

STRUCTURES OF THE SCHEDULES OF RACIST AND SEXIST EVENTS: CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S RESPONSES

Cirleen DeBlaere and Bonnie Moradi
University of Florida

Use of the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) and the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995) has advanced research on experiences of perceived racism and sexism. The present study responds to calls for further investigation of the structural properties of data from these instruments and is the first study to do so using (a) responses of African American/Black women ($N = 246$) and (b) confirmatory factor analysis. Regarding the SRE, results supported the unidimensional structures reported by Klonoff and Landrine (1999) for SRE Lifetime, SRE Recent, and SRE Appraisal data. Regarding the SSE, results supported the two-factor structures for SSE Lifetime and SSE Appraisal data and the three-factor structure for SSE Recent data derived by Matteson and Moradi (2005). Thus, the present results support the structural stability of SRE and SSE data with African American/Black women and can inform future use of these measures with this population.

Scholars have long theorized about the deleterious implications of experiences of prejudice and discrimination for targets (e.g., Allport, 1954; Barret & Swim, 1998; Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Enns, 1993; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996, 1997; Slavin, Rainer, McCreary, & Gowda, 1991; Smith, 1985; Utsey, 1998). Empirical research on targets' perceived experiences of discrimination was advanced by the development of two important measures, the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) and the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). The SRE and SSE assess perceived frequency and stressfulness of racist and sexist events, respectively. Use of the SRE and SSE has elucidated links of perceived racist and sexist events with a variety of important variables, including overall psychological distress, somatic symptoms, depression, anxiety, life satisfaction, lifetime disease history, and identity (e.g., Anthis, 2002; Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002; Crawford, Allison, Zamboni, & Soto, 2002;

Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000; Kwate, Valdimarsdottir, Guevarra, & Bovbjerg, 2003; Sherry, Wood, Jackson, & Kaslow, 2006).

Despite the growing use and impact of the SRE and SSE, the structural properties of data produced by these instruments have received limited attention (e.g., examined in the early development of the measures using only exploratory factor analytic methods). Thus, total scores have been used with limited consideration of structural stability across diverse samples or potentially meaningful subscales/factors. To address these concerns, researchers have called for studies that further investigate the structures of SRE and SSE data using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and with diverse samples (Matteson & Moradi, 2005; Utsey, 1998). The present study responds to these calls by examining the structures of SRE and SSE data with a sample of African American/Black women using CFA. A review of research with the SRE and SSE is offered next to provide a context for the present study.

Cirleen DeBlaere and Bonnie Moradi, Department of Psychology, University of Florida.

We are thankful to Sarah Lee and Yu-Ping Huang for their assistance with data collection, Lana Tolaymat for her help with data entry, and Michael Marsiske for his statistical consultation with this project.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Bonnie Moradi, Department of Psychology, University of Florida, P.O. Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250. E-mail: moradib@ufl.edu

Development of and Research With the SRE

Informed by stress theory (Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978; Kanner, Coyne, Schaeffer, & Lazarus, 1981; Lazarus, DeLongis, Folkman, & Gruen, 1985), Landrine and Klonoff (1996) defined racist events as "negative events (stressors) that happen to African Americans, because they are African American" (p. 146, emphasis in original) and hypothesized that, due to their personally demeaning and degrading quality, racist events would be

better predictors of African American persons' physical and psychological symptoms than are generic stressful events. To assess perceived experiences of racism, and based on stress theory and literature on racism (e.g., Bell, 1992; Cose, 1993), Landrine and Klonoff (1996) developed the SRE, which consists of two 18-item self-report measures that assess the perceived frequency of past-year (SRE Recent) and lifetime (SRE Lifetime) racist events as well as a 17-item self-report measure that assesses the appraised stressfulness of these events (SRE Appraisal).

Since its development, use of the SRE has advanced the literature on the prevalence and correlates of racist events in the lives of African American/Black women and men. For example, some studies point to gender differences in reported frequency of racist events; however, such differences are inconsistent across samples (e.g., Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Gibbons, Gerrard, Cleveland, Wills, & Brody, 2004; Klonoff & Landrine, 2000). Also, African American/Black persons' SRE scores have been found to be related to higher levels of overall and specific psychological symptomatology (e.g., depression, anxiety, somatization; Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) as well as physical health symptoms and risk behaviors (Gibbons et al., 2004; Harrington, Crowther, Henrickson, & Mickelson, 2006; Kwate et al., 2003). Some SRE-symptomatology relations have been found to persist after controlling for relevant covariates (Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999; Kwate et al., 2003), and longitudinal data suggest that the direction of prediction in the racism-distress relation is from perceived racism to distress (Gibbons et al., 2004). Finally, well-being indicators such as self-esteem, sense of control over one's environment, spirituality, and racial socialization (i.e., racial/ethnic identity socialization to inoculate children against future racial discrimination) may serve as moderators or mediators of racist events-distress relations (e.g., Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002; Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Moradi & Hasan, 2004).

Thus, use of the SRE has yielded important findings about the psychological and physical health correlates of perceived racist events. Despite the growing use of the SRE, however, limited information is available about the structure of SRE data across samples and with African American/Black women in particular. Without such information, researchers have assumed the stability of a unidimensional structure and relied on total scores for SRE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal, or used selected items based on study-specific needs (e.g., Gibbons et al., 2004; Simons et al., 2002). To inform future use of this important measure, research is needed to confirm the dimensionality of SRE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal data. The present study addresses this need with data from African American/Black women.

Development of and Research With the SSE

Parallel to their work on racist events, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) based their conceptualization of sexist events on

stress theory (Dohrenwend et al., 1978; Kanner et al., 1981; Lazarus et al., 1985) and stated that sexism could be operationalized as a gender-specific stressor, analogous to generic stressful life events and hassles. Specifically, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) defined sexist events as "negative events (stressors) that happen to women because they are women" (p. 441, emphasis in original). As with racist events, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) hypothesized that sexist events would be better predictors of women's physical and psychological symptoms than are generic stressful events. To assess perceived experiences of sexism, and based on prior literature on sexism and 120 women's written descriptions of "the worst thing that has ever happened to or been done to them because they are women" (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997, p. 12, emphasis in original), the authors developed the SSE. Originally, the SSE included the 20-item self-report measures, SSE Lifetime and SSE Recent, which assess the frequency of lifetime and past-year sexist events across a range of contexts. Later, the 19-item SSE Appraisal was added to evaluate the perceived stressfulness of sexist events (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997).

