Development of the Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism (REAR) Scale

Karen L. Suyemoto, Tahirah Abdullah, Danielle Godon-Decoteau, Noor N. Tahirkheli, and

Natalie Arbid

University of Massachusetts Boston

Alice A. Frye

University of Massachusetts Lowell

Word count: 5997

Short title: Resistance & Empowerment Against Racism Scale

Author Note

Karen L. Suyemoto, Psychology, Asian American Studies, and Critical Ethnic and

Community Studies, University of Massachusetts Boston; Tahirah Abdullah, Psychology

Department, University of Massachusetts Boston; Danielle Godon-Decoteau, Psychology

Department, University of Massachusetts Boston; Noor Tahirkheli, Psychology Department,

University of Massachusetts Boston; Natalie Arbid, Psychology Department, University of

Massachusetts Boston; Alice Frye, Psychology Department, University of Massachusetts Lowell.

Danielle Godon-Decoteau is now at Department of Psychology and Education, Mount Holyoke

College.

Abstract

Objectives: This study aimed to develop and validate the Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism (REAR) scale. *Method:* Fifty items developed through processes adapted from Consensual Qualitative Research were administered to a sample of 723 women and 230 men of color (Asian Americans, Black Americans, Latinx, and Native Americans). We employed exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses using stratified subsamples; examined construct validity of the final REAR scale and subscales; and evaluated 2-week test-retest reliability with a subsample. *Results:* Analyses supported a four-factor model, including Awareness and Relational Resistance; Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations; Interpersonal Confrontation; and Leadership for Resistance. The REAR demonstrated good test-retest and internal reliability and construct validity. *Conclusions*: Use of the REAR may enable researchers and clinicians to examine how people of color proactively respond to racism through empowered action to challenge racism, and how these responses may moderate the negative effects of racism on psychological well-being.

Keywords: resistance, empowerment, racism, measurement, activism

Public Significance Statement: The wide prevalence and negative effects of racism on people of color has been well established by prior literature. Resistance is a kind of empowered coping that attempts to proactively challenge the existence and perpetuation of racism. Being able to measure the extent to which people engage in resistance actions will help illuminate how resistance could be a proactive strategy to foster positive mental health for people of color and contribute to a more equitable society.

Development of the Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism (REAR) Scale

There is an established literature on racism, its effects, and ways of coping. There is also growing interdisciplinary scholarship on resistance to racism, including some measures that examine aspects of resistance; however, these measures were validated with White participants (Pieterse, Utsey, & Miller, 2016) or designed primarily for use in the context of responding to individual experiences of racism (Forsyth & Carter, 2014; Wei, Alvarez, Ku, Russell, & Bonnet, 2010). To date, there has been no measure that examines people of color's resistance to racism as a directed action to undermine systemic injustice. This paper presents empirical research addressing the development of such a scale.

Prevalence and Detrimental Effects of Racism

Research indicates that most people of color experience racial discrimination. Over 90% of Asian American participants reported daily life forms of microaggressions at least once or twice a year (Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006; Lee, 2003); more than 50% of Black[1] participants reported experiencing racial slurs and offensive racial assumptions or comments, and 42% indicated that they or a family member experienced violence because of their race (NPR, 2017a); most Latinx participants (79.5%) reported exposure to race or ethnicity-based discrimination (Arellano-Morales et al., 2015); and Native American participants indicated that in their daily lives, more than a third experienced racial slurs, offensive racial assumptions or comments, or indicated that they or a family member experienced violence because of their race (NPR, 2017b).

---

[1] We use the term "Black Americans" to refer to anyone who is racialized as and self-identifies as Black. Black people in the U.S. could come from any number of ethnic backgrounds and may or may not ethnically be African American. Latinx is a gender-neutral alternative to Latino/a/@ and refers to individuals of all gender identities of Latin American cultural identity and descent, including Brazil. We use Native American due to our regional location: although American Indian is most frequently used in some areas of the U.S., "Native American" is often the preferred term in New England. When reporting on findings of individual studies, we use the language authors used to describe their samples.

Furthermore, recent meta-analyses show positive associations between racism and psychological distress among Black American (66 studies, r = 0.20, 95% CI [0.17, 0.22]; Pieterse, Todd, Neville, & Carter, 2012), Asian American (23 studies, r = 0.23, 95% CI [0.18, 0.29]; Lee & Ahn, 2011), and Latinx (51 studies, r = 0.23, 95% CI [0.19-0.26]; Lee & Ahn, 2012) peoples. Among Asian Americans, Black Americans, Latinx, and Native Americans (with some variability among groups), racial discrimination is linked to anxiety, depression, trauma symptoms, and suicidal ideation (e.g., Alamilla, Kim, & Lam, 2010; Hudson, Neighbors, Geronius, & Jackson, 2016; Hwang & Goto, 2008; Lee & Ahn, 2011; Liu & Suyemoto, 2016; Mossakowski, 2003; Pieterse, Carter, Evans, & Walker, 2010; Sanchez, Adams, Arango & Flannigan, 2018; Tucker, Wingate & O'Kefe, 2016; Walker et al., 2017; Whitbeck, McMorris, Hoyt, Stubben, & Lafromboise, 2002).

Coping with Racism and Conceptualizing Resistance

The negative effects of racism require that people of color develop coping strategies. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) offered an integrative definition of coping as, "constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of a person" (p. 141). Coping may engage one or multiple strategies, such as problem-focused coping (e.g., planning, decision making), emotion-focused coping (e.g., venting, humor), avoidance (e.g., denial, behavioral disengagement), and seeking social support from others (Eisenbarth, 2012).

Research on coping with racism has largely focused on how individuals react to personal experiences of racism. However, people of color also undertake actions that proactively aim to prevent racism or challenge its existence. For example, Shorter-Gooden (2004) described "direct action to confront the *source* of the problem" (p. 411, italics added) among African American

women, such as "standing up and fighting back" and Ng (2017) found that Asian American women leaders used direct actions such as challenging and educating others as strategies to address racial and gender discrimination. Harrell (2000) included demonstrations, petitions, boycotts, and activities in racial/ethnic group organizations in her discussion of coping, and further noted that the individual/collective dimension of coping has been under-researched and may be salient for coping as a form of resistance.

Building on this basis, we conceptualized resistance against racism as a type of (pro)active coping that includes and extends beyond managing the personal experience of racism to incorporate approaches that challenge the existence or acceptance of the oppressive demands made within a racialized system (Hollander & Einwohner, 2004). "Proactive coping" (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997; Sohl & Moyer, 2009) involves self-regulatory personal behaviors in preparation for specific future stressors. Resistance expands upon this construct, aiming to address the negative effects of a systemic problem (racism), challenge the existence of the injustice, and emphasize collective over individual action and motivation.

Similarly, resistance extends beyond individual empowerment. Cattaneo and Chapman (2010) define empowerment as:

> An iterative process in which a person who lacks power sets a personally meaningful goal oriented toward increasing power, takes action toward that goal, and observes and reflects on the impact of this action, drawing on his or her evolving self-efficacy, knowledge, and competence related to the goal (p. 647).

Resisting racism involves empowerment where the lack of power is systemic. The goal often extends beyond what is personally meaningful or rewarding, positioning resistance against racism as a type of activism that is also a coping response for a collective goal.

Sociology has a more extensive extant research on resistance and activism, which has more recently shifted from centering resource mobilization to a greater emphasis on identity, group and collective formation, (Edelman, 2001; Poletta & Jasper, 2001) connecting to psychology's emphasis on individuals' actions, motivations, or effects. Across disciplines, the extant literature about activism and coping with racism indicates that resistance includes individual actions both to manage the individual's experience, and to influence social norms. These may include actions aimed to foster collectives and coalitions (e.g., Poletta & Jasper, 2001) and address related barriers to coalitions (e.g., Srivistava, 2005; Tawa, Tauriac, & Suyemoto, 2016); actions to titrate emotional engagement, either catalyzing or managing emotion in the service of collective action (e.g., Rodriguez, 2011; Ruiz-Junco, 2012) or lifestyle changes and indirect everyday aspects of resistance (Haenfler et al., 2012; Turiel, 2003). However, psychological research that examines individuals' engagement with racial social justice action or resistance is rare and may be hampered by a dearth of measures.

Developing a Measure of Resistance

This study aimed to create a measure of resistance against racism for people of color, emphasizing a cross-racialized-group meaning of resistance, called the Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism (REAR). Although we recognize that differences in experiences of racism and resisting racism may exist among different racialized minority groups, in this study we pursued the shared experiences of people of color, emphasizing the shared context of embeddedness in a racist system, and thus the likelihood of some shared experiences of resisting.

