Journal of Counseling Psychology
2011, Vol. 58, No. 4, 470–480

0022-0167/11/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/a0025193

The Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS): Construction, Reliability, and Validity

Kevin L. Nadal
John Jay College of Criminal Justice—City University of New York

Racial microaggressions are subtle statements and behaviors that unconsciously communicate denigrating messages to people of color. In recent years, a theoretical taxonomy and subsequent qualitative studies have introduced the types of microaggressions that people of color experience. In the present study, college- and Internet-based samples of African Americans, Latina/os, Asian Americans, and multiracial participants ($N = 661$) were used to develop and validate the Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale (REMS). In Study 1, an exploratory principal-components analyses ($n = 443$) yielded a 6-factor model: (a) Assumptions of Inferiority, (b) Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality, (c) Microinvalidations, (d) Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity, (e) Environmental Microaggressions, and (f) Workplace and School Microaggressions, with a Cronbach's alpha of .912 for the overall model and subscales ranging from .783 to .873. In Study 2, a confirmatory factor analysis ($n = 218$) supported the 6-factor model with a Cronbach's alpha of .892. Further analyses indicate that the REMS is a valid measure of racial microaggressions, as evidenced by high correlations with existing measures of racism and participants' feedback. Future research directions and implications for practice are discussed.

Keywords: microaggressions, racism, discrimination, scale construction

There have been numerous studies that have demonstrated the negative impacts that racism and racial discrimination may have on individuals' physical and mental health. Studies have reported the relationship between racial discrimination and psychological stress (Fang & Myers, 2001; Moradi & Risco, 2006), high blood pressure (Harrel, Hall, & Taliaferro, 2003; Steffen, McNeilly, Anderson, & Sherwood, 2003), depression (Lambert, Herman, Bynum, & Ialongo, 2009; Santana, Almeida-Filho, Roberts, & Cooper, 2007), sleeping problems (Steffan & Bowden, 2006), substance abuse (Wei, Alvarez, Ku, Russell, & Bonett, 2010), eating disorders (Mastria, 2002), and posttraumatic stress disorder (Flores, Tschann, Dimas, Pasch, & de Groat, 2010; Pieterse, Carter, Evans, & Walter, 2010). Given these factors, it is clear that understanding and preventing racial discrimination is important in order to promote the physical and mental health of people of color. Moreover, it is necessary for psychologists to be cognizant of the types of racial discrimination their clients of color may experience, as well as the ways their clients may cope with such experiences.

Although racism has been found to have detrimental effects on people of color, researchers have suggested that interpersonal racism has decreased, as exemplified by the fact that race-based hate crimes are viewed as socially unacceptable and have reduced significantly over the past few decades (Nadal, 2008). So although it may have been commonplace for lynchings, cross burnings, and racial assaults to have occurred 30 years ago, it is less socially acceptable to condone violent acts of racism in contemporary times. Many authors have posited that because the United States has become more politically correct, most individuals are much more aware of racism and tend to avoid engaging in racist acts (see Sue, 2010, for a review). However, although individuals may not consciously be racist, their biases and prejudices may manifest in more subtle and unconscious ways. For example, although most people self-report that they are not racist and that they uphold egalitarian values, they may unconsciously maintain negative feelings toward racial and ethnic minority groups (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2006). As a result, although interpersonal racism may no longer be as overt as it may have been in the past, racism may now take on more subtle forms (Sue et al., 2007). This new form of discrimination has been identified as symbolic racism (Sears, 1988), modern racism (McConahay, 1986), aversive racism (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002), and racial microaggressions (Pierce, Carew, Pierce-Gonzalez, & Willis, 1978).

In recent years, there has been an increase in the term *microaggressions* in the fields of psychology, education, and counseling. Sue and colleagues (2007) have described several categories of microaggressions that exist, including racial microinsults (i.e.,

This article was published Online First August 29, 2011.

I thank the American Psychological Association Promoting Psychological Research and Training on Health Disparities Issues (ProDIGS) for funding this project. I send a very special thank you to my research assistants Katie Griffin, and Yinglee Wong for assisting in the construction of this scale. I also acknowledge my other research team members, including Kristin Davidoff, Sahran Hamit, Marie-Anne Issa, Jayleen Leon, Vanessa Meterko, Michael Tobio, Vivian Vargas, and Michelle Wideman for their contributions.

Finally, I thank Derald Wing Sue, David Rivera, and my colleagues at Teachers College-Columbia University for their inspiration and support as well as their commitment to microaggression research.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kevin L. Nadal, Department of Psychology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice—City University of New York, 445 West 59th Street, New York, NY 10019. E-mail: knadal@jjay.cuny.edu

verbal and nonverbal behaviors that send denigrating messages to people of color) and racial microinvalidations (i.e., unconscious verbal statements in which the perpetrator may have good intentions, but which convey negative messages to people of color). Furthermore, Sue and colleagues (2007) presented an original taxonomy of racial microaggressions, citing various themes of ways that microaggressions may manifest in everyday life. One theme includes *Alien in One's Own Land* (i.e., experiences in which people of color may feel like perpetual foreigners). For example, telling an Asian American "You speak good English" could be considered a microaggression because such a statement implies that the Asian American is foreign-born, although she or he was born in the United States. Another theme is *Assumption of Criminality* (i.e., experiences in which people of color are stereotyped to be deviant or criminals). For example, a store owner who follows an African American around in a store while she or he is shopping could be considered a microaggression because such behavior insinuates that African Americans are going to steal from them. Other themes included *Second-Class Citizen* (e.g., when customers of color receive substandard service to Whites), *Ascription of Intelligence* (e.g., when people of color are assumed to be less intellectual or uneducated), *Assumption of Inferiority* (e.g., when people of color are assumed to be poor or hold substandard careers), *Colorblindness* (e.g., when someone claims that they "don't see race"), and *Denial of Racial Reality* (e.g., when someone defensively denies that she or he is racist or engaged in racist behaviors).

A number of qualitative studies have examined racial microaggressions experienced by African Americans (Sue et al., 2008; Watkins, LaBarrie, & Appio, 2010), Latina/os (Rivera, Forquer, & Rangel, 2010), Asian Americans (Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2010), indigenous peoples (Hill, Kim, & Williams, 2010), and students of color (Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, & Rivera, 2009). The original microaggressions taxonomy presented by Sue and colleagues (2007) has led to literature on microaggressions toward other populations including multiracial people (Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Nadal, Wong, Griffin, et al., 2011), women (Capodilupo et al., 2010; Nadal, 2010), lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people (Nadal, Issa, et al., 2011; Nadal, Rivera, & Corpus, 2010; Nadal, Wong, et al., 2011), religious minorities (Nadal, Issa, Griffin, Hamit, & Lyons, 2010), and persons with disabilities (Keller & Galgay, 2010). This literature supported that people of color and other minority groups experience a number of microaggressions in their everyday lives and that these microaggressions have negative impacts on their mental health.

