

The Racial Microaggressions Scale (RMAS): A New Scale to Measure Experiences of Racial Microaggressions in People of Color

Susan R. Torres-Harding, Alejandro L. Andrade, Jr., and Crist E. Romero Diaz
Roosevelt University

Racial microaggressions refer to the racial indignities, slights, mistreatment, or offenses that people of color may face on a recurrent or consistent basis. Racial microaggressions may represent a significant source of stress endured by people of color. The purpose of this study was to develop a scale to measure racial microaggressions. Exploratory factor analyses and confirmatory factor analyses were used to assess the dimensionality of the scale. The internal reliability, convergent validity, and concurrent validity of the scale were also explored. Results indicated that the Racial Microaggression Scale is a multidimensional tool to assess perceptions of racial microaggressions by people of color.

Keywords: racial microaggressions, exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, psychometric evaluation

Sue, Capodilupo, and colleagues (2007) defined *racial microaggressions* as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group” (p. 273). The examination of racial microaggressions builds on the earlier work of Chester Pierce who examined subtle racism manifested toward and experienced by African Americans (Pierce, Carew, Pierce-Gonzalez, & Wills, 1977). More recently, others have defined racial microaggressions as racially related acts or attitudes that are perceived as hostile, or as subtle verbal, nonverbal, or visual racial insults that are experienced repeatedly by people of color (Franklin & Boyd-Franklin, 2000; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000). The concept of racial microaggressions overlaps with similar constructs of ambiguous or covert racism such as everyday discrimination (Williams, Yu, Jackson, & Anderson, 1997), perceived discrimination (Moradi & Risco, 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003), racial battle fatigue (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007), and race-related traumatic stress (Carter, 2007). Several scales have been developed to measure everyday types of perceived racism, including the Everyday Discrimination Scale (Stucky et al., 2011; Williams et al., 1997), the Perceived Racism Scale (McNeilly et al., 1996), and the Index of Race-Related Stress (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996). These are important instruments that measure key constructs of racial microaggressions as they occur in the everyday life of people of color. However, no instrument has been developed to assess the occurrence of racial microaggressions using the taxonomy developed by Sue and colleagues (Sue, 2010; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). The purpose of the current study was to develop a scale using Sue’s model of racial microaggressions.

Sue, Capodilupo, and colleagues (2007) described racial microaggressions as involving *microassaults*, hostile or overt racial incidents such as racial name-calling; *microinsults*, incidents that are perceived as offensive or insulting; and *microinvalidations*, incidents in which a person of color feels devalued, ignored, or delegitimized. Within these categories, they described specific themes that exemplify microinsults and microinvalidations, the more ambiguous or subtle types of microaggressions. These themes included (a) assumptions that a person of color is foreign-born and therefore not a “true” American; (b) assumptions of lower intelligence; (c) statements that indicate colorblindness or denial that one “sees” race; (d) assumptions of criminality or deviancy; (e) denial of individual racism; (f) assumptions regarding the myth of meritocracy, the belief that life chances are due solely to effort and race poses no obstacles; (g) assumptions that one’s cultural background and communication style are dysfunctional or less valued than those of White culture; (h) being treated as a second-class citizen; and (i) experiencing environmental microaggressions, observing a relative absence of people of color from settings and environmental messages of being less valued or welcome.

Considerable support exists for this taxonomy of themes, although variations in microaggression themes have been reported across racial groups. Among African American students, themes have included being subject to low expectations even in the face of contradictory evidence, assumptions about academic abilities and underestimation of personal ability, dealing with the assumption that they had entered college because of affirmative action, being treated as if they didn’t belong, being racially/culturally isolated, and being seen as atypical cases of success or as criminals (Solórzano et al., 2000; Torres, Driscoll, & Burrows, 2010). Themes expressed by African American counselor trainees included supervisors invalidating racial-cultural issues, making stereotypic assumptions about African American clients or supervisees, being reluctant to give performance feedback for fear of being viewed as racist, focusing primarily on supervisees’ clinical weaknesses, blaming clients of color for problems stemming from oppression,

Susan R. Torres-Harding, Alejandro L. Andrade, Jr., and Crist E. Romero Diaz, Department of Psychology, Roosevelt University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Susan R. Torres-Harding, Department of Psychology, Roosevelt University, 430 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60605. E-mail: storresharding@roosevelt.edu

and offering culturally insensitive treatment recommendations (Constantine & Sue, 2007). Racial microaggressions reported by Asian American students included being treated as an foreigner, having assumptions made regarding intelligence, being exoticized (especially for Asian American women), experiencing invalidation of interethnic differences, having others deny racial realities, having their cultural values and communication styles pathologized, being treated as second-class citizens, and experiencing "invisibility" (Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007). Racial microaggressions reported by Latinas/os of various occupational fields included instances in which their intelligence or qualifications were questioned, being treated like second-class citizens, incidents in which their culture or values were pathologized, negative experiences related to language or speech quality, being treated as a foreigner, being treated like a criminal, and being subjected to generalized stereotypes about Latinas/os (Rivera, Forquer, & Rangel, 2010). Finally, Latino university students reported interpersonal racial affronts in the form of exclusion, avoidance, differential treatment from professors, being subject to racial slurs and racist joke-telling, observing few professors of color with whom they could identify, and lack of administrative recognition of efforts to create a more positive racial campus climate (Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009).

Because racial microaggression experiences are subtle or ambiguous, some authors (i.e., Thomas, 2008) have concluded that the impact of racial microaggression may be trivial, fleeting, inconsequential and, therefore, not worthy of study. However, others have suggested that microaggressions, like other types of perceived racism, may be harmful because they are unique, chronic stressors that cause cumulative physical and psychological dysfunction (Carter, 2007; Moradi & Risco, 2006; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008; Williams et al., 1997). Franklin and Boyd-Franklin (2000) described racial microaggressions as contributing to invisibility endured by African Americans, causing African Americans to feel delegitimized, ignored, unrecognized, invalidated, disrespected, and unrewarded. Similarly, Solórzano and colleagues (2000) reported that students of color who endured racial microaggressions experienced self-doubt, isolation, frustration, and feeling hurt as a consequence. Constantine (2007) found that African American therapy clients who experienced microaggressions in counseling reported having a poorer therapeutic relationship with their therapist and lower satisfaction with their counseling experience. On campus, Solórzano and Yosso (2002) noted that racial microaggressions contribute to a negative racial climate, which ultimately reinforces larger systemic inequalities and systems of power and privilege due to race.