The development of the SSE has resulted in a growing body of research on daily sexist events in women's lives. Specifically, use of the SSE suggests that racial/ethnic minority and unmarried women may report more frequent sexist events than do White women and married women (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), yet these differences are not consistent across samples (e.g., Lott, Asquith, & Doyon, 2001; Moradi & Subich, 2002). In addition, SSE scores have been found to account for unique variance in women's psychological symptomatology beyond the variance accounted for by generic life stressors (Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, & Lund, 1995), demographic covariates, social desirability, feminist identity attitudes (Moradi & Subich, 2002), and perceived racist events (Moradi & Subich, 2003). SSE scores also have been linked negatively to ego identity development (Anthis, 2002; Fischer et al., 2000). Parallel to the literature on racist events, moderators and mediators of the sexist events-distress relation have been identified and include personal and collective self-esteem (Fischer & Holz, 2007; Moradi & Subich, 2004), passive acceptance of sexism and traditional gender ideology (Moradi & Subich, 2002), synthesis of and active commitment to a feminist identity (Sabik & Tylka, 2006), and sexual-orientation-based hate crime victimization (Szymanski, 2005).

Thus, use of the SSE has documented the prevalence of reported sexist events in the lives of women from diverse backgrounds and suggests that reported sexist events are important correlates of women's psychological distress and identities. As with the SRE, however, limited information is available about the structure of SSE data, particularly with racial/ethnic minority women. Without such information, researchers have relied on total scores for SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal data or used selected items based on study-specific needs (e.g., Yoder & McDonald, 1998). Thus, research is needed to confirm the dimensionality of

SSE data to inform future use of this measure with women of diverse backgrounds.

Previous Examinations of the Structures of SRE and SSE Data

The structure of SRE data has been examined with only one African American/Black sample (Klonoff & Landrine, 1999). Using exploratory factor analysis (Principal Components Analysis [PCA]) with orthogonal rotation, Klonoff and Landrine (1999) found a unidimensional structure for each of the three measures of the SRE (Lifetime, Recent, Appraisal). The factor loadings for each measure were quite high for items 1 through 17 (SRE Lifetime: .61 to .80; SRE Recent: .63 to .80; SRE Appraisal: .64 to .79) and lower for item 18 (SRE Lifetime: .37; SRE Recent: .38), which assesses perceived global impact of racism. However, structural stability of data for women and men was not examined separately in that study. Thus, the replicability of this unidimensional structure with African American/Black women is evaluated in the present study.

The structure of SSE data has been examined only with samples of predominately White women and a subsample of women of different racial/ethnic minority backgrounds (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Matteson & Moradi, 2005). Klonoff and Landrine (1995) examined the factor structure of the SSE Lifetime and SSE Recent data using exploratory factor analysis (i.e., PCA) with orthogonal rotation. The authors found different factor structures across subsamples for SSE Lifetime data; with four factors emerging for White women and three factors emerging for racial/ethnic minority women. However, they did not examine subsample variability in factor structure for SSE Recent data. In the second exploratory factor analysis of SSE data, and the first to examine the factor structure of SSE Appraisal data, Matteson and Moradi (2005) used PCA with oblique rotation and found a two-factor structure for SSE Lifetime and SSE Appraisal: (a) intimate and personal experiences of sexist events and (b) unfair treatment across public contexts. The authors found a three-factor structure for SSE Recent: (a) sexist degradation and its consequences, (b) unfair and sexist treatment in work/school, and (c) unfair treatment in distant and close relationships. Factor loadings for items were acceptable for SSE Lifetime (Factor 1: .40 to .83; Factor 2: .39 to .53), SSE Recent (Factor 1: .57 to .80; Factor 2: .44 to .80; Factor 3: .37 to .66), and SSE Appraisal (Factor 1: .35 to .89; Factor 2: .59 to .72). These findings reflected data from a primarily White sample.

Some similarities and differences in Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) and Matteson and Moradi's (2005) findings about the SSE merit discussion. First, with regard to the SSE Recent, both studies identified factors that reflected sexist degradation and its consequences, sexism in work/school, and sexism in relationship contexts. Klonoff and Landrine (1995) interpreted two separate relationship factors (sexism in close relationships, sexism in distant relationships) for their overall sample. In their SSE Lifetime

data with racial/ethnic minority women, however, only a single relationship factor emerged that was similar to the SSE Recent relationship factor found by Matteson and Moradi (2005). With regard to SSE Lifetime data, Matteson and Moradi (2005) derived a more parsimonious factor solution than that obtained with the scale development sample (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). Thus, the present study will attempt to replicate Matteson and Moradi's (2005) factor solutions, which were similar to those found by Klonoff and Landrine (1995) for racial/ethnic minority women.

Aims of the Present Study

As indicated in the present review, the structure of the SRE (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) has been previously examined only with a single combined sample of African American/Black women and men (Klonoff & Landrine, 1999), and the structure of the SSE (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995) has been examined only with samples of predominately White women and a subsample of women of various racial/ethnic minority backgrounds (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Matteson & Moradi, 2005). Furthermore, examination of the structures of SRE and SSE data has relied exclusively on exploratory factor analytic procedures. Given the limited data about the structures of the SRE and SSE, scholars have called for use of confirmatory methodology and further attention to the structures of these measures with diverse populations (Matteson & Moradi, 2005; Utsey, 1998). The present study responds to these calls by (a) examining the replicability of previously reported factor structures for SRE and SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal data with a sample of African American women and (b) utilizing CFA to examine the factor structures of the SRE and SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal data.