We followed best practices for measurement development of the REAR (Boateng, Neilands, Frongillo, Melgar-Quinonez, & Young, 2018; Gehlbach & Brinkworth, 2011; Morgado, Meireles, Neves, Amara, & Ferreria, 2017) including, (1) literature review and

construct conceptualization, (2) item generation, development, and analysis, and (3)

psychometric analyses including factor structure, reliability, and validity (Cronbach & Meehl,

1955). Item generation, development, and analysis included creating items that define the

construct of interest. We employed deductive approaches (e.g., using a literature review and

assessment of existing scales) and inductive qualitative approaches (e.g., experts' knowledge

rooted in scholarly and personal, lived expertise; direct observation), which is considered best

practice (Boateng et al., 2018; Morgado et al., 2017).

We conducted an initial exploratory factor analysis (EFA). EFA is a statistical approach

applied to identify the existence of coherent constructs within a group of items (Flora & Flake,

2017). It typically proceeds without a priori hypotheses about factor loadings, which is best

practice in initiating scale development to enable consideration of unanticipated, important

factors or unanticipated cross-loadings (Flora & Flake, 2017). We conducted confirmatory factor

analysis (CFA) in a separate sample as a follow up test of the model identified in the EFA. We

established internal consistency through Cronbach's alpha and test-retest reliability over 2 weeks

to assess stability of the measure over time.

To establish convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959), we

examined relations between the REAR scale and other measures. Resistance should be positively

related to private regard and identity aspects of collective self-esteem (CSES; Luhtanen &

Crocker, 1992) given established relations between social identities and coping. For example,

Reicher (2004) asserted that how one identifies with one's group impacts choices to engage in

action, and Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) discussed how collective self-esteem has implications

for actions such as organizational commitment and behavior and political participation, as well

as determining social behavior. Social identity is a primary motivator for collective action and

social movements (Poletta & Jasper 2001). Resistance should be negatively associated with color-blind racial attitudes (CoBRAS; Neville, Lily, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000) because resisting racism requires actively perceiving and acknowledging racism. Color-blind racial attitudes have also been positively associated with endorsing, rather than challenging, racial prejudice (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011; Neville, Coleman, Falconer, & Holmes, 2005) and with internalized stereotypes and self-blame of one's own racial minority group. Neville and colleagues (2000; 2005) argued that color-blind racial attitudes may be a barrier to developing coping and defenses against a racially oppressive environment and prevent people of color from supporting structural change.

In relation to discriminant validity, a limitation noted in the scale development literature is when there is are a limited number of instruments (Morgado et al., 2017) or limited samples of behavior (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2011) available to be correlated with the measure. Given that we conceptualized resistance as a specific kind of coping that relates to, but expands beyond *active* coping, we examined relations amongst approaches to coping. We expected the REAR to relate positively with active coping strategies that also resist possible collusion or internalization (e.g., active coping and planning versus positive reframing) and with social support given the collective emphasis. We expected the REAR not to relate to coping approaches that seem unrelated to experiences of oppression or decisions to challenge structural power, such as humor. These hypotheses were supported by prior research showing that active coping and planning, as measured in the Brief COPE, are usually unrelated to humor (e.g., Monzani et al., 2015). Furthermore, in a minority sample examining coping with racism (Pearson et al., 2014), humor was unrelated to active planning (combined), while social support (instrumental and emotional combined) was significantly related (Pearson et al., 2014).

Method

Item Development

Initial items were developed by a diverse research team that engaged in a collaborative and iterative process guided by Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR) for item and domain generation and construct definition.

Research team. In CQR, it is recommended that the research team include people with different experiences and worldviews (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997; Hill et al., 2005). Our research team was diverse in gender; race; student/faculty status; age/generation; sexuality; religion; geographical experience; life and family experiences; experience in researching race and racism across racialized groups; and experiences in teaching, educational, and community initiatives related to fostering racial and ethnic identities and social justice.[2]

Consensus building. Scale development and item generation began with a literature review and team expertise. During initial meetings, we discussed meanings of "resistance" and "empowerment" as related to addressing racism and we explored the psychological, sociological, and ethnic studies literatures. We developed a consensual meaning of resistance that encompassed empowerment. Specifically, we defined resistance as "thinking *and* acting to resist oppression. Feeling that one has a sense of agency in the face of a situation/event/structure that initially makes one feel powerless and that is rooted in structural oppression, and taking action

---

[2] The team consisted of one male and one female undergraduate students, one male and four female graduate students, and two female faculty members, all of whom who racially identified as either Black or Asian American and have personal lived experiences of racism and resisting racism. Members of the team have experience living in various geographic regions of the U.S., including the south, west, and northeast. Team members' experiences in researching and teaching about race and racism ranged from this project as the first experience to over 20 years of experience with research and education about race, racism, and social justice activism. The inclusion of "novice" as well as expert perspectives was important, given that resistance could be enacted by people of color who have no education in relation to formal constructs of race or racism, or those whose personal or professional lives are consciously permeated by these issues, and that the nature of these acts may vary in relation to formal education or experience.

from that agency." We established initial consensus that resistance and related empowerment aim to explicitly create change and could happen intrapersonally, interpersonally, and within groups and society. We also agreed that action could be direct or indirect, reflecting different cultural styles. Most examples of resistance in the literature tend to be direct or confrontative, thus we explored the possibility of indirect activism that might be more congruent with cultural norms emphasizing collectivistic harmony (e.g., Asian Americans or Native Americans; see Eason & Robbins, 2012; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Yeh, Arora, & Wu, 2006).

With our operational definition, we began the iterative process of item generation and consensus building by each team member generating at least 10 items that reflected resistance and empowerment against racism. Team review and discussion of initial items led to the inductive development of 19 initial resistance domains (categories that conceptually grouped individual items). Next, each team member developed items *within* the agreed upon domains. The resulting 119 items were discussed as specific scale items and as possible domains; similar items and domains were combined. Team members then individually reviewed remaining items in a comparison analysis approach, evaluating items in relation to each other, the agreed upon construct definition of resistance, and the domains. A discussion of each item and possible domains followed, including consideration of whether there were items or domains of resistance that were not reflected in the current list. Potential scale items and domains were integrated, removed, and refined through this iterative process that involved consensual examination, discussion of the established literature, and categorization. As items were modified or moved between domains, older items were also reassessed whether they captured unique ideas within the developing scale. This process paralleled an iterative qualitative analysis, with open brainstorming and categorizing/axial sorting informed by and informing a central theoretical

construct. Constant comparative analysis in the consensual process maximizes the breadth of contributions; utilizes multiple perspectives, backgrounds, and expertise; and minimizes groupthink.

Items. The final group of items consisted of 50 items (see Table 1), reflecting ten domains of resistance: acknowledgement, resisting internalization, intentionality, indirect resistance, providing and seeking social validation and support, expressive resistance/arts, educating self and others), interpersonal confrontation, organizing and protest, and building coalitions and recognizing intersectionality. We viewed these domains as conceptual rather than structural, understood that domains were likely interrelated, and did not expect separate empirical factors.

Survey Administration

Participants. Participants were recruited nationally and locally through email listservs and social media, neighborhood flyers in local communities, and at an urban northeast university through flyers and class announcements. Recruitment materials targeted people of color generally (e.g., "Are you a person of color?") and specific racial minority groups (i.e., Asian American, Black, Latinx, Native American: e.g., "Are you Asian American?") who had experienced racism (i.e., "Have you experienced racial discrimination?"). Prospective participants were directed to an online survey where they first indicated informed consent. Participants could elect to earn course research credit, enter a raffle for one of several $200 gift cards, or have the researchers make a $5 donation to the Southern Poverty Law Center (up to a total of $2,000). This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the research team's university.

A total of 1,072 participants responded and met eligibility requirements: self-identified people of color, 18 years or older, self-reported English language fluency as a 3 ("moderately fluent") or higher on a 5-point scale. Prior to analysis, we identified potentially random or careless responses. We excluded 28 participants with unusually short response times as compared to the average time to complete the survey during pilot testing and median participant response time. We excluded 23 participants based on long string analysis (Meade & Craig, 2012) of the REAR items; these participants indicated the same response 21 or more times, which included responses spanning reversed items. We excluded 64 participants based on Mahalanobis multivariate outlier analysis using the 50 REAR items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). This yielded a final sample of 953 participants. Participant demographics are presented in Table 2.

At the end of the initial survey, participants were asked whether they wished to participate in a follow-up study to assess re-test reliability. Two weeks after completion of the initial survey, interested participants completed the follow-up study and received $10 Amazon e-gift card. We discontinued re-test recruitment within each racial group when there were at least 50 participants or when we closed the study. Cicchetti (1999) argued persuasively that for the purposes of test-retest reliability, sample sizes greater than 50 do not meaningfully increase the precision of the estimate. Response rates for the re-test invitation varied from a low of 43% (for Native Americans) to a high of 53% (for Asian Americans). This resulted in 196 participants who completed the re-test and were retained in the sample after data cleaning (as described above). Demographics for re-test participants are presented in Table 2. There were no significant differences between combined-race or race-specific samples of participants who took the re-test, as compared to participants who only took the first administration in terms of age, gender identity, sexual orientation, level of education, or current household income.