Despite the positive contributions to the literature, qualitative methods have been used all of these aforementioned studies (often with small sample sizes). Thus, it is imperative for researchers to produce quantitative studies to empirically support the presence of microaggressions and their influences on mental health, physical health, and other variables like self-esteem, self-efficacy, and performance. Harrell (2000) created the Daily Life Experiences (DLE) measure, which consists of 20 items and measures microaggressions that may occur in everyday life. However, there are no subscales in this measure, and it does reflect the breadth and categories of microaggressions that have been highlighted in the microaggression taxonomy and subsequent studies. Moreover, other instruments that measure modern racism (McConahay, 1986), perceived ethnic discrimination (Brondolo et al., 2005) and race-related stress (Liang, Li, & Kim, 2004; Utsey, 1998; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996) may include some examples of microaggressions but do not take account of the types of microaggressions that have been described in recent literature (e.g., environmental microaggressions or microinvalidations). Thus, the purpose of the present study was to create a quantitative instrument on racial microaggressions that could measure the microaggressions that people of color experience in their everyday lives.

Study 1: Principal Components Analysis and Initial Reliability and Validity

In this first study, I describe the development of items for a measure on racial microaggressions, which includes an exploratory principal components analysis, as well as initial reliability of the measure. I also describe ways that validity was tested, namely through participants' evaluations and correlations with the Racism and Life Experiences Scale-Brief (RaLES-B; Utsey, 1998). I also describe two scoring methods that were used.

Method

Development of initial pool of items. On the basis of the original taxonomy on racial microaggressions presented by Sue and colleagues (2007), as well as the previous research on African Americans (Sue et al., 2008; Watkins et al., 2010), Latina/os (Rivera et al., 2010), Asian Americans (Sue et al., 2010), indigenous people (Hill et al., 2010), and students of color (Sue et al., 2009), a team of 13 researchers gathered to create an initial pool of items for a racial microaggression measure. (The description of the research team is highlighted below.) First, the researchers worked autonomously, with the task of producing as many items as they could, using the previously described themes (from both the original taxonomy and the subsequent research studies) as stimulation. For example, with the theme Alien in One's Own Land, a researcher independently produced as many items that corresponded with this theme. Using the eight aforementioned categories, each researcher generated about 50–100 possible items independently.

After working independently and creating individual lists, the team gathered together and discussed each of their lists of items. A recorder took note of all of the items and made note of repeated items, as well as items that the team consensually decided to discard. Then, the team voted on the items that were most representative of the eight original categories (i.e., there were approximately 15–20 items per category). A subteam of four researchers worked together to discuss grammatical structure and wording of each item and produced and presented a list of 140 items to the team. The team discussed the items and offered minor suggestions; the list was then given to an auditor. This auditor, a professor who is an expert in microaggression literature, worked independently from the team, and checked the representativeness of each category (i.e., did the items characterize each category effectively?) and the grammatical structure and meaning of each item. Upon receiving the auditor's feedback, the team removed some of the confusing or inappropriate items as recommended, resulting in a final list of 131 items. Finally, the team randomized the items into one random, uncategorized list, which is henceforth referred to as the *Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale-Initial Version* (REMS-I).

Participants. The sample included a total of 443 participants; 335 were women, 108 were men, and none identified as transgender. The mean age of the sample was 24.83 (SD = 8.627), with a range of 18–66. The sample was racially diverse, with 34% Asian Americans/ Pacific Islanders, 31% Latina/os, 18% Black African Americans, 11% multiracial, and 6% who did not identify with any of these categories or did not report race. The sample was also ethnically diverse, with the largest samples including Filipino American (21%), African American (12%), Dominican American (7%), Puerto Rican (6%), Mexican/Chicano/a American (5%), and two ethnicities or more (14%). Eighty-five percent of the sample identified as heterosexual, whereas 6% identified as gay/lesbian, 3% as bisexual, and the remaining in other ways. The largest religious groups were Catholic (41%), Christian (19%), and agnostic or without a religion (15%). Fifty-eight percent identified as living in a northeastern state; 20% of participants were from the West Coast, 14% were from the Midwest, and the remainder were from the Southwest, Southeast, or Hawai'i (2.0%). The sample had a diverse range of educational levels: About 49% had a high school diploma, 11% had an associate's degree, 23% had a bachelor's degree, and 18% had a graduate degree. Finally, the majority of the sample was born within the United States (76.5%), whereas 22% of the participants were born outside of the United States.

Recruitment. Participants who identified as Black/African American, Latina/o, Asian American, Pacific Islander, Arab American, or multiracial were eligible to participate in the study. Participants were recruited in two ways: (a) through a Psychology 101 undergraduate pool and (b) through online Listservs and community websites. Students from the Psychology 101 classes were required to participate in research experiments as a part of class; these participants received credit for attending and participating in focus groups, regardless of activity of participation or quality of their answers. A community sample was recruited by sending mass e-mails to various community Listservs. Listservs included, but were not limited to, nonprofit community centers, racial minority professional organizations, and historically Black, Latina/o, or Asian American sororities and fraternities. A snowball sampling methodology was encouraged, in which participants were asked to advertise the study to their respective networks.

Measures.

Demographic sheet. An open-ended demographic questionnaire asked participants to self-identify their gender, age, race, ethnicity, immigration status, religious background, level of education, and occupation. Open-ended answers are used to allow individuals to choose their own identities, instead of limiting participants to choose a predetermined box. This decision was made because of previous authors (e.g., Johnston & Nadal, 2010) who have cited that forcing people to "choose" a box to be a microaggression in itself.

The REMS-I. The REMS-I consists of 131 items that identify various racial microaggressions. Respondents were instructed to indicate the number of times that a microaggression occurred in the past 6 months, with 1 = *I did not experience this event in the past six months,* 2 = *I experienced this event 1–3 times in the past six months,* 3 = *I experienced this event 4–6 times in the past six months,* 4 = *I experienced this event 7–9 times in the past six months,* and 5 = *I experienced this event 10 or more times in the past six months.*

The RaLES-B. The RaLES-B is a short (and more widely used) version of the Racism and Life Experiences-Self-Administration Version (RaLES-S; Utsey, 1998). The nine-item instrument is a self-report measure of perceptions of racism by a person of color and the impact and stress that racism has on an individual's personal life (Utsey, 1998). The scale measures the degree to which an individual believes that racism affects one's self and one's racial group. Four items comprise the Racism-Group score (measuring the stress that race may cause people of one's same racial/ethnic group), whereas five items comprise the Racism-Self score; a total score measures the Racism and Life Experiences score. Utsey and Ponterotto (1996) reported that the RaLES-B Racism-Self score and RaLES-B Racism-Group score had a Cronbach's alpha of .90 and .83, respectively (N = 55). High validity was exemplified by the significant and positive correlation (rs = .24–.46, p < .01) between the RaLES-B with the Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS), another measure of racism (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996). The present study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .862 for the total RaLES-B scale and .878 and .673 for the Racism-Self and Racism-Group scores, respectively.