Based on the conceptualizations of lifetime, recent, and appraisal of perceived discrimination as separate constructs, and given that the structures of SRE and SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal data have been examined separately in prior research, in the present study, a separate CFA is conducted with data from each of these six measures.

METHOD

Participants

Analyses were conducted with data from 246 African American/Black women recruited as part of a prior study (Moradi & Subich, 2003; $n = 130$) and an ongoing study ($n = 116$) about African American women's experiences and mental health. Analyses of variance indicated that participants from the two data sets did not differ significantly with respect to their scores on the three SRE measures or the three SSE measures. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 72 years ($M = 27.12$ years, $SD = 11.49$), with 67% of participants identifying as an undergraduate or graduate student, 28% indicating that they were not students, and 5% identifying as university faculty/staff (1% missing) or university employees (1% missing). Forty-seven percent of participants reported

that they had a high school degree, 23% had some college education, 17% had a bachelor's degree, 6% had a graduate or professional degree, 2% had some graduate or professional education, 1% reported some level of high school education, and 4% of the sample did not provide a response to this question. With regard to social class, 39% identified as middle class, 36% as working class, 12% as upper middle class, 7% as lower class, 1% as upper class, and 5% did not report social class.

Instruments

The SRE. The SRE (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), with the Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal items, was administered to all participants. Participants rated the frequency of each of the 18 Lifetime and Recent items on a 6-point continuum ranging from 1 (*the event has never happened*) to 6 (*the event happened almost all [i.e., more than 70%] of the time*). Participants rated the 17 Appraisal items on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all stressful*) to 6 (*extremely stressful*). Item 18 of the SRE is not included in the SRE Appraisal. Ratings across items for each measure are added to obtain total scores that could range from 18 to 108 for the SRE Lifetime and Recent and from 17 to 102 for SRE Appraisal; higher scores indicated greater perceived frequency and stressfulness of racist events.

Internal consistency estimates for the SRE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal items have ranged from .90 to .97, .87 to .96, and .90 to .97, respectively (Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002; Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Klonoff & Landrine, 2000; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). With regard to validity, SRE scores were linked as expected with another measure of racist discrimination (Klonoff & Landrine, 2000) and found to be independent of age, income, and education for African American/Black women and men (Klonoff & Landrine, 1999; Kwate et al., 2003). Also, as expected, SRE scores were correlated positively with psychological distress (Klonoff & Landrine, 1999; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) and perceived stress (Barnes & Lightsey, 2005).

The SSE. The SSE (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), with the Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal items, was administered to all participants. Participants responded to the 20 Lifetime and Recent items on a 6-point continuum ranging from 1 (*the event has never happened*) to 6 (*the event happened almost all [i.e., more than 70%] of the time*). Participants rated the 19 Appraisal items on a 6-point continuum ranging from 1 (*not at all stressful*) to 6 (*extremely stressful*). Item 20 of the SSE is not included in the SSE Appraisal. Item ratings were added to obtain total scores that could range from 20 to 120 for the SSE Lifetime and Recent and from 19 to 114 for Appraisal. Higher scores indicated greater perceived frequency and stressfulness of sexist events.

Cronbach's alpha reliability estimates for the SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal items have ranged from .90 to

.94, .88 to .92, and .92 to .93, respectively, with samples of primarily White women (Anthis, 2002; Klonoff et al., 2000; Landrine & Klonoff, 1997; Matteson & Moradi, 2005; Moradi & Subich, 2002) and lesbian women (Szymanski, 2005). In terms of validity, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found that SSE Lifetime and Recent scores correlated positively with frequency of daily hassles and stressful life events. SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores also have been linked positively with psychological distress across samples (Klonoff et al., 2000; Landrine et al., 1995; Moradi & Subich, 2004; Szymanski, 2005). Finally, SSE scores had negligible or nonsignificant correlations with social desirability (Fischer et al., 2000).

Procedures

Participants were recruited through (a) student unions, (b) various university courses (e.g., history, art, mathematics), (c) African American/Black student organizations (e.g., Black Student Union, Club Crèole), (d) personal contacts on campus and in the community, and (e) snowball sampling. Participants were informed that the study was about the life experiences and well-being of African American/Black women. If they were interested in participating, they received written information about the study and were given a survey packet. To minimize order effects, the sequence of instruments in the survey was counterbalanced. Survey packets were completed when they were received or at another time that was convenient for the participant and an appointment was made to retrieve the completed survey. Upon submitting their completed survey, participants received a written debriefing. In addition, participants from the first sample received a three-dollar honorarium for their participation; however, participants from the second sample did not receive an honorarium due to unavailability of funding. As reported previously, there were no differences in variables of interest between the two groups of participants.

RESULTS

Descriptive data, reliabilities, and intercorrelations obtained with the present sample are reported in Table 1. Overall, the present sample's SRE and SSE scores were similar to those of prior samples of African American/Black women and men and predominately White women. Specifically, means and standard deviations obtained with the present sample for totaled scores (item ratings added) on the SRE Lifetime ($M = 46.14$, $SD = 17.61$), SRE Recent ($M = 37.18$, $SD = 16.31$), and SRE Appraisal ($M = 44.70$, $SD = 20.06$) resembled those obtained by Klonoff and Landrine (1999) for SRE Lifetime ($M = 45.86$, $SD = 18.44$), SRE Recent ($M = 38.77$, $SD = 17.18$), and SRE Appraisal ($M = 44.13$, $SD = 20.37$). Also, the current sample's totaled scores for SSE Lifetime ($M = 48.46$, $SD = 15.47$), SSE Recent ($M = 41.10$, $SD = 14.02$), and SSE Appraisal ($M = 42.26$, $SD = 16.98$) were