Measures. Means, standard deviations, and internal reliability for all measures are presented in Table 3.

Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism. REAR items (see Table 1) were presented with the following instructions: "Please complete the items below to reflect your actual experiences and what you do, rather than your intentions or what you think you should or shouldn't do. Remember, there is no 'right' answer." Items were accompanied by a 5-point Likert scale with the following anchors: (1) rarely, (2) occasionally, (3) sometimes, (4) usually, (5) almost always.

The Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). The CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000) is a 20-item measure assessing cognitive aspects of color-blind racial attitudes and provides a general measure of awareness of more structural and systemic aspects of race and racism. The CoBRAS has shown good internal reliability for full scale score ($\alpha = .87$) in a mixed sample of Whites, Blacks, Latinos, Asian Americans, and American Indians (Neville et al., 2000). The CoBRAS was slightly modified for this study to make a clearer distinction between race and ethnicity (e.g., ethnic terms and examples, such as "Italian American," were deleted or changed to clearly reference racialized groupings). The CoBRAS demonstrated good internal reliability in this sample ($\alpha = .90$).

Brief COPE. The Brief COPE (Carver, 1997) is an abbreviated version of the Cope Scale designed to assess coping strategies in fourteen subscales of two items each. We used the active coping, planning, instrumental support, and emotional support subscales in our convergent validity analyses, and we used the humor subscale in our discriminant validity analysis. The reliabilities previously established for these subscales with a sample of non-Hispanic Whites, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans (Carver, 1997) were: active coping ($\alpha =$

.68), planning (α = .73), instrumental support (α = .64), emotional support (α = .71), and humor

(α = .73). In the current study, reliability estimates in this sample for the subscales used were:

active coping (α = .74), planning (α = .80), instrumental support (α = .85), emotional support (α

= .86), and humor (α = .89).

Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES). The CSES (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) measures

individuals' evaluations of their collective esteem and sense of membership in particular groups

in four subscales: membership esteem; private esteem; public regard; and importance to identity.

The CSES shows concurrent validity through correlations with a higher sense of collectivism and

collective aspects of identity (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Internal consistency coefficients

ranged from .85 to .88 for the total CSES score in the initial three racially mixed (predominantly

White) undergraduate samples (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and from .72 to .88 with a

modification to reference racial group in a more racially diverse (40% White) sample (Crocker,

Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994). The CSES has been widely used in research with specific

minority groups. Internal consistency with the present sample ranged from .76 to .81. It was

modified so that the language used specifically related to the racial group the participant

endorsed (e.g., "my social group" became "the Asian American group," "the Black American

group," "the Latina/o group," or "the Native American group").

University of Massachusetts Boston Comprehensive Demographics Questionnaire.

Demographic data to describe participants was collected with the University of Massachusetts

Boston Comprehensive Demographics questionnaire (Suyemoto et al., 2016). This demographic

questionnaire was developed with the goal of capturing the complexity within various identities

that participants possess using an ethics of care (Haverkamp, 2005), aiming to support

participants' experience of having their multiple identities and contexts acknowledged in the research process.

Results

Scale Construction and Identification

We divided the sample into two stratified subsamples based on race and gender distribution, one for the initial EFA and the other for the CFA. Group one had 477 members, and group two had 476 members. We used six racial groups in stratification: Asian American, Black, Latinx, Native American, Multiracial, and Other. The Asian American, Black, Latinx, and Native American groups included multiracial individuals who indicated that they *primarily* identified with a single specific racial group when asked to describe the experience of their multiracial self-categorization. The Multiracial group included participants who identified as multiracial and selected mixed, multiracial, multiple races, or other. We used four gender groups in stratification: females, males, non-binary-conforming individuals, and individuals who did not indicate their gender. All analyses were conducted using Mplus version 8.3 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2019) or SPSS version 24.

We approached scale construction and identification using a combination of empirically driven decisions from results of analyses, and theoretically driven decisions drawing on the literature. We ran both EFA and CFA, treated items as continuous in scale, and applied the maximum likelihood robust estimator (MLR) to adjust for the fact that items were scored on a Likert scale.

Prior to running the EFA, we ran group-specific preliminary EFAs for each of the primary racialized groups (Asian American, Black, Latinx, Native American) because our aim was to develop a scale that captured the conceptual core of resistance actions that is common

across racialized groups. By excluding items that had weak loadings for any single group, we increased the focus on the common core. In these EFAs, we reviewed items that loaded less than .5 on any factor (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). We excluded 11 of the original 50 items with loadings under .4 for at least one group (see Table 1). Simultaneously, we sought not to exclude items with strong loadings for multiple groups and adequate loadings (between .4 and 5) for other groups. We retained 7 items that loaded between .4 and .5 (items 9, 15, 25, 32, 33, 34, 46). These items related to organizational leadership and indirect resistance, both of which have been noted as conceptually important in the literature.

Using the first sample, we conducted EFA with a geomin (oblique) rotation. We retained items that loaded significantly at .5 or higher. We excluded 9 items that did not load significantly at or above .4 on any factor (see Table 1). We reexamined the 7 items that loaded between .4 and .5, considering loadings, cross-loadings, and conceptual contributions. Of these, we retained 3 items (15, 34, 39) that significantly loaded greater than .4 but less than .5 and that did not cross-load above .3, as they captured conceptual aspects not represented by other items, including addressing the social collectivistic and indirect, rather than confrontative, aspects of resistance.

We ran an EFA with the 26 remaining selected items using the same sample. A scree plot indicated that more than four factors would not contribute meaningfully to the model. This decision was supported by the model fit indices. With respect to model fits, a six-factor model had the strongest fits but was uninterpretable. The five-factor model had the next strongest fits; however, one of the factors in that model had only two items with strong loadings. Therefore, we chose the four-factor model, which had fits in the acceptable range and where each factor was represented by at least three items (see Tables 4 and 5). The four- and five-factor models were very similar. All items loaded on the same factors across both models, except for items 42 and

43, which were on the fifth factor in the five-factor model and loaded on the first factor in the four-factor model.

We then applied CFA to the second sample, constraining items to load uniquely onto the factors with the highest loads per item in the four-factor EFA. Model fits, as expected with these constraints, were not as strong as for the EFA, but may be considered acceptable given the sample size (Chen, Curran, Bollen, Kirby & Paxton, 2008; Weston & Gore, 2006; see Table 5). Factor loadings were generally similar to loadings and structure for the four-factor model results for group one (Table 4). The four factors captured four central aspects of resistance: (a) Awareness and Relational Resistance; (b) Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations; (c) Interpersonal Confrontation; and (d) Leadership for Resistance. Factor correlations from the CFA are presented in Table 6. Endorsement of items (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) are presented in Table 7.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability analyses. Internal and test-retest reliabilities for the REAR total and four subscales were good, ranging from .85 to .96 and .81 to .98, respectively (see Table 8).

Validity analyses. As hypothesized in relation to convergent validity, REAR and REAR subscales were negatively associated with color-blind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) and positively associated with identity and private regard aspects of collective self-esteem, and with active coping, planning, emotional support, and instrumental support (see Table 3). As hypothesized in relation to divergent validity, REAR and REAR subscales were not associated with humor as coping, with the exception of the Leadership subscale (see Table 3).

Discussion

Results supported a 26-item REAR measure of resistance against racism for people of color, capturing four central aspects of resistance: (a) Awareness and Relational Resistance; (b) Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations; (c) Interpersonal Confrontation; and (d) Leadership for Resistance. The full scale and each subscale demonstrated good internal and test-retest reliabilities and evidence of convergent and divergent validity.

Awareness and Relational Resistance focuses upon actions that promote personal *and* interpersonal awareness and validation about racism and resistance, actions that foster collective orientation and motivation for resistance actions. The inclusion of this factor expands understandings of resistance beyond confronting perpetrators of oppression (whether people or systems) to include collective connections and motivations reflected in relational emphases within the social justice activism literature (e.g., Burton, 2013; Poletta & Jasper, 2001; Suyemoto, Day, & Schwartz, 2015) and findings from the coping with racism literature that emphasize social support (e.g., Brown, Phillips, Abdullah, Vinson, & Robertson, 2011; Sanchez et al., 2018; Whitbeck et al., 2002). This factor included items related to educating others, suggesting that education may be experienced as a means to build connections to resist racism, in contrast to confrontation. The mean endorsement of items in this subscale was the highest overall (3.85). The inclusion of this factor accords with literature that recognizes that the core meaning of resistance includes action and opposition to injustice, and that resistance may also include "everyday" acts that may or may not be visible or recognized by those in power (Hollander & Einwohner, 2004; Turiel, 2003).

