
***Race, Racism, Ethnicity,
Racial Discrimination &
Related Measures***



Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE (IRS)

Source/Primary reference	Barbarin, O. A., & Gilbert, R. (1981). Institutional racism scale: Assessing self and organizational attributes. In O. A. Barbarin, P. R. Good, O. M. Pharr, & J. Siskind (Eds.), <i>Institutional Racism and Community Competence</i> (pp.147-171). Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Construct measured	How individuals construe institutional racism, engage in anti-racism, and view organizational commitment to the reduction of racism
Brief description	<p>The IRS consists of four subscales that assess self attributes and two subscales that assess organizational attributes.</p> <p>The self-attribute subscales include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Indices of Racism subscale. This includes 8 items frequently cited in the literature as racist to assess individual sensitivity to racism. Respondents rate the items on the extent to which they believe the items are an indication of institutional racism (1 = not at all, 7 = most sensitive).2. Use of Strategies for Reducing Racism subscale. This subscale includes 7 interventions such as voting, litigation, educating friends, lobbying, and cross-racial interaction. Respondents are first asked to indicate on a four-point scale the effectiveness of the intervention (poor to excellent) and then the extent to which they have personally used these strategies for the purpose of reducing racism (1 = never, 5 = very frequently).3. Effectiveness of Strategies for Reducing Racism subscale. This subscale consists of 11 items that are similar to the above use items but the items are rated in relation to their effectiveness in reducing racism (1 = poor, 4 = excellent).4. Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism subscale. This subscale consists of 20 semantic differential ratings regarding how active and how favorably the respondents perceive themselves in reducing racism. <p>The organizational attribute subscales include:</p> <p>Agency Climate subscale. This subscale consists of 6 statements related to the extent to which the organizational policies and climate incorporate a respect for minorities and cultural diversity, e.g., in terms of interpersonal processes, decision-making processes, and reward system/ career development processes.</p> <p>Management/Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism subscale. This includes 20 semantic-differential ratings to describe how workers perceive management's efforts to reduce racism.</p>

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE (IRS)

Sample items

Indices of Racism:

- Personnel selection based on written tests.
- Seniority as a major criterion for promotion.

Organizational Attributes:

- Minority groups have little to say about decisions which affect functioning in this agency.
- The organization goes out of its way to make minorities feel at home.

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)

Adults

Translations & cultural adaptations available

None known

How developed

The initial IRS items were developed based on a literature review of dimensions of institutional racism. Administration of the original IRS raised questions about the suitability and wording of some of the items as well as about the length of time required to complete the questionnaire. The IRS was refined on the basis of Pearson's test-retest and Kuder Richardson's reliability tests. Items with a test-retest reliability of $r = .30$ or less or intercorrelation with their test mean of $.15$ or less were eliminated from their respective subscales. The final instrument consists of 72 items – 35 items were eliminated from the original IRS.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

The IRS was administered to three separate reference groups:

Group 1: A conference group. The first group consisted of 56 individuals from educational, religious, and mental health agencies who attended a three-day conference on institutional racism. The participants were given the IRS questionnaire both before and after the conference. A three-day interval separated the administration of pre- and post-tests. The IRS was a part of the battery used to evaluate the impact of the conference.

Group 2: A government group. This group included the employees of a single Federal agency (N was not given). The IRS questionnaire was administered on an individual basis with 2-3 month intervals separating pre- and post-test administrations. Also, this government group was asked to indicate examples of racism which had occurred at their workplaces and strategies for the reduction of racism which could potentially serve as measures of institutional racism against which IRS subscales could be compared.

Group 3: A student group. The student group included 48 students enrolled in an undergraduate community psychology class who participated in the study for course credit. A 2-month interval separated

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE (IRS)

the administration of pre- and post-tests. The questionnaire was designed to solicit comments about perceived weaknesses and/or ambiguities of the measures, as well as the extent to which the IRS had influenced further thinking about institutional racism.

Participants in all three groups were classified as minorities when they identified themselves as Afro-American, Asian-American, American Indian, or Latinos. Most of the minorities in the sample were Afro-American.

VALIDITY

Concurrent Validity

Pearson correlation coefficients of the IRS subscales among Group 2.

<i>IRS subscales</i>	<i>Spontaneous report of racist incidents</i>	<i>Identification of racist practice from a list</i>	<i>Hope for change</i>
<i>Indices of racism (n = 25)</i>	.33	.51**	-.20
<i>Effectiveness of strategies (n = 21)</i>	.10	.22	-.21
<i>Use of strategies (n = 19)^a</i>	.38	-.4**	.41*
<i>Personal efforts (n = 24)^a</i>	.16	.3	-.39*
<i>Agency policies (n = 25)</i>	.53**	.44*	.32
<i>Administrative efforts (n = 19)</i>	-.43*	-.26	.51*

^an in each cell varies slightly due to missing values

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$

RELIABILITY

Test-Retest and Internal Consistency

The IRS subscales' Test-Retest and KR-14 internal consistency correlations by racial and three reference groups

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE (IRS)

<i>IRS</i>	<i>Test-retest correlations</i>				
<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Minority</i>	<i>Non-minority</i>	<i>Group 1 (conference)</i>	<i>Group 2 (government)</i>	<i>Group 3 (students)</i>
<i>Indices of racism (n)</i>	.39 (16)	.6 (48)	.5 (8)	.72 (23)	.52 (37)
<i>Effectiveness of strategies (n)</i>	.66 (13)	.81 (42)	.87 (7)	.65 (19)	.79 (32)
<i>Use of strategies (n)</i>	.79 (9)	.69 (27)	.35 (9)	.7 (18)	.55 (11)
<i>Personal efforts (n)</i>	.85 (11)	.74 (42)	.98 (7)	.8 (17)	.7 (22)
<i>Agency policies (n)</i>	.61 (13)	.66 (39)	.95 (6)	.71 (19)	.60 (31)
<i>Administrative efforts (n)</i>	.72 (8)	.73 (37)	.97 (5)	.85 (19)	.69 (25)