Table 1
Descriptives and Bivariate Correlations

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	M	SD	α
1. SSE Lifetime													2.42	0.77	0.93
2. SSE-L (Factor 1)	0.92												2.70	0.91	0.84
3. SSE-L (Factor 2)	0.80	0.50											2.01	0.87	0.87
4. SSE Recent	0.82	0.74	0.66										2.00	0.71	0.93
5. SSE-R (Factor 1)	0.71	0.78	0.39	0.89									2.42	1.02	0.84
6. SSE-R (Factor 2)	0.59	0.37	0.73	0.73	0.44								1.65	0.83	0.77
7. SSE-R (Factor 3)	0.69	0.52	0.72	0.81	0.52	0.64							1.68	0.67	0.73
8. SSE Appraisal	0.74	0.66	0.61	0.69	0.60	0.47	0.61						2.22	0.89	0.93
9. SSE-A (Factor 1)	0.66	0.69	0.38	0.63	0.63	0.29	0.48	0.93					2.42	1.03	0.86
10. SSE-A (Factor 2)	0.67	0.44	0.79	0.62	0.40	0.63	0.65	0.84	0.59				1.96	0.96	0.86
11. SRE Lifetime	0.69	0.57	0.64	0.60	0.46	0.55	0.53	0.53	0.43	0.54			2.56	0.98	0.89
12. SRE Recent	0.59	0.45	0.60	0.70	0.55	0.64	0.59	0.51	0.40	0.54	0.82		2.07	0.91	0.88
13. SRE Appraisal	0.53	0.44	0.49	0.47	0.37	0.38	0.42	0.72	0.64	0.64	0.76	0.66	2.63	1.18	0.90

Note. All correlations were significant at $p < .01$. Means and standard deviations reported in the table reflect averaged item ratings. SSE = Schedule of Sexist Events. SRE = Schedule of Racist Events.

analogous to those obtained by Matteson and Moradi (2005) with a sample of 245 women (13% African American) for SSE Lifetime ($M = 49.10$, $SD = 16.29$), SSE Recent ($M = 38.70$, $SD = 14.40$), and SSE Appraisal ($M = 46.68$, $SD = 18.89$).

Examining the Suitability of Data for CFA

Several guidelines in the literature indicated that the sample size for the current study ($N = 246$) was appropriate for conducting CFA. Kline (1998) recommended at least five cases per parameter estimated. Simulation studies suggest that a sample size of at least 200 is sufficient to derive meaningful and interpretable models and fit indices (Hau & Marsh, 2004; Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). Also, MacCullum, Browne, and Sugawara (1996) introduced a mathematical calculation and guidelines based upon model complexity and degrees of freedom (df) for determining the sample size required to achieve adequate power (i.e., .80). Finally, smaller sample sizes can be appropriate when testing a priori models (Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). We deemed the size of the present sample of African American/Black women adequate because it exceeded each of these guidelines. Specifically, our models involved estimation of 34 to 41 parameters, which required minimum sample sizes of 170 to 205 according to Kline's (1998) recommendation. In addition, df values for all of the models tested were greater than 100, requiring a sample size of approximately 180 according to MacCullum et al.'s (1996) guidelines. Finally, Mardia's coefficients (Mardia, 1970) indicated that the multivariate normality assumption was met for the present data from all six measures ($p > .05$).

CFA

LISREL 8.72 (Jöreskog & Sorbom, 2005) was used to conduct CFA of data from the six measures (i.e., SRE Lifetime, Recent, Appraisal; SSE Lifetime, Recent, Appraisal). The

covariance matrices were analyzed using maximum likelihood estimation, which is a robust estimation procedure that performs well across data conditions (e.g., Hoyle & Panter, 1995; Quintana & Maxwell, 1999). Overall model fit was evaluated with both absolute fit indices, which evaluate how well the hypothesized model reproduces the sample data, and with incremental fit indices, which measure the proportionate improvement in fit of a target model compared to a baseline model that typically involves uncorrelated observed variables (Hu & Bentler, 1995). Martens (2005) and others (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1995) have discussed the problematic nature of some of the most commonly used fit indices (e.g., goodness of fit index, adjusted goodness of fit index, χ^2 , χ^2/df ratio, normed fit index) and advised against their use. Specifically, they argued that these indices can be substantially influenced by factors other than model misspecification, such as sample size and the number of indicators per factor, and do not tend to generalize consistently across samples. Consequently, following their recommendations, absolute model fit was assessed with the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and incremental model fit was evaluated with the comparative fit index (CFI), the incremental fit index (IFI), and the non-normed fit index (NNFI, also known as the Tucker-Lewis index; TLI). A review of the literature on fit indices suggested the following guidelines for an adequate model fit: CFI, IFI, and NNFI values greater than or equal to .90 (Hoyle & Panter, 1995), RMSEA values less than or equal to .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993), and SRMR values less than or equal to .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The following results represent completely standardized solutions.

CFA of the SRE

SRE lifetime. In their prior work with the SRE, Klonoff and Landrine (1999) reported a unidimensional structure

Table 2
Unidimensional Factor Solution for SRE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal Data

Abbreviated items	<i>SRE Lifetime</i>		<i>SRE Recent</i>		<i>SRE Appraisal</i>	
	<i>Factor loadings</i>		<i>Factor loadings</i>		<i>Factor loadings</i>	
	<i>M = 2.56</i> <i>SD = .98</i> <i>α = .93</i>	<i>Uniqueness</i>	<i>M = 2.07</i> <i>SD = .91</i> <i>α = .93</i>	<i>Uniqueness</i>	<i>M = 2.63</i> <i>SD = 1.18</i> <i>α = .93</i>	<i>Uniqueness</i>
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors	0.65	0.58	0.66	0.56	0.68	0.54
2. Treated unfairly by your employer	0.65	0.58	0.65	0.58	0.67	0.55
3. Treated unfairly by coworkers	0.69	0.52	0.75	0.43	0.75	0.43
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs	0.68	0.54	0.70	0.51	0.71	0.49
5. Treated unfairly by strangers	0.75	0.44	0.79	0.38	0.72	0.49
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs	0.68	0.54	0.70	0.51	0.62	0.62
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors	0.66	0.56	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.61
8. Treated unfairly by institutions	0.69	0.53	0.78	0.39	0.63	0.61
9. Treated unfairly by friends	0.64	0.60	0.69	0.53	0.60	0.65
10. Suspected of doing something wrong	0.67	0.55	0.67	0.56	0.58	0.66
11. Misunderstood intentions	0.76	0.43	0.74	0.45	0.75	0.44
12. Wanted to tell someone off	0.41	0.83	0.51	0.75	0.64	0.59
13. Been really angry about something racist	0.65	0.57	0.72	0.48	0.76	0.42
14. Forced to take drastic steps	0.51	0.74	0.48	0.77	0.53	0.72
15. Been called a racist name	0.64	0.59	0.46	0.79	0.68	0.54
16. Gotten into an argument	0.60	0.65	0.66	0.57	0.64	0.59
17. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed	0.64	0.59	0.61	0.64	0.64	0.60
18. How different life would be	0.59	0.66	0.51	0.74		