The Interpersonal Confrontation subscale reflects the actions of "standing up and fighting back" (Shorter-Gooden, 2004) and challenging others (Ng, 2017). It focuses on interpersonal

"calling out," which may manifest through directly addressing perpetrators' harmful or offensive statements or behaviors in interpersonal interactions. Confrontation involves resistance that is both direct and interpersonal. The fact that this factor is distinct from the Awareness and Relational Resistance factor may reflect the way that Interpersonal Confrontation can be interpersonally isolating, which may be riskier for people of color depending on the context and nature of the relationship. This is supported by slightly lower mean endorsement, compared to Awareness and Relational Resistance (3.50). The Interpersonal Confrontation factor may represent a form of resistance that emerges after some foundational level of intrapsychic awareness and relational support is established.

Although Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations and Leadership for Resistance subscales relate most clearly to more traditional understandings of resistance through social movements and collective action (Edelman, 2001; Harrell, 2000), mean endorsement of items in these subscales (3.24 and 2.09, respectively) was lower than the more interpersonally oriented subscales. The strong correlation of the Participation subscale with the overall REAR scale accords with Harrell's emphasis that the individual/collective dimension may be particularly related to coping with racism; the positive coping impact of participation and leadership could result not only from engaging in protest and organizing as direction action, but also from the experience of the protest being a collective and relational effort and experience, thereby supporting relational validation and resistance. Similar to the relationship of Relational Resistance to Interpersonal Confrontation, a possible distinction between Participation vs. Leadership for Resistance may relate to developmental trajectory; leadership may not emerge until there is some groundwork of participation.

The factor structure overall, and the pattern of mean endorsement, suggests an ecological model encompassing domains of relationships closest to oneself that support and foster resistance (internal and positive or intimate relationships), interpersonal interactions including those with non-intimates (confrontation), participation as part of a group on a more systemic level, and leadership of a group or activity to develop systemic resistance. These four areas also reflect varied levels of risk and burden upon one's own resources. For example, developing and contributing to supportive relationships through actions of Awareness and Relational Resistance is less likely to reflect emotional challenges of Interpersonal Confrontation, or the dedicated time required of Leadership for Resistance. The factor organization also suggests that it is not only the target of the activism or the shared basis of oppression that organizes these experiences of resistance; but also the level of engagement and centrality, leading to the distinction between Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations versus Leadership for Resistance.

Interestingly, all items that were initially generated to reflect resisting internalizing racism (e.g., damage to self-worth and positive regard, White standards of beauty) loaded poorly for multiple racial groups, suggesting a construct separate from resistance. This would support a conceptual understanding of resistance as more outwardly directed action (Hollander & Einwohner, 2004), somewhat separate from internalized racism or decolonizing the mind (David & Okazaki, 2006). This understanding of resistance is related to empowerment (Cattaneo & Chapman, 2010) to the extent that empowerment is agentic action directed at systemic issues rather than individual issues.

Three items initially generated to reflect indirect resistance were also dropped. Measuring indirect resistance may be more difficult because of possible ambiguity: for example, the item "I disengage from people or conversations that racially stereotype or discriminate (e.g., avert my

eyes, turn my body away, physically move away)" could indicate a passive or avoidant reaction to racially biased moments rather than an active indirect action reflecting the recognition and intentionality that resistance or activism would require. The exclusion of these items suggests that it is particularly important to explicitly address the motivational aspect of actions for indirect resistance.

Results supported construct validity for the REAR, and our conceptualization of resistance as related to recognition of race and racism and their real effects on lived experience (the antithesis of color-blind racial attitudes); to positive evaluations of one's racial group and identity-based motivations for resistance; to active coping and social support, both emotional and instrumental; and as largely unrelated to coping through humor.

Limitations

Sample limitations related to gender and language may limit the generalizability of our results. Over 75% of the participants in our sample were women; this may be related to more women having interest in discussing their experiences with racism or to the effects of social media recruitment that led to oversampling women. Our sample included only participants with higher English fluency, preventing us from being able to examine the experiences of people of color with limited English proficiency.

Our choice to emphasize identifying a scale with a conceptual core of resistance common across four racialized groups allowed us to focus on elements of resistance that are centrally shared among people of color and establish a measure that can be used in studies with monoracial or multiracial samples. However, this approach also meant that the unique experiences of each racialized group are not captured by the REAR. In addition, we did not include the emerging racialized Middle Eastern and North African (MENA) group.

Additional limitations relate to item generation: As part of our measurement development process, we relied on our research team's personal, lived, and scholarly expertise in reviewing items for content and face validity. This was a strength in that this allowed us to take advantage of diverse perspectives in a depth consensual approach. However, it is possible that relying on students, faculty, and pre-existing literature may have limited our definition of resistance. We did not consult external experts, either scholarly experts (DeVellis, 2017) or through a community-based participatory process seeking perspectives from community members with lived expertise in the varied experience of racism and resistance. Future studies might use focus groups, open-ended questions, or other in-depth qualitative methodology to explore possible additional experiences of resistance from individuals in the community and/or consider a broader consensus among scholars and researchers.

Future Directions and Clinical Implications

The framework of resistance and empowerment against racism and the REAR measure could be tools for researchers and clinicians to consider how we may contribute to wellness for people of color by combatting racism at its systemic core (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 1997; Vera & Speight, 2003). This conceptualization may help clinicians to explore a wider range of behaviors that clients engage in to foster agency and empowerment to protect against the negative effects of racism.

Future studies examining the measurement model, validity, and generalizability of the REAR might examine its structure and validity for more balanced gender samples and for individuals who do not apriori self-identify as experiencing racism. Future research should also examine further the psychometric properties and validity of the 26-item REAR. One aspect of this would be to examine the internal reliability and factor structure of the 26 items with a new

sample, especially given that all of our participants took the full 50 items which may have introduced measurement error into the CFA analysis. Furthermore, the current study considered the resistance experiences of an aggregated group of people of color across race, seeking to identify resistance items that are shared across racial minorities. Future research with the REAR could examine measurement invariance within specific racialized groups, including the MENA group, to determine whether the items in the REAR are, indeed, a "common core" and also explore whether or how resistance against racism might be conceptualized or manifested differently within specific racialized groups through examining possible differences in factor structure and effects for specific racialized groups. Future research could also further examine the validity of the REAR through convergent relations with measures of coping with racism (e.g. Forsyth & Carter, 2014; Wei, Alvarez, Ku, Russell, & Bonnet, 2010) and measures that more directly assess awareness of structural racism and power asymmetries (e.g. the Critical Consciousness Scale from Diemer, Rapa, Park, & Perry, 2017; the Social Justice Attitudes Scale from Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olsen, 2012).

Moving beyond examining the measurement model, reliability, and validity, future studies using the REAR could explore how resistance against racism might relate to mental health, wellbeing, and other related outcomes and/or act as a potential moderator of the negative effects of racism and racism-related stress on mental health for people of color generally or within specific racialized groups. Additionally, qualitative research would help researchers and clinicians better understand the lived meanings and impact of resistance, resistance experiences, the process of engaging in resistance, and how resistance develops and is sustained among people of color.

Table 1

Initial 50 Items in 10 Conceptual Domains

Acknowledgement (2 items)

16. I trust my feelings that something is racial stereotyping or discrimination, even if I am not certain of the intent.	Retained
18. I actively notice experiences of racial stereotyping, or discrimination	Retained

Resisting Internalization (7 items)

5. I refuse to allow messages that racially stereotype or discriminate to diminish my self-worth.	LoCC. <.4 all groups
7R. I feel a lack of romantic attraction to people of my race.	LoCC. <.4 all groups
19. I feel good about being of my racial group despite messages that undermine that feeling.	LoCC. <.4 NA, <.5 As, Bl
28R. I believe racial discrimination doesn't really impact me because most people treat me well.	LoCC. <.4 As, Bl, NA; <.5 Lat
36R. I try to look White (e.g., clothes, hair, makeup, etc.) to fit in.	LoCC. <.4 all groups
38. I know that it is not my fault when I experience racial stereotyping or discrimination.	LoCC. <.4 NA, <.5 As, Bl, Lat
50. I feel good about my skin color, hair, nose, eyes, and other facial features despite messages that my racial group features are unattractive.	LoCC. <.4 for all groups

Intentionality (5 items)

3R. I feel there is nothing I can do about racial discrimination, so I don't see a point in trying.	LoCC. < .4 all groups
17. I recognize that I have to actively work to address racial stereotyping or discrimination.	Retained
20. I am motivated to address racial discrimination when I think about future generations.	Retained
35. I believe that it is rewarding to stand up to racial discrimination, even though it is hard.	Retained
39. I seek to reduce and resist racial discrimination for the good of my community.[†]	Retained

Indirect Resistance (6 items)

4. When someone says something that racially stereotypes or discriminates, I deliberately change the subject.	LoCC. <.4 all groups
10. I disengage from people or conversations that racially stereotype or discriminate (e.g., avert my eyes, turn my body away, physically move away).	LoCC. <.4 all groups
33. I avoid watching movies, TV, videos, or reading media that perpetuate stereotypes or racial discrimination.*	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5

40. I boycott stores or businesses with practices that racially stereotype or discriminate (e.g., racist advertising, bias in hiring or serving, etc.)	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
34. I choose not to laugh at jokes that stereotype or racially discriminate.*,†	Retained
44. I remember instances of racial stereotyping or discrimination to have as examples of the existence of racism.	Retained

Providing and Seeking Social Validation and Support (6 items)

8. I remind others of my racial group that racism is real to help them clarify when something is or is not their fault.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
12. I seek to develop closer relationships with people who support my active resistance to racial discrimination.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
14. I distance myself from people who are unwilling to address their racial stereotyping or biases.	Retained
27. I support and validate others when they experience racial stereotyping or discrimination	Retained
31. I share my own experiences of racial stereotyping and discrimination in order to validate others' experiences.	Retained
42. I publicly respond to other's online postings about racial discrimination.	Retained

Expressive Resistance/Arts (2 items)

32. I create art, music, or poetry that is about race or racial discrimination.*	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
47. I share or promote art, music, or poetry created by others that is about race or racial discrimination.	