<i>IRS</i>	<i>Internal consistency correlations</i>				
<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Minority</i>	<i>Non-minority</i>	<i>Group 1 (conference)</i>	<i>Group 2 (government)</i>	<i>Group 3 (students)</i>
<i>Indices of racism (n)</i>	na	na	na	na	na
<i>Effectiveness of strategies (n)</i>	.56 (45)	.56 (71)	.57 (49)	.26 (41)	.64 (41)
<i>Use of strategies (n)</i>	.69 (40)	.73 (60)	.55 (44)	.48 (34)	.76 (35)
<i>Personal efforts (n)</i>	.83 (42)	.91 (65)	.85 (39)	.88 (41)	.91 (37)
<i>Agency policies (n)</i>	.79 (37)	.72 (64)	.86 (38)	.69 (37)	.73 (38)
<i>Administrative efforts (n)</i>	.93 (33)	.94 (66)	.95 (35)	.91 (39)	.95 (36)

Comments

- The IRS seems to be a reliable measure of individual construction of racism, strategies for altering racist practices, and perceptions of agency climate.
- The IRS subscales seem to have good reliability and their validity is supported by their strong relationship with other measures of institutional racism.
- The IRS concentrates mostly on processes rather than outputs. Also, it provides global ratings that may require the addition of agency-specific items before recommendations for change can be developed.
- The full scale is available in the book chapter.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE (IRS)

- The post-questionnaire responses of the conference group participants may have been influenced by the conference itself, therefore affecting test-retest reliabilities. This group had only a 3-day interval between pre- and post-test administration whereas the two other reference groups had a 2-month interval.
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Jeanquart-Barone, S., & Sekaran, U. (1996) Institutional racism: An empirical study. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(4), 477-482.

Watts, R. J., & Carter, R. T. (1991). Psychological aspects of racism in organizations. *Group and Organization Management, 16*(3), 328-345.

Contact Information

Oscar A. Barbarin, Ph.D.
L. Richardson and Emily Preyer Bicentennial
Distinguished Professor for Strengthening Families
University of North Carolina School of Social Work
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3550, USA
Tel: 919 962-6405
Fax: 919 968-4033

Fellow, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute
Cheryl Mar North
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8040, USA
Tel: 919 843-6469
e-mail: barbarin@e-mail.unc.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

HISPANIC STRESS INVENTORY (HSI)

Source/Primary reference	Cervantes, R. C., Padilla, A. M., & Salgado de Snyder, N. (1991). The Hispanic Stress Inventory: A culturally relevant approach to psychosocial assessment. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i> , 3(3), 438-447.
Construct measured	Five psychological stressors in the Hispanic population: marital stress, family stress, occupational/economic stress, discrimination stress, and acculturation stress
Brief description	<p>There are two versions of the scale: one for immigrant Hispanics and one for U.S.-born Hispanics.</p> <p><u>Immigrant Version</u></p> <p>73 items (yes/no, then not at all stressful-extremely stressful)</p> <p>5 Subscales:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Occupational/Economic Stress 2. Parental Stress 3. Marital Stress 4. Immigration Stress 5. Family/Cultural Stress <p><u>U.S.-Born Version</u></p> <p>59 items (yes/no, then not at all stressful-extremely stressful)</p> <p>4 Subscales:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Occupational/Economic Stress 2. Parental Stress 3. Marital Stress 4. Family/Cultural Stress <p>Participants respond by rating whether they have experienced the situation described in each item during the past three months. If affirmative, the degree of stress that the participant associates with the corresponding item is to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all stressful to 5 = extremely stressful).</p>
Sample items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Since I'm Latino, I felt isolated at work. ■ Boss thought I was too passive. ■ Others worried about amount/quality of work I do.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Hispanic adults living in the US
Translations & cultural adaptations available	Spanish translation; there is an 11-item variation developed for Mexican women (Salgado de Snyder, 1987).

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

HISPANIC STRESS INVENTORY (HSI)

How developed

Phase 1: Semi-structured interview consisted of 33 open-ended questions around six psychological stress domains: marital stress, family stress, occupational stress, economic stress, discrimination stress, and acculturation stress. Interviews were tape-recorded. Commonly reported stressor events were identified, developed into short statements, and included in the initial 176 HSI items.

Phase 2: Five Hispanic judges – two women and three men – rated all 176 items and categorized them into six conceptually meaningful stressor categories (cultural, marital, familial, occupational, economic, and discrimination). Items could be assigned to as many categories as needed to allow overlapping. The judges were asked to pay attention to any awkwardly worded items or items that were irrelevant for the population. Through this process, a new refined HSI, with 133 items in five subscales, was developed.

Phase 3: The HSI developed in Phase 2 was administered to 493 people. The scale was refined further. If a particular item was reported to be experienced by less than 5% of immigrants, that item was deleted and not included in the further analysis. Items with means less than 2.0 (somewhat stressful) were also deleted. The construct validity and correlations with other pre-selected measures were examined. Two HSI versions were established: (i) for immigrant Hispanics, and (ii) for U.S.-born Hispanics.