REMS evaluation. At the conclusion of the REMS-I, participants were asked three open-ended questions. These questions included the following:

1. Describe what you believe these questions were trying to measure.
2. Write three keywords or key phrases that can be used to label the various experiences that are described above.
3. Do you remember any questions or experiences that were not written in a clear or concise manner? If so, please list them.

Procedure. After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board of the principal investigators' institution, all measures were made available through the website www.surveymonkey.com. First, participants were presented with an informed consent form to read, which indicated their voluntary participation, as well as potential risks and benefits to the study. Next, participants filled out the demographic questionnaire followed by the REMS, the RALES, and the REMS-Evaluation. Each research session lasted 30–45 min. At the completion of the survey, participants received a debriefing statement, which indicated the purpose of the statement, as well as the principal investigator's contact information.

Results

To test the REMS-I and create possible subscales, the researchers first conducted an exploratory principal components analysis. An exploratory principal components analysis was used initially instead of a confirmatory factor analysis because of the large number of items that were included, as well as the uncertainty of which factors would emerge from the several aforementioned microaggression studies. Thus, using Tabachnick and Fidell's (2001) suggestion of .32 as a sufficient loading, and Guadagnoli and Velicer's (1988) recommendation of .40 or greater as adequate, items with factor loadings of .45 or greater would be included. Additionally, following Costello and Osborne's (2005) recommendation of identifying and removing cross-loadings, items with loadings of .50 or above on more than one component would be removed.

The principal components analysis resulted in a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient of .894 (well above the recommended .50) and a Bartlett's Test of Sphericity χ^2 of 8155.78 ($df = 990$, $p > .001$), suggesting significant sampling adequacy. Thus, an orthogonal method was chosen. First, 131 items were entered into the principal-components factor analysis on SPSS Version 18, with a varimax rotation and eigenvalues greater than 1. This procedure yielded 28 components, with eigenvalues ranging from 1.01 to 32.94. Next, researchers examined each of these 28 components and assessed whether a number of items had a factor loading greater than .45. After eliminating items with weak loadings and cross-loadings, a total of 79 items remained. In order to reach the predetermined number of factors to extract (6), these 79 items were submitted to a second principal components analysis, with a varimax rotation, a Kaiser normalization, and eigenvalues greater than 1. Using this orthogonal rotation was chosen because not all correlations were significant, and many had *r* scores that were less than .15 (De Vellis, 2003); using such a varimax rotation is further supported by Finch (2006), who found that both orthogonal and oblique rotations are equally effective.

This procedure resulted in eight components, which were then evaluated by the researchers to determine whether the groupings of items made conceptual sense. Six components were retained, each with a range of five to nine items each. The other two components did not produce substantial items with loadings greater than .45 and did not make conceptual sense.

Furthermore, retaining these six components aligned with the number of components determined by using the Monte Carlo principal components analysis for Parallel Analysis—a standalone RealBASIC program that allows specification of three to 300 variables, 100–2,500 participants, and 1–1,000 replications (Watkins, 2006). Results from 11 variables, 443 participants, and 100 replications were produced in 33 s by a Windows NT personal computer and yielded six random components with eigenvalues greater than 1. These six components accounted for 12.70%, 4.00%, 3.42%, 3.13%, 1.84%, and 1.61% of the variance, respectively, and were labeled as Component 1: Assumptions of Inferiority, Component 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality, Component 3: Microinvalidations, Component 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity, Component 5: Environmental Microaggressions, and Component 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions. According to an analysis of postrotation sums of squared loadings, components account for 11.25%, 10.93%, 10.33%, 9.51%, 8.50%, and 7.34% of the total variance. (See Table 1 for loadings, commonalities, and variance accounted for.) Components 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 were all significantly positively correlated with each other ($r = .219–.589$, $p < .01$). Component 5 was significantly negatively correlated with Components 1, 2, 3, and 4 ($r = -.173$ to $-.117$, $p < .01$); however, there was no significant correlation between Components 5 and 6 (see Table 2).

Supporting internal consistency reliability, the 45-item REMS produced a coefficient alpha of 0.928 ($M = 1.6702$, $SD = 0.543$). Each subscale produced a coefficient alpha well over .80—Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority ($\alpha = .894$, $M = 1.4052$, $SD = 0.754$), Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality ($\alpha = .883$, $M = 1.2981$, $SD = 0.668$), Subscale 3: Microinvalidations ($\alpha = .888$, $M = 1.5249$, $SD = 0.780$), Subscale 4: Exoticization/ Assumptions of Similarity ($\alpha = .852$, $M = 1.6573$, $SD = 0.883$), Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions ($\alpha = .850$, $M = 3.205$, $SD = 0.870$), and Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions ($\alpha = .850$, $M = 1.2894$, $SD = 0.691$). The REMS-45 produced high internal reliabilities with all major racial groups—Black/African Americans ($\alpha = .918$), Latina/os ($\alpha = .905$), Asian Americans ($\alpha = .909$), and multiracial persons ($\alpha = .922$). Means and reliabilities for the scale and subscales for four major racial groups are included in Table 3.

Testing for concurrent validity, the REMS-45 was positively correlated with the RALES-B ($r = .464$, $N = 376$, $p < .001$). Five of the six subscales were also positively correlated with the RALES-B—Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority ($r = .343$, $N = 376$, $p < .001$), Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumption of Criminality ($r = .351$, $N = 376$, $p < .001$), Subscale 3: Microinvalidations ($r = .380$, $N = 376$, $p < .001$), Subscale 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity ($r = .216$, $N = 376$, $p < .001$), and Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions ($r = .433$, $N = 376$, $p < .001$). Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions was not significantly correlated with the RALES-B. The same five REMS subscales also correlated highly with both the RALES-B Individual and RALES-B Group subscales.

One way that I tested an element of construct validity, or whether the scale is accurately measuring microaggressions, was by using the REMS Evaluation. Participants were asked to describe what they thought the questions were trying to measure, as well as three keywords that represented the items that were listed. Using a content analysis method (see Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, for a review), a subteam of five researchers worked independently, thoroughly read each answer, and categorized each answer into themes (i.e., descriptions that were based on keywords or ideas). The team reconvened and discussed their findings, and the team consensually agreed on major categories, which were sent to an auditor who checked for accuracy and provided feedback. Finally, the team reviewed and classified each item into one of the major themes and tallied the number of responses under each category. For answers that may have fit under more than one theme, the researchers consensually agreed on a theme that each response fit best.