Educating Self and Others (5 items)

1. I engage in conversations with others about race and racial discrimination directly in person or online.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
22. I use social media to educate others and share information about race and racial discrimination.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
26. I educate myself about race and racial discrimination.	Retained
43. I educate others about race and racial discrimination.	Retained
45. I educate myself about how being from my racial group interacts with experiences of privilege and oppression in other areas to affect my life (e.g., interactions of race with sexual orientation, gender or social class).	Retained

Interpersonal Confrontation (3 items)

2. I confront my acquaintances when they do or say something that racially stereotypes or discriminates.	Retained
6. I confront my friends and family when they do or say something that racially stereotypes or discriminates.	Retained
37. I point it out to people when they say something that stereotypes or racially discriminates.	Retained

Organizing and Protest (6 items)

30. I organize vigils or protests that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	LoCC. <.4 As, Bl, Lat
11. I sign petitions, write letters, or make phone calls that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
29. I participate in vigils or protests that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
9. I create or lead activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.*	Retained
15. I organize petitions, letter writing, or phone drives that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.*,†	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
21. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	Retained

Building coalitions and recognizing intersectionality (8 items)

24. I advocate for racial equality in spaces that are not focused on race or racial discrimination (e.g., feminist spaces, religious spaces, or queer spaces).	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
41. I take actions that aim to reduce or resist all forms of oppression, not just racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, ableism).	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
48. I seek out relationships with other racial minorities to take a stand together against racial discrimination.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
49. I actively build coalitions across groups of marginalized identities (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, etc.) to reduce or resist oppression.	Dropped from EFA, loaded <.5
13. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist all forms of oppression, not only racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, etc.).	Retained
23. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination for all people of color, not only my racial group	Retained
25. I create or lead activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination for all people of color, not only my racial group.*	Retained

46. I create or lead activities or organizations that that aim to reduce or resist all forms of   Retained
oppression, not only racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, etc.).*

Note: REAR=Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism scale. As=Asian, Bl=Black, Lat=Latinx, NA=Native American. LoCC=Lack of common core, meaning that the item was dropped because it did not load at the .4 or greater level for at least one of the individual racial groups (Asian, Black, Latinx, Native American) in preliminary group-specific EFAs. The groups that had loadings less than .5 are specified.

*In the preliminary group-specific analyses, these items loaded between .4 and .5 for some racial groups but did not load less than .4 for any racial group.

†These items (15, 34, 39) failed to load above .5 on any factor in the initial combined group EFA. However, they all loaded between .4 and .5 and did not cross-load above .3. They were retained for conceptual contributions.

Table 2

Participant Demographics

	Total Sample	Retest Participants
Age	Range: 18 to 76 years ($M = 25.26$, $SD = 9.10$)	Range: 18 to 67 ($M = 25.45$, $SD = 8.38$)

Race	Asian American: $n = 257$ (27%)
	Black $n = 244$ (25.6%)
	Latinx/Hispanic, non-White: $n = 243$ (25.5%)
	Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native/
	   Indigenous: $n = 115$ (12.1%)
	Multiracial: $n = 45$ (4.7%)
	Other: $n = 49$ (5.1%)
		Asian American: $n = 54$ (28.1%)
		Black: $n = 41$ (21.4%)
		Latinx/Hispanic, non-White: $n = 45$ (23.4%)
		Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native/
		   Indigenous: $n = 35$ (18.2%)
		Multiracial: $n = 9$ (4.7%)
		Other: $n = 8$ (4.1%)

Gender	Female: $n = 723$; 75.9%) Male: $n = 151$ (15.8%) Nonbinary, Transgender, Queer, or Agender: $n = 72$ (7.6%) Did not answer: $n = 7$	Female: $n = 140$ (72.9%) Male: $n = 35$ (18.2%) Nonbinary, Transgender, Queer, or Agender: $n = 16$ (8.3%) Did not answer: $n = 1$
Income	$0 - $15,000: $n = 206$ (21.6%) $15,001 - $25,000: $n = 120$ (12.6%) $25,001 - $35,000: $n = 129$ (13.5%) $35,001 - $50,000: $n = 125$ (13.1%) $50,001 - $75,000: $n = 107$ (11.2%) $75,001 - $100,000: $n = 111$ (11.6%) $100,001 - $200,000: $n = 104$ (10.9%) More than $200,000: $n = 31$ (3.3%) Did not answer: $n = 20$ (2.1%)	$0 - $15,000: $n = 36$ (18.8%) $15,001 - $25,000: $n = 29$ (15.1%) $25,001 - $35,000: $n = 25$ (13.0%) $35,001 - $50,000: $n = 19$ (9.9%) $50,001 - $75,000: $n = 28$ (14.6%) $75,001 - $100,000: $n = 23$ (12.0%) $100,001 - $200,000: $n = 23$ (12.0%) More than $200,000: $n = 8$ (4.2%) Did not answer: $n = 1$ (0.5%)

Education	Less than high school: $n = 16$ (1.7%)	Less than high school: $n = 3$ (1.5%)
	HS diploma: $n = 115$ (12.1%)	High School diploma: $n = 15$ (7.8%)
	Some college, Associates, or post-HS trade certification: $n = 467$ (49%)	Some college, Associates, or post-HS trade certification: $n = 85$ (44.27%)
	Bachelor's degree: $n = 226$ (23.7%)	Bachelor's degree: $n = 53$ (27.6%)
	Graduate degree: $n = 125$ (13%)	Graduate degree $n = 36$ (19%)
	Did not answer: $n = 4$ (0.4%)	
Place born	U.S.: $n = 708$ (74.3%)	U.S.: $n = 152$ (79%)
	U.S. territory: $n = 8$ (0.8%)	U.S. territory: $n = 1$ (0.5%)
	Outside of U.S.: $n = 217$ (22.8%)	Outside of U.S.: $n = 38$ (19.8%)
	Did not answer: $n = 20$ (2.1%)	Did not answer: $n = 1$ (0.5%)

Note: Total sample N = 953, Retest sample N = 192. Multiracial participants who stated that they primarily identified with a single racial group are included within that racial group; the Multiracial category therefore includes those participants who stated instead that they primarily identified as multiracial without particular relation to specific heritages, as mixed/both/multiple races or heritages (later specified), or as other. Income is likely skewed by the inclusion of students—see Education.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations with REAR for Variables

Measure	REAR Total	REAR ARR	REAR IC	REAR PAR	REAR LEAD	N	Mean	SD	Internal Reliability (α)
REAR Total						953	90.33	23.29	.96
REAR ARR	.95**†††					953	61.52	15.16	.95
REAR IC	.73**†††	.68**†††				953	10.70	3.2	.85
REAR PAR	.82**†††	.68**†††	.48**†††			953	9.72	4.09	.92
REAR LEAD	.66**†††	.43**†††	.35**††	.69**†††		953	8.38	4.78	.89
CoBRAS	-.63**†††	-.67**†††	-.43**††	-.46**††	-.23**†	899	35.94	14.22	.90
BCOPE_Active Coping	.45**†††	.40**††	.30**††	.41**††	.38**††	949	4.85	1.84	.74
BCOPE_Emotional Sup	.34**††	.31**††	.20**†	.31**††	.27**††	949	4.55	2.01	.86
BCOPE_Humor	.04	.02	-.01	.06	.08*†	949	3.82	1.97	.89
BCOPE_Instrumental Sup	.39**††	.37**††	.20**†	.34**††	.29**††	948	4.55	1.64	.85
BCOPE_Planning	.45**††	.43**††	.28**†	.37**††	.34**††	943	4.91	1.90	.80
CSES_Identity	.51**†††	.51**†††	.33**††	.40**††	.28**††	931	5.63	1.21	.76
CSES_Membership	.23**†	.16**†	.18**†	.25**†	.29**†††	939	4.95	1.41	.80
CSES_Private esteem	.28*†	.28**†	.22**†	.22**†	.14**†	934	5.99	1.03	.81
CSES_Public regard	-.31**††	-.34**††	-.24**†	-.22**†	-.10**†	941	3.30	1.37	.81

Note: The Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism scale (REAR: total scores range from 26 to 130); ARR = REAR Awareness and Relational Resistance (scores range from 16 to 80), IC = REAR Interpersonal Confrontation (scores range from 3 to 15), PAR = Participating in Resistance Activities and Organizations (scores range from 3 to 15), LEAD = Leadership for Resistance (scores range from 4 to 20). CoBRAS = Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (total score range from 20 to 120). BCOPE = Brief COPE (subscale scores range from 2 to 8), subscales: Emotional Sup = Use of emotional support, Instrumental Sup= Use of instrumental support. CSES = Collective Self-Esteem Scale.
*p < .05, **p < .01, †Small effect (.10), ††Medium effect (.30), †††Large effect (.50). Reliability was conducted using Cronbach's alpha.