Phase 4: Reliability estimates – estimates of internal consistency and test-retest procedure – were obtained.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES:

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Phase 1</i>	
		<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 43	<i>n</i> = 62
<i>Description</i>		convenience sample of 43 Hispanic adults	sample of 62 Mexican and Central American adults who were more recent immigrants - these respondents had 5 years of residency in the US
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range Mean Mean</i>	20-69 39	33.8
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	44.2%	50.0%
	<i>Male</i>	55.8%	50.0%
<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>Mexican born</i>	53.5%	
	<i>Mexican-American</i>	46.5%	
	<i>Mexican</i>		51.6%
	<i>Salvadoran</i>		27.4%
	<i>Guatemalan</i>		17.7%
	<i>Honduran</i>		1.6%
	<i>Nicaraguan</i>		1.6%

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

HISPANIC STRESS INVENTORY (HSI)

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Phase 3</i>	
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n= 493</i>	<i>n=141</i>
<i>Description</i>		Volunteers from two adult community schools located in the Central Downtown area of Los Angeles and East Los Angeles	To ensure cultural specificity of the HAS for Hispanic culture, items common to the Immigrant and U.S.-Born versions were administered to a <u>non-Hispanic sample</u> .
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i> <i>Mean</i>	17-56 23	17-40 22
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i> <i>Male</i>	<i>n=238 (48.3%)</i> <i>n=255 (51.7%)</i>	<i>n=78 (55.3%)</i> <i>n=63 (44.7%)</i>
<i>Education</i>		13 years	13 years
<i>Per Capita Income</i>		\$464 per month	\$1,147 per month
<i>Employed</i>		40.9%	66%
<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Married</i> <i>Single</i> <i>Divorced/Separated</i>	13.6% 79.6% 4.0%	11% - -
<i>Number of Children (mean)</i>		1.9	-
<i>Number of Persons Living at Home (Mean)</i>		4.9	-
<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>Mexican-born</i> <i>Central American</i> <i>Other Latin American</i> <i>U.S.-born</i> <i>Anglo-American</i>	3.2% 24.3% 9.5% 38.1%	- - - - 100%

VALIDITY

Content Validity

Phase 1: Commonly reported stressor events were identified through interviews. The initial 176 HSI items were selected and developed into a series of short statements.

Phase 2: Five Hispanic judges – two women and three men – rated all 176 items and categorized them into six conceptually meaningful stressor categories (cultural, marital, familial, occupational, economic, and discrimination). The judges reached complete agreement on the categorization of 79 items (45%). Four of five judges were in agreement on the assignment of an additional 52 items (30%). If an item was not categorized similarly by at least four of five judges, it was discarded, unless the item was seen as clinically important by the authors. Individual items were also removed if three of five judges thought the item to be unrelated to stress. The remaining 133 items were randomly ordered, producing a refined first version of HSI with five subscales; occupational and economic scales were combined.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

HISPANIC STRESS INVENTORY (HSI)

Construct Validity

The factor analyses yielded a five-factor solution for the immigrant subsample and a four-factor solution for the U.S.-born subsample. The average factor loading for the immigrant sample was .55 and for the U.S.-born sample it was .56.

Final factor solutions and influence on the total variance

<i>HSI Factors</i>	<i>% of total variance</i>
Immigrant Version subscales	
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	13
<i>Parental Stress</i>	8
<i>Marital Stress</i>	6
<i>Immigration Stress</i>	5
<i>Family/Culture Stress</i>	3
U.S.-Born Version subscales	
<i>Marital Stress</i>	13
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	10
<i>Parental Stress</i>	7
<i>Family Culture Stress</i>	6

To ensure the cultural specificity of the HSI to Hispanic culture, items common to both the immigrant and U.S.-born versions of the HSI were administered to the combined Hispanic sample (immigrant and U.S.-born), as well as to a non-Hispanic, Anglo-American sample. Factor analysis of the item responses of the combined Hispanic sample yielded five conceptually distinct factors, with the first factor accounting for 12% of the total variance, followed by 8%, 6%, 4%, and 3% for the remaining four factors. In contrast, comparative factor analysis of the item responses of the non-Hispanic sample yielded 12 factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Next, a five-factor extraction was performed on the item responses of the non-Hispanic sample for more direct comparison with the structure that emerged for the combined Hispanic sample. Results of this extraction demonstrated that the first factor accounted for a large percentage (29%) of the total variance and the remaining four factors accounted for an additional 17% of the variance. Further, the factors that did emerge were not interpretable. Thus, the factor matrix of item responses of the non-Hispanic sample differed markedly from that of the combined Hispanic sample, indicating the specificity of the HSI to Hispanic culture.

Pearson correlations were computed to examine the strength of the relationships between each of the HSI subscale scores and the pre-selected criterion measures: SCL-90-R = Symptom Checklist-90-

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

HISPANIC STRESS INVENTORY (HSI)

Revised (Derogatis, 1977); CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977); RSI = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1965); PCI = Campbell Personal Competence Inventory (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960).

<i>HSI Subscales</i>	<i>Symptomatology</i>		
	SCL-90-R		
	Somatization	Depression	Anxiety
Immigrant Version (n = 305)			
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	.21***	.26	.17
<i>Parental Stress</i>	.04	.11	.06
<i>Marital Stress</i>	.16	.20***	.17
<i>Immigration Stress</i>	.20***	.26***	.17
<i>Family/Culture Stress</i>	.30***	.36***	.31***
U.S.-Born Version (n = 188)			
<i>Marital Stress</i>	.12	.19	.19
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	.11	.22	.17
<i>Parental Stress</i>	.05	.07	.04
<i>Family Culture Stress</i>	.29***	.38***	.34***

*** $p < .001$

<i>HSI Subscales</i>	<i>Symptomatology</i>		
	CES-D	RSI	PCI
Immigrant Version (n = 305)			
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	.23***	-.15	.11
<i>Parental Stress</i>	.12	-.07	-.04
<i>Marital Stress</i>	.25***	-.06	-.02
<i>Immigration Stress</i>	.27***	-.10	.06
<i>Family/Culture Stress</i>	.45***	-.18***	-.04
U.S.-Born Version (n = 188)			
<i>Marital Stress</i>	.17	-.06	.14
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	.31***	-.07	.03
<i>Parental Stress</i>	.10	-.01	-.03
<i>Family Culture Stress</i>	.40***	-.17	-.03

*** $p < .001$

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency and Reliability

Coefficient alphas were obtained for the Phase 3 data set. For the test-retest study, participants were 35 adult members of a local church group born either in Mexico or Central America.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

HISPANIC STRESS INVENTORY (HSI)

HSI subscale internal consistencies and reliabilities.