Given the potential negative impacts of microaggressions, more research is needed to explore the validity of the categories reported by Sue (2010) and others (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007; Sue et al., 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007; Torres et al., 2010; Yosso et al., 2009). People of color may experience different types and degrees of racial microaggressions because of differing histories of discrimination, exploitation, exclusion, and expulsion directed toward diverse racial groups within our country (Bell, 1997). However, Sue, Capodilupo, and colleagues' (2007) model assumes commonalities of themes that may occur across racial groups. These common themes may arise because of one's status as being a member of a

subordinate or oppressed group in our society (Bell, 1997; Trickett, Watts, & Birman, 1991), such as noticing that one's group is devalued when compared with the White group. Developing a quantitative scale to measure these experiences will allow researchers to assess whether common themes exist across racial groups, and would allow researchers to test the assertion that racial microaggressions, like other forms of perceived racism, have a significant impact on the psychological and physical well-being of people of color (Carter, 2007; Franklin & Boyd-Franklin, 2000; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Sue, 2010; Williams et al., 1997).

The purpose of this study was to evaluate a scale measuring racial microaggressions, the Racial Microaggressions Scale (RMAS). This scale measured both the occurrence (i.e., how often a person experiences racial microaggressions) and the distress elicited by the incident (i.e., how much the incident caused him or her to feel stressed or upset). However, only items focusing on the occurrence of racial microaggression incidents were examined to determine whether these items fit with the themes reported in the literature. Exploratory factor analyses and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to explore the factor structure of the scale. Convergent validity was assessed by examining the associations between the RMAS and a scale of racism-related events. It was expected that occurrence of racial microaggressions would correlate positively with the occurrence of racism-related events, as measured by the Schedule of Racist Events (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). In addition, analyses were conducted across racial groups, gender, and student status to further explore the utility of the scale.

Method

Procedure

An implied consent procedure was used to preserve anonymity of the study responses. Data were collected both in person, using paper-and-pencil questionnaires, and through an online survey. Participants were recruited from both university and community settings. Student participants were recruited through the use of an online research scheduling system, classroom announcements, by visiting student groups' meetings, and by disseminating links to the survey to student organizations that directly served students of color. Nonstudents were recruited through e-mail listservs, social networking (i.e., Facebook), from among the staff of a local outpatient hospital-based health clinic, and through announcements at local churches. Some students received extra credit as an incentive to participate; otherwise, no compensation was given for study participation. This study was reviewed and approved by the Roosevelt University Institutional Review Board to ensure that all ethical standards were fully met in the conduct of the study.

During recruitment, study researchers informed potential participants, both verbally and via the consent statement, that the purpose of the study was to examine the experiences of people of color and not White individuals. Although the participation of people of color was specifically encouraged and requested, anyone, regardless of race, was allowed to participate, including those who were curious or interested in the topic and students interested in receiving extra credit. Consequently, 170 White participants completed the study questionnaires in addition to the study sample described below. The race of the participants was assessed using

the demographic questionnaire, and the responses of the White individuals were excluded from all study analyses, with the exception of one analysis used to test concurrent validity, as described below.

Participants

Individuals who identified as being people of color participated in the study ($N = 406$). Incomplete data were obtained from 29 respondents, so their data were excluded from further analysis. Thus, the total sample size was 377. Regarding race/ethnicity, 150 (39.8%) were African American/Black, 149 (39.5%) were Latino, 47 (12.5%) were multiracial, and 31 (8.2%) identified as Asian American, South Asian, or Middle Eastern. The sample included 94 (24.9%) men and 282 (74.8%) women (with one person not identifying gender). Thirty-three (8.8%) individuals in the sample identified as being lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, or questioning, with the rest identifying as heterosexual. Regarding immigration status, 48 (12.7%) of the sample were first-generation immigrants (born outside the United States), 110 (29.2%) were second-generation immigrants, 37 (9.8%) were third-generation immigrants, eight (2.1%) identified as foreign nationals, and 171 (45.4%) were none of these; three individuals did not indicate their immigration status. The mean age was 26.7 years ($SD = 8.6$), and the ages ranged from 18 to 76 years; 202 (53.6%) participants were students, and 175 participants (46.4%) were nonstudents recruited from the community.

Measures

The Racial Microaggression Scale. This scale was developed to assess the themes and categories of racial microaggressions presented and discussed in the literature. Specific themes within the larger categories of microinsults and microinvalidations were used as the underlying basis for the questionnaire items (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). Members of the research team developed each item to closely match the themes and categories described in the literature. Then, members of the research team reviewed items for readability and comprehension. In addition, for each set of items below, specific statements, thoughts, descriptions, and phrasing expressed or quoted by participants in the qualitative investigations (cited below) were used to inform item development. Feedback on the scale was sought from other university students who were familiar with the racial microaggressions construct. Similarly, during the administration of the study measures, feedback was sought regarding reactions to the items from both university students and community members.

First, four items assessed the theme *alien in own land* (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007) and being treated as if one does not belong (Rivera et al., 2010; Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2008; Yosso et al., 2009). Items included the perceptions that one is treated as a foreigner, is not a “true” American, or is made to feel as if he/she does not fully belong or is an outsider.

Five items were created to assess the theme *ascription of intelligence* (Rivera et al., 2010; Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007; Yosso et al., 2009). Items assessed being treated as intellectually inferior, as if others expect one to have low intellectual abilities, and the assumption that one is either intellectually gifted or intellectually deficient.

The themes *colorblindness* and *denial of individual racism* (Constantine, 2007; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007), which involved minimization, invalidation of racial or cultural issues, and accused hypersensitivity regarding racial or cultural issues, were assessed in a set of four items. Items included perceptions that others were minimizing, ignoring, or downplaying the importance of racial issues and that persons of color were being viewed as hypersensitive or exaggerating racial issues.

The next set of items assessed the theme *criminality/assumption of criminal status* (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). Five items assessed incidents in which one is treated as dangerous, aggressive, or likely to engage in criminal behavior.

Six items assessed *invalidation of interethnic differences* (Sue et al., 2008). These items emphasized being treated interchangeably with others of the same race and the assumption that all of the people of one’s background have the same thoughts, ideas, and values.

The next category assessed the theme *exoticized*, being overly sexualized because of one’s racial background (Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007). This theme has been noted by Sue, Bucceri, and colleagues (2007) as being reported by Asian American women; however, items were developed for this theme because sexual stereotyping impacts other ethnic groups (Rivera et al., 2010). Three items assessed being treated in an overly sexual manner because of one’s race.

The theme *myth of meritocracy* (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007) involved being seen as incompetent or having one’s success perceived by others as atypical or exceptional (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Solórzano et al., 2000). Five items assessed the perceptions of others denying structural inequalities that perpetrate racism or blaming people of color for problems that stem from oppression. Items also assessed the assumption that one’s lack of intellectual or academic achievement stemmed from a lack of effort or abilities while also attributing success to unfair benefits or special treatment.

Seven items measured *pathologizing cultural values and communication styles* (Rivera et al., 2010; Sue et al., 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). Items in this category involved others emphasizing negative, dysfunctional, or problematic aspects of one’s background, including being asked to “play down” aspects of one’s culture, being expected to assimilate to the White culture, receiving negative feedback about aspects of one’s speech, and having others devalue the physical features of one’s racial group.