Table 4

Items and Factor Loadings for Group One EFA and Group Two CFA

Item	Group One EFA				Group Two CFA			
	FI	F2	F3	F4	F1	F2	F3	F4
Factor 1: Awareness and Relational Resistance								
14. I distance myself from people who are unwilling to address their racial stereotyping or biases.	.585*	0.123	0.059	-0.201*	.625*			
16. I trust my feelings that something is racial stereotyping or discrimination, even if I am not certain of the intent.	.535*	0.020	0.064	0.035	.678*			
17. I recognize that I have to actively work to address racial stereotyping or discrimination.	.674*	0.063	0.089	0.027	.823*			
18. I actively notice experiences of racial stereotyping, or discrimination.	.718*	0.078	0.018	-0.050	.801*			
20. I am motivated to address racial discrimination when I think about future generations.	.591*	0.162	0.115	-0.28	.821*			
26. I educate myself about race and racial discrimination.	.904*	-0.015	-0.079	-0.032	.814*			
27. I support and validate others when they experience racial stereotyping or discrimination.	.871*	-0.027	-0.063	0.013	.805*			
31. I share my own experiences of racial stereotyping and discrimination in order to validate others' experiences.	.654*	0.020	-0.054	0.162*	.709*			
34. I choose not to laugh at jokes that stereotype or racially discriminate.	.540*	.239*	.014	-.253*	.597*			
35. I believe that it is rewarding to stand up to racial discrimination, even though it is hard.	.760*	-.045	.080	-.079	.713*			
39. I seek to reduce and resist racial discrimination for the good of my community.	.564*	.260*	.052	.013	.803*			

42. I publicly respond to other's online postings about racial discrimination.	.462*	.129	.195*	.052	.695*
43. I educate others about race and racial discrimination.	.687*	-.021	.103	.204*	.834*
44. I remember instances of racial stereotyping or discrimination to have as examples of the existence of racism.	.769*	.006	.002	.045	.819*
45. I educate myself about how being from my racial group interacts with experiences of privilege and oppression in other areas to affect my life (e.g., interactions of race with sexual orientation, gender or social class).	.955*	-.039	-.167*	.050	.827*
47. I share or promote art, music, or poetry created by others that is about race or racial discrimination.	.475*	.238*	.021	.029	.659*

Factor 2: Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations

13. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist all forms of oppression, not only racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, etc.).	.127*	.698*	-.010	.028	.870*
21. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	.023	.804*	-.006	.147*	.880*
23. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination for all people of color, not only my racial group.	.100	.913*	.010	.017	.884*

Factor 3: Interpersonal Confrontation

2. I confront my acquaintances when they do or say something that racially stereotypes or discriminates.	-.020	.058	.868*	-.002	.787*

6. I confront my friends and family when they do or say something that racially stereotypes or discriminates.	.139	-.071	.629*	.078	.779*
37. I point it out to people when they say something that stereotypes or racially discriminates.	.195*	.004	.699*	-.008	.881*

Factor 4: Leadership for Resistance

9. I create or lead activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	-.056	.213*	-.005	.735*	.851*
15. I organize petitions, letter writing, or phone drives that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	.004	.196*	.134*	.447*	.672*
25. I create or lead activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination for all people of color, not only my racial group.	.050	.180*	.027	.724*	.862*
46. I create or lead activities or organizations that that aim to reduce or resist all forms of oppression, not only racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, etc.).	.069*	.020	.010	.840*	.856*

Note: *$p < .001$; The first ten eigenvalues for the four factor EFA were: 12.760, 2.779, 1.243, 0.858, 0.811, 0.703, 0.649, 0.552, 0.533, 0.505.

Table 5

EFA and CFA Fit Indices

EFA Model: Group One	*df*	χ2	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	(95% CI)	SRMR
4-Factor	227	625.984	.951	.929	.061	(.055-.066)	.026
5-Factor	205	525.133	.960	.937	.056	(.051-.063)	.021

CFA Model: Group Two	*df*	χ2	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	(95% CI)	SRMR
4-Factor	293	821.762	.934	.927	.062	(.057-.067)	.044

Note: EFA Group One, N = 477, and CFA Group Two, N = 476. *df* = degrees of freedom; χ2 = Chi-squared; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker Lewis index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual.

Table 6

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Correlations

	1. Awareness and Relational Resistance	2. Participation in Resistance Activities	3. Interpersonal Confrontation
1. Awareness and Relational Resistance	--		
2. Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations	.73*	--	
3. Interpersonal Confrontation	.76*	.55*	--
4. Leadership for Resistance	.43*	.73*	.38*

*Note: *p* < .001*

Table 7

Item Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Mean ($\bar{x}$) SD (s)
Factor 1: Awareness and Relational Resistance						
14. I distance myself from people who are unwilling to address their racial stereotyping or biases.	88 9.2%	102 1.7%	136 14.3%	216 22.7%	411 43.1%	$\bar{x}$ =3.80 s=1.339
16. I trust my feelings that something is racial stereotyping or discrimination, even if I am not certain of the intent.	66 6.9%	135 14.2%	198 20.8%	296 31.1%	258 27.1%	$\bar{x}$ =3.57 s=1.219
17. I recognize that I have to actively work to address racial stereotyping or discrimination.	54 5.7%	91 9.5%	149 15.6%	255 26.8%	404 42.4%	$\bar{x}$ =3.91 s=1.210
18. I actively notice experiences of racial stereotyping, or discrimination.	31 3.3%	86 9.0%	130 13.6%	281 29.5%	425 44.6%	$\bar{x}$ =4.03 s=1.120
20. I am motivated to address racial discrimination when I think about future generations.	48 5.0%	76 8.0%	128 13.4%	219 23.0%	482 50.6%	$\bar{x}$ =4.06 s=1.188
26. I educate myself about race and racial discrimination.	25 2.6%	59 6.2%	80 8.4%	202 21.2%	587 61.6%	$\bar{x}$ =4.33 s=1.037
27. I support and validate others when they experience racial stereotyping or discrimination.	28 2.9%	52 5.5%	109 11.4%	211 22.1%	553 58.0%	$\bar{x}$ =4.27 s=1.052
31. I share my own experiences of racial stereotyping and discrimination in order to validate others' experiences.	103 10.8%	138 14.5%	205 21.5%	225 23.6%	282 29.6%	$\bar{x}$ =3.47 s=1.334
34. I choose not to laugh at jokes that stereotype or racially discriminate.	67 7.0%	121 12.7%	115 12.1%	176 18.5%	474 49.7%	$\bar{x}$ =3.91 s=1.324
35. I believe that it is rewarding to stand up to racial discrimination, even though it is hard.	33 3.5%	54 5.7%	100 10.5%	226 23.7%	540 56.7%	$\bar{x}$ =4.24 s=1.073
39. I seek to reduce and resist racial discrimination for the good of my community.	67 7.0%	118 12.4%	156 16.4%	225 23.6%	387 40.6%	$\bar{x}$ =3.78 s=1.286
42. I publicly respond to other's online postings about racial discrimination.	194 20.4%	133 14.0%	169 17.7%	181 19.0%	276 29.0%	$\bar{x}$ =3.22 s=1.502

43. I educate others about race and racial discrimination.	78	114	167	246	348	$\bar{x} = 3.71$
	8.2%	12.0%	17.5%	25.8%	36.5%	s=1.292
44. I remember instances of racial stereotyping or discrimination to have as examples of the existence of racism.	66	86	157	227	417	$\bar{x} = 3.88$
	6.9%	9.0%	16.5%	23.8%	43.8%	s=1.255
45. I educate myself about how being from my racial group interacts with experiences of privilege and oppression in other areas to affect my life (e.g., interactions of race with sexual orientation, gender or social class).	51	68	124	219	491	$\bar{x} = 4.08$
	5.4%	7.1%	13.0%	23.0%	51.5%	s=1.186
47. I share or promote art, music, or poetry created by others that is about race or racial discrimination.	217	105	137	204	290	$\bar{x} = 3.26$
	22.8%	11.0%	14.4%	21.4%	30.4%	s=1.546