The most frequently used words included (a) *racism* ($n = 99$), *discrimination* ($n = 70$), *stereotype* ($n = 45$), *ignorance* ($n = 40$), and *prejudice* ($n = 35$). Five major themes emerged, with 60 or more responses that were categorized under each theme. Theme 1: Experiences with Racism ($N = 255$) illustrated descriptions that explicitly used the word *racism* (on interpersonal, institutional, societal, or abstract levels). For example, one participant wrote "I believe the questions were measuring the amount of racism an average person encounters during the aforementioned 6 month period," whereas another wrote "I think the study is trying to find out whether or not I believe racism still exists." Theme 2: Experiences of Race and Ethnicity ($N = 140$) described responses that discussed treatment of people of color, without necessarily describing such situations as positive or negative. For example, one participant wrote "I believe that the questions wanted to measure how people belonging to my culture are treated in today's society." Theme 3: Perceptions of Race-Related Situations ($N = 90$) included descriptions that discussed the idea of perceptions of race by self or by others. For example, one participant shared "[This is a study about] perceptions of daily interactions that carry racial or

Table 1
Principal Component Analysis Loadings and Commonalities for Study 1 (N = 443)

		Component						
Item		1	2	3	4	5	6	h^2
	Component 1: Assumptions of Inferiority; PoV = 11.23							
32	Someone assumed that I would have a lower education because of my race.	0.82	0.23	0.11	0.17	0.04	0.13	0.8
38	Someone assumed that I was poor because of my race.	0.75	0.25	0.12	0.24	−0.02	0.02	0.69
21	Someone assumed that I would not be educated because of my race.	0.74	0.29	0.17	0.12	0.01	0.23	0.72
17	Someone acted surprised at my scholastic or professional success because of my race.	0.72	0.19	0.19	0.2	−0.01	0.22	0.68
9	Someone assumed that I would not be intelligent because of my race.	0.69	0.18	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.33	0.66
36	Someone assumed that I held a lower paying job because of my race.	0.61	0.24	0.08	0.23	0.04	0.29	0.57
5	Someone assumed that I grew up in a particular neighborhood because of my race.	0.51	0.13	0.01	0.45	0.13	−0.03	0.57
22	Someone told me that I was "articulate" after she/he assumed I wouldn't be.	0.49	0.28	0.25	0.26	0.12	0.12	0.52
	Component 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality; PoV = 10.93							
6	Someone avoided walking near me on the street because of my race.	0.19	0.81	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.19	0.77
31	Someone clenched her/his purse or wallet upon seeing me because of my race.	0.2	0.81	0.02	0.14	0.05	0.03	0.72
8	Someone avoided sitting next to me in a public space (e.g., restaurants, movie theaters, subways, buses) because of my race.	0.12	0.74	0.12	0.14	0.07	0.31	0.69
40	Someone avoided eye contact with me because of my race.	0.3	0.74	0.17	0.01	0.02	0.16	0.68
2	Someone's body language showed they were scared of me, because of my race.	0.36	0.72	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.13	0.71
34	Someone assumed that I would physically hurt them because of my race.	0.35	0.65	−0.03	0.24	0.13	0.08	0.67
11	I received substandard service in stores compared to customers of other racial groups.	0.08	0.55	0.15	0.09	0.02	0.29	0.5
	Component 3: Microinvalidations; PoV = 10.32							
27	Someone told me that they "don't see color."	0.07	0.17	0.84	0.1	0.11	−0.02	0.79
30	Someone told me that they do not see race.	0.05	0.18	0.84	0	0.08	0.03	0.77
39	Someone told me that people should not think about race anymore.	0.16	0.06	0.8	0.08	0.11	0.1	0.7
7	Someone told me that she or he was color-blind.	0.03	0.02	0.72	−0.04	0.07	0.16	0.57
26	I was told that people of color do not experience racism anymore.	0.17	0.03	0.62	0.05	0.03	0.14	0.57
33	Someone of a different racial group has stated that there is no difference between the two of us.	0.16	−0	0.61	0.29	0.08	0.18	0.51
4	I was told that I should not complain about race.	0.11	0.18	0.53	0.14	−0.01	0.2	0.79
14	I was told that people of all racial groups experience the same obstacles.	0.31	−0.09	0.47	0.27	−0.03	0.25	0.53
10	I was told that I complain about race too much.	0.16	0.18	0.47	0.03	−0.06	0.25	0.7
	Component 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity; PoV = 9.51							
3	Someone assumed that I spoke a language other than English.	0.1	0.1	0.04	0.74	−0.15	0.02	0.67
29	Someone asked me to teach them words in my "native language."	0.12	0.05	0.03	0.74	−0.07	0.05	0.59
45	Someone assumed that I speak similar languages to other people in my race.	0.17	0.05	0.01	0.71	0.01	0.11	0.58
35	Someone assumed that I ate foods associated with my race/culture every day.	0.26	0.05	0.12	0.69	−0.12	−0.09	0.58
42	Someone told me that all people in my racial group look alike.	0.13	0.19	0.16	0.6	0.07	0.08	0.62
23	Someone told me that all people in my racial group are all the same.	0.21	0.1	0.22	0.59	0.13	0.15	0.62
13	Someone wanted to date me only because of my race.	−0.06	0.01	0.11	0.51	0.2	0.46	0.55
20	Someone did not believe me when I told them I was born in the U.S.	0.24	0.23	−0.05	0.51	0.1	0	0.47
43	Someone objectified one of my physical features because of my race.	0.08	0.22	0.25	0.49	0.12	0.14	0.62
	Component 5: Environmental Microaggressions; PoV = 8.50							
37	I observed people of my race portrayed positively in movies.	−0.01	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.84	−0.08	0.72
24	I observed people of my race portrayed positively in magazines.	0.06	0.02	0.07	−0.02	0.85	0.01	0.75
19	I observed people of my race portrayed positively on television.	0.02	−0.09	0.06	−0.12	0.78	0.03	0.66
28	I read popular books or magazines in which a majority of contributions featured people from my racial group.	0.14	0.12	0.12	−0.02	0.7	0.01	0.58
18	I observed that people of my race were the CEOs of major corporations.	−0.12	0.07	−0.04	0.04	0.69	0.08	0.62
41	I observed that someone of my race is a government official in my state.	0.09	0.17	0.18	0.12	0.55	−0.04	0.56
12	I observed people of my race in prominent positions at my workplace or school.	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.55	−0.09	0.6
	Component 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions; PoV = 7.34							
25	An employer or co-worker was unfriendly or unwelcoming toward me because of my race.	0.35	0.27	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.76	0.77
15	My opinion was overlooked in a group discussion because of my race.	0.18	0.16	0.3	0.13	−0.09	0.67	0.66
1	I was ignored at school or at work because of my race.	0.09	0.34	0.18	0.05	−0.09	0.65	0.61
16	Someone assumed that my work would be inferior to people of other racial groups.	0.41	0.15	0.16	0.06	0.11	0.64	0.64
44	An employer or co-worker treated me differently than White co-workers.	0.38	0.29	0.12	0.03	−0.09	0.62	0.63

Note. PoV = Percentage of Variance accounted for (after rotation).

