Journal of Counseling Psychology
2015, Vol. 62, No. 2, 289–302

0022-0167/15/$12.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000062

Construction and Initial Validation of the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale for Black Women

Jioni A. Lewis
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Helen A. Neville
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign

The purpose of this study was to develop a measure of gendered racial microaggressions (i.e., subtle and everyday verbal, behavioral, and environmental expressions of oppression based on the intersection of one's race and gender) experienced by Black women by applying an intersectionality framework to Essed's (1991) theory of gendered racism and Sue, Capodilupo, et al.'s (2007) model of racial microaggressions. The Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale (GRMS), was developed to assess both frequency and stress appraisal of microaggressions, in 2 separate studies. After the initial pool of GRMS items was developed, we received input from a community-based focus group of Black women and an expert panel. In Study 1, an exploratory factor analysis using a sample of 259 Black women resulted in a multidimensional scale with 4 factors as follows: (a) Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification, (b) Silenced and Marginalized, (c) Strong Black Woman Stereotype, and (d) Angry Black Woman Stereotype. In Study 2, results of confirmatory factor analyses using an independent sample of 210 Black women suggested that the 4-factor model was a good fit of the data for both the frequency and stress appraisal scales. Supporting construct validity, the GRMS was positively related to the Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (Nadal, 2011) and the Schedule of Sexist Events (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). In addition, the GRMS was significantly related to psychological distress, such that greater perceived gendered racial microaggressions were related to greater levels of reported psychological distress. Implications for future research and practice are discussed.

Keywords: gendered racial microaggressions, gendered racism, racism, sexism, stress

Researchers have documented the deleterious influence of racism for African Americans and sexism for women across race and ethnicity. This body of work indicates that perceived discrimination has a cumulative negative effect on people of color (Pieterse, Todd, Neville, & Carter, 2012; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999) and on women (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009). Theorists have long argued and researchers have now offered initial empirical support for the unique stressors that Black women experience on the basis of intersections of their race and gender (Shorter-Gooden, 2004; Woods-Giscombé & Lobel, 2008). These unique stressors contribute to the health disparities among Black women and their White counterparts, including increased risks of heart disease and diabetes, increased mortality from certain types of cancer, and adverse birth outcomes for Black women (e.g., U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2010).

However, there is a dearth of empirical research exploring the extent to which the intersection of racism and sexism affects the lives of Black women. In this study, we sought to address the gaps in the literature by exploring the intersection of subtle forms of racism and sexism for Black women. We applied an intersectionality framework by drawing on Essed's (1991) concept of gendered racism and Sue's (2010) work on microaggressions to frame the study; we extended these bodies of research by constructing and providing initial psychometric support for a quantitative scale to assess gendered racial microaggressions experienced by Black women.

Microaggressions

Although we have integrated a number of theories in the conceptualization of this project, the current research is centered in the emerging scholarship on microaggressions. The term *racial microaggression* was originally defined by Pierce, Carew, Pierce-Gonzalez, and Wills (1978) as "subtle, stunning, often automatic, and nonverbal exchanges, which are 'put downs' toward people of color" (p. 66). Sue (2010) and colleagues (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007) have further developed the concept of microaggressions and proposed a framework to classify everyday manifestations of oppression and explore the psychological consequences of these experiences for target groups. From this perspective, dominant groups often unconsciously and unintentionally deliver these subtle slights and putdowns to marginalized groups in verbal and

Jioni A. Lewis, Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Helen A. Neville, Departments of Educational Psychology and African American Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign.

This article is based on the doctoral dissertation of Jioni A. Lewis at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign under the direction of Helen A. Neville. Results from Study 1 were previously presented at the American Psychological Association National Multicultural Conference and Summit in Houston, Texas, January 2013. We thank Carolyn J. Anderson, Ruby Mendenhall, and James Rounds for their helpful feedback during the development of this scale.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jioni A. Lewis, Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Austin Peay Building, Knoxville, TN 37996. E-mail: jalewis@utk.edu

nonverbal ways. We were particularly attracted to the broader microaggressions framework because of its applicability to other forms of discrimination, such as gender and sexual identity (Sue, 2010), and its flexibility to consider intersecting multiple identities.

The majority of the early theoretical and empirical research on microaggressions focused on race; from this perspective, these forms of subtle discrimination are considered sources of racism-related stress. Findings from qualitative research suggest that people of color experience common types of racial microaggressions related to being treated like second-class citizens, being made to feel invisible, and having assumptions made about their cultural ways of being and communication styles (Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008). However, some racial microaggressions are unique to people's experiences and stereotypes based on their racial group. For example, one study found that Asian American students and working professionals had experienced feeling like an alien in their own land (Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007), whereas other research has found that African Americans and Latinos are more likely to experience assumptions of criminality and intellectual inferiority (Sue et al., 2008). Thus, the expression of racial microaggressions can vary on the basis of one's racial group membership.

Articulations of gender microaggressions have emerged in the literature, particularly in the last 5 years. Initial findings from empirical studies highlighted the diversity of gender microaggressions that women perceive. For example, Capodilupo et al. (2010) uncovered nine microaggressive themes in their qualitative study, including *sexual objectification* (e.g., women being reduced to their body in verbal or nonverbal ways), *invisibility* (e.g., ignoring women in the workplace or minimizing their contributions at work), and *sexist humor/jokes* (e.g., jokes that demean women and reinforce gender-role stereotypes).

In sum, initial empirical studies centered on describing various types of microaggressions experienced by specific target groups. Consistent with the well-documented association between discrimination and negative mental health (Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009), more recent scholarship has provided empirical support for the link between microaggressions and a range of mental health correlates. For example, recent studies have found that an increased frequency of experiences with racial and ethnic microaggressions is related to lower levels of mental health among Asian Americans (Nadal, Wong, Sriken, Griffin, & Fujii-Doe, 2014) and Latinos (Rivera, 2012).

Intersectionality Theory

The research on racial and gender microaggressions generally treats these social identities as distinct and separate as opposed to interconnected. Thus, the unique experiences of women of color are often overlooked and/or undertheorized in this body of research. The interdisciplinary research on Black women published over the past 2 decades, mostly from Black feminist scholarship, provides insights into ways to expand the microaggressions framework to include the intersectional experiences of women on the basis of their racial and gender identities. Particularly relevant to the current project are the concepts of intersectionality and gendered racism.

To adequately explore intersections of race, gender, and social class as they relate to Black women's experiences with oppression, researchers have developed an intersectionality theoretical perspective. There are four common intersectional approaches discussed in the interdisciplinary literature to describe Black women's lived experiences. Black women could (a) experience racism and sexism similarly to Black men and White women (Crenshaw, 1989), (b) experience double oppression or double jeopardy (Crenshaw, 1989; Thomas, Witherspoon, & Speight, 2008), (c) experience the interaction of race and gender oppression (e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2003), or (d) experience specific oppression that is unique to Black women on the basis of the intersection of their race and gender (Crenshaw, 1989; Thomas et al., 2008). The first, or single-axis approach assumes that Black women's experiences of racism hold their gender constant and that their experiences of sexism hold their race constant.

The second, or double jeopardy approach assumes that racism and sexism have equal effects on the individual and that these experiences are additive. According to Thomas et al. (2008), empirical research using the double jeopardy approach typically tries to test racism and sexism separately by using race and gender as independent variables. Using this approach, researchers try to explore the additive effects of race and gender, which may be problematic, because racism and sexism could affect Black women in interlocking ways that cannot be captured by exploring them separately.

Closely linked to the double jeopardy approach is the interactional approach where, psychology researchers have included race, gender, and an interaction term of race and gender in their analyses to explore the influence of each identity group separately and together (Moradi & Subich, 2003; Thomas et al., 2008). Researchers typically seek to approximate the interaction effect of race and gender through statistical analysis. The main limitation of this approach is that it assumes that the experience of race and gender can be multiplied statistically which might not have practical significance and can reinforce an artificial hierarchy of oppressions and lead to misleading findings.

The fourth, or intersectionality approach views race and gender as interlocking identities and oppressions that simultaneously influence a person's life experiences (Cole, 2009). There is some debate in the literature about which approach is best to explore intersecting identities in psychology. We are in agreement with scholars who argue that the intersectionality approach is preferred, because it is the only approach that explores race and gender simultaneously, without trying to tease them apart (e.g., Bowleg, 2008; Thomas et al., 2008). This approach, thus, more accurately captures the complexities of the experiences of women of color.