Factor 2: Participation in Resistance Activities and Organizations

13. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist all forms of oppression, not only racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, etc.).	157	134	158	216	288	$\bar{x} = 3.36$
	16.5%	14.1%	16.6%	22.7%	30.2%	s=1.452
21. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	197	160	181	178	237	$\bar{x} = 3.10$
	20.7%	16.8%	19.0%	18.7%	24.9%	s=1.472
23. I participate in activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination for all people of color, not only my racial group.	184	141	155	191	282	$\bar{x} = 3.26$
	19.3%	14.8%	16.3%	20.0%	29.6%	s=1.497

Factor 3: Interpersonal Confrontation

2. I confront my acquaintances when they do or say something that racially stereotypes or discriminates.	79	152	239	257	226	$\bar{x} = 3.42$
	8.3%	15.9%	25.1%	27.0%	23.7%	s=1.239
6. I confront my friends and family when they do or say something that racially stereotypes or discriminates.	60	121	200	267	305	$\bar{x} = 3.67$
	6.3%	12.7%	21.0%	28.0%	32.0%	s=1.223
37. I point it out to people when they say something that stereotypes or racially discriminates.	47	139	215	283	269	$\bar{x} = 3.62$
	4.9%	14.6%	22.6%	29.7%	28.2%	s=1.179

Factor 4: Leadership for Resistance

9. I create or lead activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	479 50.3%	143 15.0%	116 12.2%	110 11.5%	105 11.0%	$\bar{x}$ =2.18 s=1.431
15. I organize petitions, letter writing, or phone drives that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination.	570 59.8%	155 16.3%	112 11.8%	60 6.3%	56 5.9%	$\bar{x}$ =1.82 s=1.211
25. I create or lead activities or organizations that aim to reduce or resist racial discrimination for all people of color, not only my racial group.	438 46.0%	153 6.1%	136 14.3%	89 9.3%	137 14.4%	$\bar{x}$ =2.30 s=1.477
46. I create or lead activities or organizations that that aim to reduce or resist all forms of oppression, not only racism (e.g., sexism, classism, heterosexism, etc.).	521 54.7%	127 13.3%	120 12.6%	83 8.7%	102 10.7%	$\bar{x}$ =2.07 s=1.407

Note: 1 = almost never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = almost always.

Table 8

Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Reliability

	Time 1		Time 2			Combined sample
	M (SD)	α	*M (SD)*	α	Test-retest *r*	internal consistency (α)
REAR Total	90.29 (23.18)	.95	88.68 (23.62)	.96	.88	.96
REAR ARR	60.97 (14.46)	.94	60.23 (14.76)	.95	.88	.95
REAR IC	10.34 (3.27)	.87	10.36 (3.20)	.88	.98	.85
REAR PAR	10.02 (4.16)	.93	9.65 (4.13)	.94	.81	.92
REAR LEAD	8.96 (5.08)	.89	8.44 (5.13)	.91	.84	.89

Note: Time 1 and Time 2 means, standard deviations, and reliabilities reported for the 192 participants who took the REAR at both Time 1 and at Time 2. Combined sample reliability reported for the whole sample (N = 953) from Time 1 administration. The Resistance and Empowerment Against Racism Scale (REAR: total scores range from 26 to 130); ARR = REAR Awareness and Relational Resistance (scores range from 16 to 80), IR = REAR Interpersonal Confrontation (scores range from 3 to 15), PAR = Participating in Resistance Activities and Organizations (scores range from 3 to 15), Lead = Leadership for Resistance (scores range from 4 to 20).

References

Alamilla, S. G., Kim, B. S., & Lam, N. A. (2010). Acculturation, enculturation, perceived

racism, minority status stressors, and psychological symptomatology among

Latino/as. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *32*(1), 55-76. doi:

10.1177/0739986309352770

Alvarez, A. N., Juang, L., & Liang, C. T. H. (2006). Asian Americans and racism: When bad

things happen to "Model Minorities." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority

Psychology*, *12*(3), 477–492. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.12.3.477

Arellano-Morales, L., Roesch, S.C., Gallo, L.C., Emory, K.T., Molina, K.M., Gonzalez, P.,

…Brondolo, E. (2015). Prevalence and correlates of perceived ethnic discrimination in

the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos Sociocultural Ancillary Study.

Journal of Latino/a Psychology, *3*(3), 160-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lat0000040

Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. (1997). A stitch in time: Self-regulation and proactive coping.

Psychological Bulletin, 121(3), 417-436. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.121.3.417

Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quinonez, H. R., & Young, S. L.

(2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and

behavioral research: A primer. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *6* (159). 1-18. doi:

10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149

Bonilla-Silva, E., & Dietrich, D. (2011). The sweet enchantment of color-blind racism in

Obamerica. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *634*(1),

190–206. doi: 10.1177/0002716210389702

Brown, T. L., Phillips, C.M., Abdullah, A., Vinson, E., & Robertson, J. (2011). Dispositional

versus situational coping: Are the coping strategies African Americans use different for

general versus racism-related stressors? *Journal of Black Psychology, 37*(3), 311-335.

doi: 10.1177/0095798410390688

Burton, M. (2013). Liberation psychology: A constructive critical praxis. *Estudos de*

Psicologia, 30 (2), 249-259. doi: 10.1590/S0103-166X2013000200011

Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-

multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56(2*), 81-105.

Cattaneo, L. B., & Chapman, A. R. (2010). The process of empowerment: A model for use in

research and practice. *American Psychologist, 65*(7), 646-659. doi.org/10.1037/a0018854

Carver, C. S. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: Consider the

Brief COPE. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *4*, 92-100.

doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6

Chen, F., Curran, P. J., Bollen, K. A., Kirby, J., & Paxton, P. (2008). An empirical evaluation of

the use of fixed cutoff points in RMSEA test statistic in structural equation

models. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *36*(4), 462-494. doi:

10.1177/0049124108314720

Cicchetti, D. (1999). Sample size requirements for increasing the precision of reliability

estimates: Problems and proposed solutions. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental*

Neuropsychology 21, 567-570.

Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and

psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality*

and Social Psychology Bulletin, *20*(5), 503–513. doi: 10.1177/0146167294205007

Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological*

Bulletin, *52*, 281–302

David, E. J. R. & Okazaki, S. (2006). The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) for Filipino

    Americans: Scale construction and psychological implications. *Journal of Counseling*

    Psychology, 53(2), 241-252. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.2.241

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications, 4th edition.* Thousand Oaks,

    CA: Sage Publications.

Diemer, M. A., Rapa, L. J., Park, C. J., & Perry, J. C. (2017). Development and validation of the

    Critical Consciousness Scale. *Youth & Society*, *49*(4), 461–483. https://doi-

    org.ezproxy.lib.umb.edu/10.1177/0044118X14538289

Eason, E. A., & Robbins, R. (2012). Walking in beauty: An American Indian perspective on

    social justice. *Counseling & Values*, *57*(1), 18-23. doi:10.1002/j.2161-

    007X.2012.00003.x

Edelman, M. (2001). Social movements: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual*

    Review of Anthropology, 30, 285-317. doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.285

Eisenbarth, C. (2012). Coping profiles & psychological distress: A cluster analysis. *North*

    American Journal of Psychology, 14(3), 485-496.

Flora, D. B., & Flake, J. K. (2017). The purpose and practice of exploratory and confirmatory

    factor analysis in psychological research: Decisions for scale development and validation.

    Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, *49*(2), 78-88.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000069

Forsyth, J. M., & Carter, R. T. (2014). Development and preliminary validation of the Racism-

    Related Coping Scale. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and*

    Policy, *6*(6), 632. doi: 10.1037/a0036702

Gehlbach, H. & Brinkworth, M.E. (2011). Measure twice, cut down error: A process for

enhancing the validity of survey scales. *Review of General Psychology, 15*(4), 380-387.

doi: 10.1037/a0025704

Haenfler, R., Johnson, B., & Jones, E. (2012). Lifestyle movements: Exploring the intersection

of lifestyle and social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, *11*(1), 1-20. doi:

10.1080/14742837.2012.640535

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*(1), 42–

57. doi: 10.1037/h0087722

Haverkamp, B. E. (2005). Ethical perspectives on qualitative research in applied psychology.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52(2), 146-155. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.146

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S., & Ladany, N. (2005).