Table 2
Intercorrelations Among Factors of the Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale in Study 1 (N = 406)

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Assumptions of Inferiority	—					
2. Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality	.550**	—				
3. Microinvalidations	.470**	.381**	—			
4. Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity	.339**	.258**	.285**	—		
5. Environmental Microaggressions	−.115*	−.148**	−.173**	−.127**	—	
6. Workplace and School Microaggressions	.589**	.563**	.515**	.219**	−0.02	—

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

racist assumptions," whereas another participant stated, "They are trying to measure how our specific ethnicity/race plays a role into how others treat us and how those experiences appear racist or not to us. The questions explore how race/ethnicity can affect our daily activities and how we perceive those interactions from people outside our own race/ethnicity." Theme 4: Stereotypes ($N = 65$) classified descriptions that discussed the ideas of stereotyping, prejudice, or negative portrayals of people of color. For example, one participant stated, "The questions were trying to show racial stereotyping experiences." Theme 5: Microaggressions and Subtle Discrimination ($N = 138$) was used to discuss descriptions directly using the word *microaggression* or that describe the "subtle," "covert" or "everyday" forms of discrimination. For example, one participant shared, "This study measures how much we are exposed to microaggressions and how we perceive them," whereas another shared "[This study is about] the constant subtle and not-so-subtle ways we are treated differently because of our racial identity." Another participant shared, "individually these seem to be small or minor incidents, but collectively they add up and lead to a particular experience in this country for people of color," whereas another participant shared "I think these questions were designed to discover what kinds of racial interactions or conflicts people may have on a daily basis and how often people face racial discrimination."

Recoding of scores. Upon completion of data collection, the researchers decided to recode participants' answers into dichotomous variables. Because the pilot study yielded less variance than expected, researchers altered the scoring system into a checklist

Table 3
Psychometric Properties for Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale (REMS-45) for Study 1 (N = 406)

Participant's race	REMs Average	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	Subscale 4	Subscale 5	Subscale 6
Total							
M	1.67	1.41	1.30	1.52	1.66	3.21	1.29
N	406	402	404	403	404	382	404
SD	0.54	0.75	0.67	0.78	0.88	0.87	0.69
	α = .928	α = .894	α = .883	α = .888	α = .852	α = .850	α = .850
Asian							
M	1.94	1.39	1.30	1.55	1.62	4.27	1.39
N	138	137	137	137	137	129	137
SD	0.47	0.60	0.47	0.74	0.86	0.69	0.60
	α = .909	α = .857	α = .835	α = .909	α = .806	α = .821	α = .817
Black							
M	2.05	1.72	1.64	1.87	1.61	3.89	1.51
N	74	74	74	74	74	73	74
SD	0.49	0.87	0.83	0.81	0.90	0.87	0.70
	α = .918	α = .932	α = .895	α = .895	α = .910	α = .866	α = .853
Latino/a							
M	2.09	1.76	1.46	1.75	1.84	4.12	1.41
N	127	125	126	126	126	118	126
SD	0.51	0.88	0.73	0.75	0.95	0.72	0.71
	α = .905	α = .891	α = .899	α = .820	α = .830	α = .800	α = .828
Multiracial							
M	1.99	1.56	1.45	1.68	1.35	4.23	1.66
N	46	46	46	46	46	42	46
SD	0.49	0.76	0.67	0.86	0.76	0.82	1.02
	α = .922	α = .795	α = .896	α = .813	α = .842	α = .771	α = .933

Note. Data represent means and reliability. REMS Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority; REMS Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumption of Criminality; REMS Subscale 3: Microinvalidations; REMS Subscale 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity; REMS Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions; REMS Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions; REMS = Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale.

form. If an individual did not experience the event in the past 6 months, her or his score was recoded to a 0, and if an individual did experience the event at least once, her or his score was recoded to a 1. This step was also taken because there were some items (e.g., "Someone wanted to date me only because of race") that were viewed as unlikely to have occurred several times in the past 6 months for most participants.

The REMS-45 with the new scoring system, which is now referred to as the REMS-Checklist, yielded a coefficient alpha of .912. Reliability of subscales include the following: Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority (α = .873), Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality (α = .821), Subscale 3: Microinvalidations (α = .841), Subscale 4: Exoticization/ Assumptions of Similarity (α = .783), Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions (α = .785), and Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions (α = .792). Subscales 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 were all positively correlated with each other, with *r* scores ranging from .328 to .606 ($p > .01$). However, Subscale 5 (Environmental Microaggressions) was not significantly correlated with any of the other subscales.

Given this new scoring system, the researchers conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using the MPlus 5.21 program (Muthén & Muthén, 2009). The hypothesized model consisted of six first-order latent variables representing the six subscales from the principal-components factor analysis. The model yielded a χ^2 of 1822.31 (df = 930, $p > .001$), which is large enough to reject the null of a good fit. However, although this is statistically significant, it is common for large sample sizes to result in significant chi-squares (Bentler & Bonett, 1980). Thus, the adequacy of model fit was determined using consensus among three indices recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999): the comparative fit index (CFI), the standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR), and the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA). According to Hu and Bentler, CFI values of .95 and higher, SRMR values of .08 or lower, and RMSEA values of .06 and lower indicate a relatively good fit of the model to the data, whereas CFI values of .90–.94, SRMR values of .09–.10, and RMSEA values of .07–.10 indicate an acceptable fit. RMSEA score less than .05 is considered excellent. The present model resulted in a CFI = .78, indicating an unacceptable fit. However, the model resulted in an SRMR of .067 and an RMSEA of .05, which suggests a good fit of the model. Thus, two of these three methods suggest that the present model is a good fit, and one model even suggesting an excellent fit.

The REMS-Checklist resulted in an increase in *r* scores with the RALES-B (r = .489, N = 376, $p < .001$). Five of the six subscales were also positively correlated with the RALES-B—Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority (r = .418, N = 376, $p < .001$), Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumption of Criminality (r = .427, N = 376, $p < .001$), Subscale 3: Microinvalidations (r = .376, N = 376, $p < .001$), Subscale 4: Exoticization/ Assumptions of Similarity (r = .237, N = 376, $p < .001$), and Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions (r = .466, N = 376, $p < .001$). With this sample, Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions was still not significantly correlated with the RALES- B. The same five REMS subscales also correlated highly with both the RALES-B Individual and RALES-B Group subscales.

Study 2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Reliability, and Validity

The purpose of Study 2 was to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis with a new sample. Reliability for the new measure was also tested, and validity was measured by testing correlations with the DLE scale (Harrell, 2000).

Method

Participants. Participants were recruited in the same manner as the first sample, and they followed the same procedures as well. The second sample included a total of 218 participants; 166 were women, 51 were men, none identified as transgender, and one did not report gender. The mean age of the sample was 20.56 (SD = 4.427), with a range of 17–54. Again, the sample was racially diverse, with 35% Latina/os, 20% Black/African Americans, 13% multiracial persons, 12% Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, and 4% who did not identify with any of these categories. The largest ethnic groups included African American (12.5%), Dominican (10.3%), Puerto Rican (8.4%), Chinese (4.2%), Filipino (3.4%), and individuals with two or more ethnicities (15.6%). The majority of the sample was heterosexual (84.0%), whereas 5.3% of the participants was gay/lesbian, 3.8% was bisexual, and 1.5% did not disclose their sexual orientations or described themselves differently. The largest religious groups were Catholic (36.1%), Christian (19%), and Muslim (4.2%), and 28% reported being nonreligious. The majority of the sample (92%) lived in a northeastern state and, in addition, (74%) were born in the United States. The educational background of this sample was different than the first, with 71.5% having an associate's degree, 14% having a bachelor's degree, and 11% having a graduate degree.