<i>HSI subscales</i>	<i>Coefficient α</i>	<i>Test-retest Pearson coefficient</i>
Immigrant Version subscales		
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	.91	.79****
<i>Parental Stress</i>	.88	.73****
<i>Marital Stress</i>	.86	.61****
<i>Immigration Stress</i>	.85	.80****
<i>Family/Culture Stress</i>	.77	.86
U.S.-Born Version subscales		
<i>Marital Stress</i>	.90	-
<i>Occupational/Economic Stress</i>	.88	-
<i>Parental Stress</i>	.85	-
<i>Family Culture Stress</i>	.85	-

**** $p < .0001$

Comments

- The measure addresses stresses in multiple domains and could be adapted to be more specific to the work setting.
- While somewhat similar to the FASE (Padilla, Wagatsuma, & Lindholm, 1985), the HSI is specifically designed to tap stressors faced by Hispanic adults.
- Given the systematic approach, it was possible to generate a list of stressors both for recent Hispanic immigrants and for U.S.-born Hispanics. Therefore, two separate versions of the HSI were established. one for immigrants, and one for U.S.-born Hispanics.
- Studies show that the HSI has good reliability and validity.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Cervantes, R., Padilla, A., & Salgado de Snyder, N. (1990). Reliability and validity of Hispanic Stress Inventory. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 11(1), 76-82.

Contact Information

Richard C. Cervantes
 Behavioral Assessment, Inc.
 291 South La Cienega Blvd., Suite 308
 Beverly Hills, CA 90211, USA
 Tel: 310-652-6449
 Fax: 310-652-5462
 e-mail: bassessment@aol.com
 web address: www.bai-eval.com/download/rccvitabai2002.pdf

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

PERCEPTIONS OF RACISM SCALE (PRS)

Source/Primary reference	Green, N. L. (1995). Development of the Perceptions of Racism Scale. <i>Journal of Nursing Scholarship</i> , 2(2), 141-146.
Construct measured	Perceptions of racism against African Americans
Brief description	<p>The PRS is a 20-item self-report measure of perceived racism. The instrument is a <i>single</i>-dimension measure of racism. Each item is rated on a 4-point scale; respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with a given statement. The scale range is from 1 = strongly agree to 4 = strongly disagree.</p> <p>A high score indicates high perceptions of racism.</p>
Sample items	<p>African American women experience negative attitudes when they go to a white doctor's office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Racism is a problem in my life.▪ Officials listen more to whites than African Americans.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Adults
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known
How developed	<p>The PRS items were developed on the assumption that racism perceptions can be divided into three categories: affective, behavioral, and cognitive. Items were collected from two sources: 1) interviews with 8 African American childbearing women about their perceptions of racism; and 2) a Business Week/Harris Poll regarding perceptions of general racism (employment, housing, judicial system). The items were ordered to mix health and general statements and to allow reversal statements and a mix of positive and negative responses.</p> <p>The items were reviewed by six African American nurse-midwives and one teacher (content validity). Two experts in instrument design judged item syntax. The selected items were duplicated and reversed. The result was the final 20-item instrument.</p> <p>The initial conceptualization of PRS distinguished two subscales representing 1) health care and 2) societal racism.</p>

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

PERCEPTIONS OF RACISM SCALE (PRS)

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 109	<i>n</i> = 136
<i>Description (Convenience Samples)</i>		African American educated, employed women; churches & community organizations	African American pregnant women; health clinic
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i> <i>Mean (SD)</i>	20-80 47 (15)	18-39 24 (5)
<i>Education</i>	<i>Range</i> <i>Mean (SD)</i>	2-18 years 15 (3)	8-18 years 14 (2)
<i>Monthly Family Income (categorized)</i>	<i>Range</i> <i>Mean</i> <i>Mode</i> <i>Median</i>	\$500 or less – over \$2,600 \$1,701-\$2,000 over \$2,600 \$2,201-\$2,600	\$500 or less – over \$4,000 \$1,501-\$2,000 \$1,501-\$2,000 \$1,501-\$2,000
<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Never Married</i>	12 (11%)	81 (60%)
	<i>Married</i>	51 (47%)	47 (35%)
	<i>Widowed</i>	14 (13%)	0
	<i>Separated/Divorced</i>	30 (27%)	5 (4%)
	<i>Other</i>	0	3 (2%)
	<i>Missing</i>	2 (2%)	0

VALIDITY

Content Validity

Content validity was assessed by asking 6 African American nurse-midwives and one teacher to provide written and verbal critiques of the assumption that the scale content had been adequately sampled and translated into scale items.

Construct Validity

In study 1, an orthogonal rotation did not result in any clear division of the items into two separated subscales. Principal components analysis with rotation resulted in a single factor accounting for 41% of the total variance. As a result, the 20 items were retained in a single scale.

In study 2, a lower perception of racism was found. Responses were significantly different between the two groups on all items except two. Responses to the two items were not correlated with the overall responses.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

PERCEPTIONS OF RACISM SCALE (PRS)

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's α coefficients were high in each pilot study.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Study 1</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 2</i> $\alpha =$
<i>PRS</i>	.86	.91

Comments

- The author mentioned that a hypothesized positive relationship between racism and stress was found, but specific evidence of relationship to health was not presented.
 - The scale is a unidimensional measure of racism. However, given the ample evidence of racism's multidimensional nature, it is unclear what dimension PRS actually captures (i.e., unlikely a measure of the full experience of racism).
 - Items were developed based on interviews with childbearing African American women and some items are very specific to interactions with medical providers. While many general racism items are included, the scale may be particularly useful for assessing perceptions of racism in health care.
 - Although many of the items would seem transferable to other groups in other situations, the scale's usefulness with a broader African American population or non-African American populations is unknown.
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Murrell, N. (1996). Stress, self-esteem, and racism: Relationships with low birth weight and preterm delivery in African American women. *Journal of National Black Nurses Association*, 8(1), 45-53.

Contact Information

Nanny Green
University of California
San Francisco, CA, USA

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

Source/Primary reference

Harrell, S. P. (1997). *The Racism and Life Experience Scales*. Unpublished instrument. Los Angeles, CA: Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology.