The next set of items assessed the theme *second-class citizenship* (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). Three items assessed being treated as a lower status person within one’s community or seeing White persons receive preferential treatment.

Fives items were developed to assess the theme *environmental invalidations* (Sue et al., 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007; Yosso et al., 2009). These items assessed the perception of negative environmental messages deriving from the absence of people from one’s racial background in school or work settings, being in contexts where an individual is the “only person of color,” and observing that visible or powerful roles in one’s community do not include people from one’s own racial background.

A final set of five items was derived from Franklin and Boyd-Franklin’s (2000) conceptualization of *invisibility*. These items assessed being treated as if one is not visible, and being dismissed,

devalued, ignored, and delegitimized by others because of one's race.

For each item, respondents were asked to indicate how often they have encountered a particular racial microaggression on a 4-point Likert-type scale (0 = *never*, 1 = *a little/rarely*, 2 = *sometimes/a moderate amount*, 3 = *often/frequently*). If a respondent positively endorsed the item (that it had in fact happened, i.e., 1 or greater on the occurrence item), they were also asked to indicate how stressful, upsetting, or bothersome the experience was for them (0 = *not at all*, 1 = *a little*, 2 = *moderate level*, 3 = *high level*). In this study, only responses from the first part of the item, the reported frequency, were used in the study analyses.

Schedule of Racist Events (SRE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

This measure assesses specific, negative life events and race-related stressors that occur to African Americans. Although this scale was developed specifically for African Americans, it was modified to be applicable more generally to people of color. For instance, when scale items stated "because you are Black," the items were modified so that they read "because of your race." This scale contained 18 items. For each item, individuals were asked to report how frequently they had experienced the event during the past year, during their entire lifetime, and the level of stress provoked by the experience. For each subscale, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) found very good reliability, with Cronbach's alphas of .95 for Recent Racist Events, .95 for Lifetime Racist Events, and .93 for Appraised Life Events. Similarly, they found good evidence for the validity of the scale, and, in general, the three SRE subscales positively correlated with measures of psychiatric symptomatology, smoking, and acculturation status. Because the scale was modified for the current study, Cronbach's alphas for the subscales were computed as a check for reliability. Evidence for very good internal consistency was found in the current sample, with .91 for Recent Racist Events, .90 for Lifetime Racist Events, and .92 for Appraised Life Events.

Demographics and additional questions. Demographic information collected included age, self-reported race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, generational status, and whether one was working and/or a student.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analyses

Exploratory factor analyses were conducted to explore the underlying factor structure of the scale items using SPSS 17.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL). A split-half procedure was used for the analysis, and a random split was conducted on the entire sample. The exploratory factor analyses were conducted with the first half of the sample, comprising 189 participants. Analyses were conducted between the two samples using *t* tests or chi-square tests to examine demographic differences between the two samples (age, race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, generational status, student/nonstudent); no significant differences were found.

Next, a Cronbach's alpha was run with the entire 52-item scale and was found to be very good ($\alpha = .949$). Prior to subsequent analysis, some items were removed because feedback from the study participants indicated that these items were not clearly understandable or that the items could be interpreted in multiple

ways. This feedback was sought from the respondents after completing the questionnaire; and although most respondents declined to give feedback, some items were identified as problematic by at least two respondents. For this reason, Item 3 (regarding others' perception of language facility) and Item 17 (regarding others not "seeing" one's race) were removed. In addition, another five items were removed because of either very low or zero (i.e., no, one, or two endorsements within the entire sample) rates of responding, because they exhibited relatively low item-total correlations on the reliability analysis ($< .30$), or because of multicollinearity (i.e., interitem correlation at .9 or higher). Thus, Items 6, 7, 8, 12, and 38 were removed from further analysis.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted with the remaining 45 items. Because the data from the individual items were not normally distributed, but rather were categorical-ordered responses, we used the unweighted least squares (ULS) extraction method. To allow for the factors to correlate, we used an oblique rotation (direct oblimin). Analysis indicated the presence of 10 factors as evidenced by eigenvalues greater than 1.00, but examination of the scree plot indicated the presence of either six or seven factors. Analyses using the 10-factor solution, six-factor solution, and seven-factor solutions were examined, and the six-factor solution was found to be the most theoretically consistent when compared with the Sue, Capodilupo, et al. (2007) model. Specifically, the six-factor model most closely reproduced nine of the themes described above, with the items from three themes, invalidation of interethnic differences, myth of meritocracy, and pathologizing cultural values and communications styles, loading together on one factor, and items assessing the themes of invisibility and second-class citizen loading together on one factor. In contrast, the seven-factor solution closely reproduced only five of the a priori themes, and the 10-factor solution included multiple factors consisting of single items. In addition, the six-factor solution was preferred because it offered a parsimonious solution, and additional Factors 7, 8, 9, and 10 would have resulted in each explaining less than 2.0% of the additional variance.

Next, the following criteria were developed and used to evaluate the retention of specific items in the scale itself and the factors. Items were deleted from the scale if they were found to load poorly on all factors (i.e., $< .30$) or if the item was found to load on more than one factor at .60 or greater. Thus, 10 items were deleted from the scale. The factor loadings for the remaining items are presented in Table 1. The six-factor solution with the 35 remaining items explained 53.99% of the variance of the scale, and each of the six factors explained 31.6%, 6.5%, 5.2%, 4.5%, 3.5%, and 2.8% of the total variance, respectively.

The six factors included (a) Invisibility, being treated as if one is of lower status, not visible, not seen as a "real" person, and being dismissed or devalued; (b) Criminality, being treated as if one is aggressive, dangerous, or a criminal; (c) Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture, being treated as if people from one's racial background are interchangeable, uniformly incompetent, incapable, low achieving, and dysfunctional, and as if successes are due to unfair entitlements and special treatment; (d) Sexualization, being treated in an overly sexual manner and being subject to sexual stereotypes; (e) Foreigner/Not Belonging, being made to feel as if one is not a "true" American or does not really belong because of one's racial background; and (f) Environmental Invaluations, negative perceptions that derive from observing that

Table 1
Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Six-Factor Solution for the 35-Item Racial Microaggressions Scale