Note. SRE Lifetime Fit Indices: RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .05, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, NNFI = .97

SRE Recent Fit Indices: RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .06, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, NNFI = .96

SRE Appraisal Fit Indices: RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .05, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, NNFI = .96

Means and standard deviations reported in the table reflect averaged item ratings. SRE = Schedule of Racist Events; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; NNFI = nonnormed fit index.

with all items loading on a single underlying construct. With the present SRE Lifetime data, the fit of the unidimensional model was excellent (RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .05, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, NNFI = .97) and supported the global factor of perceived racism (see Table 2). Factor loadings ranged from .41 to .76 and were significant. Cronbach's alpha for items on this measure was .93.

SRE Recent. Again, the unidimensional model provided an excellent fit to SRE Recent data (RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .06, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, NNFI = .96) and is depicted in Table 2. The factor loadings ranged between .46 and .79 and all were significant. Cronbach's alpha for items on this measure was .93.

SRE Appraisal. As with the other SRE instruments, the fit of the global factor model to SRE Appraisal data was excellent (RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .05, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, NNFI = .96). The factor loadings were statistically significant and ranged from .53 to .76 (see Table 2). Cronbach's alpha for items on this measure was .93.

CFA of the SSE

Following the recommendation of Matteson and Moradi (2005), item 20, which assesses the extent to which par-

ticipants believe their life would be different if they had not been treated in a sexist manner, and which did not load cleanly or substantially on any factor in their study, was not included in the present factor analyses of the SSE data.

SSE Lifetime. Matteson and Moradi (2005) found a two-factor structure for SSE Lifetime data. To test the replicability of this structure, the 19 items of the measure (excluding item 20) were constrained to load on two factors on the basis of the item-to-factor loadings reported by Matteson and Moradi (2005). This model provided a good fit to the data (RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .07, CFI = .95, IFI = .95, NNFI = .94). Factor loadings and uniquenesses for the model are presented in Table 3. The factor loadings for Factors 1 and 2 ranged from .33 to .77 and .58 to .73, respectively. All of these factor loadings were significant. In addition, the alphas for the intimate and personal experiences of sexist events and unfair treatment across public contexts items were .84 and .87, respectively. Alpha for all SSE Lifetime items was .93.

SSE Recent. The 19 SSE Recent items were constrained to the three-factor solution obtained by Matteson

Table 3
Two-Factor Solution for SSE Lifetime Data

Abbreviated Items	Factor Loadings		Uniqueness
	Factor 1 <i>M</i> = 2.56 <i>SD</i> = .98 α = .93	Factor 2 <i>M</i> = 2.07 <i>SD</i> = .91 α = .93	
14. Been really angry about something sexist	0.77		0.41
13. Wanted to tell someone off	0.72		0.48
12. Failed to get the respect you deserved	0.71		0.50
17. Gotten into an argument	0.66		0.56
16. Been called a sexist name	0.58		0.66
11. Inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances	0.57		0.68
19. Heard people making sexist jokes	0.55		0.70
18. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed	0.45		0.80
8. Treated unfairly by an important man in your life	0.44		0.81
15. Forced to take drastic steps	0.35		0.88
10. Treated unfairly by your family	0.33		0.89
5. Treated unfairly by strangers		0.73	0.47
3. Treated unfairly by coworkers		0.71	0.50
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs		0.70	0.51
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs		0.68	0.54
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors		0.67	0.56
2. Treated unfairly by your employer		0.65	0.57
9. Denied a raise or promotion, tenure, a job		0.63	0.60
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors		0.58	0.66

Note. Factor 1: Intimate/Personal Sexist events. Factor 2: Unfair Treatment in Public Contexts. The correlation between these two factors was $r = .59$. Fit Indices: RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .07, CFI = .95, IFI = .95, NNFI = .94. Means and standard deviations reported in the table reflect averaged item ratings. SSE = Schedule of Sexist Events; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; NNFI = nonnormed fit index.

and Moradi (2005).¹ The overall fit of the model to the data was good (RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .08, CFI = .93, IFI = .94, NNFI = .93). The SSE Recent model is presented in Table 4. All factor loadings were significant and ranged from .43 to .80 for Factor 1, .62 to .74 for Factor 2, and .27 to .72 for Factor 3. Cronbach's alphas for the three subscales, sexist degradation and its consequences, unfair and sexist events at work/school, and unfair treatment in distant and close relationships, were .84, .77, and .73, respectively. Alpha for all SSE Recent items was .93.

SSE Appraisal. To test the posited two-factor structure of the SSE Appraisal data, its 19 items were constrained to load on the two factors obtained by Matteson and Moradi (2005). The fit of the model was adequate (RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .07, CFI = .95, IFI = .95, NNFI = .94). This evaluation was made despite the slightly higher RMSEA value, which may have been inflated by the large number of parameters (Ding, Velicer, & Harlow, 1995; Marsh, Hau, Balla, & Grayson, 1998) and because other fit index values suggested a good fit. The factor loadings and uniquenesses for the model are presented in Table 5. The factor loadings were significant and ranged from .41 to .74 for the first

factor and .59 to .73 for the second factor. Alphas for the intimate and personal experiences of sexist events items and for the unfair treatment across public contexts items subscales both were .86. The alpha for all SSE Appraisal items was .93.