Gendered Racism Among Black Women

The concept of gendered racism is an intersectional framework consistent with contemporary microaggressions research that specifically examines the interconnection of racism and sexism. Essed (1991) originally coined the term *gendered racism* to capture the complexity of oppression experienced by Black women on the basis of racist perceptions of gender roles. The foundation of Essed's gendered racism was her interdisciplinary theory of *everyday racism* or the recurrent, familiar practices of racism that

occur in everyday life. In her qualitative research with Black women in the United States and the Netherlands, Essed (1991) found that their experiences of everyday racism were manifested and maintained through three processes: "marginalization of Black women's experiences, containment of internal reactions to oppression, and problematization and legitimization of oppression" (p. 10). Essed contended that Black women experience gendered and classed forms of racism that are based on the stereotypes of Black womanhood.

The emerging psychological studies on the intersection of racism and sexism among Black women suggest that women experience everyday discrimination based on race and gender and that these intersectional experiences have an influence on their psychological health. For example, Thomas et al. (2008) explored the relations between gendered racism and psychological distress among a sample of Black women. They modified the Schedule of Sexist Events (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995) to explore the perceived sexist events that Black women experience. Specifically, they revised the scale items by inserting "Black woman" in each item. Findings suggested a significant positive relationship between experiences of gendered racism and psychological distress. These findings are important because they provide empirical support for the link between gendered racism and psychological distress. However, by simply modifying a scale that was intended to measure perceived sexism, additional types of experiences that are unique to Black women may have been overlooked.

Drawing on both the microaggression and gendered racism literatures, Jioni A. Lewis (Lewis, Mendenhall, Harwood, & Browne Huntt, 2010) explored the various types of gendered racial microaggressions experienced by Black women—which were defined as subtle and everyday nonverbal, verbal, behavioral, and environmental expressions of oppression based on the intersection of one's race and gender—a definition adapted from Sue and his colleagues' definitions of racial (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007) and gender microaggressions (Sue & Capodilupo, 2008). On the basis of a review of the literature and findings from focus groups with Black undergraduate and graduate student women, we developed three core types of gendered racial microaggressions: (a) Projected Stereotypes, (b) Silenced and Marginalized, and (c) Assumptions About Style and Beauty. In the following, we outline each of the themes and place them in conversation with the broader microaggressions and Black feminist literature.

Projected Stereotypes

Stereotypes of Black women are often perpetrated on the interpersonal level in the form of gendered racial microaggressions that objectify Black women and reduce them to their race and gender. For example, Black women have been stereotyped as hardworking and obedient "mammies," dominant "matriarchs," dependent "welfare queens," and sexually promiscuous "Jezebels" (Collins, 1991). Collins highlighted the historical and socially constructed images of Black women that have been created in society to oppress and subordinate them. In contemporary society, the stereotype of the dominant and emasculating Black woman as the matriarch has been transformed into the "strong Black woman" stereotype, the independent Black woman who is self-sufficient and can take care of herself (Harris-Perry, 2011). In Lewis's (Lewis et al., 2010) previous study, it was found that women experienced gendered racial microaggressions based on expectations of being a Jezebel (perceived exoticization and/or sexualization by men) and an angry Black woman (perceived expectation to embody the angry Black woman stereotype). For example, participants reported receiving sexualized comments about their body parts. However, at the same time, they received comments about being "angry," which often served to silence them.

Silenced and Marginalized

The everyday experience of oppression is a process of marginalization (Collins, 1991; Essed, 1991). Another common type of gendered racial microaggression experienced by Black women is the process of being silenced and marginalized in the workplace, school, or other professional settings. We found that Black women experienced a power struggle for respect (perceived authority and/or intellect questioned or challenged in work or professional settings) and invisibility (perceptions of being ignored and made to feel invisible in work or professional settings; Lewis et al., 2010). This is a common theme that has been found in the literature on both racial microaggressions (e.g., Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008) and gender microaggressions (Capodilupo et al., 2010). Thus, people of color and women of all racial and ethnic backgrounds often report experiencing invisibility, but we have found that Black women experience invisibility in the form of being silenced and marginalized on the basis of gendered racial stereotypes.

Assumptions About Style and Beauty

Gendered racial microaggressions could take the form of assumptions about cultural ways of being. We found that Black women students reported being reduced to their communication styles, physical appearances, and body types in verbal and nonverbal ways, which included assumptions about communication styles (assumptions about communication styles and cultural values) and assumptions about physical appearance and aesthetics (stereotypes about aspects of physical appearance, such as hairstyles, facial features, and body size; Lewis et al., 2010). These findings compliment the theoretical and empirical literature on people of color and women broadly. Specifically, pathologizing cultural values and communication styles is a racial microaggression theme that has been found in the literature on people of color (Sue, 2010; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). For example, Black people are often assumed to be loud or assumed to speak using African American vernacular English (AAVE). But Black women also are mocked for what others perceive as a gender-specific form of AAVE or "sassy" use of language (e.g., "hey g-i-r-l-f-r-i-e-n-d"). In terms of physical appearance and aesthetics, Black women are also assumed to have a certain body type, and they experience disparaging comments about the size of their butt, hips, or other body parts. These gendered racial microaggressions represent a range of intersecting subtle racist and sexist slights and insults that Black women experience, which currently cannot be measured quantitatively because of a dearth of measures to assess these interlocking forms of oppression.

Rationale and Purpose of the Study

A majority of the research on gendered racism is theoretical and qualitative, and although there has been a boom in research on microaggressions in the psychology literature in the last 5 years, with notable exceptions (e.g., Mercer, Zeigler-Hill, Wallace, & Hayes, 2011; Nadal, 2011; Owen, Tao, & Rodolfa, 2010; Torres-Harding, Andrade, & Romero Diaz, 2012), few scales have been developed to assess racial and gender microaggressions. Although all of the recently published scales have sound psychometric support, they do not evaluate the intersecting experiences of racial and gender microaggressions. One of the only scales to examine intersectional microaggressions is the LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale (Balsam, Molina, Beadnell, Simoni, & Walters, 2011). Thus, the unique experiences of the intersections of subtle forms of racism and sexism are not captured in existing microaggression measures.

The gendered racism work, on the one hand, has helped to describe the experiences of racism and sexism for Black women. The microaggressions research, on the other, has provided a framework in which to capture the subtle everyday discriminatory experiences of people of color and women across race and ethnicity. The development of a scale to capture these intersectional experiences responds to calls from psychologists who have challenged the field to move from exploring racism and sexism as mutually exclusive and unidimensional constructs to exploring the simultaneous multidimensionality of racism and sexism in the lives of Black women (e.g., Cole, 2009; Moradi & Subich, 2003).

This study heeds these suggestions by applying an intersectionality framework to the development of a quantitative multidimensional scale to measure the frequency and stress appraisal of the intersection of racial and gender microaggressions experienced by Black women. The conceptualization of the scale draws on Essed's (1991) theory of gendered racism, Sue, Capodilupo, et al.'s (2007) theory of racial microaggressions, and Lewis's previous research (Lewis et al., 2010). Specifically, the investigation consisted of scale construction (i.e., development of scale items), initial validation (Study 1; i.e., exploration of construct validity via exploratory factor analysis), and construct validity (Study 2; i.e., support for factor structure and exploration of other indicators of validity via confirmatory factor analysis and associations with a range of related constructs, including racial microaggressions, perceived sexist events, and psychological distress).

Scale Construction: Preliminary Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale (GRMS) Items

We developed the items for this scale using scale-development best practices in counseling psychology (see Dawis, 1987; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). One of the first steps in creating items for a scale is to develop a clear operational definition of the construct under investigation. To assist in this process, we reviewed the literature on racial microaggressions, subtle forms of racism and sexism, intersectionality, and Black women's experiences with multiple forms of oppression and an earlier qualitative study that Lewis conducted on gendered racial microaggressions (Lewis et al., 2010).

We defined *gendered racial microaggressions* as subtle and everyday verbal, behavioral, and environmental expressions of oppression based on the intersection of one's race and gender. These gendered racial microaggressions can include the frequency and stressfulness of slights, insults, and invalidations based on stereotypes, assumptions, and marginalization.