Item	INV	CRIM	LOW	SEXU	FOR	ENV
33. Other racial group members expect me to behave in a way that is not consistent with my own racial or cultural values.	.55	-.28	.48	.37	.26	.48
39. I am mistaken for being a service worker or lower-status worker simply because of my race.	.62	-.49	.36	.17	.42	.32
40. I am treated like a second-class citizen because of my race.	.72	-.53	.49	.18	.46	.39
41. I receive poorer treatment in restaurants and stores because of my race.	.61	-.57	.37	.23	.28	.46
47. Sometimes I feel as if people look past me or don't see me as a real person because of my race.	.78	-.55	.43	.18	.28	.48
49. I feel invisible because of my race.	.74	-.22	.41	.20	.15	.44
51. I am ignored in school or work environments because of my race.	.84	-.34	.32	.23	.17	.38
52. My contributions are dismissed or devalued because of my racial background.	.79	-.43	.41	.34	.17	.44
9. Other people make assumptions about my intelligence and abilities because of my race.	.37	-.47	.31	.35	.13	.45
14. Other people treat me like a criminal because of my race.	.41	-.84	.32	.14	.18	.25
15. People act like they are scared of me because of my race.	.40	-.84	.30	.27	.02	.18
16. Others assume that I will behave aggressively because of my race.	.29	-.72	.49	.29	-.09	.18
18. I am singled out by police or security people because of my race.	.32	-.68	.27	.19	.11	.18
22. Other people act as if they can fully understand my racial identity, even though they are not of my racial background.	.30	-.24	.62	.38	.07	.37
23. Others act as if all of the people of my race are alike.	.30	-.32	.58	.17	.27	.35
28. Others suggest that people of my racial background get unfair benefits.	.31	-.19	.60	.22	.12	.28
29. Others assume that people of my racial background would succeed in life if they simply worked harder.	.28	-.27	.71	.20	.08	.24
30. Other people deny that people of my race face extra obstacles when compared to Whites.	.35	-.25	.76	.25	.09	.40
32. Other people assume that I am successful because of affirmative action, not because I earned my accomplishments.	.37	-.33	.50	.41	.06	.36
35. Others hint that I should work hard to prove that I am not like other people of my race.	.43	-.38	.66	.29	.26	.32
36. Others suggest that my racial heritage is dysfunctional or undesirable.	.49	-.37	.64	.19	.13	.43
37. Others focus only on the negative aspects of my racial background.	.48	-.45	.73	.16	.23	.42
19. People suggest that I am "exotic" in a sexual way because of my race.	.22	-.19	.16	.77	.23	.25
20. Other people view me in an overly sexual way because of my race.	.31	-.27	.37	.85	.19	.32
21. Other people hold sexual stereotypes about me because of my racial background.	.30	-.35	.44	.69	.13	.25
1. Because of my race, other people assume that I am a foreigner.	.16	-.02	.09	.20	.87	.29
2. Because of my race, people suggest that I am not a "true" American.	.27	-.15	.28	.06	.69	.27
4. Other people ask me where I am from, suggesting that I don't belong.	.16	-.04	.09	.25	.68	.31
26. Other people assume that I am knowledgeable about multicultural issues, simply because I am a member of a racial minority group.	.34	-.17	.50	.42	.28	.55
27. Others ask me to serve as a "spokesperson" for people in my racial group.	.38	-.18	.48	.44	.17	.53
42. When I interact with authority figures, they are usually of a different racial background.	.33	-.27	.38	.27	.22	.61
43. I notice that there are few role models of my racial background in my chosen career.	.41	-.19	.31	.22	.36	.56
44. Sometimes I am the only person of my racial background in my class or workplace.	.42	-.23	.36	.27	.24	.83
45. Where I work or go to school, I see few people of my racial background.	.35	-.09	.32	.03	.25	.70
46. I notice that there are few people of my racial background on the TV, books, and magazines.	.37	-.18	.25	.25	.27	.62

Note. INV = Invisibility factor; CRIM = Criminality factor; LOW = Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture factor; SEXU = Sexualization factor; FOR = Foreigner/Not Belonging factor; ENV = Environmental Invalidations factor. Items in bold italic indicate the respective factor onto which each item loads.

people from one's racial background are largely absent from work, school, or community settings or from positions of power.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

To test the 35-item, six-factor structure developed in the first half of the sample, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in the second half of the sample ($n = 188$) using LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2007). Because the item responses were item-level categorical-ordered data, we did not use maximum-likelihood estimators (Wirth & Edwards, 2007). The ULS method was used because the covariance matrix in the originally planned analysis, using a weighted least squares method of estimation, was a nonpositive definite matrix, and attempts to resolve this were unsuccessful. Therefore, the ULS method was used as an alternative, per Wothke (1993). The results found evidence for good fit for the 35-item model in this second sample, $\chi^2(545) = 1139.83$,

$p = .000$; root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) = .076. However, examinations of the modification indices indicated that three items (9, 26, and 27) had very high values (i.e., above 25) relative to the other items for which modification indices were presented. After examination, these items appeared to be less theoretically consistent with their respective factor items and loaded more strongly on other factors than what was originally proposed, so these paths were deleted (per Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993).

The final six factors with the remaining 32 items were entered into a second CFA using the ULS method of estimation. Examination of the six-factor solution, $\chi^2(480) = 912.15$, $p = .00$; RMSEA = .069, 90% confidence interval (CI) [.063, .076], which was less than .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993) and close to .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Steiger, 2007), indicated that this model was likely a close fit to the data. We also examined the fit indices to test the extent to which the hypothesized model was congruent with the

observed data (Hu & Bentler, 1995; Tanaka, 1993). Many fit indices are descriptive in that they do not involve either-or cutoffs, but rather are generally constructed with an approximate 0–1 range, with values close to 1.0 indicating a stronger level of fit. Some have proposed cutoff scores of .90 for fit indices, but the use of fit index cutoff scores as markers for model fit is controversial and has been debated in the literature (i.e., Barrett, 2007; Mulaik, 2007; Steiger, 2007; Tanaka, 1993). Examination of the fit indices indicated a good level of fit to the data, as many were close to or equal to 1.0: goodness of fit index (GFI) = .96, adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) = .96, parsimony goodness of fit index (PGFI) = .82, normed fit index (NFI) = 1.0, and comparative fit index (CFI) = 1.0. The root mean square residual (RMSR) and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) indicate better fit when close to zero; in the current sample, examination of both indices also suggested a good fit to the data, with RMSR = .07 and SRMR = .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). An examination of the standard errors found that all were close to zero, suggesting that the parameters were estimated correctly (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001). Thus, the revised six-factor scale consisted of 32 items. The 32 items and their corresponding loadings are presented in Table 2. Intercorrelations between the factors ranged from .07 to .68, indicating that these factors were related yet distinct (see Table 3).

Comparison of the Multidimensional Model With a Bifactor Model

Next, the dimensionality of the scale was assessed by fitting a bifactor model. A bifactor model assumes that items load on a single general factor in addition to loading onto group factors. Testing a bifactor model helps determine whether the use of an overall general factor, subscales, or both would increase the overall precision of the scale (Reise, Moore, & Haviland, 2010). In the current study, fitting a bifactor model allowed us to test whether a general racial microaggressions factor might also have contributed to the individual item variability, and, thus, whether it would make sense to form an overall factor score (“racial microaggressions”) in addition or possibly in place of individual group factor scores (Reise et al., 2010; Reise, Morizot, & Hays, 2007). A CFA was conducted testing a bifactor model, in which all items were proposed to load on their respective factors, and then all items were proposed to load on a Racial Microaggressions factor, the general factor. The results of these analyses indicated a good fit to this model, $\chi^2(411) = 639.35$, $p = .00$; RMSEA = .05, 90% CI [.05, .06]. Goodness of fit indices indicated a very good level of fit: GFI = .98, AGFI = .97, PGFI = .76, NFI = 1.0, CFI = 1.0, RMSR = .05, SRMR = .05. The factor loadings are presented in Table 2. Examining the items loading on the general factor, however, indicated that main source of variance arose from the loadings on the specific factors; with a few exceptions, the majority of items loaded more strongly on the individual factors, even when accounting for this general factor. This suggests that the subscales on this measure might be treated more properly as individual scales, and the development of an overall total scale would be inappropriate given that an overall general factor accounted for little of the item variance. The intercorrelations reported above suggest that, although the factors appear to be related, they are distinct subscales and might best be interpreted separately.