Measures.

Demographic sheet. The same open-ended demographic questionnaire was used for participants to self-identify their gender, age, race, ethnicity, immigration status, religious background, level of education, and occupation.

The REMS-Checklist. Initially, the scoring system was altered from the first sample. Respondents were instructed to indicate the number of times that a microaggression occurred in the past 6 months, with 0 = *I did not experience this event in the past six months*, 1 = *I experienced this event 1 time in the past six months*, 2 = *I experienced this event 2 times in the past six months*, 3 = *I experienced this event 3 times in the past six months*, 4 = *I experienced this event 4 times in the past six months*, and 5 = *I experienced this event 5 or more times in the past six months*. Similar to the first sample, researchers recoded the REMS-45 into the dichotomous scoring system of the REMS-Checklist (i.e., 0 = *I did not experience this event in the past six months* and 1= *I experienced this event at least once in the past six months*).

Daily Life Experiences-Frequency (DLE-F) scale. The DLE-F is a subscale of the RaLES-S (Harrell, 2000). The 20-item scale is a self-report measure of perceptions of racism by a person of color and the impact that racism has on an individual's personal life (Utsey, 1998). The frequency scale (which was used in this study) assesses racial microaggressions or daily experiences that may occur in an individual's life. The DLE has been tested on all major racial groups and has produced high reliability coefficients (Harrell, 2000). The present study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .941 for the DLE-F scale.

Results

To test the validity of REMS-45, the researchers conducted a confirmatory factor analysis with a new sample, using the MPlus 5.21 program (Muthén & Muthén, 2009). The hypothesized model consisted of six first-order latent variables representing the six subscales (i.e., eight indicators for Assumptions of Inferiority, seven indicators for Second-Class Citizen andAssumptions of Criminality, nine indicators for Microinvalidations, nine indicators for Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity, seven indicators for Environmental Microaggressions, and five indicators for Workplace and School Microaggressions) and one second-order latent variable representing the total REMS-45 score. Similar to the confirmatory factor analysis from the first sample, the model yielded a significant χ^2 of 1400.37 ($df = 930$, $p > .001$), which is large enough to reject the null of a good fit. Although the present model resulted in a CFI of .815 (which is slightly higher than the first sample, but would still be considered a poor fit), it also yielded in an SRMR score of .071, and an RMSEA score of .05, which would indicate a good or excellent fit. Thus, as noted in Table 4, two of the three fit indices support the REMS-45, and its subscales are adequate measures of racial microaggressions.

In terms of internal consistency reliability, the second sample of the REMS-Checklist produced a coefficient alpha of .882 ($M = 0.556$, $SD = 0.18$). Each subscale produced a coefficient alpha well above .70—Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority ($\alpha = .862$, $M = 0.421$, $SD = 0.34$), Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality ($\alpha = .820$, $M = 0.418$, $SD = 0.29$), Subscale 3: Microinvalidations ($\alpha = .792$, $M = 0.467$, $SD = 0.27$), Subscale 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity ($\alpha = .715$, $M = 0.724$, $SD = 0.21$), Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions ($\alpha = .768$, $M = 0.288$, $SD = 0.27$), and Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions ($\alpha = .747$, $M = 0.423$, $SD = 0.28$). Subscales for all African Americans, Latina/os, Asian Americans, and multiracial people were high, with alpha ranges from .762 to .928. Subscales 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 were significantly positively correlated with each other, ranging from .313 to .602. Subscale 5 was significantly negatively correlated with all five other subscales, with r scores ranging from −.285 to −168. All intercorrelations, Cronbach's alphas, means, and standard deviations are reported in Table 5.

Concurrent validity of the REMS-Checklist was supported through significant correlations with the DLE-F scale ($r = .698$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$). All six subscales produced high correlations with the DLE-F—Subscale 1: Assumptions of Inferiority ($r = .567$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$), Subscale 2: Second-Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality ($r = .611$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$), Subscale 3: Microinvalidations ($r = .505$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$), Subscale 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity ($r = .461$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$), Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions ($r = -.209$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$), and Subscale 6: Workplace and School Microaggressions ($r = .643$, $N = 253$, $p < .001$).

Table 4
Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for the Competing Models of the 45-Item REMS-Checklist (N = 262)

Model	*df*	χ^2	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Five-factor	930	1400.74	0.812	0.050	0.071
One-factor	945	1951.5	0.597	0.072	0.084

Note. REMS-Checklist = Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale-Checklist; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual.

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to create a measure that evaluates the types of racial microaggressions that individuals experience in their everyday lives. Both theory and statistical methods were used in this study to identify 45 microaggression incidents and to categorize them into six major subscales: (a) Assumptions of Inferiority, b) Second-Class Citizen andAssumption of Criminality, (c) Microinvalidations, (d) Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity, (e) Environmental Microaggressions, and (f) Workplace and School Microaggressions. The overall scale and the subscales support both theoretical literature (Sue et al., 2007) and qualitative studies (Hill et al., 2010; Rivera et al., 2010; Sue et al., 2010, 2008; Watkins et al., 2010), which posit that people of color experience microaggressions in their everyday lives and are able to identify such instances as being racially related.

Results through two large samples provided evidence of reliability through satisfactory internal consistency estimates and evidence of validity through correlations with other scales, suggesting that the REMS is an adequate measure of racial microaggressions. First, through exploratory principal components analyses, researchers were able to identify six components with eigenvalues over 1. All of the items that were produced under each component made conceptual sense, and a confirmatory factor analysis with a new sample supported that the overall scale was acceptable. Second, the REMS was found to be correlated with both the RaLES-B and the DLE (two scales frequently used to measure experiences of racism and discrimination), supporting the validity of the measure. Furthermore, participants were overwhelmingly able to identify that the REMS was a measure of racial discrimination, further suggesting that the scale was measuring what it was intended to measure. The REMS was also found to be a reliable measure across four major racial groups, namely, Asian Americans, Latina/o Americans, Black/African Americans, and multiracial people. High coefficient alphas (all over .80) in two independent samples indicate the reliability of the overall scale and its subsequent subscales, indicating its appropriate use for individuals of all racial minority groups.