Harrell, S. P., Merchant, M. A., & Young, S. A. (August, 1997). *Psychometric properties of the Racism and Life Experiences Scales (RaLES)*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Chicago, IL.

Construct measured

The RaLES is a comprehensive set of scales that measures racism-related stress, coping, socialization, and attitudes. Only the scales for frequency and stressfulness of racism-related experiences are described here.

Brief description

The RaLES includes five primary scales and one overview scale that assess the frequency, intensity, and stressfulness of multiple dimensions of racism-related experiences. (The ratings for each set of questions are listed in the next section.)

1. The *Perceived Influence of Race (PER)* scale assesses the degree to which race is judged to have influenced one's life experiences across twenty contexts of living (finding a job, quality of education, family life, money and finances, health, etc.). It reflects stress that is chronic, contextual, or role-related (vs. specific life events).
2. The *Racism Experiences (EXP)* scales assess the frequency of 17 specific types (*EXP-TP*) of direct and vicarious experiences of racism over a specified time period (e.g., past month, year, 3 years, lifetime), as well as the stressfulness of those experiences (*EXP-ST*) and the domains of daily life (*EXP-DM*) in which they have occurred (ten areas of life such as employment, financial, and health care).
3. The *Daily Life Experiences (DLE)* scale assesses the frequency, perceived involvement of race, and stressfulness of 20 daily "micro-experiences" (i.e., daily hassles) over a specified period of time. Three subscales (frequency, race involvement, and bother) are summed for the total score.
4. The *Life Experiences and Stress (STR)* scale is a comprehensive inventory of the occurrence and stressfulness of 128 specific personal life events within 9 life contexts (e.g., employment, community life, law enforcement and legal system). This scale can be administered in full (128 items), or specific contexts can be chosen as relevant. The items include both generic stressors and stressors associated with discrimination.
5. The *Group Impact (GRP)* scale assesses collective racism experiences, those that involve the observation of racism in the lives of others of one's own group regardless of personal experience.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

The scale includes 16 areas of life such as employment, education, housing, and health care/health status.

The *Brief* scale is a general overview measure of racism-related stress that may be used as an alternative to the full instrument. It includes 9 questions that assess direct, vicarious, and collective experiences of racism, as well as the stressfulness of racism.

Sample items

Perceived Influence of Race (PER)

- How much do you think that your race has influenced your life in the area of experiences at your job?

5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 = Not at all influenced by my race to 4 = extremely influenced by my race.

Domains of Racism Experience (EXP-DOM)

How much have you personally experienced racism, racial discrimination, or racial prejudice during the past 1 year (may vary) in each of the following areas of your life:

- Employment/job
- Loans, credit, financial matters

5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 = not at all to 4 = extremely.

Racism Experiences (EXP-TP, EXP-ST)

Listed below are different types of racism-related experiences that some people have. Please think about experiences you might have had involving racism, racial discrimination, or racial prejudice during the past year (may vary) and rate how often you had the experience and how stressful the experience was:

- Conflict between you and someone of a different race/ethnicity
- Witnessing discrimination or prejudice directed toward someone else
- Hearing about someone else's experience of discrimination or prejudice
- Observing limited participation in decision-making, opportunities, access to resources for people of your racial/ethnic group (i.e., "ol' boys network")

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

5-point Likert-type scales: frequency responses range from 0 = never to 4 = very often; stress-bother responses range from 0 = has never happened to me to 4 = extremely.

Daily Life Experiences (RaLES-DLE)

These questions ask you to think about experiences that some people have as they go about their daily lives. Think only about the past year (may vary). Please consider how often you usually have each of the experiences listed below:

- Others reacting to you as if they were afraid or intimidated
- Hearing or being told an offensive joke
- Others expecting your work to be inferior
- Being mistaken for someone who serves others (e.g., janitor, maid, etc.)
- Being asked to speak for or represent your entire racial/ethnic group (e.g., “What do _____ people think?”)

6-point Likert scales: frequency responses range from 0 = never to 5 = once a week or more; stress-bother responses range from 0 = has never happened to me to 5 = bothers me extremely.

Life Experiences and Stress (RaLES-STR)

EMPLOYMENT. Think about your experiences related to employment and the jobs you have had. Place a check by any experience that has ever been a problem for you. Then, only for the ones that you checked, answer whether or not racism has been involved in the difficulties that you have had:

- Deciding on a career to pursue
- Not having a mentor or someone to "show you the ropes"
- Being assigned undesirable tasks or projects at a job
- Taking a job below your abilities or education
- Not receiving information or communication (being left “out of the loop”)
- Having your work criticized frequently or being watched closely at your job

Two additional items are included for each life context (e.g., employment) concerning stressfulness of that context in the past year and during one’s lifetime.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

Group Impact (GRP)

Please indicate how much you believe racism affects each of the following areas of life for people of your same racial/ethnic group, even if your personal experiences have not been related to racism

- Things that happen in the workplace or related to employment
- Things that happen in schools and the educational system
- Health status and health care
- Relationships between people of your same racial/ethnic group

5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 = not at all influenced by racism to 4 = extremely influenced by racism.

Brief scale (RaLES-B)

- DURING THE PAST YEAR, how much have you personally experienced racism, racial discrimination, or racial prejudice?
- Overall, how much do you think racism affects the lives of people of your same racial/ethnic group?
- In general, how frequently do you hear about incidents of racial prejudice, discrimination, or racism from family, friends, co-workers, neighbors, etc.?

All items rated on 5-point Likert-type scales.

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)

Adolescents and adults of diverse racial/ethnic heritage. Most appropriate for members of historically oppressed racial/ethnic groups (e.g., African Americans, Native Americans, Latino, Arab/Middle Eastern, etc.)