On the basis of our literature review, we generated an initial pool of 35 preliminary items that represented three central themes from our previous research: projected stereotypes ($n = 14$; i.e., being reduced to stereotypes of Black women), silenced and marginalized ($n = 9$; i.e., being ignored in the workplace, school, or other professional settings and having one's contributions minimized), and assumptions about style and beauty ($n = 12$; i.e., being reduced to one's appearance and being stereotyped on the basis of one's body in verbal and nonverbal ways).

Item Revision

Community focus group. We conducted a focus group with a community sample of Black women to obtain feedback about item length and appropriateness. Because much of our previous research focused on college women, we used a community sample of women to ensure that the items were generalizable to a range of Black women in terms of age, socioeconomic background, educational background, and occupational status.

Twelve diverse adult Black women participated in the focus group. Participants represented a range of social positions, including unemployed women, working-class women (e.g., secretaries, day-care providers), and professional women (e.g., teachers, business women). We recruited the participants through a local African American community-based organization that serves the needs of African American families. Several methods were used to recruit the women, including direct e-mail contact, flyers posted in the community, and purposeful recruitment through informal contacts in the community. Participants received $10 and a resource list as a token of appreciation for their participation. In addition, light refreshments were served. Prior to the beginning of the focus group, we reviewed the informed consent form, and participants had an opportunity to ask questions about participation before making a decision to participate in the study. We provided focus group members with our operational definition of gendered racial microaggressions and invited them to suggest items for the new scale and to comment on the appropriateness and accuracy of the items we had initially generated. On the basis of this feedback, we revised the scale. This resulted in a total of 41 items.

Expert panel review. To receive additional feedback about the quality, face validity, and content validity of the items, we solicited feedback from a panel of six experts on racism and sexism. All six of the experts were women who had research and clinical expertise on race and racism, microaggressions, and Black women's issues. In terms of racial/ethnic background, five of the women self-identified as Black, and one woman self-identified as White. Five of the experts had doctoral degrees in the field of counseling psychology, and one had a doctoral degree in sociology. Two of the women also had joint faculty appointments in African American studies, and many of the experts also had training in African American psychology. We incorporated all of the expert feedback by modifying and deleting weak items and adding five items to capture underdeveloped areas. This revision produced a total of 46 gendered racial microaggressions.

Pilot test. As a final step, we conducted a small pilot study with a convenience sample of 10 individuals to assess scale length, clarity, and appropriateness. On the basis of the feedback from participants in the pilot study, 14 items were deleted to address feedback about redundancy and unclear constructs.

Preliminary GRMS

The preliminary scale included a total of 32 gendered racial microaggressions items that represented each of the three hypothesized dimensions: projected stereotypes ($n = 13$), silenced and marginalized ($n = 7$), and assumptions about style and beauty ($n = 12$). Similar to several racism-related stress measures (e.g., the Schedule of Racist Events [Landrine & Klonoff, 1996], the Racism and Life Experiences Scale [Harrell, 1997]) and perceived sexism measures (e.g., the Schedule of Sexist Events; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), participants responded to each item based on both frequency and stress appraisal using a 6-point Likert-type response format. Frequency was assessed by asking participants to rate how often they experienced each event in their lifetime, ranging from 0 (*never*) to 5 (*once a week or more*). Stress Appraisal was assessed by asking participants how stressful each event was for them, ranging from 0 (*not at all stressful*) to 5 (*extremely stressful*). Items were scored such that higher scores indicated a higher frequency and higher stress appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions, whereas lower scores indicated a lower frequency and lower stress appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions.

Study 1: Initial Validation of the GRMS

The purpose of Study 1 was to conduct an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to assess the underlying factor structure and obtain initial psychometric information on the GRMS. We used EFA to examine the underlying dimensionality of the initial set of items. On the basis of our review of the literature and findings from initial qualitative studies in this area (Lewis et al., 2010), we hypothesized that the scale would have a multidimensional factor structure and that the scale dimensions would include Projected Stereotypes, Silenced and Marginalized, and Assumptions about Style and Beauty.

Method

Participants. The initial sample comprised 265 participants who completed an online survey. A total of six cases were omitted due to not reporting race, age, or gender or having over 40% missing data, resulting in a final sample of 259 participants. The majority of the participants self-identified as African American or Black (82%). The other women self-identified as having an African ethnic background (7%; e.g., Ghanaian, Nigerian, Kenyan); being Caribbean, Jamaican, or Caribbean American (5%); being both African American and Caribbean American (2%); being American (2%); or being African American and some other race/ethnicity (2%). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 77 years ($M = 39.17$, $SD = 12.49$). The majority of women (93%) identified as heterosexual, and the remainder of participants identified as lesbian, bisexual, questioning, or queer. A majority of participants (55%) self-identified as middle class, 17.5% had at least a bachelor's degree, and about 47.5% had at least a master's degree. Participants were diverse in terms of geographical region, with 33% from the west coast, 33% from the Midwest, 17% from the east coast, 14% from the South, and 3% not reporting their geographical region. Approximately 94% of participants were born in the United States. In addition, 80% of the sample identified as Christian, and 20% of the sample identified as atheist, agnostic, practicing a non-Christian religion, being spiritual, or nonreligious.

Measures: GRMS. The 32-item GRMS was used to assess the frequency and stress appraisal of nonverbal, verbal, and behavioral negative racial and gender slights experienced by Black women.

Measures: Demographic questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire was constructed for the study to obtain information about participants' race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, and so forth.

Procedure. Prior to data collection, we obtained institutional review board approval. We used a purposeful sampling method to recruit Black women students and community members from various geographical locations. Participants were recruited through a variety of methods, including posting a recruitment e-mail on relevant local and national Listservs and Facebook groups. Data collection began in April 2012. After the first e-mail invitation was sent, there were several follow-up e-mails sent at 1-week intervals. The online survey was available for approximately 2 months. Participants who were interested in taking part in the study were directed to a URL in the recruitment e-mail where they could access the online survey. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The only surveys that were used for data analysis were completed surveys in which the participant completed the demographic questionnaire, which was at the end of the survey. If a participant did not self-report their race, gender, and/or age, their responses were not used in the analysis. As an incentive, after participants completed the survey, they could enter their name into a raffle on a page separate from the survey to win one of three $50 cash prizes.

Results

Preliminary analyses. Data were cleaned and checked for missing values and outliers. For the final sample of 259 participants, a small amount of missing data remained. Analysis of the patterns of missing data revealed that 79.5% of cases had no missing data. In addition, no item had more than 2.2% or more missing values. In addition, R.J.A. Little's (1988) missing completely at random (MCAR) analysis revealed an insignificant chi-square statistic, indicating that the data were missing completely at random. Despite the very small amount of missing data, we chose to use the expectation maximization (EM) imputation method, which uses a maximum-likelihood technique for estimating missing values (R.J.A. Little & Rubin, 2002); this method is appropriate when data are MCAR.

EFA. Before conducting an EFA, we assessed the factorability of the correlation matrix by using Bartlett's test of sphericity, which was statistically significant for both frequency and stress appraisal ($p < .001$). In addition, we used the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin test to measure sampling adequacy, which indicated a value of .91. Using the criteria of Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), values greater than .60 are required for factor analysis. Next, we conducted an

EFA using a maximum-likelihood extraction method. Given that the underlying factors were correlated, we chose promax rotation, an oblique rotation. We examined the scree plot and also conducted a parallel analysis to determine the potential number of factors for extraction. Using O'Connor's (2000) syntax developed for SPSS, we conducted a principal axis parallel analysis, and the method indicated that a five-factor solution was optimal. We examined two-, three-, four-, and five-factor solutions to determine which one showed the best fit to the data. The two-factor and three-factor solutions were not chosen because of a lack of conceptual clarity of the factors. On the basis of the EFA for both frequency and stress appraisal, we chose a four-factor solution for its conceptual clarity and interpretability; it was the most consistent with our initial conceptualization. In addition, a five-factor solution was not optimal because one factor had fewer than three items, which is the minimum number of items for a viable factor (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). For item deletion, items with less than a .40 loading on one factor or with cross-loadings less than a .15 difference from an item's highest factor loading were omitted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). We also compared the EFA for both frequency and stress appraisal and sought to retain items that loaded on both scales. We deleted two items that met our minimum factor-loading criteria but did not add conceptual clarity to the scale. For the stress appraisal scale, a total of seven items were deleted (four items from the hypothesized Assumptions of Style and Beauty factor and three items from the hypothesized Projected Stereotypes factor). For the frequency scale, a total of nine items were deleted (four items from the hypothesized Assumptions of Style and Beauty factor and five items from the hypothesized Projected Stereotypes factor; see Table 1).