Factor Structure Across Gender

Next, analyses were run to test the goodness of fit of the model across genders to check for measurement invariance. The purpose of testing for measurement invariance, or the equivalence of constructs in two groups, it to assess whether the same factors are being measured in each group (Chen, West, & Sousa, 2006). The six-factor model was tested separately in men ($n = 94$) and women ($n = 284$). The goodness of fit for men was very good, $\chi^2(419) = 566.47$, $p = .00$; RMSEA = .076, 90% CI [.04, .07], and examination of the fit indices also indicated a good level of fit (GFI = .97, AGFI = .96, PGFI = .82, NFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, RMR = .07, SRMR = .07), similar to results obtained with the overall sample. However, given the small sample size for the men, and the somewhat larger 90% confidence interval for the RMSEA, these results should be interpreted cautiously. For women, the model appeared to fit well overall, $\chi^2(419) = 872.12$, $p = .00$; RMSEA = 0.0620, 90% CI [.06, .07]. Fit indices for the female-only sample also appeared to indicate a good fit, similar to the overall sample: GFI = .97, AGFI = .96, PGFI = .82, NFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, RMR = .06, SRMR = .06.

Internal Consistency

Next, internal consistency of the revised six-factor model was examined using Cronbach’s alphas for the entire sample ($n = 377$). The Cronbach’s alphas were found to be very good: Environmental Invalidation ($\alpha = .81$); Foreigner/Not Belonging ($\alpha = .78$); Sexualization ($\alpha = .83$); Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture ($\alpha = .87$); Criminality ($\alpha = .85$), and Invisibility ($\alpha = .89$).

Convergent Validity

Next, scores were computed for the individual factors by computing the mean of all items for each factor, and mean scores of each subscale were compared with the subscales of the SRE (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). It was expected that occurrence of racial microaggressions would correlate positively with the occurrence of racism-related events. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between the RMAS factor scores and the subscales of the SRE. The results are presented in Table 4. All of the RMAS subscales positively correlated with the three SRE subscales. Thus, as hypothesized, experiences of racial microaggressions as measured by the RMAS were found to be positively correlated with racist life events as measured by the SRE.

Concurrent Validity

The results between people of color and White persons were compared to examine concurrent validity of the scale. It is possible that White persons might also experience stressors or mistreatment from others because of their race; however, because of their dominant status in American society, it was expected that this would be reported much less frequently when compared with persons of color. To examine concurrent validity, we conducted a series of t tests with racial group category as the independent variable and the subscale scores as the dependent variables. These analyses found that people of color reported higher scores than White persons on the Invisibility, $t(520) = -11.61$, $p < .001$, Criminality, $t(537) = -11.98$, $p < .001$, Low-Achieving/

Table 2.
Comparison of Confirmatory Factor Analysis Loadings for the Revised 32-Item Racial Microaggressions Scale in Sample 2 (n = 188) Using a Multidimensional Model and a Bifactor Model

Item	Multidimensional model					Bifactor model							
	FOR	CRIM	SEXU	LOW	INV	ENV	RMA (general factor)	FOR	CRIM	SEXU	LOW	INV	ENV
1. Because of my race, other people assume that I am a foreigner.	.66						-.07	.94					
2. Because of my race, people suggest that I am not a "true" American.	.90						.21	.56					
4. Other people often ask me where I am from, suggesting that I don't belong.	.63						.03	.65					
14. Other people treat me like a criminal because of my race.		.78					.17		.61				
15. People act like they are scared of me because of my race.		.80					.11		.71				
16. Others assume that I will behave aggressively because of my race.		.73					-.25		1.09				
18. I am singled out by police or security people because of my race.		.75					.43		.28				
19. People suggest that I am "exotic" in a sexual way because of my race.			.64				-.02			.76			
20. Other people view me in an overly sexual way because of my race.			.85				.10			.82			
21. Other people hold sexual stereotypes about me because of my racial background.			.82				.19			.62			
22. Other people act if they can fully understand my racial identity, even though they are not of my racial background.				.64			.32				.33		
23. Other people act as if all of the people of my race are alike.				.54			-.02				.59		
28. Others suggest that people of my racial background get unfair benefits.				.49			-.23				.22		
29. Others assume that people of my background would succeed in life if they simply worked harder.				.63			-.10				.77		
30. Other people deny that people of my race face extra obstacles when compared to Whites.				.58			.08				.53		
32. Other people assume that I am successful because of affirmative action, not because I earned my accomplishments.				.67			.52				.16		
35. Others hint that I should work hard to prove that I am not like other people of my race.				.67			.26				.43		
36. Others suggest that my racial heritage is dysfunctional or undesirable.				.76			.22				.59		
37. Others focus only on the negative aspects of my racial background.				.72			-.03				.79		
33. Others prefer that I assimilate to the White culture and downplay my racial background.					.66		.54					.12	
39. I am mistaken for being a service worker or lower-status worker simply because of my race.					.70		.93					-.22	
40. I am treated like a second-class citizen because of my race.					.79		1.13					-.34	
41. I receive poorer treatment in restaurants and stores because of my race.					.71		.55					.17	
47. Sometimes I feel as if people look past me or don't see me as a real person because of my race.					.71		.01					.72	
49. I feel invisible because of my race.					.61		.05					.57	
51. I am ignored in school or work environments because of my race.					.65		-.62					1.31	
52. My contributions are dismissed or devalued because of my racial background.					.70		-.93					1.69	
42. When I interact with authority figures, they are usually of a different racial background.						.71	.21						.50
43. I notice that there are few role models in my racial background in my chosen career.							.70						.60
44. Sometimes I am the only person of my racial background in my class or workplace.							.74						.75
45. Where I work or go to school, I see few people of my racial background.							.57						.69
46. I notice that there are few people of my racial background on the TV, books, and magazines.							.65						.64

Note. INV = Invisibility factor; CRIM = Criminality factor; LOW = Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture factor; SEXU = Sexualization factor; FOR = Foreigner/Not Belonging factor; ENV = Environmental Invalidation factor; RMA = Racial Microaggression factor.

