This process resulted in an initial 62 items. These items were then reviewed for clarity and representativeness by a group of 10 counseling psychology doctoral students who were enrolled in a course on psychometrics.</p> <p>An exploratory factor analysis with direct oblimin rotation resulted in 15 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00. Examination of the interpretability and composition of those factors led to the retention of 29 items correlating with three factors. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that their data adequately fit the three-factor model.</p>
Samples	<p>The factor structure of the AARRSI was explored based on a sample of 161 participants (88 women, 73 men). The sample was composed of a college sample and a community sample who ranged in age from 17 to 41 years ($M = 20.33$, $SD = 2.83$), and 24 to 57 years ($M = 38.14$, $SD = 10.60$). Both samples were diverse with respect to Asian ethnic background.</p> <p>A second sample of 142 undergraduate students (83 men, 58 women, 1 did not indicate gender) participated in a study confirming the factor structure of the AARRSI. Their age ranged from 17 to 65 years ($M = 19.73$; $SD = 5.39$). There was a diverse group of Asian ethnic groups represented in the sample.</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each of the three subscales of the AARRSI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-Historical: 14 items General Racism: 8 items Perpetual Foreigner: 7 items Total AARRSI: 29 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of racism-related stress. No transformations are required.</p>

Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscales and total scale were as follows:</p> <p>Socio-Historical: Alpha = .93 General Racism: Alpha = .86 Perpetual Foreigner: Alpha = .84 Total AARRSI: Alpha = .95</p> <p>Two-Week Test-Retest Reliability</p> <p>Socio-Historical: $r = .87$ General Racism: $r = .82$ Perpetual Foreigner: $r = .73$ Total AARRSI: $r = .84$</p>
Validity	<p>Discriminant validity was established through the lack of significant correlation between the AARRSI, its subscales, and the Asian Value Scale (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999).</p> <p>Concurrent validity of AARRSI subscales was established through expected significant positive correlations with a measure of perceived racism (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; McNeilly et al., 1996) and minority status stress (Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). The AARRSI, however, was not found to be significantly related to measures of psychological distress (Derogatis et al., 1974), stress (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983), or self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965).</p>
Related References	<p>Liang, C. T. H., Alvarez, A. N., Juang, L., & Liang, M. (2007). The role of coping in the relationship between perceived racism and racism-related stress for Asian Americans: Gender differences. <i>Cultural Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54</i>, 132–142.</p> <p>Liang, C. T. H., & Fassinger, R. E. (2008). Collective self-esteem in the relationship between racism-related stress and psychological adjustment: A test of moderator and mediator hypotheses. <i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14</i>, 19–28.</p> <p>Patel, S. G., Salahuddin, N. M., & O'Brien, K. M. (2008). Career decision-making self-efficacy of Vietnamese adolescents: The role of acculturation, social support, socioeconomic status, and racism. <i>Journal of Career Development, 34</i>, 218–240.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Christopher T. H. Liang 1950 Third Street University of La Verne Department of Psychology La Verne, CA 91750</p>

7.11.5 Name of the Measure	Race-Related Stressor Scale RRSS
Primary Reference	Loo, C. M., Fairbank, J. A., Scurfield, R. M., Ruch, L. O., King, D. W., Adams, L. J., & Chemtob, C. M. (2001). Measuring exposure to racism: Development and validation of a Race-Related Stressor Scale (RRSS) for Asian American Vietnam Veterans. <i>Psychological Assessment, 13</i> , 503–520.
Purpose	The RRSS is designed to measure exposure to race-related stressors in the military or a war zone by Asian Americans.
Description	<p>The RRSS is a 33-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale: 0 = Never; 1 = Rarely; 2 = Sometimes; 3 = Frequently; 4 = Very Frequently.</p> <p>The RRSS is composed of three subscales: (1) Racial Prejudice and Stigmatization; (2) Bicultural Identification and Conflict; and (3) Racist Environment.</p> <p>Four methods were used to develop the items of the RRSS: (a) a review of the literature on race-related stressors among minority Vietnam War veterans; (b) clinical interviews with Asian American Vietnam War veterans who had symptoms of PTSD; (c) focus groups; and (d) input from clinicians with experience working with Asian American Vietnam War veterans. Items were sorted into three categories: Racial Prejudice and Stigmatization, Bicultural Identification and Conflict, and Racist Environment. As a result of these four steps, an initial pool of 94 items was included in a pilot study to test for variability in responses for each of the aforementioned dimensions. Results of their analyses also indicated differences in mean scores between clinical and nonclinical veterans.</p> <p>After further examination of the measure, the item pool was reduced to 39. The scale was then subjected to an exploratory factor analysis using maximum-likelihood estimation with oblimin rotation. Items with a structure coefficients less than .50 were omitted. This resulted in a 33-item measure.</p>
Samples	<p>The psychometric properties of the RRSS were established based on several samples. The primary sample was composed of 300 veterans of Asian American descent who served in the U.S. military during the Vietnam War. The mean age of the sample was 55.07 years ($SD = 6.53$). The average number of years of education was 14.18 ($SD = 2.74$). This sample was composed of Asian Americans of several different ethnic backgrounds, including Mixed Asian or mixed race (37%), Japanese/Okinawan (21%), Chinese (14%), Chamorro (13%), Filipino (12%), and Korean (3%).</p> <p>Multiple sampling methods were utilized to recruit those participants who were in treatment for medical or mental health and those who were not in treatment.</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each subscale is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Racial Prejudice and Stigmatization: 19 items Bicultural Identification and Conflict: 7 items Racist Environment: 7 items Total RRSS: 33 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale. No transformations are required.</p>