Consensual Qualitative Research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*,

196-205. doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.196

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual

qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*, 517-572.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000097254001

Hollander, J.A. & Einwohner, R.L. (2004). Conceptualizing resistance. *Sociological Forum,

19*(4), 533-554. Doi: 10.1007/s11206-004-0694-5

Hudson, D. L., Neighbors, H. W., Geronimus, A. T., & Jackson, J. S. (2016). Racial

discrimination, John Henryism, and depression among African Americans. *Journal of

Black Psychology, 42*(3), 221-243. doi: 10.1177/0095798414567757

Hwang, W.-C., & Goto, S. (2008). The impact of perceived racial discrimination on the mental

health of Asian American and Latino college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *14*(4), 326–335. http://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.14.4.326

Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer Publishing.

Lee, D. L. & Ahn, S. (2011). Racial discrimination and Asian mental health: A meta-analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist, 39*(3), 463-489. doi: 10.1177/0011000010381791

Lee, D. L. & Ahn, S. (2012). Discrimination against Latina/os: A meta-analysis of individual-level resources and outcomes. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40*, 28-65. doi: 10.1177/0011000011403326

Lee, R. M. (2003). Do ethnic identity and other-group orientation protect against discrimination for Asian Americans? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(2), 133–141. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.13

Liu, C. M., & Suyemoto, K. L. (2016). The effects of racism-related stress on Asian Americans: Anxiety and depression among different generational statuses. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 7*(2), 137-146. doi: 10.1037/aap0000046

Luhtanen, R. & Crocker, J. (1992). A Collective Self-Esteem Scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*(3), 302-318. doi: 10.1177/0146167292183006

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Meade, A. W & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods, 17* (3), 437-55. doi: 0.1037/a0028085

Monzani, D., Steca, P., Greco, A., D'Addario, M., Cappelletti, E., & Pancani, L. (2015). The

situational version of the Brief COPE: Dimensionality and relationships with goal-related

variables. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *11*(2), 295–310.

https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v11i2.935

Morgado, F., Meireles, J., Neves, C., Amaral, A., & Ferreira, M. (2017). Scale development: Ten

main limitations and recommendations to improve future research practices. *Psicologia:*

Reflexão E Crítica, *30*(1), 1-20.

Mossakowski, K. N. (2003). Coping with perceived discrimination: Does ethnic identity predict

mental health? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *44*(3), 318–331. doi:

10.2307/1519782

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2017). Mplus User's Guide. Eighth Edition. Los Angeles,

CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Neville, H.A., Coleman, M.N., Falconer, J.W., Holmes, D. (2005). Color-blind racial ideology

and psychological false consciousness among African Americans. *Journal of Black*

Psychology, 31, 27-45.

Neville, H., Lilly, R.L., Duran, G., & Lee, R., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial

validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 47, 59-70. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59.

Ng, F. (2017). Asian American women's strategies for resisting intersectional racism and sexism

in leadership. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts, Boston,

MA.

NPR (2017a). Discrimination in America: Experiences and views of African Americans.

Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/assets/img/2017/10/23/discriminationpoll-african-

americans.pdf

NPR (2017b). Discrimination in America: Experiences and views of Native Americans.

Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/documents/2017/nov/NPR-discrimination-native-

americans-final.pdf

Pearson, M. R., Derlega, V. J., Henson, J. M., Holmes, K. Y., Ferrer, R. A., & Harrison, S. B.

(2014). Role of neuroticism and coping strategies in psychological reactions to a racist

incident among African American university students. *Journal of Black

Psychology*, *40*(1), 81-111. doi: 10.1177/0095798412471682

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

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), 1–9. doi: 10.1037/a0026208

Pieterse, A. L., Utsey, S. O., & Miller, M. J. (2016). Development and initial validation of the

anti-racism behavioral inventory (ARBI). *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(4), 356-

381. doi: 10.1080/09515070.2015.1101534

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual review of

Sociology*, *27*(1), 283-305. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.283

Prilleltensky, I., & Nelson, G. (1997). Community psychology: Reclaiming social justice. In D.

Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 166-184).

Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Raykov, T. & Marcoulides, G. (2011*). Introduction to psychometric theory*. New York:

Routledge.

Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change. *Political Psychology*, *25*(6), 921–945. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00403.x

Rodriguez, D. (2011). Silent rage and the politics of resistance: Countering seductions of Whiteness and the road to politicization and empowerment. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(7), 589-598. doi:10.1177/1077800411413994

Roemer, L.**,** Martinez, J. H., Eustis, E. H., **&** Orsillo, S. M. (2017). Some current and future directions in mindfulness and acceptance-based behavioral therapies for anxiety and related challenges: Identifying common factors and addressing specific contexts. *The Clinical Psychologist, 70,* 7-16.

Ruiz-Junco, N. (2012). Feeling social movements: Theoretical contributions to social movement research on emotions. *Sociology Compass, 7*(1), 45-54. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12006

Sanchez, D., Adams, W. N., Arango, S. C., & Flannigan, A. E. (2018). Racial-ethnic microaggressions, coping strategies, and mental health in Asian American and Latinx American college students: A mediation model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *65*(2), 214-225. doi:10.1037/cou0000249

Shorter-Gooden, K. (2004). Multiple resistance strategies: How African American women cope with racism and sexism. *Journal of Black Psychology, 30*(3), 406-425. doi: 10.1177/0095798404266050

Sohl, S. J., & Moyer, A. (2009). Refining the conceptualization of an important future-oriented self-regulatory behavior: Proactive coping. *Personal and Individual Differences, 47*(2), 139-144. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.02.013

Srivastava, S. (2005). "You're calling me a racist?" The Moral and Emotional Regulation of

    Antiracism and Feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society*, *31*(1), 29-62.

Suyemoto, K. L., Day, S. C., & Schwartz, S. (2015). Exploring effects of social justice youth

    programming on racial and ethnic identities and activism for Asian American youth.

    Asian American Journal of Psychology, *6*(2), 125–135. https://doi-

    org.ezproxy.lib.umb.edu/10.1037/a0037789

Suyemoto, K. L., Erisman, S. M., Holowka, D.W., Fuchs, C., Barrett-Model, H., Ng, F., Liu, C.,

    Chandler, D., Hazeltine, K. & Roemer, L. (2016). UMass Boston Comprehensive

    Demographic Questionnaire, Revised. In Wadsworth, L. P., Morgan, L. P., Hayes-

    Skelton, S. A., Roemer, L., & Suyemoto, K. L. Ways to boost your research rigor through

    increasing your cultural competence. *The Behavior Therapist, 39,* 83-91.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics, 6th Ed*. Pearson.

Tawa, J., Tauriac, J. J. & Suyemoto, K. L. (2016). Fostering inter-minority race-relations: An

    intervention with Black and Asian Students at an urban university. *Making Connections:

    Interdisciplinary Approaches to Cultural Diversity, 16*(2), 33-64.

Torres-Harding, S. R., Siers, B., & Olson, B. D. (2012). Development and psychometric

    evaluation of the Social Justice Scale (SJS). *American Journal of Community

    Psychology*, *50*(1–2), 77–88. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.umb.edu/10.1007/s10464-011-

    9478-2

Tucker, R.P., Wingate, L.R., & O'Kefe, V.M. (2016). Historical loss thinking and symptoms of

    depression are influenced by ethnic experience in American Indian college students.

    Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22(3), 350-358. doi:

    10.1037/cdp0000055

Turiel, E. (2003). Resistance and subversion in everyday life. *Journal of Moral Education, 32*(2), 115-130. doi.org/10.1080/0305724032000072906

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(3), 253-272. doi:10.1177/0011000003031003001

Walker, R. L., Francis, D., Brody, G. H., Simons, R. L., Cutrona, C., & Gibbons, F. X. (2017). A longitudinal study of racial discrimination and risk for death ideation in African American youth. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 47*(1), 86-102. doi: 10.1111/sltb.12251

Wei, M., Alvarez, A. N., Ku, T. Y., 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*(3), 328-344. doi: 10.1037/a0019969

Weston, Rebecca., Gore, P., (2006) A Brief Guide to Structural Equation Modeling: *The Counseling Psychologist 36(*5) 719-751 doi: 10.1177/0011000006286345

Whitbeck, L.B., McMorris, B.J., Hoyt, D.R., Stubben, J.D., & Lafromboise, T. (2002). Perceived discrimination, traditional practices, and depressive symptoms among American Indians in the upper midwest. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43*(4), 400-418. doi: 10.2307/3090234

Wilson, K.G., Sandoz, E. K., Kitchens, J., & Roberts, M. (2010). The Valued Living Questionnaire: Defining and measuring valued action within a behavioral framework. *Psychological Record, 60*(2), 249-272. doi: 10.1007/BF03395706

Yeh, C. J., Arora, A. K., & Wu, K. A. (2006). A new theoretical model of collectivistic coping. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *International and Cultural Psychology Series.*

Handbook of Multicultural Perspectives on Stress and Coping (pp. 55-72). Dallas, TX, US: Spring Publications. doi: 10.1007/0-387-26238-5_3