DISCUSSION

The present study contributes to the literature on the SRE and the SSE in a number of important ways. First, this study provides the first CFA of SRE and SSE data. Second, this study is the first to examine SRE and SSE factor structures with a sample of African American/Black women. Thus, findings of this study can inform future use of the SRE and SSE in research and practice with African American Black women.

The present data confirmed the unidimensional structures of SRE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal data. The generally high factor loadings of SRE items on Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal racial discrimination factors suggest that researchers and practitioners can use total SRE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores to assess African American/Black women's experiences of perceived racism

Table 4
Three-Factor Solution for SSE Recent Data

Abbreviated Items	Factor Loadings			Uniqueness
	Factor 1 <i>M</i> = 2.42 <i>SD</i> = 1.02 α = .84	Factor 2 <i>M</i> = 1.65 <i>SD</i> = .83 α = .77	Factor 3 <i>M</i> = 1.68 <i>SD</i> = .67 α = .73	
14. Been really angry about something sexist	0.80			0.36
13. Wanted to tell someone off	0.74			0.46
12. Failed to get the respect you deserved	0.69			0.53
17. Gotten into an argument	0.63			0.61
16. Been called a sexist name	0.59			0.66
11. Inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances	0.56			0.69
19. Heard people making sexist jokes	0.56			0.69
18. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed	0.43			0.82
9. Denied a raise or promotion, tenure, a job		0.74		0.45
2. Treated unfairly by your employer		0.72		0.49
3. Treated unfairly by coworkers		0.66		0.57
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors		0.62		0.61
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs			0.72	0.48
5. Treated unfairly by strangers			0.72	0.48
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs			0.69	0.52
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors			0.61	0.62
8. Treated unfairly by an important man in your life			0.38	0.85
15. Forced to take drastic steps			0.36	0.87
10. Treated unfairly by your family			0.27	0.93

Note. Factor 1: Sexist Degradation and Its Consequences. Factor 2: Unfair/Sexist Events at Work/School. Factor 3: Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships. The correlation between factors 1 and 2, 1 and 3, and 2 and 3 were $r = .58$, $r = .60$, and $r = .82$, respectively. Fit Indices: RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .08, CFI = .93, IFI = .94, NNFI = .93. Means and standard deviations reported in the table reflect averaged item ratings. SSE = Schedule of Sexist Events; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; NNFI = nonnormed fit index.

across domains (e.g., work, personal and public relationships) and to examine the links of these experiences with both specific and global outcome variables.

Similarly, in research on perceived sexist events, use of SSE Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores remains appropriate when general outcome variables are of interest. On the other hand, the present findings' substantiation of the two-factor structures of the SSE Lifetime and SSE Appraisal (intimate and personal experiences of sexist events and unfair treatment across public contexts) and the three-factor structure of the SSE Recent (sexist degradation and its consequences, unfair and sexist events at work/school, and unfair treatment in distant and close relationships) can inform researchers' use of subscale scores that can measure specific aspects of African American/Black women's experiences of perceived sexist events. Use of these subscales can also provide practitioners with information about their clients' experiences of sexism in specific domains. Given the consistent links found in prior literature between reported experiences of sexist events and the psychological and physical symptomatology of women of color, continued research in this area seems essential. Also, use of subscale scores can elucidate relations between specific dimensions

of sexist events and specific outcome variables for African American/Black women. For example, recent unfair treatment as measured by the distant and close relationships may be related to relationship satisfaction. Similarly, the unfair and sexist events at work/school may be related to academic satisfaction and work outcomes. Such domain-specific links may be obscured by reliance on total SSE scores, and future use of SSE subscale scores can facilitate exploration of such links.

In addition, the confirmation of a unidimensional structure for the SRE and multiple factors for the SSE suggests that racist events may be perceived as a more global concept for African American/Black women than are sexist events. This is an interesting finding that could be related to the perspective of some racial/ethnic minority feminists that issues of racial oppression may be more omnipresent and pervasive in the lives of racial/ethnic minority women (Reid & Comas-Diaz, 1990; St. Jean & Feagin, 1997) than are issues of gender oppression. Perhaps, perpetrators of racist discrimination are viewed more generally as individuals and institutions outside of one's racial/ethnic group and this is reflected in the conceptualization of racism as a more universal experience. On the other hand, African American

Table 5
Two-Factor Solution for SSE Appraisal Data

Abbreviated Items	Factor Loadings		Uniqueness
	Factor 1 <i>M</i> = 2.42 <i>SD</i> = 1.03 α = .86	Factor 2 <i>M</i> = 1.96 <i>SD</i> = .96 α = .86	
14. Been really angry about something sexist	0.74		0.45
12. Failed to get the respect you deserved	0.72		0.48
13. Wanted to tell someone off	0.71		0.50
17. Gotten into an argument	0.70		0.51
19. Heard people making sexist jokes	0.66		0.57
11. Inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances	0.65		0.58
16. Been called a sexist name	0.59		0.65
8. Treated unfairly by an important man in your life	0.55		0.70
18. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed	0.50		0.75
15. Forced to take drastic steps	0.41		0.83
10. Treated unfairly by your family	0.41		0.83
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs		0.73	0.47
5. Treated unfairly by strangers		0.72	0.48
3. Treated unfairly by coworkers		0.72	0.48
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs		0.68	0.54
2. Treated unfairly by your employer		0.64	0.59
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors		0.61	0.63
9. Denied a raise or promotion, tenure, a job		0.61	0.62
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors		0.59	0.66

Note. Factor 1: Intimate/Personal Sexist events. Factor 2: Unfair Treatment in Public Contexts. The correlation between these two factors was $r = .67$. Fit indices: RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .07, CFI = .95, IFI = .95, NNFI = .94. Means and standard deviations reported in the table reflect averaged item ratings. SSE = Schedule of Sexist Events. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; CFI = comparative fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; NNFI = nonnormed fit index.

women may perceive sexism as more nuanced and context specific than they do racism. For example, perpetrators of sexist discrimination may be individuals and institutions both within and outside of African American/Black women's racial and ethnic communities (e.g., family members versus strangers). Such distinctions in the perception of racist and sexist events may have implications for the well-being of African American/Black women. For example, as previously mentioned, global SRE scores may be linked comparably with specific and global outcomes. With sexist events, however, the implications of sexism perpetrated by a family member may differ from that of sexism perpetrated by a stranger or sexism committed in work contexts.