Reliability	<p>Cronbach's coefficient alpha for scores of the total scale and the three subscale scores were as follows:</p> <p>Racial Prejudice and Stigmatization: Alpha = .97 Bicultural Identification and Conflict: Alpha = .93 Racist Environment: Alpha = .93 Total RRSS: Alpha = .97</p> <p>Test-Retest coefficients are based on data collected within a 5- to 16-week interval between test administrations. The Pearson coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>Racial Prejudice and Stigmatization: $r = .84$ Bicultural Identification and Conflict: $r = .84$ Racist Environment: $r = .69$ Total RRSS: $r = .85$</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity was indicated through significant correlations between the RRSS total, RRSS subscale scores, and scores of the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis, Rickles, & Rock, 1976) and the measure of combat-related post-traumatic stress disorder (Keane, Caddell, & Taylor, 1988).</p>
Related References	<p>Rippy, A. E., & Newman, E. (2008). Adaptation of a scale of race-related stress for use with Muslim Americans. <i>Journal of Muslim Mental Health</i>, 3, 53–68.</p>
Language Versions	<p>English</p>
Contact	<p>Chalsa M. Loo 1164 Bishop Street, Suite 1502 Honolulu, HI 96813 (808) 526–2008 Email: chalsa@earthlink.net</p>

7.11.6 Name of the Measure	Psychosocial Costs of Racism for Whites PCRW
Primary Reference	Spanierman, L. B., & Heppner, M. J. (2004). Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites Scale (PCRW): Construction and initial validation. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51</i> , 249–262.
Purpose	The PCRW is designed to measure an individual's awareness and acceptance of similarities and differences in others.
Description	<p>The PCRW is a 16-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors (1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree).</p> <p>The PCRW is composed of three subscales: (1) White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism; (2) White Guilt; and (3) White Fear of Others.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through several steps. An initial pool of 39 items was created based on a review of research literature regarding Whiteness to reflect behavioral, cognitive, and affective costs of racism for Whites. Five counseling psychology doctoral students provided feedback regarding the appropriateness of content, clarity, and parsimony of the items. An additional panel of five faculty members with expertise with race, multiculturalism, and scale construction was consulted to further ensure the appropriateness of the items. As a result of this process, several items were reworded, four items were deleted, and one new item was created.</p> <p>The authors first tested their data to ensure their sample was appropriate for factor analysis. Principal components analysis was conducted to estimate the number of factors to specify in the exploratory factor analysis. Two-, three-, and four-factor solutions were tested. Based on eigenvalues and examination of scree plot, a three-factor solution emerged as the best fit for their data. An exploratory factor analysis, using maximum likelihood extraction with oblique rotation, was used. Items correlating with multiple factors or with structure coefficients less than .35 were deleted. This resulted in a 16-item measure. Confirmatory factor analysis, using AMOS (Arbuckle, 1999), was used to test for stability of the factor structure. Their data fit a three-factor solution best.</p>
Samples	A sample of 361 White American undergraduate college students from a university in the Midwestern portion of the United States was recruited to explore the factor structure of the PCRW. A second sample of 366 undergraduate students attending either a large or a midsized university in the Midwestern portion of the United States was used to confirm the factor structure and further establish validity of the measure.
Scoring	<p>The number of items for the subscales are follows:</p> <p>White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism: 6 items</p> <p>White Guilt: 5 items</p> <p>White Fear of Others: 5 items</p> <p>Total PCRW: 16 items</p>

	<p>Three of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher experience of the psychosocial costs of racism. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the subscale scores ranged from .63 to .78.</p> <p>White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism: Alpha = .78, .79, .85 White Guilt: Alpha = .70, .73, .81 White Fear of Others: Alpha = .63, .69, .78</p> <p>Two-week Test-retest reliability coefficients were as follows: White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism: Alpha = .84 White Guilt: Alpha = .69 White Fear of Others: Alpha = .95</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity of PCRW subscales was established through expected findings of significant negative and positive correlations with subscales of the Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale (Neville et al., 2000), Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE; Wang et al., 2003). None of the SEE subscales were found to be related to White Guilt. Furthermore, contrary to expectations, White Fear of Others was negatively related to three of the four SEE subscales.</p> <p>Additional convergent validity was established through significant positive correlations between White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism, White Guilt, and the Quick Discrimination Index (Ponterotto et al., 1995) and through significant negative correlations between White Fear of Others and the QDI. The Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale (LaFleur, Leach, & Rowe, 2002) also was used to establish convergent validity. Its subscales were found to be related to PCRW subscales in the expected directions.</p> <p>Discriminant validity was established through the lack of significant correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Form C (Reynolds, 1982) and Negative Affectivity (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).</p>
Related References	<p>Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2008). Further validation of the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to White Scale among employed adults. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36</i>, 871–894.</p> <p>Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Beer, A. M., & Armstrong, P. I. (2006). Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Exploring patterns through cluster analysis. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53</i>, 434–441.</p> <p>Spanierman, L. B., Todd, N. R., & Anderson, C. J. (2009). Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Understanding patterns among university students. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56</i>, 239–252.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Lisa B. Spanierman Department of Educational Psychology University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 226 Education Building MC-708 Champaign, IL 61820 Email: lspan@illinois.edu</p>