The six subscales paralleled several of the racial microaggression categories that have been described in previous literature. The experiences of being assumed to be inferior or a criminal were expressed in studies with Black/African American samples (Sue et al., 2008; Watkins et al., 2010) and Latina/os (Rivera et al., 2010). The experiences of being exoticized were described by both Asian Americans (Sue et al., 2010) and Latina/os (Rivera et al., 2010), whereas being treated as a second-class citizen was reported across all of the aforementioned samples. The Workplace and School Microaggressions subscale supports a previous study that examined microaggressions in the classroom or school environment (Sue et al., 2009). Finally, microinvalidations and environmental microaggressions have been discussed in previous theoretical literature (Sue et al., 2007), as well as in studies with microaggres-

Table 5
Intercorrelations and Psychometric Properties for Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale-Checklist for Study 2 (N = 262)

Variable	REMS average	1	2	3	4	5	6	α	*M*	*SD*
REMS average	—	.815**	.719**	.691**	.697**	−.083	.774**	0.882	0.556	0.18
Subscale 1		—	.602**	.413**	.552**	−.246**	.586**	0.862	0.421	0.34
Subscale 2			—	.421**	.313**	−.284**	.522**	0.82	0.418	0.29
Subscale 3				—	.369**	−.285**	.488**	0.792	0.467	0.27
Subscale 4					—	−.202**	.506**	0.715	0.724	0.21
Subscale 5						—	−.168**	0.768	0.288	0.27
Subscale 6							—	0.747	0.423	0.28

Note. REMS = Racial and Ethnic Microaggression Scale; REMS Subscale 1 = Assumptions of Inferiority; REMS Subscale 2 = Second-Class Citizen and Assumption of Criminality; REMS Subscale 3 = Microinvalidations; REMS Subscale 4: Exoticization/Assumptions of Similarity; REMS Subscale 5: Environmental Microaggressions; REMS Subscale 6 Workplace and School Microaggressions.
** $p < .01$.

sions with women, LGBT populations, and persons with disabilities (see Sue, 2010, for a review).

The present study also suggests that experiences and perceptions of microaggressions are complex. Some items from our initial pool loaded heavily on more than one factor and were therefore removed from the scale. This result indicates that there are some microaggressions that may be classified under more than one category and perhaps may have an array of interpretations for the individuals who experience them. For example, one of the original items "I was ignored when trying to get the attention of a waiter, bartender, or store clerk because of my race" loaded highly on the Assumptions of Inferiority factor as well as the Second-Class Citizen and Assumption of Criminality factor. Perhaps an individual did not receive good service because the waiter or bartender assumed her or him to be poor or uneducated, or perhaps the individual was ignored because the waiter or bartender assumed her or him to be a criminal. Accordingly, it is possible that there are some experiences of microaggressions that did not emerge into the final scale because of the complexities of dynamics and interpretation. Similarly, some items did not load highly on any of the principal components as well; some of these include "I have been accused of being too loud or "I have been accused of being too quiet." Perhaps these items did not load well because some individuals may interpret such experiences as being racially related, whereas some may view these as critiques of one's personality. Nonetheless, future analyses of the original 131 items may be helpful in understanding additional components that did not emerge from these studies.

The Environmental Microaggression subscale did not correlate significantly with the other subscales with the first sample, and had significant but smaller correlations than the other subscales with the second sample. Perhaps this discrepancy is because the items were written inversely, measuring positive perceptions of race, instead of identifying negative or active experiences with racism or microaggressions. It is also conceivable that environmental microaggressions may be measured differently because such experiences manifest differently than the experiences listed in the other subscales. Although the other subscales measure microaggressions that occur interpersonally, environmental microaggressions represent perceptions that individuals have of the environment around them. Perhaps interpersonal and environmental microaggressions have differential impacts on individual's mental health.

There are a few limitations to the present study. First, the two samples may not be representative of all individuals, as many of the participants were college students recruited through Psychology 101 classes, and many other participants were recruited through racial and ethnic organizations. Similarly, because much of the data were collected online, the integrity of the data is unknown because participants were not supervised, and there were no provisions made to follow up with participants. Second, because the study requires participants to self-report their experiences with microaggressions, it is difficult to assess the true quantity or quality of microaggressions that these individuals may or may not experience. Perhaps further development of the scale can replicate other scales measuring experiences with racial discrimination (e.g., Harrell, 2000; Liang et al., 2004) and inquire about how bothersome these events were for the individuals. Third, in the exploratory principal components analysis, the prerotated model indicated that the entire scale accounts for only about 27% of the total variance, with a single component (Assumptions of Inferiority) accounting for the largest proportion of the variance at only 12.70%. Perhaps this lower number may be due to the notion that the scale examines racial microaggressions from a diverse group of people of color or that the items that were chosen do not fully represent the vast amount of racial microaggressions that people may experience. Perhaps it may be difficult to measure microaggressions for people of various racial and ethnic groups because their racial and phenotypic appearances may yield different types of microaggressive incidents. Thus, it is possible that the various types of microaggressions do not correlate with each other and that individuals will less likely experience all of the microaggressions listed in the REMS. Finally, although the confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the overall model was a good fit (with a significant chi-square, RMSEA, and SRMR), it is possible that the REMS can be condensed or altered even further, in order to achieve a higher CFI score.

Future research directions and implications for practice. There are many implications that the REMS has for the field of psychology. First and foremost, as the only known measure that examines racial microaggressions using the taxonomy provided by Sue and colleagues (2007), the REMS could be a useful instrument to examine the impact that racial microaggressions have on individuals' well-being, particularly their mental and physical health. One of the main critiques regarding previous racial microaggres-

sion studies is that they used qualitative methods and consisted of small samples. Using these statistical methods to measure racial microaggressions can assist researchers in investigating the relationship of microaggressions with various psychological constructs. Perhaps future researchers can test alternative factor models of racial microaggressions in the future by adding or altering items or subscales to the REMS, or running a CFA with other factors presented in the original taxonomy by Sue and colleagues (2007).

Second, these two studies indicate that individuals are able to identify racial microaggressions and are able to label them as being race related. This finding is important because of the aforementioned studies that have reported the relationship between perceived racial discrimination and psychological stress, mental health disorders, and even physical health. However, because none of these previous studies focused on microaggressions specifically, future researchers may use the REMS to investigate other variables as well. Perhaps future empirical studies can examine the influence of racial microaggressions on mental health variables like depressive symptoms, anxiety, or self-esteem. Studies may examine how racial identity, ethnic identity, or gender may influence one's ability to recognize microaggressions, and further research may explore how microaggressions may impact personality development, coping mechanisms, and resiliency.

With the potential research that may emerge with this new scale, there are many implications for practice as well. Clinicians must be aware of the various types of microaggressions that their clients experience as well as the ways that their clients cope with such instances. Examining these microaggressions can help psychotherapists to conceptualize their clients' presenting problems, while preparing for the most effective ways to combat and handle microaggressions when they occur. Clinicians, supervisors, educators, and researchers must be cognizant of the ways that microaggressions may occur in all professional settings, and they must advocate for their clients, supervisees, students, and others to be aware of racial microaggressions as well. Finally, given the ever-changing global society, psychologists and other practitioners must educate other lay people about microaggressions (against all marginalized groups) in order to prevent both blatant and subtle forms of discrimination from occurring in everyday life.