Table 3
Intercorrelations Between the Racial Microaggressions Scale Factors

Factor	Invisibility	Criminality	Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture	Sexualization	Foreigner/Not Belonging	Environmental
Invisibility						
Criminality	.58**					
Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture	.66**	.56**				
Sexualization	.41**	.33**	.41**			
Foreigner/Not Belonging	.32**	.05	.20**	.20**		
Environmental	.53**	.26**	.43**	.33**	.28**	

** $p < .01$ (Pearson correlation coefficient analysis).

Undesirable Culture, $t(527) = -16.68, p < .001$, Sexualization, $t(538) = -8.07, p < .001$, Foreigner/Not Belonging, $t(544) = -8.71, p < .001$, and Environmental Invalidations, $t(524) = -14.92, p < .001$, subscales.

Comparison of Racial Group, Gender, and Student/Nonstudent Scores

Finally analyses were conducted to examine differences by racial group, gender, and student status. The means and standard deviations by gender, racial group, and student status are presented in Table 5. First, mean subscale scores for men and women were compared using separate independent samples t tests. Results of these analyses found that men exhibited higher mean scores on the Criminality, $t(377) = 3.00, p = .003$, subscale, and women had higher mean scores on the Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture, $t(377) = 2.68, p = .008$, and the Sexualization, $t(377) = -2.16, p = .032$, subscales. There were no statistically significant differences between men and women on the other subscales.

To examine differences among the racial groups on the subscales, we conducted a series of analyses of variance. Significant differences were found between the racial groups on the Criminality, $F(3) = 22.71, p < .001$, Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture, $F(3) = 14.47, p < .001$, and Foreigner/Not Belonging, $F(3) = 46.63, p < .001$, subscales. Post hoc comparisons were conducted using the Bonferroni statistic, and, in these analyses, African Americans were found to score significantly higher than Latinos ($p < .001$), Asian Americans ($p < .001$), and multiracial individuals ($p < .001$) on the Criminality subscale. African Americans also scored significantly higher than Latinos ($p = .002$),

Asian Americans ($p < .001$), and multiracial individuals ($p < .001$) on the Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture subscale. In addition, Latinos scored higher on the Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture subscale when compared with Asian Americans ($p = .002$). On the Foreigner/Not Belonging subscale, Latinos scored significantly higher than African Americans ($p < .001$) and multiracial individuals ($p < .001$), and Asian Americans scored higher than African Americans ($p < .001$) and multiracial individuals ($p < .001$); Latinos and Asian Americans were not significantly different from each other. Finally, comparisons were conducted between the student and nonstudent samples using t tests, and no statistically significant differences were found between students and nonstudents on any of the subscales.

Discussion

The current study results provide preliminary evidence that the RMAS is a reliable and valid tool to assess the occurrence of racial microaggressions in people of color. Factors that fit well with the model of Sue, Capodilupo, et al. (2007) included the Criminality factor (assumption of criminality theme), the Foreigner/Not Belonging factor (alien in own land theme), Environmental Invalidations factor (environmental invalidation theme), and Sexualization (exoticized theme; Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007). In addition, it appears that these factors are related, yet distinct. Evidence could not be found for a general racial microaggressions factor, which suggests that these subscales should be scored and examined separately. Examination of mean differences also found different patterns of results across racial groups, indicating that some factors are more salient for some racial groups than for others. This might have explained why, although many of the subscales were correlated, others (i.e., Criminality and Foreigner/Not Belonging) were not.

The criminality theme emerged as a factor on this scale, and although this was reported by both men and women, male respondents and African Americans reported experiencing this more frequently. This finding appears consistent with previous findings that African American men, in particular, are stereotyped as being aggressive or criminal (Smith et al., 2007), that Latino males have been stereotyped as aggressive/violent and dangerous, and that African American females are seen as antagonistic (Falicov, 2010; Franklin & Boyd-Franklin, 2000; Niemann, Jennings, Rozelle, Baxter, & Sullivan, 1994).

Likewise, the emergence of the Foreigner/Not Belonging factor is also consistent with previous literature in which individuals

Table 4
Intercorrelations Between the Racial Microaggressions Scale Factors and the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE)

Factor	SRE Recent Events	SRE Lifetime Events	SRE Appraisal
Invisibility	.67**	.69**	.56**
Criminality	.46**	.46**	.32**
Low-Achieving/ Undesirable Culture	.45**	.51**	.43**
Sexualization	.31**	.37**	.33**
Foreigner/Not Belonging	.23**	.23**	.15
Environmental	.44**	.47**	.49**

** $p < .01$ (Pearson correlation coefficient analysis).

Table 5
Subscale Means (Standard Deviations) Across Demographic Groups

Subscale	Race				Sex		Status	
	African Americans	Latinos	Asian Americans	Multiracial	Males	Females	Students	Nonstudents
Foreigner/Not Belonging	0.48 (0.59)***	1.41 (0.88)***	1.41 (0.86)***	.67 (0.66)***	0.98 (0.86)	0.95 (0.87)	0.95 (0.86)	1.02 (0.86)
Criminality	1.19 (0.83)***	0.61 (0.70)***	0.44 (0.62)***	0.48 (0.65)***	1.02 (0.96)**	0.74 (0.73)**	0.83 (0.81)	0.66 (0.75)
Low-Achieving/ Undesirable Culture	1.68 (0.72)***	1.40 (0.68)***	0.89 (0.60)***	1.21 (0.75)***	1.27 (0.70)**	1.50 (0.74)**	1.47 (0.73)	1.24 (0.70)
Sexualization	0.95 (0.89)	0.89 (0.87)	0.93 (0.80)	1.13 (0.88)	0.78 (0.84)*	1.00 (0.88)*	0.95 (0.87)	0.96 (0.90)
Invisibility	0.86 (0.72)	0.77 (0.70)	0.63 (0.59)	0.60 (0.68)	0.75 (0.64)	0.77 (0.72)	0.77 (0.70)	0.76 (0.66)
Environmental	1.27 (0.70)	1.19 (0.68)	1.61 (0.59)	1.18 (0.76)	1.19 (0.66)	1.28 (0.71)	1.25 (0.70)	1.31 (0.72)

* Significant at the $p < .05$ level. ** Significant at the $p < .01$ level. *** Significant at the $p < .001$ level.

from non-White groups, especially Asian Americans and Latinos, are viewed as the “other,” as immigrants, and not as full, whole, or patriotic Americans (Cowan, Martinez, & Mendiola, 1997; Park, 2011). As expected, in the current sample, Latinos and Asian Americans reported more occurrences of this particular microaggression when compared with African Americans and multiracial individuals.

The Sexualization factor also emerged in the current study. Sue, Bucciari, et al. (2007) indicated that this a key microaggression reported by Asian American women. As expected, the current study suggests that this is a salient factor for many women of color. In addition, women reported being sexualized more often than men. However, relatively few men of color participated in the study, and more research is needed to examine how much this might apply to men of color, as men of color can also be subject to sexual stereotypes, such as being sexually aggressive and “macho” or being sexually undesirable (Niemann et al., 1994; Wong, Owen, Tran, Collins, & Higgins, 2011).