We also used Cohen's (1988) guidelines for interpreting correlation coefficients for the factor intercorrelations. Specifically, the factor intercorrelations ranged from .50 to .66, representing large correlations between each of the factors. In addition, we examined the communality statistics to explore the nature of the theoretical factors that contributed to observed interitem correlations (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995). Items with communalities below .40 would not be correlated highly with one of the factors in the solution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The communalities for each of the retained items ranged from .50 to .88, which indicates that the items retained were highly correlated and contributed to the variance of the factors. As a result of these procedures, 25 items were retained for the stress appraisal scale, which accounted for approximately 49% of the variance. In addition, 23 items were retained for the frequency scale, which also accounted for 49% of the variance; the items retained on the frequency scale were nearly identical to the items retained on the appraisal scale.

Naming the factors. Factor A, *Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification*, consisted of 10 items and accounted for 31% and 34% of the variance for frequency and stress appraisal, respectively. This factor was named on the basis of items that represented assumptions about style and beauty, attractiveness, and standards of beauty. In addition, items included stereotypes about aspects of physical appearance, such as hairstyles, facial features, and body size. Higher scores indicated higher frequency and stress associated with these assumptions of beauty and sexual objectification. In addition, 92% of women in the sample reported experiencing at least one of these types of microaggressions (e.g., "Someone has imitated the way they think Black women speak in front of me"). Factor B, *Silenced and Marginalized*, consisted of seven items and accounted for 6% and 8% of the variance for stress appraisal and frequency, respectively. This factor was named on the basis of items that included being silenced and marginalized in work, school, and other professional settings. In addition, 91% of women in our sample reported experiencing at least one of these types of microaggressions (e.g., "Someone challenged my authority in a work, school, or other professional setting"). Factor C, *Strong Black Woman Stereotype*, consisted of three items for frequency and five items for stress appraisal and accounted for approximately 4% and 5% of the variance for frequency and stress appraisal, respectively. Items reflected themes such as being expected to be strong or being considered "too" independent and "too" assertive. A total of 87% of women in the sample reported experiencing at least one of these types of microaggressions (e.g., "I have been told that I am sassy and straightforward"). Factor D, *Angry Black Woman Stereotype*, consisted of three items and accounted for approximately 4% and 6% of the variance for stress appraisal and frequency, respectively. It included items such as being expected to fulfill the stereotype of an angry Black woman. About 90% of women in our sample reported experiencing this type of gendered racial microaggression (e.g., "Someone accused me of being angry when I was speaking in a calm manner").

Descriptive statistics and factor intercorrelations. The descriptive statistics on the data for frequency and stress appraisal scores—including means, standard deviations, and Pearson product–moment correlations—are presented in Table 2. The Pearson product–moment correlations indicated significant positive correlations between each of the four factors. As noted in Table 2, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients on the GRMS factors were acceptable, ranging from .74 (for Strong Black Woman Stereotype) to .88 (for Silenced and Marginalized) for frequency and appraisal; the total GRMS reliability coefficients were .92 and .93 for the frequency scale and the stress appraisal scale, respectively.

Study 2: Construct Validity of the GRMS

The purpose of Study 2 was to further explore the construct validity of the GRMS. Specifically, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis and explored estimates of reliability and validity of the GRMS. Also, we examined the relations between participants' responses on the GRMS and measures of racial and ethnic microaggressions, sexist events, and mental health outcomes to assess construct validity. Our hypotheses were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: The four-factor model found in Study 1 will be a good fit of the data for both the frequency and appraisal scales and the best fit compared with competing models.

Hypothesis 2: Greater perceived frequency and stress appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions will be positively and significantly correlated with other indicators of microaggressions and sexist events.

Hypothesis 3: Greater perceived frequency and stress appraisal of gendered racial microaggressions will be positively and significantly correlated with psychological distress.

Method

Participants. We recruited an independent sample of 214 participants using the same recruitment strategy outlined in Study 1. Four cases were omitted on the basis of having over 40% missing data on the GRMS, resulting in a final sample of 210 participants. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 68 years ($M = 37.69$, $SD = 13.14$). A majority of participants (60%) self-identified as middle class. Participants were diverse in terms of geographical region, with 31% from the west coast, 31% from the Midwest, 25% from the east coast, 11% from the South, and 2% not reporting their geographical region or living outside the United States. Approximately 92% of participants were born in the United States.

Measures: Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS). The REMS (Nadal, 2011) is a 45-item scale that assesses the frequency of one's perceptions of microaggressions within the past 6 months. We selected the REMS because this was the only published multidimensional measure of racial microaggressions at the time of the development of this study and was also based on Sue's (2010) microaggressions framework. The five-point Likert-type response scale ranges from 1 (*I did not experience this event*) to 5 (*I experienced this event 7 or more times*). Higher mean scores indicate greater frequency of perceived microaggressions. There are six subscales: Assumption of Inferiority,

Table 1
Summary of GRMS Stress Appraisal and Frequency Subscales and Factor Loadings From Maximum Likelihood Estimation With Promax Rotation ($N = 259$)

	Factor loading: Stress Appraisal				Factor loading: Frequency			
Item	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Factor A: Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification								
Unattractive because of size of butt	**.69**	.07	−.08	−.06	**.75**	.04	−.10	−.07
Negative comments about size of facial features	**.69**	−.07	−.08	.03	**.64**	.01	−.13	.11
Imitated the way they think Black women speak	**.60**	.00	.00	.16	**.47**	.05	−.02	.18
Someone made me feel unattractive	**.59**	.07	.06	.01	**.52**	.33	−.19	−.03
Negative comment about skin tone	**.55**	−.18	.16	.05	**.52**	−.19	.15	.07
Someone assumed I speak a certain way	**.55**	.22	−.06	.09	**.48**	.19	.05	.01
Objectified me based on physical features	**.54**	.23	.08	−.08	**.66**	.22	−.08	.01
Someone assumed I have a certain body type (stress only)	**.50**	−.01	.16	−.06				
Made a sexually inappropriate comment	**.41**	.03	.22	.07	**.59**	−.09	.05	.01
Negative comments about my hair when natural	**.41**	.02	.23	−.03	**.54**	.10	.08	−.12
Assumed I was sexually promiscuous (frequency only)					**.59**	.01	.07	−.14
Factor B: Silenced and Marginalized								
I have felt unheard	.04	**.93**	−.04	−.08	.03	**.89**	.01	−.10
My comments have been ignored	−.15	**.81**	.01	.18	−.10	**.82**	.02	.04
Someone challenged my authority	.06	**.69**	−.05	.03	.02	**.54**	.14	.14
I have been disrespected in workplace	.12	**.67**	−.11	.06	.03	**.64**	−.04	.20
Someone has tried to "put me in my place"	.20	**.61**	−.16	.06	.00	**.59**	.07	.17
Felt excluded from networking opportunities	−.01	**.58**	.25	−.21	.00	**.71**	.18	−.32
Assumed I did not have much to contribute to the conversation	−.22	**.54**	.16	.21	−.03	**.63**	−.08	.16
Factor C: Strong Black Woman Stereotype								
Someone assumed I was sassy and straightforward (stress only)	−.02	−.04	**.59**	.21				
I have been told that I am too independent	.02	−.07	**.55**	.03	−.11	.11	**.81**	−.04
Someone made me feel exotic as a Black woman (stress only)	.12	−.04	**.54**	−.06				
I have been told that I am too assertive	−.09	.00	**.54**	.26	−.07	.09	**.51**	.35
Assumed to be a strong Black woman	.06	.19	**.51**	−.14	.12	.15	**.54**	−.05
Factor D: Angry Black Woman Stereotype								
Someone has told me to calm down	.19	.00	−.12	**.70**	−.02	.03	−.09	**.81**
Perceived to be "angry Black woman"	−.03	.04	.08	**.69**	.01	.19	.01	**.66**
Someone accused me of being angry when speaking calm	−.13	.08	.03	**.68**	−.12	.02	.01	**.76**
Eigenvalue	10.76	1.92	1.66	1.34	9.96	2.54	1.39	1.89
Percentage of variance	33.63	6.01	5.18	4.25	31.12	7.93	4.35	5.92
M	1.91	2.76	1.59	2.31	1.47	2.03	2.16	1.75
SD	1.07	1.21	0.90	1.18	.87	1.12	1.19	1.03
Cronbach's α	.87	.88	.74	.75	.85	.88	.74	.79
Total variance	49.07				49.32			

Note. $N = 259$. Values in boldface indicate the highest factor loadings. Stress appraisal items ranged from 0 (*not at all stressful*) to 5 (*extremely stressful*). Frequency items ranged from 0 (*never*) to 5 (*once a week or more*) Numbers in the columns refer to GRMS Factor A - GRMS Factor D, respectively. The items listed in the table represent abbreviations of the wording of the items. For a complete list of the scale items, please contact the first author.