7.11.7 Name of the Measure	Cultural Mistrust Inventory CMI
Primary Reference	Terrell, F., & Terrell, S. (1981). An inventory to measure cultural mistrust among Blacks. <i>The Western Journal of Black Studies</i> , 5, 180–185. Whaley, A. L. (2002). Psychometric analysis of the Cultural Mistrust Inventory with a Black psychiatric inpatient sample. <i>Journal of Clinical Psychology</i> , 58, 383–396.
Purpose	The CMI is a measure of the personality characteristics among Black individuals to perceive mistrust of White people and institutions that are perceived to reflect White culture.
Description	<p>The CMI is a 48-item self-report inventory. Each item is rated on a 9-point Likert-type scale: 0–1 = Not in the Least Agree; 2–3 = Slightly Agree; 4–5 = Moderately Agree; 6–7 = Very Much Agree; and 8–9 = Entirely Agree. Respondents are instructed that selection of the higher value within each response option indicates stronger agreement with the statement.</p> <p>The CMI is composed of four subscales: (1) Education and Training, (2) Interpersonal Relations, (3) Business and Work, and (4) Politics and Law.</p> <p>These four subscales were developed based on a review of the literature that indicated that African Americans make decisions in life based on a tendency to be suspicious of White individuals. Items were then developed for each subscale by the original authors. A team of four African American psychologists then rated each scale for clarity and appropriateness. Items deemed to not meet these criteria were rewritten or eliminated. This procedure was followed for all items that required rewriting.</p> <p>Eighty-one items composed the initial CMI. A total of 23 items were eliminated from further consideration after a three-step process including the elimination of items that were endorsed by a majority of the participants, as well as analyses of relationships between items and of each item’s relationship to social desirability (Jackson, 1970). Items yielding significant correlations of .50 or higher with other items on the scale or with the measure of social desirability were eliminated.</p>
Samples	<p>Initial validation of the measure was established using two samples.</p> <p>The first sample was composed of 172 African American first- and second-year college students. A second sample composed of 69 African American individuals similar to those in the first sample.</p> <p>In a study that further analyzed the psychometric properties of the CMI, Whaley (2002) sampled 154 participants who were patients of a state psychiatric hospital. In this sample, there were 116 males (75%) and 38 females (25%). The mean age of the sample was 38.88 ($SD = 9.89$).</p>
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each of the subscales are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and Training: 7 items Interpersonal Relations: 14 items Business and Work: 15 items Politics and Law: 12 items Total CMI: 48 items

	<p>Twenty of the 48 items are negatively worded, which requires reverse scoring. Scoring the CMI consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items in the specific subscale. Scores for the full scale are obtained similarly. Higher scores indicate higher levels of cultural mistrust.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the full or subscale scores were not reported by Terrell and Terrell (1981).</p> <p>Whaley (2002) reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the full and subscale scores.</p> <p>Full Scale: Alpha = .85</p> <p>Education and Training: Alpha = .63</p> <p>Interpersonal Relations: Alpha = .43</p> <p>Business and Work: Alpha = .71</p> <p>Politics and Law: Alpha = .63</p> <p>A two-week test-retest reliability coefficient of .86 was reported for the full scale score.</p>
Validity	<p>In the initial college sample, convergent validity was established through the demonstration that individuals reporting higher incidences of racial discrimination (Terrell & Miller, 1980) also would report higher levels of cultural mistrust.</p> <p>Whaley (2002) reported convergent validity through significant relationships with nonclinical paranoia (Fenigstein & Vanable, 1992), criterion validity with self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1989), and discriminant validity with social desirability (measured through an instrument adapted by the author from the Crowne and Marlowe [1960] Social Desirability Scale).</p> <p>Whaley (2002) also conducted a principal components analysis to examine the structure of the total scale and its subscales. Results of their analyses indicated a different CMI factor structure. High intercorrelations between subscales also suggest the possibility of a unidimensional structure of the CMI for clinical samples.</p>
Related References	<p>Bell, T. J., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2006). The relation of cultural mistrust and psychological health. <i>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34</i>, 2–14.</p>
Language Versions	<p>English</p>
Contact	<p>Francis Terrell University of North Texas Department of Psychology 1611 W. Mulberry Terrill Hall Room 359 Denton, TX 76203 940-565-2678 Email: terrellf@unt.edu</p>

7.11.8 Name of the Measure	Africultural Coping Systems Inventory ACSI
Primary Reference	Utsey, S. O., Adams, E. P., & Bolden, M. (2000). Development and initial validation of the Africultural Coping Systems Inventory. <i>Journal of Black Psychology</i> , 26, 194–215.
Purpose	The ACSI is a 30-item measure of the culture-specific coping strategies and behaviors used by African Americans in stressful situations. The ACSI is grounded in an African-centered conceptual framework.
Description	<p>The ACSI contains the following four subscales: Cognitive/Emotional Debriefing (CED), Spiritual-Centered Coping (SC), Collective Coping (CC), and Ritual-Centered Coping (RC).</p> <p>To complete the ACSI, respondents are asked to “recall a stressful situation that occurred within the past week or so.” Respondents are then asked to describe the stressful situation. Lastly, using a 4-point Likert-type scale (0 = Did Not Use, 1 = Used a Little, 2 = Used a Lot, 3 = Used a Great Deal), respondents are asked to indicate which coping strategies they employed with this particular stressful situation.</p> <p>A confirmatory factor analysis with a separate sample ($N = 220$) provided evidence that the four-factor model of coping adequately fit the data.</p>
Samples	The convenience sample consisted of 180 African American adults (104 women and 75 men) from the northeastern United States. Ages ranged from 16 to 66 years ($M = 29.87$, $SD = 11.07$). Marital status of the sample was 69% single, 24% married/committed relationship, 3% separated, 3% divorced, and 1% widowed. Mean educational level was $M = 13.75$, $SD = 1.99$. Mean annual income was $M = \$28,043$, $SD = \$17,480$.
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the four subscales is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cognitive/Emotional Debriefing: 11 items Spiritual-Centered Coping: 8 items Collective Coping: 8 items Ritual-Centered Coping: 3 items Total ACSI: 30 items <p>Scoring the ACSI consists of adding the respondent’s ratings on each item in the subscale and dividing by the number of subscale items to obtain a subscale mean. No reverse coding or transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .76 to .82 across the scores of the four subscales.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cognitive/Emotional Debriefing (CED): Alpha = .79 Spiritual-Centered Coping (SC): Alpha = .78 Collective Coping (CC): Alpha = .78 Ritual-Centered Coping (RC): Alpha = .76