Items that were developed as part of three separate proposed themes, myth of meritocracy, pathologizing cultural values and communication styles, and invalidation of interethnic differences, loaded on one factor that we labeled Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture. This factor included items that assessed being treated as if one’s background were dysfunctional, low achieving, or incompetent, and being treated as if one’s successes were the result of affirmative action or special treatment. This factor also included the idea of being treated interchangeably with others, or as if people from one’s racial group were all alike. This fit well with the idea of being subject to negative cultural stereotyping that all people from a particular racial background will be uniformly low achieving and dysfunctional, and successful people are either rare exceptions or used unfair advantages. African Americans reported higher levels of this type of microaggression when compared with the other racial groups, which is consistent with previous research (Rivera et al., 2010; Solórzano et al., 2000).

In addition, analyses found evidence for the second-class citizen theme, which we named Invisibility because it also included items that were designed to assess Franklin and Boyd-Franklin’s (2000) concept of invisibility. Invisibility as a racial microaggression has been reported in several investigations as affecting primarily African American males (Franklin & Boyd-Franklin, 2000). However, the emergence of this factor suggests that invisibility, which

involves being devalued, delegitimized, or ignored, may be applicable across racial groups. There were no differences in the reported occurrence of these types of experiences, which suggests that this devaluation and cultural invalidation may affect many people of color to a similar degree.

Contrary to what was expected, none of the items developed to measure colorblindness or denial of individual racism emerged as separate factors. It is possible that assessing someone else’s colorblindness may be difficult because it involves evaluating someone’s silence or denial about race. Most surprising, the ascription of intelligence items did not emerge as a separate factor and were eliminated because they loaded weakly on multiple factors. The Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture subscale included indirect measures of assumptions of intelligence, such as being viewed as if one is successful because of affirmative action, which may imply low intelligence. However, the inclusion of both positive and negative ascriptions of intelligence may have been problematic for the factor analyses. In addition, there were relatively few endorsements of the items of high intelligence, and these “positive” assumptions may not have been seen as problematic or related to one’s race. This study included only a modest sample of Asian Americans for whom this stereotype might be most salient, as Asian Americans have commonly reported being viewed as the “model minority” that includes ascriptions of higher intelligence and academic ability (Kawai, 2005; Niemann et al., 1994; Sue, Bucciari, et al., 2007; Wong et al., 2011). Finally, approximately half of the sample was university students. By virtue of their status as college students, they could be seen as exhibiting some academic success. It is possible that they were more likely to be seen as exceptional in their academic achievement rather than simply viewed as unintelligent. Future research should continue to explore the experiences of ascriptions of intelligence, as qualitative investigations suggest this is a common racial microaggression.

As hypothesized, all of the RMAS factor scores were positively correlated with the subscales of the SRE, a measure of current and lifetime racial mistreatment and discrimination, which suggests good convergent validity. Similarly, when comparing scores of White respondents with respondents of color, White persons were less likely to report experiencing racial microaggressions when compared with persons of color. This finding appears to confirm that White persons are subject to race-related hostilities or mis-

treatment more infrequently than people of color. However, the scale itself was not developed to measure racial microaggressions in White persons, so they may have scored lower because of this. Thus, this comparison needs to be interpreted with caution, as the experiences of White persons were not a focus of the current investigation.

The factor structure of the scale appeared to be consistent across men and women, suggesting that these subscales are reliable ways to assess these types of experiences in men and women of color. However, as noted above, gender differences were found in the current sample on the Criminality, Low-Achieving/Undesirable Culture, and Sexualization factors. This fits well with previous scholarship, which suggests that it may be impossible to disentangle the effects of race and gender (i.e., Jun, 2010; King, 2005) when understanding an individual's life experiences. Future investigations should examine the impact of gender, race, sexual orientation, and other types of diversity on these race-related experiences because being a member of more than one oppressed social group may change the quality and impact of these negative experiences and also may address how individuals cope with these experiences (Jun, 2010; King, 2005; Niemann et al., 1994; Sue, 2010).

Although variation exists in the occurrence of microaggressions across racial groups, the current scale assesses common types of experiences that may occur across many racial/ethnic groups. These commonalities may occur because of similarities in experiences that arise due to being a subordinate, devalued group in the United States. This scale measures these constructs across racial groups, in contrast to other scales that have been developed for use with specific racial groups (i.e., McNeilly et al., 1996; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996). In addition, the current scale is more narrow in scope in its focus on specific microaggression categories rather than a general racial microaggression factor. Sue (2010) has stated that a need exists for an empirical tool to measure racial microaggression experiences, and the development of this scale is an attempt to meet this perceived need. In addition, some (i.e., Cauce, 2011) have noted the importance of integrating quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry when understanding multicultural constructs, and it is anticipated that this measure will facilitate quantitative research in this area.

Limitations of the study include the relative imbalance of men to women: Men composed only 25% of the sample. This may have affected the study results—in particular, a negative factor loading was viewed for the Criminality subscale on the initial exploratory factor analysis, and this might have arisen after factor rotation because the majority of the sample (women) scored lower than the men on this subscale. Also, there were comparatively few Asian Americans and Middle Eastern individuals. Including more men of color and more diverse racial/ethnic groups in future research using this scale would be helpful to further validate the RMAS. In addition, modifications to the scale were made as a result of the first CFA, which meant that this was not a strictly confirmatory procedure, so it is possible that the results might be due to unique characteristics of the current sample. Testing this model in other samples would provide evidence for generalizability of the study results. Also, other ways to test the validity of the scale (test–retest administrations, discriminant validity) were not used. The comparison, with the White sample, although

providing some support for concurrent validity, was limited because the scale was not developed to test the racial experiences of White persons. Multiple comparisons were performed across demographic groups and the six subscales, and this might have increased the risk of Type I error. However, many of the statistically significant group comparisons occurred at the $p < .01$ level, and the Bonferroni statistic was used for post hoc analyses, which is a more conservative statistic for evaluating differences. This suggests that these findings were likely not due to chance. Nevertheless, the current findings should be replicated in future samples to provide evidence for their validity.

In addition, another limitation was the modest sample size employed for the analyses. Given that structural equation modeling is a large-sample procedure, accurate parameter estimates are dependent on sufficient sample size. According to MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara (1996), given that the current study had a large number of parameters to be estimated and, consequently, large degrees of freedom ($df = 499$ in the final model), this meant that a relatively modest sample size, as in the current study, would be expected to yield sufficient power to reject a null hypothesis of close fit using the RMSEA statistic. However, they also noted that, with a moderate sample size, researchers must ensure that a large enough sample size is used to allow for accurate parameter estimation. MacCallum et al. also recommended examining the confidence intervals for the RMSEA, as these may also be large if power is inadequate. The confidence intervals for the RMSEA appeared to be narrow around the estimations, with the exception of the male-only sample analysis, indicating that the CFAs may have had adequate power. However, replication of results in larger samples would help validate the current findings.