Second-Class Citizen and Assumption of Criminality, Microinvalidations, Exoticization and Assumptions of Similarity, Environmental Microaggressions, and Workplace and School Microaggressions. Reliability estimates for the total score ranged from .91 (Asian American sample) to .92 (African American sample). The REMS has also been shown to be significantly positively correlated with a measure of race-related stress (Nadal, 2011).

Measures: Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE). The SSE (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995) is a 20-item scale that assesses lifetime and recent experiences with everyday sexism. We selected the SEE because it is one of the few well-established measures of perceived sexism in the literature. Participants report lifetime and recent events on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*the event has never happened*) to 6 (*the event happened almost all* [i.e., more than 70%] *of the time*) and provide an appraisal score on each item on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all stressful*) to 6 (*extremely stressful*). For the purposes of this study, only the lifetime frequency scores were obtained. Higher scores indicate greater perceived frequency of sexist events. Cronbach's alpha reliability estimates for the SSE have ranged from .88 to .94 with majority White samples. Thomas et al. (2008) conducted a study with Black women using a slightly revised version of the SSE and found an acceptable internal consistency estimate (.93). However, for the purposes of this study, we used the original version of the SSE because we were interested in exploring perceived sexist events. In terms of construct validity, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found the SSE to be significantly correlated with measures of daily hassles and general stressful life events. In addition to the full score, we also calculated three subscale scores on the basis of a recent psychometric study by Matteson and Moradi (2005): Sexist Degradation and Its Consequences (eight items), Unfair/Sexist Events at Work/School (five items), and Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships (seven items).

Measures: Mental Health Inventory 5 (MHI-5). The MHI-5 (Veit & Ware, 1983) assesses overall mental health, with higher scores indicating higher levels of psychological well-being and lower scores indicating higher levels of psychological distress. For the purposes of this study, we reverse scored the items so that higher scores would indicate higher levels of psychological distress. We selected the MHI-5 because previous research has shown a significant correlation between perceived racist events and sexist events and psychological distress. Participants reported the duration of each feeling over the past month. Responses are on a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*all of the time*) to 6 (*none of the time*). The MHI has been found to be significantly negatively correlated with stressful life events and positively correlated with social support and life satisfaction. Reliability coefficients range from .89 (McHorney & Ware, 1995) to .96 (Veit & Ware, 1983) among predominantly White samples, .94 among a sample of African American college students (Fischer & Shaw, 1999), and .92 among a sample of racially diverse women (Fischer & Bolton Holz, 2010).

Procedure. After preliminary data analysis was conducted for Study 1, a separate survey was developed for Study 2, and an independent sample was collected in February 2013. The recruitment and participation procedures were similar to those reported in Study 1. There were some key differences in the formats of the Study 1 and Study 2 surveys. In this study, we created three different versions of the online survey so that each survey version would take under 30 minutes to complete. Survey Version A (n = 49) included the GRMS, the REMS, the MHI-5, and a demographic questionnaire. Survey Version B (n = 72) included the GRMS, the SSE, the MHI-5, and the demographic questionnaire. Survey Version C (n = 89) included the GRMS, the MHI-5, and the demographic questionnaire.

Results

Preliminary analyses. For the final sample of 210 participants, a small amount of missing data remained. Findings from the MCAR analysis (R.J.A. Little, 1988) were not significant, which indicated that the data were missing completely at random. We used the EM imputation method to estimate missing values (R.J.A. Little & Rubin, 2002).

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We conducted a CFA using LISREL 9.10 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2013) to test whether the four-factor 23-item GRMS frequency scale and the 25-item GRMS stress appraisal scale found in Study 1 were good fits of the data and the best fit compared with two competing models. We analyzed comparisons between the four-factor model from Study 1, a three-factor theoretical model, a two-factor competing model from the

Table 2
Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations for GRMS Stress Appraisal and Frequency Subscales

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	*M*	*SD*	α
1. Assumptions of Beauty	—	.63**	.62**	.48**		1.91	1.07	.87
2. Silenced and Marginalized	.55**	—	.52**	.50**		2.76	1.21	.88
3. Strong Black Woman	.49**	.51**	—	.46**		1.59	.90	.74
4. Angry Black Woman	.45**	.44**	.51**	—		2.31	1.18	.75
5. GRMS total score					—	2.13	0.91	.93
M	1.47	2.03	2.16	1.75	1.81			
SD	0.87	1.12	1.19	1.03	0.81			
α	.85	.88	.74	.79	.92			

Note. Pearson product–moment correlations above the diagonal refer to the stress appraisal subscales; values below the diagonal refer to the frequency subscales. Means and standard deviations for stress appraisal are in the vertical columns, and those for frequency are in the horizontal rows. GRMS = Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale.
** $p < .01$.

EFA, a three-factor competing model from the EFA, and a one-factor overall model. Because we hypothesized that the GRMS would have a multidimensional factor structure, we did not use any parceling techniques (T. D. Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002).

Consistent with standard CFA practices, we assessed a number of goodness-of-fit indicators (see Table 3 and 4). Comparing the four models for both frequency and stress appraisal, it was clear that each model was similar in the goodness-of-fit statistics, indicating that each model would be an acceptable fit to the data (i.e., the chi-square statistic divided by the degrees of freedom was less than 2 [Newcomb, 1994]; the comparative fit index was greater than .90 [Hu & Bentler, 1999], as was the goodness-of-fit index [Kline, 2005]; and the root mean square error of approximation was less than .08 [Hu & Bentler, 1999]). However, on the basis of the conceptual clarity of the four-factor solution and the slightly superior goodness-of-fit statistics, the four-factor model indicated an acceptable-to-good model fit.

Descriptive statistics and correlations among factors. There was a significant positive correlation among the four factors for both stress appraisal (see Table 5) and frequency (see Table 6).

Reliability estimates. The reliability coefficient estimates for the GRMS factors were acceptable for stress appraisal (see Table 5) and frequency (see Table 6). The GRMS total score had reliability coefficients of .92 for frequency and .93 for stress appraisal.

Convergent validity. The GRMS total and subscale scores were significantly and positively related to the racial and ethnic microaggressions as measured by the REMS and to perceived sexist events as measured by the SSE (see Tables 5 and 6).

Psychological distress. Results from the full sample (N = 210) indicated that the GRMS total and subscale scores were significantly and positively related to psychological distress as measured by the MHI-5 (see Tables 5 and 6).

General Discussion

The purpose of this study was to construct and validate a new measure of microaggressions—the GRMS for use with Black women. Findings revealed four conceptually meaningful factors that largely support the initial operationalization of the scale. Specifically, Factor A (Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification) was consistent with our initial conceptualization of assumptions about style and beauty; however, in Factor A, items about sexual objectification—namely, items reflecting the Jezebel stereotype—were included, and this was not the case in our initial conceptualization in the scale-development phase of the project. Factor B (Silenced and Marginalized) was consistent with our initial conceptualization of the ways Black women experience being silenced and marginalized in the workplace, school, and other professional settings. In addition, we found two types of projected stereotypes (as opposed to one larger factor): Strong Black Woman Stereotype (Factor C) and the Angry Black Woman Stereotype (Factor D). The four factors accounted for nearly half of the variance in Study 1 for both the frequency and stress appraisal scales. In addition, the factor structure was shown to provide a good fit of the data in Study 2. Initial internal consistency estimates of the total and subscale scores were acceptable, and, moreover, the GRMS frequency and stress appraisal subscales were related to increased perceived racial microaggressions, sexist events, and psychological distress.

Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification (GRMS Factor A)

This factor captures both the prevailing stereotypes about aspects of Black women's physical appearance—such as hairstyles, facial features, and body size—and gendered racial forms of objectification that Black women experience. Over 90% of the women in our samples reported experiencing at least one of these types of gendered racial microaggressions, and women reported these experiences as stressful. The emergence of this subscale adds a nuanced understanding to the gender microaggression theme of sexual objectification as articulated in Capodilupo et al.'s (2010) previous research. Capodilupo et al. found that women reported overt experiences of sexual objectification, such as being catcalled or stared at by a stranger, which are experiences that can apply to women of any racial or ethnic group. Findings from this investigation suggest that, for Black women, the way that they are objectified is inextricably linked to their bodies as racialized beings. Thus, the stereotypes of Black women as having

Table 3
Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Goodness-of-Fit Summary for the Revised GRMS Stress Appraisal Items

	Model				
Index	1	2	3	3*	4
CFI	.943	.969	.967	.958	.974
GFI	.752	.839	.837	.773	.851
AGFI	.707	.809	.806	.740	.820
SRMR	.072	.059	.060	.066	.056
RMSEA	.086	.064	.065	.072	.061
90% CI	[.079, .094]	[.056, .073]	[.056, .073]	[.066, .078]	[.052, .070]
χ^2	705.165	511.230	555.056	963.205	480.188
df	275	274	269	461	269
χ^2/df	2.564	1.866	2.063	2.089	1.785

Note. Models 1, 2, 3, and 4 represent the one-, two-, three-, and four-factor models from Study 1, respectively. Model 3* represents the three-factor theoretical model. GRMS = Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale; CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval.

Table 4
Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Goodness-of-Fit Summary for the Revised GRMS Frequency Items

	Model				
Index	1	2	3	3*	4
CFI	.913	.945	.963	.953	.975
GFI	.684	.760	.828	.757	.863
AGFI	.620	.721	.795	.722	.828
SRMR	.088	.071	.063	.073	.057
RMSEA	.135	.089	.069	.080	.061
90% CI	[.128, .144]	[.082, .096)]	[.060, .077]	[.074, .086]	[.049, .069]
χ^2	811.638	846.391	556.635	975.468	386.433
df	230	349	272	461	220
χ^2/df	3.529	2.425	2.046	2.116	1.757

Note. Models 1, 2, 3, and 4 represent the one-, two-, three-, and four-factor models from Study 1, respectively. Model 3* represents the three-factor theoretical model. GRMS = Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale; CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval.

certain physical features—such as a large butt, hips, or thighs—become the focus of the sexual objectification and a male gaze. In addition to sexual objectification of body parts, Black women are also made to feel like objects when disparaging comments, which are linked to race and culture, are made about their aesthetic (hair styles, communication styles).

Silenced and Marginalized (GRMS Factor B)

Almost all of the women in these studies reported experiencing being silenced and marginalized in work, school, and other professional settings in their lifetime, and they found these microaggressions moderately stressful. Although the broader microaggres-

Table 5
Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations Among REMS, SSE, MHI-5, and GRMS Stress Appraisal Subscales

Variable	1	2	3	4	*M*	*SD*	α
GRMS Factor A	—				1.85	1.08	.87
GRMS Factor B	.63**	—			2.67	1.21	.87
GRMS Factor C	.66**	.59**	—		1.61	0.99	.78
GRMS Factor D	.51**	.62**	.61**	—	2.29	1.17	.74
REMS Factor 1	.22	.39**	.24	.28	2.05	1.00	.92
REMS Factor 2	.13	.26	.27	.31*	1.80	0.82	.87
REMS Factor 3	.29*	.39**	.35*	.19	2.00	0.94	.92
REMS Factor 4	.24	.27	.34*	.28	1.58	0.55	.73
REMS Factor 5	.10	.07	−.08	−.06	3.34	0.79	.76
REMS Factor 6	.18	.49**	.28	.16	1.86	1.19	.93
SSE Factor 1	.63**	.40**	.47**	.50**	2.54	1.26	.84
SSE Factor 2	.33**	.47**	.50**	.35**	2.68	1.24	.89
SSE Factor 3	.46**	.50**	.51**	.45**	2.27	0.92	.86
MHI-5 Total	.23**	.26**	.23**	.28**	2.49	0.86	.85

Note. *N*s = 210 for the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale (GRMS) and the Mental Health Inventory 5 (MHI-5). *N* = 49 for the Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS). *N* = 72 for the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE). Numbers in the columns refer to GRMS Factor A–GRMS Factor D, respectively. GRMS Factor A = Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification; GRMS Factor B = Silenced and Marginalized; GRMS Factor C = Strong Black Woman Stereotype; GRMS Factor D = Angry Black Woman Stereotype; REMS Factor 1 = Assumptions of Inferiority; REMS Factor 2 = Second Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality; REMS Factor 3 = Microinvalidations; REMS Factor 4 = Exoticization and Assumptions of Similarity; Factor 5 = Environmental Microaggressions; Factor 6 = Workplace and School Microaggressions; SSE Factor 1 = Sexist Degradation and Its Consequences; SSE Factor 2 = Unfair/Sexist Events at Work/School; SSE Factor 3 = Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 6
Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations Among REMS, SSE, MHI-5, and GRMS Frequency Subscales

Variable	1	2	3	4	*M*	*SD*	α
GRMS Factor A	—				1.45	0.86	.84
GRMS Factor B	.57**	—			1.99	1.17	.90
GRMS Factor C	.55**	.53**	—		2.21	1.29	.77
GRMS Factor D	.53**	.53**	.62**	—	1.81	1.14	.83
REMS Factor 1	.40**	.52**	.28	.27	2.05	1.00	.92
REMS Factor 2	.31*	.39**	.34*	.37**	1.80	0.82	.87
REMS Factor 3	.36*	.50**	.17	.20	2.00	0.94	.92
REMS Factor 4	.46**	.37**	.37**	.46**	1.58	0.55	.73
REMS Factor 5	.05	.11	−.26	−.04	3.34	0.79	.76
REMS Factor 6	.26	.56**	.20	.18	1.85	1.12	.93
SSE Factor 1	.64**	.43**	.38**	.36**	2.54	0.79	.84
SSE Factor 2	.35**	.57**	.46**	.27*	2.68	1.24	.89
SSE Factor 3	.52**	.55**	.44**	.27*	2.27	0.92	.86
MHI-5 Total	.26**	.32**	.15**	.26**	2.49	0.86	.85

Note. *N*s = 210 for the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale (GRMS) and the Mental Health Inventory 5 (MHI-5). *N* = 49 for the Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS). *N* = 72 for the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE). Numbers in the columns refer to GRMS Factor A–GRMS Factor D, respectively. GRMS Factor A = Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification; GRMS Factor B = Silenced and Marginalized; GRMS Factor C = Strong Black Woman Stereotype; GRMS Factor D = Angry Black Woman Stereotype; REMS Factor 1 = Assumptions of Inferiority; REMS Factor 2 = Second Class Citizen and Assumptions of Criminality; REMS Factor 3 = Microinvalidations; REMS Factor 4 = Exoticization and Assumptions of Similarity; Factor 5 = Environmental Microaggressions; Factor 6 = Workplace and School Microaggressions; SSE Factor 1 = Sexist Degradation and Its Consequences; SSE Factor 2 = Unfair/Sexist Events at Work/School; SSE Factor 3 = Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

sions theory incorporates the concept of invisibility, and both the REMS and the SSE have a work/school subscale, this GRMS subscale highlights the intersecting ways that Black women feel silenced and marginalized in the workplace and other professional settings. A salient aspect of these forms of gendered racial microaggressions for Black women is the feeling of being silenced. For example, one of the highest factor loadings was for the item "As a Black woman, I have felt unheard in a work, school, or other professional setting." Black women in our previous qualitative studies (i.e., Lewis et al., 2010; Lewis, Mendenhall, Harwood, & Browne Huntt, 2013) also discussed the ways that the stereotypes of Black women as being "angry" and "loud" actually serve to silence them because they feel reluctant to speak up in professional environments to avoid being negatively stereotyped.