Validity	Concurrent validity was established by correlating the ACSI subscales with the subscales of the Ways of Coping Questionnaire (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988) subscales.
Related References	Constantine, M. G., Donnelly, P. C., & Myers, L. J. (2002). Collective self-esteem and Africultural coping styles in African American adolescents. <i>Journal of Black Studies</i> , 32(6), 698–710. Utsey, S. O., Bolden, M. A., Williams, O., III, Lee, A., Lanier, Y., & Newsome, C. (2007). Spiritual well-being as a mediator of the relation between culture-specific coping and quality of life in a community sample of African Americans. <i>Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology</i> , 38(2), 123–136.
Language Versions	English
Contact	Shawn Utsey Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Psychology and African American Studies 915 W. Franklin St., Stark House, Rm. 102 P.O. Box 842509 Richmond, VA 23284–2509 (804) 828–1384 (Office) (804) 828–1665 (Fax) Email: soutsey@vcu.edu

7.11.9 Name of the Measure	Index of Race-Related Stress IRRS IRRS-B
Primary Reference	Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1996). Development and validation of the Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS). <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43</i> , 490–501.
Purpose	The IRRS is designed as a measure of the stress experienced by African Americans as a result of their encounters with racism.
Description	<p>The IRRS is a 46-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = This Event Has Never Happened to Me or Someone I Know to 5 = This Event Happened and I Was Extremely Upset.</p> <p>The IRRS is composed of 4 subscales: (1) Cultural Racism, (2) Institutional Racism, (3) Individual Racism, and (4) Collective Racism.</p> <p>The instrument was developed through (1) a review of the literature, (2) informal interviews with African American from diverse backgrounds, (3) the personal life experiences of the primary author, an African American male, (4) comments from a focus group of five individuals regarding their reactions to the content of the IRRS, and (5) a second focus group with five experts who rated the measure for clarity and appropriateness. As a result of these steps, several items were reworded to add more clarity. Additionally, the original Likert-type scale was changed. Efforts also were made to ensure that individuals with an 8th-grade reading level could complete the survey.</p> <p>A pilot study utilizing the 67-item IRRS was administered to a sample of 377 participants (203 women, 163 men). Based on the results of the study, the Likert-type response was changed again (to its final format). Based on principal components analysis with orthogonal and oblique rotations and evaluation of scree test, a three-factor model was found to be most interpretable. Based on the principal components analysis and a review by the researchers, the IRRS was reduced to 59 items.</p> <p>A principal components analysis with orthogonal rotation and analysis of scree test yielded a four-factor structure. The authors reported that items were required to have a structure coefficient of at least .40.</p> <p>Confirmatory factor analysis, using LISREL (Jöreskog & Sörborn, 1989), was used to test for stability of the factor structure. Their data indicated a four-component oblique model to be the best fit.</p> <p>Utsey developed and tested the psychometric properties of a 22-item version of the IRRS-Brief. Because some of the items on the Collective Racism subscale were found to be geographically specific, it was eliminated from the IRRS-Brief. The IRRS-Brief was found to have adequate reliability, construct validity, criterion validity, and concurrent validity.</p> <p>Seaton (2003, 2006) tested the psychometric properties of the IRRS for use with adolescents.</p>

Samples	<p>Principal components analysis was conducted with a sample of 302 participants from Greensboro, NC ($n = 113$), and New York City ($n = 188$). The ages ranged from 18–61 years of age ($M = 26.77$, $SD = 9.02$) and were composed primarily of American-Born Blacks (92%). Thirty-five percent of the participants were from the community, 51% were college students, and 13% were residents in a substance abuse treatment facility.</p> <p>A group of 310 African American participants (207 women, 92 men), who ranged in age from 17–76 ($M = 23.38$, $SD = 7.74$), was sampled. The sample was composed of 153 participants from Washington, DC, and 157 from the New York City area. Sixteen percent were individuals from the community, with the remaining from colleges and universities. Thirty-one additional non-Black participants were recruited as well. They ranged in age from 19 to 47 years ($M = 27.97$, $SD = 7.64$).</p>
Scoring	<p>Cultural Racism: 16 items Institutional Racism: 11 items Individual Racism: 11 items Collective Racism: 8 items Total IRRS: 46 items</p> <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate higher experience of each component of race-related stress. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Cultural Racism: Alpha = .87 Institutional Racism: Alpha = .85 Individual Racism: Alpha = .84 Collective Racism: Alpha = .79</p> <p>Three-Week Test-Retest reliability coefficients for the subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Cultural Racism: $r = .77$ Institutional Racism: $r = .69$ Individual Racism: $r = .61$ Collective Racism: $r = .79$</p> <p>Two-Week Test-Retest reliability coefficients for the subscales were as follows:</p> <p>Cultural Racism: $r = .58$ Institutional Racism: $r = .71$ Individual Racism: $r = .54$ Collective Racism: $r = .75$</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