Translations & cultural adaptations available

None known

How developed

Development of the RaLES began in a substance abuse referral and treatment project among African American and Latino men in Los Angeles in 1991. The author expanded the initial items assessing the frequency and stressfulness of racism-related life events in 1993 and developed the first three scales (PER, GRP, and STR). Scale items were developed based on literature review, focus groups, and the author's experiences. The remaining scales were developed in 1994-1997 and operationalized the conceptualization of the multidimensionality of racism-related stress (see Harrell, 2000).

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RaLES)

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES: Six psychometric studies conducted between 1993-1996 have provided data on the reliability and validity of the RaLES scales.

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Description</i>
<i>Development Sample</i>	Racially and ethnically diverse undergraduate and graduate students from colleges and universities in Los Angeles County
<i>Sample 2</i>	Ethnically diverse college freshmen
<i>Sample 3</i>	Racially and ethnically diverse students in pre-freshman and pre-transfer summer programs at a large West Coast university
<i>Sample 4</i>	Undergraduate and graduate students from the same West Coast university
<i>Sample 5</i>	National sample of African American adults recruited from professional organizations
<i>Sample 6</i>	African American adults recruited from community settings and networks known to the author

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Development Sample</i>	<i>Sample 2</i>	<i>Sample 3</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 286	<i>n</i> = 126	<i>n</i> = 187
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	18 – 39+	16 – 39	16 – 40
	<i>Mean</i>	†	†	18.44
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	76.5%	65.9%	67.4%
	<i>Male</i>	23.5%	34.1%	32.1%
<i>Race/ Ethnicity</i>	<i>African American</i>	15.1%	24.6%	19.4%
	<i>Latino</i>	10.3%	57.9%	62.9%
	<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	9.3%	11.1%	8.6%
	<i>Middle Eastern</i>	4.0%	0%	0.5%
	<i>American Indian</i>	1.5%	0%	†
	<i>Biracial/ Multiracial</i>	4.0%	6.3%	5.9%
	<i>White (non-Jewish)</i>	51.5%	0%	1.6%
	<i>White-Jewish</i>	4.0%	0%	†
	<i>Other</i>	†	†	1.1%

†Not reported

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Sample 4</i>	<i>Sample 5</i>	<i>Sample 6</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 150	<i>n</i> = 104	<i>n</i> = 50
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	16 – 60+	16 – 60+	†
	<i>Mean</i>	22.18	40.47	†
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	62.4%	73.1%	†
	<i>Male</i>	37.6%	26.9%	†
<i>Race/ Ethnicity</i>	<i>African American</i>	26.8%	100%	100%
	<i>Latino</i>	29.5%	-	-
	<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	28.9%	-	-
	<i>Middle Eastern</i>	0.7%	-	-
	<i>American Indian</i>	†	-	-
	<i>Biracial/Multiracial</i>	4.0%	-	-
	<i>White (non-Jewish)</i>	2%	-	-
	<i>White-Jewish</i>	†	-	-
	<i>Other</i>	5.4%	-	-

†Not reported

VALIDITY

Content Validity

In multiple samples, correlations with social desirability were either small or not statistically significant for the PER, EXP-DM, EXP-TP, DLE, and RaLES-B scales.

EXP-DM had a small negative correlation with social desirability in sample 2. In sample 3, DLE-frequency, EXP-TP (direct), and EXP-ST subscales had small, but statistically significant, negative correlations. The GRP scale also had a significant negative correlation with social desirability.

No data were available for the STR scale.

Concurrent Validity

Most of the scales were significantly correlated as expected with criterion measures, indicating strong concurrent validity:

PER with perceived discrimination, racism reaction, urban life stress, and collective self esteem (Samples 1 and 3).

EXP-DM with urban stress, racial discrimination, collective self-esteem, and cultural mistrust.

DLE subscales with collective self-esteem, cultural mistrust, racial discrimination, racism reaction, and urban life stress.

EXP with measures of urban life stress, collective self-esteem, racial discrimination, and cultural mistrust.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

GRP with urban life stress, collective self-esteem, racism reaction, and racial discrimination.

RaLES-B with urban life stress, collective self-esteem, racial discrimination, and cultural mistrust.

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency and Reliability

Across the various population samples, reliability was high or moderately high for the PER; EXP-DM; DLE-frequency, DLE-race involvement, and DLE-stress/bother subscales; EXP frequency and stressfulness subscales (as well as for the direct experiences and vicarious experiences factors that emerged); GRP; and RaLES-B scales. No data were available for the STR scale.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Cronbach's α</i>	<i>Split-half reliability</i>	<i>Test-retest reliability</i>
<i>PER</i>	1	.91	.90	.79
	3	.91		
<i>EXP-DM</i>	2	.82		
	3	.84		
	4	.90		
	5	.85		
<i>DLE-frequency</i>	1	.89	.85	.79
	3	.89		
<i>DLE-race</i>	1	.94		
	2	.84		
	3	.92		
	4	.94		
	5	.90		
<i>DLE-bother</i>	4	.94		
	5	.93		
<i>EXP-frequency</i>	2	.83	.82	
	3	.86		
	4	.90		
	5	.88		
<i>EXP-frequency (direct)</i>	3	.74		
	4	.85		
	5	.84		
<i>EXP-frequency (vicarious)</i>	3	.85		
	4	.87		
	5	.83		
<i>EXP-stressfulness</i>	2	.88	.83	
	3	.89		
<i>EXP-stressfulness (direct)</i>	3	.74		
<i>EXP-stressfulness (vicarious)</i>	3	.87		
<i>GRP</i>	1	.96	.94	.86
	3	.92		
<i>RaLES-B</i>	2	.86	.82	
	3	.86		
	4	.77		
	5	.79		

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

Comments

- Several of the psychometric studies described above also provided preliminary data on the relationship between the RaLES scales and health outcomes. In Sample 3, the DOM, EXP (direct experiences), and DLE (frequency) had significant negative correlations with positive well-being, while the GRP scale had a significant positive correlation with positive well-being. The DOM, EXP, DLE, and BRF scales were all significantly and positively correlated with psychological symptomatology (i.e., depression, anxiety, somaticization) in Sample 4. In Sample 5, the DOM, EXP, DLE, and BRF scales were all significantly correlated with trauma-related symptoms. In addition, after controlling for demographic variables and experiences of other forms of discrimination (e.g., sexism, classism), the DLE and RaLES-B scales accounted for a significant proportion of explained variance in trauma-related symptoms.
- The strengths of the RaLES include: 1) its comprehensive approach to the measurement of racism experiences and stress; 2) the ability for users to choose one or more scales based on need; 3) ease of administration; 4) applicability to different racial/ethnic groups; and 5) data suggesting strong psychometric properties. A full Interview Version is under development for populations where literacy may be a concern.
- The primary drawbacks of the RaLES include its length, its limited use in published studies to date, and the need to develop norms for broader and more representative samples.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

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

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, N. J. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1079-1092.