Strong Black Woman Stereotype (GRMS Factor C)

The third factor captures projected notions of being strong, sassy, independent, and assertive. Gendered racial microaggressions of being a strong Black woman were identified as the most frequent among Black women, with 94% of women reporting these types of experiences. However, women reported these microaggressions to be the least stressful compared with the other subscales. This finding might highlight the ways that some Black women internalize this projected stereotype and, thus, do not view being assumed to be a strong Black woman as offensive. There has been an increase in research on the psychological costs of this projected stereotype. Specifically, although some African American women may pride themselves on being independent and self-reliant, the other side of this stereotype is the expectation to minimize one's own needs and put others before oneself (Beauboeuf-Lafontant, 2007; Woods-Giscombé, 2010; Woods-Giscombé & Black, 2010).

The emergence of the Strong Black Woman factor contributes to the emerging literature by capturing the expectation to be strong and self-reliant and the subtle messages not to be "too independent" and "too assertive"—unique stereotypes of Black women. Scholars have argued that the idea of Black women as strong is usually contrasted with descriptions of White women (Harris-Perry, 2011). These stereotypes serve to reduce Black women to being less feminine and ladylike compared to White women (Collins, 1991). However, this might also make Black women vulnerable to assumptions and expectations in interpersonal relationships to be very direct, assertive, and "sassy." This new addition to the literature highlights the unique ways that Black women are exoticized through the stereotype of the strong Black woman.

Angry Black Woman Stereotype (GRMS Factor D)

The fourth factor reflects the expectation to fulfill the stereotype of an angry Black woman. The vast majority of the women in this study (90%) reported experiencing at least one of these types of gendered racial microaggressions in their lifetime. These types of gendered racial microaggressions had the highest frequency, with participants reporting, on average, that these experiences were slightly stressful to moderately stressful. This extends the literature by highlighting the unique ways that this common stereotype of Black women is perpetrated against them and contributes as a source of stress.

GRMS Convergent Validity

The GRMS was associated with other measures of sexist events, racial and ethnic microaggressions, and mental health outcomes in the expected direction.

GRMS and sexist events. The GRMS subscales were positively related to perceived sexist events. Each of the GRMS frequency and stress appraisal subscales was positively correlated with each of the SSE subscales. However, the moderate correlations between the GRMS and perceived sexist events suggest that they are related but conceptually distinct, which adds to our understanding of the intersecting multiple oppressions experienced by many Black women. These findings are interesting in light of the previous research on perceived sexism experienced by Black women. For example, both Moradi and Subich (2003) and Szymanski and Stewart (2010) explored the relationship between racist events and sexist events in predicting distress in samples of African American women. Both studies found that sexist events were a unique predictor of psychological distress over and above racist events. They concluded that Black women's experiences with racism and sexism are intersectional in nature and that their subjective experiences of racist events and sexist events are intertwined. Given that many of the gendered racial microaggressions conceptualized in the GRMS emphasize the ways in which Black women's racialized experiences are also gendered, this finding is not surprising. Previous research on race-related stress (cf. Utsey, 1999) has found significant gender differences in the types of racism-related stressors that Black men and women experience. Thus, this finding supports the literature that highlights the uniqueness of Black women's experiences with subtle forms of oppression as a result of the intersections of race and gender.

GRMS and racial microaggressions. Increased experiences with gendered racial microaggressions in this study were related to greater reported racial microaggressions as measured by the REMS. Specifically, participants' experiences with gendered racial microaggressions about assumptions of beauty and sexual objectification and the strong Black woman stereotype were related to microinvalidations as measured by the REMS. The Strong Black Woman Stereotype factor was also related to exoticization, which supports previous research on the microaggressions experienced by other women of color (e.g., Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007). In addition, gendered racial microaggressions that include being silenced and marginalized were positively related to the microinvalidations subscale, which supports Sue's (2010) theory of microaggressions. Specifically, the experience of being made to feel invisible is a type of microinvalidation according to Sue's theory and empirical work. For example, Constantine et al. (2008) found that African American faculty members experienced invisibility in their workplace. Further, the Silenced and Marginalized subscale was also related to workplace and school microaggressions as well as assumptions of inferiority, which highlights the ways that perpetrators' assumptions about inferiority might be related to silencing and marginalizing Black women in the workplace. The projected stereotype of the angry Black woman was also related to assumptions of criminality, which adds a nuanced understanding to the link between these stereotypes. The findings suggest that although there is some overlap between gendered racial microaggressions and racial microaggressions, as evidenced by the moderate correlations, there are also some unique differences. The

findings also suggest there are some differences between the associations of gendered racial microaggressions and racial microaggressions depending on the type of assessment (frequency compared with stress appraisal).

GMRS and psychological distress. As expected, gendered racial microaggressions were related to psychological distress. Each of the GRMS subscales for both frequency and stress appraisal was positively related to greater psychological distress, which supports previous research that perceived racism is negatively related to psychological health among African Americans in general (Pieterse et al., 2012) and Black American women more specifically (Thomas et al., 2008). Thomas et al. examined the relations between gendered racism and psychological distress and found a significant and positive association. In addition, Moradi and Subich (2003) found that both perceived racism and sexism were positively related to psychological distress when explored separately. However, when both racism and sexism were included in the model together to predict psychological distress, their findings indicated that sexism was the only unique predictor of distress. Our findings highlight the benefits of using an intersectional measure of gendered racism, such as the GRMS to more accurately capture the simultaneous experience of both racism and sexism.

Limitations

Although this study shows promising results, it is important to note some of its limitations. The online data-collection method is one limitation. Collecting data online allowed for data collection from a diverse sample of participants in terms of geographical location and age; however, one drawback of online survey methodology was the oversampling of women from middle and upper social class levels. Given the social class disparities in access to the Internet that individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds experience, the sample was highly educated, which could have affected the generalizability of the findings. In addition, although it was important to use a purposeful sampling method to actively recruit a multiple minority sample, the lack of use of a random sample could also affect the ability to generalize to the population. Another drawback of this study was the self-selected nature of the sample; individuals were told that the study was focused on Black women's experiences, which could have resulted in a greater inclusion of women whose race and gender were more salient to them. Given the length of the survey and the fact that we did not pay each participant to complete the survey, we opted to create three versions of the survey to ensure greater participation and completion. Thus, in the current study, we were unable to examine incremental validity and explore whether the GRMS accounted for more variance in psychological distress over and above what could be explained by measures of sexist events or racial microaggressions separately. However, future research could examine incremental validity of the GRMS.

Implications for Future Research

The findings from this study have several important implications for future research on microaggressions. It is critical to determine the function of gendered racial microaggressions in Black women's lives—does this type of intersectional approach help us to better explain mental, behavioral, and physical health outcomes (e.g., distress, depression, anxiety, substance use, blood pressure) compared with racist and sexist discrimination more generally and racial and gender microaggressions more specifically? This type of work should include correlational designs and also longitudinal and experimental designs to better investigate the causality of the association.

Future research could also continue to explore the construct validity of the GRMS with diverse groups of Black women in terms of age, geographical region, social class, and other intragroup variables. The frequency and stress appraisal of experiences with gendered racial microaggression might vary on the basis of several of these demographic variables. For example, one group of particular interest is younger women, who might be more likely to experience increased assumptions of beauty and sexual objectification. Although this study was limited to Black women over the age of 18, future research could explore Black teenage girls, who might be at an increased risk of exposure to certain microaggressions. In addition, the GRMS can add to the existing research on sexual harassment experienced by women in the workplace. Although there has been an increase in research on Black women's unique experiences with racialized sexual harassment (e.g., Buchanan & Ormerod, 2002), there is a dearth of measures to assess the intersectional effect of these experiences. The Silenced and Marginalized factor represents a measure of intersecting gendered racial microaggressions that are specific to the experience of Black women in professional careers.

Implications for Practice

This study also has implications for clinical practice. It is important for mental health professionals to be aware of the gendered racial microaggressions that their Black women clients may experience in their day-to-day lives, particularly in the workplace, and how these experiences can negatively affect mental health. Specifically, mental health professionals could try to assess the extent to which gendered racial microaggressions might contribute to increased stress in the lives of their Black women clients and help their clients develop strategies to cope with these experiences (e.g., Lewis et al., 2013).