Validity	<p>Concurrent validity was established through significant correlations with the total scale and IRRS subscales scores and another measure of perceived discrimination (Harrell, 1994) and perceived stress (Cohen, Karmarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).</p> <p>Criterion-related validity was tested using one-way MANOVAs to examine the effects of race on the IRRS subscales. Results indicated that Blacks reported higher levels of each form of racism than did an aggregated group of Asian Americans and White Americans.</p>
Related References	<p>Seaton, E. K. (2003). An examination of the factor structure of the Index of Race-Related Stress among a sample of African American adolescents. <i>Journal of Black Psychology, 29</i>, 292–307.</p> <p>Seaton, E. K. (2006). Examination of a measure of racial discrimination among African American adolescents. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36</i>, 1414–1429.</p> <p>Utsey, S. O. (1999). Development and validation of a short form of the Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS)–Brief Version. <i>Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32</i>, 149–167.</p> <p>Utsey, S. O., Ponterotto, J. G., Reynolds, A. L., & Cancelli, A. A. (2000). Racial discrimination, coping, life satisfaction, and self-esteem among African Americans. <i>Journal of Counseling and Development, 78</i>, 72–80.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Shawn O. Utsey Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Psychology 806 West Franklin Street Richmond, VA 23284–2018 (804) 828–1144 Email: soutsey@vcu.edu</p>

7.11.10 Name of the Measure	Internalization of the Model Minority Myth Measure IM-4
Primary Reference	Yoo, H. C., Burrola, K. S., & Steger, M. F. (2010). A preliminary report on a new measure: Internalization of the Model Minority Myth Measure (IM-4) and its psychological correlates among Asian American college students. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i> , 57, 114–127.
Purpose	The IM-4 is designed to measure Asian Americans' internalization of the model minority myth, a stereotype of the group as being successful compared to other racialized groups and that this achievement is associated with the groups' work and effort.
Description	<p>The IM-4 is a 15-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The IM-4 is composed of two subscales: (1) Model Minority—Achievement Orientation (MM-AO) and (2) Model Minority—Unrestricted Mobility (MM-UM).</p> <p>The instrument was developed through (1) a review of the literature regarding the model minority myth and feedback from six experts, representing multiple academic disciplines, in the field of Asian American studies. Specifically, an initial pool of 49 items that were based on the literature was developed by the primary author and his team of research assistants. Fifteen items were deleted based on feedback from the experts.</p> <p>The 34-items were then submitted for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with promax rotation. The EFA indicated a clear and interpretable 15-item, two-factor solution. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was then used to test the stability of the proposed factor structure. Results of the CFA indicated good fit of the data to the model.</p>
Samples	<p>Asian American undergraduate college students ($N = 206$) participated in a study that explored the IM-4's factor structure. Their mean age was 20 ($SD = 2.1$). There were 94 women and 111 men with one not responding. The respondents represented first- ($n = 78$), second- ($n = 73$), and third- ($n = 55$) generation students. In terms of ethnic background, the sample was composed of 61 Chinese, 38 Vietnamese, 30 multiracial/multiethnic, 29 Filipino/a, 21 Korean, 8 Japanese, 6 Asian Indian, 3 Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 2 Cambodian, 2 Taiwanese, 1 Thai, and 1 Bengali with four individuals not responding.</p> <p>A second sample of 187 college students (79 women, 99 men) with a mean age of 21 ($SD = 2.5$) participated in a study to confirm the factor structure of the IM-4. In terms of ethnic background, the sample was composed of 45 Chinese, 15 Vietnamese, 13 multiracial/multiethnic, 19 Filipino/a, 34 Korean, 19 Japanese, 15 Asian Indian, 16 other Asian with 11 individuals not responding.</p>

(Continued)

(Continued)

Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the two subscales is as follows:</p> <p>MM-AO: 10 items MM-UM: 5 items Total IM-4: 15 items</p> <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items and dividing by the number of items of which it is composed. Higher scores indicate greater levels of internalizing these two components of the model minority myth. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscales were as follows:</p> <p>MM-AO: Alpha = .91 MM-UM: Alpha = .77</p> <p>Two-Week Test-Retest reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>MM-AO: $r = .72$ MM-UM: $r = .70$</p>
Validity	<p>Evidence for discriminant validity was demonstrated through small positive or nonstatistically significant relations between the IM-4 subscales and Asian American values (Kim et al., 2005). Convergent validity was demonstrated through some statistically significant relationships found between the IM-4 subscales and ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992), psychological distress (Green, Walkey, McCormick, & Taylor, 1988), and through statistically significant correlations between MM-UM and negative affect (Thompson, 2007).</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Hyung Chol Yoo Asian Pacific American Studies Arizona State University P.O. Box 874902 Tempe, AZ 85287-4902 Email: yoo@asu.edu</p>