Despite the strengths of the present study, a number of limitations are important to consider when interpreting its findings. First, support for the structural stability of the SRE and SSE with data from African American/Black women may not necessarily generalize to women of other racial, ethnic, and cultural minority backgrounds. Thus, research is needed to explore the structural properties of the SRE and SSE with women of other socioeconomic backgrounds, racial/ethnic groups, and sexual orientations. Although results from Szymanski (2005) and Crawford et al. (2002)

show initial promise for the use of the SSE with White lesbian women and the SRE with gay and bisexual African American/Black men, the structural stability of the SRE and SSE cannot be assumed for these or other populations without empirical evaluation.

In addition to examining structural stability across groups, there is a need to examine construct equivalence. For example, in a study of 138 racially/ethnically diverse women, Landrine, Klonoff, and Brown-Collins (1992) investigated whether items on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory held the same meaning for women of different racial/ethnic backgrounds. Women rated themselves on the items and also chose from a list the definition that most closely resembled the meaning that they had in mind when answering each question. Although White and racial/ethnic minority women did not differ on average item-ratings, they did differ significantly on definitions chosen on a number of items (e.g., passive, assertive, feminine). These results suggest that an etic approach to psychometric examination may overlook important cultural variation in the underlying constructs of interest. Thus, it is imperative to evaluate instruments with racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse populations and to conduct analyses, similar to those in the

current study, that will allow for statistical investigation of the underlying constructs of interest across groups. An extension of the current study's methodology and a suggestion to future researchers is to conduct multiple group comparisons in structural investigations to directly assess statistical similarity in factor structure (and the underlying constructs) across diverse groups. Such efforts can inform instrument development and usage and contribute to the theoretical understanding of constructs across groups.

An additional issue to consider is the utility of separate Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores for the SRE and SSE. High correlations among Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores in the current study (SRE: $r = .66$ to $.82$; SSE: $r = .69$ to $.82$) and in prior research, as well as the identical unidimensional structures of the three SRE measures and similarity in structures of the SSE Lifetime and SSE Appraisal scales indicate overlap among Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores of the SRE and SSE. Although high intercorrelations have been reported across many prior studies (e.g., Barnes & Lightsey, 2005; Fischer & Shaw, 1999; Matteson & Moradi, 2005), researchers have used this information in different ways. Some researchers utilized all three scores, despite the sizable overlap in variance and potential for multicollinearity (e.g., Bowen-Reid & Harrell, 2002), other researchers chose to use a single score to avoid redundancy (e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2003), and still others made inclusion decisions based on the relevance of proximal or distal discrimination or stress appraisals (e.g., Crawford et al., 2002; Harrington et al., 2006; Szymanski, 2005). The present findings of structural similarities and high correlations among Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scores suggest conceptual overlap among these three dimensions. Further examination of the distinctiveness of these dimensions as well as the distinctiveness of their links with other variables across diverse populations is needed to build on the present findings.

Finally, it is our hope that the current study will facilitate additional research that moves beyond examining African American/Black women's experiences of racism and sexism in isolation and, instead, explores the concomitant and interactive links of these experiences. In the present study, we found substantial overlapping variance between corresponding dimensions of perceived experiences of racism and sexism (Lifetime $r = .69$, Recent $r = .70$, Appraisal $r = .72$). These results are consistent with assertions that some experiences of racism and sexism may be linked or fused for African American/Black women (Moradi & Subich, 2003; Smith & Stewart, 1983); however, additional research is needed to clarify this relationship.

In summary, the current research replicated previously reported factor structures for the SRE (Klonoff & Landrine, 1999) and SSE (Matteson & Moradi, 2005) using CFA methods with a sample of African American/Black women. Researchers and practitioners may use the present findings to make informed decisions about using subscale and/or total scores in their research with the SRE and SSE.

Specifically, our results extend support for the use of total SRE and SSE scores and SSE subscale scores with African American/Black women. We hope that use of these measures will advance research in this area by encouraging further investigation of the roles of perceived racism and sexism in the lives of African American/Black women.

Initial submission: January 15, 2007

Initial acceptance: May 22, 2007

Final acceptance: June 22, 2007

NOTE

1. Given the two-factor structures of the SSE Lifetime and SSE Appraisal, an alternative, two-factor model identical to that of the SSE Lifetime and SSE Appraisal was examined for the SSE Recent as well. Compared to the three-factor SSE Recent model, the two-factor model provided a significantly worse fit to the data, $\Delta\chi^2(2, N = 246) = 11.81, p < .05$, and was therefore rejected.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anthis, K. S. (2002). The role of sexist discrimination in adult women's identity development. *Sex Roles, 47*, 477-484.
- Barnes, P. W., & Lightsey, O. R. (2005). Perceived racist discrimination, coping, stress, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 33*, 48-61.
- Barrett, L. F., & Swim, J. K. (1998). Appraisals of prejudice and discrimination. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 11-35). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowen-Reid, T. L., & Harrell, J. P. (2002). Racist experiences and health outcomes: An examination of spirituality as a buffer. *Journal of Black Psychology, 28*, 18-36.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. *American Psychologist, 54*, 805-816.
- Cose, E. (1993). *The rage of the privileged class*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Crawford, I., Allison, K. W., Zamboni, B. D., & Soto, T. (2002). The influence of dual-identity development on the psychosocial functioning of African-American gay and bisexual men. *The Journal of Sex Research, 39*, 179-189.
- Ding, L., Velicer, W. F., & Harlow, L. L. (1995). The effects of estimation methods, number of indicators per factor and improper solutions on structural equation modeling fit indices. *Structural Equation Modeling, 2*, 119-144.
- Dohrenwend, B. S., Krasnoff, L., Askenasy, A. R., & Dohrenwend, B. P. (1978). Exemplification of a method for scaling life events: The PERI-Life Events Scale. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19*, 205-229.