In summary, this study was a preliminary evaluation of a racial microaggressions scale that was developed from Sue, Capidilupo, et al.'s (2007) model. This model holds much promise to understand the complex, multilayered, and challenging experiences that people of color may face when confronted with racial microaggressions. It is hoped that this scale might facilitate future research examining the impact of being exposed to these unique, chronic, and often threatening or offensive experiences. The current study suggests that the RMAS is a reliable and valid measure for individuals from diverse racial backgrounds. It is anticipated that the development of this scale may facilitate quantitative research in this area. Future research should assess the utility of these factors to predicting physical and mental health, stress reactions or health-related behaviors, as has been demonstrated with other types of racism (Carter, 2007; Pascoe & Richman, 2009). Finally, future research should further examine the validity of this scale with Asian Americans, males, and multiracial individuals who might be negatively affected by racial microaggressions.

References

- Barrett, P. (2007). Structural equation modeling: Adjudging model fit. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 815–824. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.018
- Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 3–15). New York, NY: Routledge.

- 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.
- Carter, R. T. (2007). Racism and psychological and emotional injury: Recognizing and assessing race-based traumatic stress. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*, 13–105. doi:10.1177/0011000006292033
- Cauce, A. M. (2011). Is multicultural psychology a-scientific? Diverse methods for diversity research. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*, 228–233. doi:10.1037/a0023880
- Chen, F. F., West, S. G., & Sousa, K. H. (2006). A comparison of bifactor and second-order models of quality of life. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 41*, 189–225. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr4102_5
- Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions against African American clients in cross-racial counseling relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 1–16. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.1.1
- Constantine, M. G., & Sue, D. W. (2007). Perceptions of racial microaggressions among Black supervisees in cross-racial dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 142–153. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.2.142
- Cowan, G., Martinez, L., & Mendiola, S. (1997). Predictors of attitudes towards illegal Latino immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 19*, 403–415. doi:10.1177/07399863970194001
- Falicov, C. J. (2010). Changing constructions of machismo for Latino men in therapy: “The devil never sleeps.” *Family Process, 49*, 309–329. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010.01325.x
- Franklin, A., & Boyd-Franklin, N. (2000). Invisibility syndrome: A clinical model of the effect of racism on African-American males. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*, 33–41. doi:10.1037/h0087691
- 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., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2007). *LISREL 8.80*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Jun, H. (2010). *Social justice, multicultural counseling, and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Kawai, Y. (2005). Stereotyping Asian-Americans: The dialectic of the model minority and the yellow peril. *Howard Journal of Communications, 16*, 109–130. doi:10.1080/10646170590948974
- King, K. R. (2005). Why is discrimination stressful? The mediating role of cognitive appraisal. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11*, 202–212. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.11.3.202
- 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. doi:10.1177/00957984960222002
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and the determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods, 1*, 130–149. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130
- McNeilly, M. D., Anderson, N. B., Armstead, C. A., Clark, R., Corbett, M., Robinson, E. L., . . . Lepisto, E. M. (1996). The Perceived Racism Scale: A multidimensional assessment of the experience of White racism among African Americans. *Ethnicity and Disease, 6*, 154–166.
- Moradi, B., & Risco, C. (2006). Perceived discrimination experiences and mental health of Latino/a American persons. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 411–421. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.411
- Mulaik, S. (2007). There is a place for approximate fit in structural equation modeling. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 883–891. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.10.024
- Niemann, Y. F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R. M., Baxter, J. C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 379–390. doi:10.1177/0146167294204005
- Park, G. C. (2011). “Are we real Americans?” Cultural production of forever foreigners at a diversity event. *Education and Urban Society, 43*, 451–467. doi:10.1177/0013124510380714
- Pascoe, E. A., & Richman, L. S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 531–554. doi:10.1037/a0016059
- Pierce, C. M., Carew, J. V., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Wills, D. (1977). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. *Education and Urban Society, 10*, 61–87. doi:10.1177/001312457701000105
- Reise, S. P., Moore, T. M., & Haviland, M. G. (2010). Bifactor models and rotations: Exploring the extent to which multidimensional data yield univocal scale scores. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 92*, 544–559. doi:10.1080/00223891.2010.496477
- Reise, S. P., Morizot, J., & Hays, R. D. (2007). The role of the bifactor model in resolving dimensionality issues in health outcome measures. *Quality of Life Research, 16*, 19–31. doi:10.1007/s11136-007-9183-7
- Rivera, D. P., Forquer, E. E., & Rangel, R. (2010). Microaggressions and life experience of Latina/o Americans. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality* (pp. 59–83). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. M. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1079–1092. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1079
- Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). “Assume the position . . . you fit the description”: Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African-American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist, 51*, 551–578. doi:10.1177/0002764207307742
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 60–73.
- Solórzano, D., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). A critical race counterstory of race, racism, and affirmative action. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*, 155–168. doi:10.1080/713845284
- Steiger, J. H. (2007). Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modeling. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 893–898. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.017
- Stucky, B. D., Gottfredson, N. C., Panter, A. T., Daye, C. E., Allen, W. R., & Wightman, L. F. (2011). An item factor analysis and item response theory-based revision of the Everyday Discrimination Scale. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*, 175–185. doi:10.1037/a0023356
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2007). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13*, 72–81. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.13.1.72
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., & Holder, A. M. B. (2008). Racial microaggressions in the life experience of Black Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*, 329–336. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.39.3.329
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*, 271–286. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271
- Tanaka, J. S. (1993). Multifaceted conceptions of fit in structural equation models. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 10–39). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thomas, K. R. (2008). Macrononsense in multiculturalism. *American Psychologist, 63*, 274–275. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.4.274
- Torres, L., Driscoll, M. W., & Burrow, A. L. (2010). Racial microagres-

- sions and psychological functioning among highly achieving African-Americans: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 29*, 1074–1099. doi:10.1521/jscp.2010.29.10.1074
- Trickett, E., Watts, R. J., & Birman, D. (1991). Toward an overarching framework for diversity. In E. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human DIVERSITY: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 7–26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1996). Development and validation of the Index of Race-Related Stress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 490–501. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.4.490
- Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socioeconomic status, stress, and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology, 2*, 335–351. doi: 10.1177/135910539700200305
- Wirth, R. J., & Edwards, M. C. (2007). Item factor analysis: Current approaches and future directions. *Psychological Methods, 12*, 58–79. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.12.1.58
- Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., Tran, K. K., Collins, D. L., & Higgins, C. E. (2011). Asian American male college students' perceptions of people's stereotypes about Asian American men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/a0022800
- Wothke, W. (1993). Nonpositive definite matrices in structural modeling. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 256–293). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*, 659–690.