7.12 ADOLESCENT EXPERIENCES

7.12.1 Name of the Measure	Everyday Discrimination Scale—Modified EDS–M
Primary Reference	Clark, R., Coleman, A. P., & Novak, J. D. (2004). Brief report: Initial psychometric properties of the everyday discrimination scale in Black adolescents. <i>Journal of Adolescence</i> , 28, 363–368.
Purpose	The EDS–M is designed to measure perceptions of racism among African American adolescents.
Description	The EDS–M is a 9-item self-report measure. It utilizes a 6-point Likert scale with the following anchors: 1 = Almost Every Day and 6 = Never. The EDS-M is a unidimensional measure. The EDS-M is a modified version of the Everyday Discrimination Scale (Forman, Williams, & Jackson, 1997). One component, accounting for 49.34% of the standardized variance, emerged from a principal components analysis using varimax rotation.
Samples	A sample of 120 African American adolescents (55 females, 65 males) in grades 9–12 participated in the study. The sample's mean age was 15.70 years (<i>SD</i> = 0.95).
Scoring	Total EDS-M: 9 items All of the items are reverse scored. Scoring consists of summing nine items. Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of perceived racism. No transformations are required.
Reliability	Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the total scale score was .87.
Validity	Criterion-related validity of the EDS-M was evidenced through significant positive relationships with both internalizing and externalizing symptoms, as measured by the Child Behaviour Checklist-Youth Self-Report Form (Achenbach, 1991).
Related References	Forman, T. A., Williams, D. R., & Jackson, J. S. (1997). Race, place, and discrimination. <i>Perspectives on Social Problems</i> , 9, 231–261.
Language Versions	English
Contact	Items of the EDS-M are published in Clark et al. (2004).

7.12.2 Name of the Measure	Adolescent Discrimination Distress Index ADDI
Primary Reference	Fisher, C. B., Wallace, S. A., & Fenton, R. E. (2000). Discrimination distress during adolescence. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i> , 29, 679–695.
Purpose	The ADDI is designed to measure experiences of distress in response to perceived race-based discrimination experiences among multi-ethnic American adolescents.
Description	<p>The ADDI is a 15-item self-report measure. It utilizes Yes/No response format to measure the frequency of perceived discrimination and a 5-point Likert scale with the following anchors: 1 = Not at All and 5 = Extremely to assess for distress.</p> <p>The ADDI is composed of three subscales: (1) Institutional Discrimination Subscale, (2) Educational Discrimination Subscale, and (3) Peer Discrimination Subscale. For each subscale, an “experience” and “distress” score can be derived.</p> <p>Nineteen items originally composed the ADDI. Items were constructed based on existing literature, news reports, personal experiences of the research team members, and the Racial Discrimination Index (Terrell & Miller, 1988). Items were reviewed for clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of terminology by a multi-ethnic group of 28 high school students. A final three-factor, 15-item ADDI emerged from their feedback and the results of a principal-components analysis (rotation unspecified). The ADDI is a modified version of the Everyday Discrimination Scale (Forman, Williams, & Jackson, 1997).</p>
Samples	A sample of 177 high school students ranging from 13–19 years of age ($M = 16$ years) from an academically competitive and ethnically diverse urban school participated in the study. There were 78 males, 98 females, as well as one person who did not identify her or his gender in the sample. With respect to race, 21% reported African American (American, African, Caribbean), 23% Latino/a American (Caribbean, Central or South American), 25% East Asian (Chinese or Korean), 8% South Asian (Indian), and 23% White American (Europe, Russia, and Mid-East).
Scoring	<p>The number of items for each of the three subscales of the ADDI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional Discrimination Subscale: 6 items Educational Discrimination Subscale: 4 items Peer Discrimination Distress: 5 items Total ADDI: 15 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring for “experience” can be derived by summing the “yes” responses. Higher scores indicate more perceived experiences of discrimination. Scoring of “distress” can consists of summing the items on the corresponding subscale. Higher scores indicate greater levels of distress experienced in response to perceived race-based discrimination. No transformations are required.</p>

Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscale are as follows:</p> <p>Institutional Discrimination Distress Subscale: Alpha = .72</p> <p>Educational Discrimination Distress Subscale: Alpha = .60</p> <p>Peer Discrimination Distress Subscale: Alpha = .60</p> <p>Two-week test-retest reliability coefficients were calculated for a subsample ($n = 52$) of the total participants. The reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p>Institutional Discrimination Distress Subscale: $r = .76$</p> <p>Educational Discrimination Distress Subscale: $r = .53$</p> <p>Peer Discrimination Distress Subscale: $r = .75$</p>
Validity	<p>Evidence for known-groups validity was demonstrated through statistically significantly higher levels of distress in institutional and educational settings among African American, Latino/a American, and South Asian Americans, and East Asian Americans than White Americans. Higher levels of peer racial discrimination were reported by East Asian American and White American participants.</p> <p>Evidence for criterion-related validity was demonstrated through statistically significant inverse relationships between self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1986) and scores on the peer discrimination distress and educational discrimination distress subscales of the ADDI.</p>
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Celia B. Fisher Center for Ethics Education Fordham University 441 E. Fordham Road Dealy Hall Bronx, NY 10458 Phone: 718-817-3793 Email: fisher@fordham.edu</p>