Utsey, S. (1998). Assessing the stressfulness of racism: A review of instrumentation. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24, 269-288.

The RaLES has been used in numerous doctoral dissertations from the California School of Professional Psychology. These include:

Cotton, L. M. (1999). *The impact of stress, exposure to violence, and racism on HIV knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors.*

Garcia, R. A. (1998). *The role of socialization influences, racism-related stress, and perceptions of collective racism in adopted patterns of acculturation among young adult Mexican Americans.*

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE RACISM AND LIFE EXPERIENCE SCALES (RALES)

Hagen, K. L. (1997). *The impact of child maltreatment experiences, adult revictimization, history of traumatization symptoms, and racism on the psychological well-being of African American women.*

Miller, J. L. (2001). *Understanding achievement attribution and achievement motivation among African American youth: Racism, racial socialization, and spirituality.*

Oh, M. Y. (2001). *Contingencies of self-esteem: Psychological well-being and impact of perceived experiences of discrimination among Korean Americans.*

Rivera, B. C. (1997). *Perceptions of racism, acculturation, and depression in first-generation Mexican American immigrants and descendants of Mexican American immigrants.*

Rosas, M. C. (1999). *The impact of affirmation action legislation and racism experiences on the collective self-esteem and psychological well-being of college students of color.*

Contact Information

Shelly P. Harrell, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology
6100 Centre Drive / Howard Hughes Center
Los Angeles, CA 90045, USA
e-mail: sharrell@pepperdine.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

WORKPLACE RACIAL BIAS

Source/Primary reference	Hughes, D., & Dodge, M. (1997). African American women in the workplace: Relationships between job conditions, racial bias at work, and perceived job quality. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 25(5), 581-600.
Construct measured	Experiences of interpersonal and institutional discrimination at work
Brief description	<p>The instrument includes 13 items along two dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Institutional discrimination - 5 statements about the extent to which systems-level transactions are biased (e.g. salaries, job assignments, promotions)2. Interpersonal prejudice - 8 statements about experiences of racial bias in daily interactions (e.g. jokes and slurs, assumption of incompetence) <p>All statements are rated on a 4-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.</p>
Sample items	<p>Institutional Discrimination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ There is discrimination against [<i>ethnic group</i>] in salaries.▪ [<i>Ethnic group</i>]s get the least desirable assignments. <p>Interpersonal Prejudice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ People notice your ethnic background before they notice anything else about you.▪ People you work with have stereotypes about [<i>ethnic group</i>] that affect how they judge you.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	<p>For Institutional Discrimination items, it is appropriate for all working adults.</p> <p>For the Interpersonal Prejudice items, it is most appropriate for workers of color (non-majority workers).</p>
Translations & cultural adaptations available	Spanish translation available
How developed	Items for the two scales were developed based on a series of six focus groups with African American workers in blue and white collar jobs.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

WORKPLACE RACIAL BIAS

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 79
<i>Description</i>		Full-time employed African American women in married-couple families with at least one child between the ages of 4 and 14 years, from 30 different communities.
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	21-53
	<i>Mean</i>	37
<i>Education</i>	<i>College</i>	22%
	<i>High School</i>	95%
<i>Income</i>	<i>Median Personal</i>	\$10,000-\$24,999
	<i>Median Family</i>	\$40,000-\$54,000
<i>Positional Tenure</i>	<i>Mean</i>	7.5 years

The authors have also used the scale in studies with diverse Latino samples (e.g., Enchautegui de Jesus & Hughes, in preparation).

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

Principal axis factor analysis of ratings on all developed items confirmed two distinct dimensions of workplace bias (items loading above .6 on one factor and below .45 on the other were retained).

Concurrent Validity

The measure of institutional discrimination was significantly correlated with a single item assessing discrimination in workers' present jobs ($r = .40$), but not with a similar item assessing discrimination in past jobs. This seems to indicate that the measure assesses current discrimination and not just a predisposition to perceive/report discrimination. The interpersonal discrimination scale was not associated with global items assessing either present or past discrimination.

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's α reliability coefficients by group:

<i>Group</i>	<i>Institutional discrimination</i>	<i>Interpersonal prejudice</i>
	$\alpha =$	$\alpha =$
<i>Puerto Rican</i>	.90	.84
<i>Dominican</i>	.90	.79
<i>Black</i>	.85	.83
<i>Mexican</i>	.93	.83
<i>Men</i>	.89	.84
<i>Women</i>	.95	.84

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

WORKPLACE RACIAL BIAS

Comments

Specifically designed to assess the work environment.

- Spanish translation is available.
 - Relies on respondents' perceptions.
 - This instrument is short and easy to administer.
 - Appears reliable with multiple ethnic/racial groups.
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Enchautegui de Jesus, N. (2002). Relationships between normative and race/ethnic-related job stressors and marital and individual well-being among Black and Latino/a workers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(8-B), 3834.

Enchautegui de Jesus, D., & Hughes, D. (in preparation). *Relationships between job discrimination, psychological well-being, and psychological distress among Latino and Black adults*. New York University and University of Michigan.

Hughes, D., & Chen, L. (1997). When and what parents tell children about race: An examination of race-related socialization in African American families. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1(4), 200-214.