- Enns, C. Z. (1993). Twenty years of feminist counseling and therapy: From naming biases to implementing multifaceted practice. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *21*, 3–87.
- Fischer, A. R., & Holz, K. B. (2007). Perceived discrimination and women's psychological distress: The roles of collective and personal self-esteem. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*, 154–164.
- Fischer, A. R., & Shaw, C. M. (1999). African American's mental health and perceptions of racist discrimination: The moderating effects of racial socialization experiences and self-esteem. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *46*, 395–407.
- Fischer, A. R., Tokar, D. M., Mergl, M. M., Good, G. E., Hill, M. S., & Blum, S. A. (2000). Assessing women's feminist identity development: Studies of convergent, discriminant, and structural validity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *24*, 15–29.
- Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., Cleveland, M. J., Wills, T. A., & Brody, G. (2004). Perceived discrimination and substance use in African American parents and their children: A panel study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 517–529.
- Harrington, E. F., Crowther, J. H., Henrickson, H. C. P., & Mickelson, K. D. (2006). The relationships among trauma, stress, ethnicity, and binge eating. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *12*, 212–229.
- Hau, K., & Marsh, H. W. (2004). The use of item parcels in structural equation modeling: Non-normal data and small sample sizes. *British Journal of Mathematical Statistical Psychology*, *57*, 327–351.
- Hoyle, R. H., & Panter, A. T. (1995). Writing about structural equation models. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 56–75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 76–99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1–55.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (2005). *LISREL 8.72*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaeffer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *4*, 1–39.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford.
- Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, H. (1995). The Schedule of Sexist Events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *19*, 439–472.
- Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, H. (1999). Cross-validation of the Schedule of Racist Events. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *25*, 231–254.
- Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, H. (2000). Is skin color a marker for racial discrimination? Explaining the skin color-hypertension relationship. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *23*, 329–338.
- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *24*, 93–99.
- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Ullman, J. B. (1999). Racial discrimination and psychiatric symptoms among Blacks. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *5*, 329–339.
- Kwate, N. O. A., Valdimarsdottir, H. B., Guevarra, J. S., & Bovbjerg, D. H. (2003). Experiences of racist events are associated with negative health consequences for African American women. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, *95*, 450–460.
- 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. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *22*, 144–168.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1997). *Discrimination against women: Prevalence, consequences, remedies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A., & Brown-Collins, A. (1992). Cultural diversity and methodology in feminist psychology: Critique, proposal, empirical example. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *16*, 145–163.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., Gibbs, J., Manning, V., & Lund, M. (1995). Physical and psychiatric correlates of gender discrimination: An application of the Schedule of Sexist Events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *19*, 473–492.
- Lazarus, R. S., DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Gruen, R. (1985). Stress and adaptational outcomes: The problem of confounded measures. *American Psychologist*, *40*, 770–779.
- Lott, B., Asquith, K., & Doyon, T. (2001). Relation of ethnicity and age to women's responses to personal experiences of sexist discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *141*, 309–322.
- MacCullum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *1*, 130–149.
- Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika*, *57*, 519–530.
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K., Balla, J. R., & Grayson, D. (1998). Is more ever too much? The number of indicators per factor in confirmatory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *33*, 181–220.
- Martens, M. P. (2005). The use of structural equation modeling in counseling psychology research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *33*, 269–298.
- Matteson, A. V., & Moradi, B. (2005). Examining the Structure of the Schedule of Sexist Events: Replication and extension. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*, 47–57.
- Moradi, B., & Hasan, N. T. (2004). Arab American persons' reported experiences of discrimination and mental health: The mediating role of personal control. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*, 418–428.
- Moradi, B., & Subich, L. M. (2002). Perceived sexist events and feminist identity development attitudes: Links to women's psychological distress. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *30*, 44–65.
- Moradi, B., & Subich, L. M. (2003). A concomitant examination of the relations of perceived racist and sexist events to psychological distress for African American women. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*, 451–469.
- Moradi, B., & Subich, L. M. (2004). Examining the moderating role of self-esteem in the link between experiences of per-

- ceived sexist events and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51, 50–56.
- Quintana, S. M., & Maxwell, S. E. (1999). Implications of recent developments in structural equation modeling for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 27, 485–527.
- Reid, P. T., & Comas-Diaz, L. (1990). Gender and ethnicity: Perspectives on dual status. *Sex Roles*, 22, 397–408.
- Sabik, N. J., & Tylka, T. L. (2006). Do feminist identity styles moderate the relation between perceived sexist events and disordered eating? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30, 77–84.
- Sherry, A., Wood, K., Jackson, E. B., & Kaslow, N. (2006). Racist events and ethnic identity in low income, African Americans. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 1365–1380.
- Simons, R. L., Murry, V., McLoyd, V., Lin, K., Cutrona, C., & Conger, R. D. (2002). Discrimination, crime, ethnic identity, and parenting as correlates of depressive symptoms among African American children: A multilevel analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 371–393.
- Slavin, L. A., Rainer, K. L., McCreary, M. L., & Gowda, K. K. (1991). Toward a multicultural model of the stress process. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 156–163.
- Smith, A., & Stewart, A. J. (1983). Approaches to studying racism and sexism in Black women's lives. *Journal of Social Issues*, 39, 1–15.
- Smith, E. M. J. (1985). Ethnic minorities: Life stress, social support, and mental health issues. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 13, 537–579.
- St. Jean, Y., & Feagin, J. R. (1997). Racial masques: Black women and subtle gendered racism. In N. V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change* (pp. 179–201). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Heterosexism and sexism as correlates of psychological distress in lesbians. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83, 355–360.
- Utsey, S. O. (1998). Assessing the stressful effects of racism: A review of instrumentation. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24, 269–288.
- Yoder, J. D., & McDonald, T. W. (1998). Measuring sexist discrimination in the workplace: Support for the validity of the Schedule of Sexist Events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 487–491.