7.12.3 Name of the Measure	The Racial Bias Preparation Scale RBPS
Primary Reference	Fisher, C. B., Wallace, S. A., & Fenton, R. E. (2000). Discrimination distress during adolescence. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i> , 29, 679–695.
Purpose	The RBPS is designed to measure the frequency with which adolescents perceive receiving messages about living in a multiethnic society from primary caretakers.
Description	<p>The RBPS is a 20-item self-report measure. It utilizes a 3-point Likert scale (1 = Never, 2 = A Few Times, 3 = A Lot).</p> <p>The RBPS is composed of two dimensions: (1) Reactive Messages and (2) Proactive Messages.</p> <p>Items of the RBPS were constructed based on the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale (Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002) and a review of the related literature. Items were reviewed for clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of terminology by a multi-ethnic group of 28 high school students. A final two-factor, 20-item RBPS emerged from their feedback and the results of a principal-components analysis (rotation unspecified).</p>
Samples	A sample of 177 high school students ranging from 13–19 years of age ($M = 16$ years) from an academically competitive and ethnically diverse urban school participated in the study. There were 78 males, 98 females, as well as one person who did not identify her or his gender in the sample. With respect to race, 21% reported African American (American, African, Caribbean), 23% Latino/a American (Caribbean, Central or South American), 25% East Asian (Chinese or Korean), 8% South Asian (Indian), and 23% White American (Europe, Russia, and Mid-East).
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the subscales is as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Reactive Messages: 10 items</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Proactive Messages: 10 items</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total RBPS: 20 items</p> <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring consists of dividing the summed score by the number of the items on the corresponding subscale. Higher scores indicate greater levels of racial bias preparation by primary caretakers. No transformations are required.</p>
Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores on the subscale are as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Reactive Messages: Alpha = .86</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Proactive Messages: Alpha = .83</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total RBPS: 20 items</p> <p>Two-week test-retest reliability coefficients were calculated for a subsample ($n = 52$) of the total participants. The reliability coefficients were as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Reactive Messages: $r = .87$</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Proactive Messages: $r = .76$</p>

Validity	Evidence for concurrent validity was demonstrated through statistically significant positive relationships between the ADDI and the RBPS.
Related References	
Language Versions	English
Contact	Celia B. Fisher Center for Ethics Education Fordham University 441 E. Fordham Road Dealy Hall Bronx, NY 10458 Phone: 718-817-3793 Email: fisher@fordham.edu

7.12.4 Name of the Measure	Scale of Racial Socialization—Adolescents SORS–A
Primary Reference	Stevenson, H. C. (1994). Validation of the Scale of Racial Socialization for African American Adolescents: Steps toward multidimensionality. <i>Journal of Black Psychology</i> , 20, 445–468.
Purpose	The SORS–A is designed to measure the level of acceptance of racial socialization attitudes or race-related messages.
Description	<p>The SORS–A is a 45-item self-report inventory. Each of these items is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.</p> <p>The SORS–A is composed of 4 subscales: (1) Spiritual and Religious Coping, (2) Extended Family Caring, (3) Cultural Pride Reinforcement, and (4) Racism Awareness Teaching.</p> <p>One hundred items were initially developed based on a review of the interdisciplinary literature pertaining to African American family functioning and on literature on racial socialization. These were revised to form a 45-item measure.</p> <p>A principal components analysis using varimax rotation was conducted on the SORS-A. A four-factor solution was found to be most meaningful and interpretable. A principal axis factor analysis with oblique and equamax rotations was conducted and yielded a five-factor solution. The fifth factor, however, was not found to have strong internal consistency and was not included in subsequent analyses. Factors were deemed acceptable based on a scree test, its ability to retain five or more items with structure coefficients greater than or equal to .30, yielded satisfactory internal consistency coefficients, included only items that correlated onto one factor, and made psychological sense.</p> <p>The four factors were subjected to higher-order principal components factor analysis. This resulted in two second-order factors: Proactive and Protective.</p>
Samples	The factor structure of the SORS–A was explored based on a sample of 236 African American adolescents (156 females, 80 males). The sample's mean age was 14.6 years. Only 200 of these participants were included in the final sample.
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the four subscales is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spiritual and Religious Coping: 7 items Extended Family Caring: 10 items Cultural Pride Reinforcement: 10 items Racism Awareness Teaching: 9 items Total SORS-A: 45 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of agreement with racial socialization practices. No transformations are required.</p>

Reliability	Cronbach's alpha for the subscale and total scale scores were as follows: Spiritual and Religious Coping: Alpha = .74 Extended Family Caring: Alpha = .70 Cultural Pride Reinforcement: Alpha = .63 Racism Awareness Teaching: Alpha = .60 Total Scale: Alpha = .75
Validity	Concurrent validity of SORS–A subscales was established through expected significant positive correlations with self-reports of how often one's family talked about racism.
Related References	Bennett, A. D., Jr. (2006). Culture and context: A study of neighborhood effects on racial socialization and ethnic identity content in a sample of African American adolescents. <i>Journal of Black Psychology, 32</i> , 479–500. Wilson, D., Foster, J., Anderson, S., & Mance, G. (2009). Racial socialization's moderating effect between poverty stress and psychological symptoms for African American youth. <i>Journal of Black Psychology, 35</i> , 102–124.
Language Versions	English
Contact	Howard C. Stevenson Jr. Graduate School of Education University of Pennsylvania 3700 Walnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19104–6216 Email: howards@nwfs.upenn.gse.edu