References

Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significant tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structure. *Psychological Bulletin, 88,* 588–606. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588

Brondolo, E., Kelly, K. P., Coakley, V., Gordon, T., Thompson, S., Levy, E . . . Tobin, J. N. (2005). The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire: Development and preliminary validation of a community version. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35,* 335–365. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02124.x

Capodilupo, C. M., Nadal, K. L., Corman, L., Hamit, S., Lyons, O., & Weinberg, A. (2010). The manifestation of gender microaggressions. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 193–216). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation, 10,* 1–9.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we all just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8,* 88–102. doi: 10.1037/1099-9809.8.2.88

Fang, C. Y., & Myers, H. F. (2001). The effects of racial stressors and hostility on cardiovascular reactivity in African American and Caucasian men. *Health Psychology, 20,* 64–70. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.20.1.64

Finch, H. (2006). Comparison of the performance of varimax and promax rotations: Factor structure recovery for dichotomous items. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 43,* 39–52. doi:10.1111/j.1745-3984.2006.00003.x

Flores, E., Tschann, J. M., Dimas, J. M., Pasch, L. A., & de Groat, C. L. (2010). Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination, posttraumatic stress symptoms, and health risk behaviors among Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57,* 264–273. doi:10.1037/a0020026

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2006). Understanding and addressing contemporary racism: From aversive racism to the common ingroup. *Journal of Social Issues, 61,* 615–639. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00424.x

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1998). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin, 103,* 265–275. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.103.2.265

Harrel, J. P., Hall, S., & Taliaferro, J. (2003). Physiological responses to racism and discrimination: An assessment of the evidence. *American Journal of Public Health, 93,* 243–248.

Harrell, S. P. (2000). A multidimensional conceptualization of racism-related stress: Implications for the well-being of people of color. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70,* 42–57. doi:10.1037/h0087722

Hill, J. S., Kim, S., & Williams, C. D. (2010). The context of racial microaggressions against indigenous peoples: Same old racism or something new? In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 105–122). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Hsieh, H-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15,* 1277–1288. doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. (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

Johnston, M. P., & Nadal, K. L. (2010). Multiracial microaggressions: Exposing monoracism in everyday life and clinical practice. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 123–144). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Keller, R. M., & Galgay, C. E. (2010). Microaggressions experienced by people with disabilities in US society. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 241–268). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Lambert, S. F., Herman, K. C., Bynum, M. S., & Ialongo, N. S. (2009). Perceptions of racism and depressive symptoms in African American adolescents: The role of perceived academic and social control. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38,* 519–531. doi:10.1007/s10964-009-9393-0

Liang, C. T. H., Li, L. C., & Kim, B. S. K. (2004). The Asian American Race-Related Stress Inventory: Development, factor analysis, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51,* 103–114.

Mastria, M. R. (2002). Ethnicity and eating disorders. *Psychoanalysis & Psychotherapy, 19,* 59–77.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 91–126). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Moradi, B., & Risco, C. (2006). Perceived discrimination experiences and mental health of Latina/o American persons. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53,* 411–421.

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2009). *Mplus user's guide* (Version 5.21). Los Angeles, CA: Author.

Nadal, K. L. (2008). Preventing racial, ethnic, gender, sexual minority, disability, and religious microaggressions: Recommendations for promoting positive mental health. *Prevention in Counseling Psychology: Theory, Research, Practice and Training, 2,* 22–27.

Nadal, K. L. (2010). Gender microaggressions and women: Implications for mental health. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Feminism and women's rights worldwide, Volume 2: Mental and physical health* (pp. 155–175). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Nadal, K. L., Issa, M-A., Griffin, K., Hamit, S., & Lyons, O. (2010). Religious microaggressions in the United States: Mental health implications for religious minority groups. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 287–310). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Nadal, K. L., Issa, M., Leon, J., Meterko, V., Wideman, M., & Wong, Y. (2011). Sexual orientation microaggressions: "Death by a thousand cuts" for lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 8,* 1–26.

Nadal, K. L., Rivera, D. P., & Corpus, M. J. H. (2010). Sexual orientation and transgender microaggressions in everyday life: Experiences of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender individuals. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 217–240). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Griffin, K., Sriken, J., Vargas, V., Wideman, M., & Kolawole, A. (2011). Microaggressions and the multiracial experience. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1,* 36–44.

Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Issa, M., Meterko, V., Leon, J., & Wideman, M. (2011). Sexual orientation microaggressions: Processes and coping mechanisms for lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 5,* 21–46.

Pierce, C., Carew, J., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Willis, D. (1978). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. In C. Pierce (Ed.), *Television and education* (pp. 62–88). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pieterse, A. L., Carter, R. T., Evans, S. A., & Walter, R. A. (2010). An exploratory examination of the associations among racial and ethnic discrimination, racial climate, and trauma-related symptoms in a college student population. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57,* 255–263. doi:10.1037/a0020040

Rivera, D. P., Forquer, E. E., & Rangel, R. (2010). Microaggressions and the life experience of Latina/o Americans. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 59–83). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Santana, V., Almeida-Filho, N., Roberts, R., & Cooper, S. P. (2007). Skin colour, perception of racism and depression among adolescents in urban Brazil. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 12,* 125–131. doi:10.1111/j.1475-3588.2007.00447.x

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53–84). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Steffen, P. R., & Bowden, M. (2006). Sleep disturbance mediates the relationship between perceived racism and depressive symptoms. *Ethnicity & Disease, 16,* 16–21.

Steffen, P. R., McNeilly, M., Anderson, N., & Sherwood, A. (2003). Effects of perceived racism and anger inhibition on ambulatory blood pressure in African Americans. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 65,* 746–750. doi:10.1097/01.PSY.0000079380.95903.78

Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J. M., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2010). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Asian American Journal of Psychology S,* 88–101. doi:10.1037/1948-1985.S.1.88

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M., Nadal, K. L., . . . Esquilin, M. E. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for counseling. *American Psychologist, 62,* 271–286. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15,* 183–190. doi:10.1037/a0014191

Sue, D. W., Nadal, K. L., Capodilupo, C. M., Lin, A. I., Rivera, D. P., & Torino, G. C. (2008). Racial microaggressions against Black Americans: Implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86,* 330–338.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Utsey, S. O. (1998). Assessing the stressful effects of racism: A review of instrumentation. *Journal of Black Psychology, 24,* 269–288. doi: 10.1177/00957984980243001

Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1996). Development and validation of the Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43,* 490–501. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.4.490

Watkins, M. W. (2006). Determining parallel analysis criteria. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods, 5,* 344–346.

Watkins, N. L., LaBarrie, T. L., & Appio, L. M. (2010). Black undergraduates experience with perceived racial microaggressions in predominantly White colleges and universities. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 25–58). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Wei, M., Alvarez, A. N., Ku, T., Russell, D. W., & Bonett, D. G. (2010). Development and validation of a Coping with Discrimination Scale: Factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57,* 328–344. doi:10.1037/a0019969

Received September 28, 2010
Revision received July 5, 2011
Accepted July 14, 2011 ■