It is also very important for mental health professionals, counselors, psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, and trainees to be aware of the ways that they might unknowingly perpetrate gendered racial microaggressions against their Black female clients. Research (e.g., Sue et al., 2008) indicates that there are several racial microaggressions that are common in clinical work, including blaming the victim, racial colorblindness, and denying clients' experiences of racism. This research can extend to the experience of gendered racial microaggressions. There might be ways that counselors silence and marginalize their Black women clients or reduce them to a stereotype, such as the angry Black woman. These microaggressions in the therapy room can disrupt the therapeutic alliance by making it difficult to establish rapport and could contribute to early termination (Sue, 2010).

Conclusion

This project extended Sue's (2010) theory of microaggressions and Essed's (1991) theory of gendered racism by constructing and validating a quantitative scale to measure Black women's experi-

ences with the intersection of racial and gendered microaggressions. Findings revealed four meaningful aspects of gendered racial microaggressions experienced by Black women: Assumptions of Beauty and Sexual Objectification, Silenced and Marginalized, Strong Black Woman Stereotype, and Angry Black Woman Stereotype. This study provided psychometric support for this measure, which was positively related to racial microaggressions and perceived sexist events in theoretically expected ways. In addition, greater perceived gendered racial microaggressions were related to greater levels of psychological distress. The GRMS makes a significant contribution to the research literature by providing a measurement tool that was created using an intersectional analytic framework to capture the unique experiences of Black women.

References

Balsam, K. F., Molina, Y., Beadnell, B., Simoni, J., & Walters, K. (2011). Measuring multiple minority stress: The LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17,* 163–174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023244

Beauboeuf-Lafontant, T. (2007). You have to show strength: An exploration of gender, race, and depression. *Gender & Society, 21,* 28–51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243206294108

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + lesbian + woman ≠ Black lesbian woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles, 59*(5–6), 312–325. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z

Bryant, F. B., & Yarnold, P. Y. (1995). Principal-components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In L. Grimm & P. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 99–136). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Buchanan, N. T., & Ormerod, A. J. (2002). Racialized sexual harassment in the lives of African American women. *Women & Therapy, 25,* 107–124. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J015v25n03_08

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: Wiley.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64,* 170–180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Constantine, M. G., Smith, L., Redington, R. M., & Owens, D. (2008). Racial microaggressions against Black counseling and counseling psychology faculty: A central challenge in the multicultural counseling movement. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86,* 348–355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00519.x

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 140,* 139–167.

Dawis, R. V. (1987). Scale construction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34,* 481–489. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.4.481

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483345239

Fischer, A. R., & Bolton Holz, K. (2010). Testing a model of women's personal sense of justice, control, well-being, and distress in the context of sexist discrimination. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34,* 297–310. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01576.x

Fischer, A. R., & Shaw, C. M. (1999). African American's mental health and perceptions of racist discrimination: The moderating effects of racial socialization experiences and self-esteem. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46,* 395–407. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.46.3.395

Harrell, S. P. (1997). *The racism and life experiences scale (RaLES-Revised)*. Unpublished manuscript.

Harris-Perry, M. V. (2011). *Sister citizen: Shame, stereotypes, and Black women in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6,* 1–55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (2013). *LISREL 9.10*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.

Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, H. (1995). The Schedule of Sexist Events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19,* 439–472. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1995.tb00086.x

Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The Schedule of Racist Events: A measure of discrimination and a study of its negative physical and mental health consequences. *Journal of Black Psychology, 22,* 144–168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00957984960222002

Lewis, J. A., Mendenhall, R., Harwood, S., & Browne-Huntt, M. (2010). *Ain't I a woman? The experience of racial and gender microaggressions at a predominantly White institution*. Poster session presented at the 27th Annual Conference on Multicultural Psychology and Education, Columbia Teachers College, New York, NY.

Lewis, J. A., Mendenhall, R., Harwood, S. A., & Browne Huntt, M. (2013). Coping with gendered racial microaggressions among Black women college students. *Journal of African American Studies, 17,* 51–73. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12111-012-9219-0

Little, R. J. A. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83,* 1198–1202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1988.10478722

Little, R. J. A., & Rubin, D. B. (2002). *Statistical analysis with missing data* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781119013563

Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9,* 151–173. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1

Matteson, A. V., & Moradi, B. (2005). Examining the structure of the Schedule of Sexist Events: Replication and extension. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29,* 47–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0361-6843.2005.00167.x

McHorney, C. A., & Ware, J. E., Jr. (1995). Construction and validation of an alternate form general mental health scale for the Medical Outcomes Study Short-Form 36-Item Health Survey. *Medical Care, 33,* 15–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00005650-199501000-00002

Mercer, S. H., Zeigler-Hill, V., Wallace, M., & Hayes, D. M. (2011). Development and initial validation of the Inventory of Microaggressions Against Black Individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58,* 457–469. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024937

Moradi, B., & Subich, L. M. (2003). A concomitant examination of the relations of perceived racist and sexist events to psychological distress for African American women. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 451–469. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000003031004007

Nadal, K. L. (2011). The Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58,* 470–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025193

Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Sriken, J., Griffin, K., & Fujii-Doe, W. (2014). Racial microaggressions and Asian Americans: An exploratory study on within-group differences and mental health. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038058

Newcomb, M. D. (1994). Drug use and intimate relationships among women and men: Separating specific from general effects in prospective data using structural equation models. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62,* 463–476. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.62.3.463

O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, 32,* 396–402.

Owen, J., Tao, K., & Rodolfa, E. (2010). Microaggressions and women in short-term psychotherapy: Initial evidence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 38,* 923–946. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000010376093

Pascoe, E. A., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135,* 531–554. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016059

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

Pieterse, A. L., Todd, N. R., Neville, H. A., & Carter, R. T. (2012). Perceived racism and mental health among Black American adults: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59,* 1–9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026208

Rivera, D. P. (2012). *Microaggressions and health outcomes for Latina/o Americans: Understanding the influences of external characteristics and psychological resources*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Shorter-Gooden, K. (2004). Multiple resistance strategies: How African American women cope with racism and sexism. *Journal of Black Psychology, 30,* 406–425. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095798404266050

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 and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13,* 72–81. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.13.1.72

Sue, D. W., & Capodilupo, C. M. (2008). Racial, gender, and sexual orientation microaggressions: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy. In D. W. Sue & D. Sue (Eds.), *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (pp. 193–216). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

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. http://dx.doi.org/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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Szymanski, D. M., & Stewart, D. (2010). Racism and sexism as correlates of African American women's psychological distress. *Sex Roles, 63,* 226–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9788-0

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Thomas, A. J., Witherspoon, K. M., & Speight, S. L. (2008). Gendered racism, psychological distress, and coping styles of African American women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14,* 307–314. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.14.4.307

Torres-Harding, S. R., Andrade, A. L., Jr., & Romero Diaz, C. E. (2012). The Racial Microaggressions Scale (RMAS): A new scale to measure experiences of racial microaggressions in people of color. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18,* 153–164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027658

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Minority Health. (2010. Diabetes and African) Americans. http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/templates/content.aspx?lvl02&lvlID051&ID03017. Retrieved on March 18, 2012.

Utsey, S. O. (1999). Development and validation of a short form of the Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS)–Brief Version. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32,* 149–167.

Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1999). Further factorial validity assessment of scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59,* 325–335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00131649921969875

Veit, C. T., & Ware, J. E., Jr. (1983). The structure of psychological distress and well-being in general populations. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51,* 730–742. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.51.5.730

Williams, D. R., & Williams-Morris, R. (2000). Racism and mental health: The African American experience. *Ethnicity & Health, 5,* 243–268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713667453

Woods-Giscombé, C. L. (2010). Superwoman schema: African American women's views on stress, strength, and health. *Qualitative Health Research, 20,* 668–683. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732310361892

Woods-Giscombé, C. L., & Black, A. R. (2010). Mind–body interventions to reduce risk for health disparities related to stress and strength among African American women: The potential of mindfulness-based stress reduction, loving-kindness, and the NTU therapeutic framework. *Complementary Health Practice Review, 15,* 115–131.

Woods-Giscombé, C. L., & Lobel, M. (2008). Race and gender matter: A multidimensional approach to conceptualizing and measuring stress in African American women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14,* 173–182. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.14.3.173

Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34,* 806–838. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127

Received April 9, 2014
Revision received December 24, 2014
Accepted December 28, 2014 ■