7.12.5 Name of the Measure	Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale TERS
Primary Reference	Stevenson, H. C., Jr., Cameron, R., Herrero-Taylor, T., & Davis, G. Y. (2002). Development of the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale: Correlates of race-related socialization frequency from the perspective of Black youth. <i>Journal of Black Psychology</i> , 28, 84–106.
Purpose	The TERS is designed to measure the frequency of messages or practices regarding race that teenagers have received or experienced from their parents or guardians.
Description	<p>The TERS, a 39-item self-report inventory, is an empirically supported measure developed based on the theoretical tenets of African-centered psychology. Each of these items is rated on a 3-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Never; 2 = A Few Times; 3 = Lots of Times.</p> <p>The TERS is composed of five subscales: (1) Cultural Coping With Antagonism; (2) Cultural Pride Reinforcement; (3) Cultural Appreciation of Legacy; (4) Cultural Alertness to Discrimination; (5) Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream.</p> <p>A principal components analysis with equamax rotation yielded a five-factor solution as most interpretable. The five-factor solution was evaluated by (a) scree test, (b) a factor's ability to retain at least five items where structure coefficients were greater than or equal to .30, (c) the demonstration of strong internal consistency for items within a factor, (d) the inclusion of items correlating only onto one factor, and (e) the psychological and conceptual clarity of factor.</p> <p>Second-order factor analysis indicated that with the exception of Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream, all factors correlated with one higher-order factor of racial socialization. This higher-order factor is called Cultural Socialization Experience.</p>
Samples	Initial validation of the 39-item measure was established using a sample composed of 260 African American adolescents ($M = 14.3$ years) who were enrolled in a summer job preparation program. The sample was comprised of 136 females and 124 males.
Scoring	<p>The number of items in each of the subscales of the TERS are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural Coping With Antagonism: 13 items Cultural Pride Reinforcement: 9 items Cultural Appreciation of Legacy: 5 items Cultural Alertness to Discrimination: 6 items Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream: 6 items Total TERS: 39 items <p>None of the items are reverse scored. Scoring the subscales consists of summing subscale items. No transformations are required.</p>

Reliability	<p>Cronbach's alpha for the scores ranged from .71 to .85.</p> <p>Cultural Coping with Antagonism: Alpha = .85</p> <p>Cultural Pride Reinforcement: Alpha = .83</p> <p>Cultural Appreciation of Legacy: Alpha = .74</p> <p>Cultural Alertness to Discrimination: Alpha = .76</p> <p>Cultural Endorsement of the Mainstream: Alpha = .71</p> <p>Total TERS: Alpha = .91</p>
Validity	<p>Convergent validity was established through multivariate analysis of variance. Specifically, MANOVA indicated a significant effect of family communication about race on all of the subscales of the TERS, such that adolescents who reported that their family talked about the least reported lower levels of each of the subscales of the TERS.</p> <p>Discriminant validity was determined through correlation analysis. Specifically, a measure of Racial Socialization Beliefs (Stevenson, 1996) was not found to be strongly related to the subscales of the TERS.</p>
Related References	<p>Barr, S. C., & Neville, H. A. (2008). Examination of the link between parental racial socialization message and racial ideology among Black college students. <i>Journal of Black Psychology, 34</i>, 131–155.</p> <p>Fischer, A. R., & Shaw, C. M. (1999). African Americans' mental health and perceptions of racist discrimination: The moderating effects of racial socialization experiences and self-esteem. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46</i>, 395–407.</p>
Language Versions	English
Contact	<p>Howard C. Stevenson Jr. 3700 Walnut Street University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA 19104–6216 Email: howards@gse.upenn.edu</p>

8

Gender-Related Measures

8.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF GENDER

The role of gender in the daily lives of individuals is ubiquitous. Along with race, gender is a visible trait upon which individuals make judgments of others and that impact their relationships with others and themselves. From the moment a young boy or girl is born, she or he and her or his parent(s) are inculcated with messages of appropriate behaviors and style of dress. Throughout their lives, boys and girls are reminded of the roles to perform and the ways to look and express oneself lest they be marginalized (e.g., Brannon, 1976; Chrisler, 2008). Women must contend with both role overload (i.e., being the “supermom”) and pervasive sexism at cultural, institutional, and interpersonal levels and threats to their physical safety and economic well-being. In addition to coping with sexism, women and men are socialized to expect certain behaviors from women and girls (e.g., meeting the standards of the ideal body; being nurturing). Men, on the other hand, must negotiate their privilege with the restrictions and expectations that are embedded in the system of patriarchy. For instance, Brannon (1976) used the terms “*No Sissy Stuff*,” “*The Big Wheel*,” “*The Sturdy Oak*,” and “*Give 'Em Hell*” to illustrate how men are expected to (1) avoid engaging in feminine behaviors

(e.g., expressing feelings); (2) become successful in sports, work, and sexual relations with women; (3) be independent and in control of one’s own emotions; and (4) to be adventurous, respectively. As a result of attempting to conform to gender role expectations, men and women may experience gender role strain (Levant & Philpot, 2002; Pleck, 1981), gender role conflict (O’Neil et al., 1986), gender role stress (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), and role overload (Hochschild, 1989) as well as threats to health behaviors and psychological well-being (e.g., Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Kilmartin, 2009; Yoder, 2009). Needless to say, gender is indeed an important dimension of identity. The purpose of this chapter is to offer a brief overview of the study of gender and provide a summary of measures currently in use.

8.2 GENDER DEFINED

A brief overview of the history of the psychological study of sex and gender is provided here. It is worthwhile, however, to first provide some discussion of terminology. The terms *sex* and *gender* often are used interchangeably but reflect two different meanings (Wester & Trepal, 2008). While *sex* refers to biological