Hughes, D., & Chesir-Tehran, D. (in preparation). *Relationships between job characteristics, job discrimination, and the quality of parenting among dual-earner African American families*. New York University.

Contact Information

Dianne Hughes
Department of Psychology
New York University
6 Washington Place
New York, NY 10003, USA

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

KRIEGER MEASURE OF EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

Source/Primary reference

Krieger, N. (1990). Racial and gender discrimination: Risk factors for high blood pressure? *Social Science Medicine*, 30(12), 1273-1281.

Krieger, N., & Sidney S. (1996). Racial discrimination and blood pressure: The CARDIA study of young black and white adults. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86, 1370-1378.

Construct measured

Self-reported experiences of and responses to racial discrimination

Brief description

The instrument first asks respondents about their typical response to unfair treatment and then asks respondents about whether they have ever experienced racial discrimination in seven different domains. It is a self-administered paper-and-pencil instrument.

Sample items

We are going to ask you a number of questions related to discrimination. Please select one response on questions 1 and 2.

1. If you feel you have been treated unfairly, do you usually:

___ Accept it as a fact of life?

___ Try to do something about it?

2. And if you have been treated unfairly, do you usually:

___ Talk to other people about it?

___ Keep it to yourself?

3. Have you ever experienced discrimination, been prevented from doing something, or been hassled or made to feel inferior in any of the following seven situations because of your race or color?

At school No___ Yes ___

Getting a job No___ Yes ___

At work No___ Yes ___

Getting housing No___ Yes ___

Getting medical care No___ Yes ___

From the police or in the courts No___ Yes ___

On the street or in a public setting No___ Yes ___

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

KRIEGER MEASURE OF EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Adolescents or adults
Translations & cultural adaptations available	Currently being translated into Spanish and tested among Latinos/Latinas, as part of the validation study now under way (see “Psychometric Properties,” below).
How developed	The instrument was developed for the CARDIA (Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults) study. The questions were developed by the author based on a review of the extant literature (on racial discrimination, measurement of social stressors, etc.), plus pilot testing both for the initial study, published in 1990, and then among CARDIA participants, for the 1996 article.
Psychometric properties	<p>The discrimination questions (pertaining to discrimination based on race/ethnicity, gender, social class, sexual orientation, and religion) were pilot tested by CARDIA staff for their acceptability to CARDIA participants. No explicit psychometric evaluation was conducted.</p> <p>Two new developments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A recently conducted and as-of-yet unpublished analysis, performed as part of a new CARDIA-based study looking at risk of low birth weight in relation to racial discrimination, gave a Cronbach’s α for the racial discrimination measure of 0.78.2. Data collection is under way (2003) for a study to evaluate the validity and reliability of a revised version of the racial discrimination instrument, in a population of working class African Americans and Latinos/Latinas.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Used in studies of African Americans (could be adapted for other populations of color) and white Americans, including persons of low literacy and also very low income.■ The studies cited below provide evidence on associations with: blood pressure, preterm delivery, self-reported health status, cigarette smoking, and alcohol-related behaviors.■ The instrument is concise, easy to understand, and easy to administer.■ The instrument does not capture the duration, intensity, or frequency of the self-reported experiences of racial discrimination; it also asks only about the respondent’s experiences.
Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)	Broman, C. L. (1996). The health consequences of discrimination: A study of African Americans. <i>Ethnicity Disease</i> , 6, 148-152.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

KRIEGER MEASURE OF EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

Broman, C. L., Mavaddat, R., & Hsu, S. (2000). The experiences and consequences of perceived racial discrimination: A study of African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 26, 165-180.

Collins, J. W., David, R. J., Symons, R., Handler, A., Wall, S. N., & Dwyer, L. (2000). Low-income African-American mothers' perceptions of exposure to racial discrimination and infant birth weight. *Epidemiology*, 11, 337-9.

Krieger, N., & Sidney, S. (1997). Prevalence and health implications of anti-gay discrimination: A study of black and white women and men in the CARDIA cohort. *International Journal of Health Services*, 27, 157-176.

Krieger, N., Sidney, S., & Coakley, E. (1998). Racial discrimination and skin color in CARDIA: Implications for public health research. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88, 1308-1313.

Ren, X. S., Amick, B. C., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racial/ethnic disparities in health: The interplay between discrimination and socioeconomic status. *Ethnicity Disease*, 9, 151-165.

Watson, J. M., et al. (2002). Race, socioeconomic status, and perceived discrimination among healthy women. *Journal of Women's Health & Gender-Based Medicine*, 11(5), 441-451.

Yen, I. H., Ragland, D., Breiner, B. A., & Fisher, J. A. (1999). Racial discrimination and alcohol-related behavior in urban transit operators: Findings from the San Francisco Municipal Health and Safety Study. *Public Health Report*, 114, 448-458.

For further discussion, see:

Krieger, N. (2000). Discrimination and health. In L. Berkman & I. Kawachi (Eds). *Social Epidemiology* (pp. 36-75). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Contact Information

The instrument is available from Nancy Krieger at no cost, under the stipulation that it is cited using both the 1996 CARDIA study and the 1990 article in which the questions were first used (details provided in Dr. Krieger's standard cover letter for the instrument).

Nancy Krieger, Ph.D.
Department of Health and Social Behavior
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115, USA

Tel: 617-432-1571 - work

e-mail: nkrieger@hsph.harvard.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

SCHEDULE OF RACIST EVENTS (SRE)

Source/Primary reference	Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The schedule of racist events. <i>Journal of Black Psychology</i> , 22, 144-168.
Construct measured	Experiences of specific instances of racial discrimination and racist events
Brief description	<p>The SRE is a self-report inventory containing 18 items that are each rated in three different ways. They are answered once for the frequency in the last year, another time for the frequency in the respondent's lifetime, and a third time for appraising the stressfulness of each event.</p> <p>Responses range from 1 = the event never happened to me, to 6 = the event happens all of the time, for the first two subscales, and 1 = not at all stressful to 6 = very stressful, for the third subscale.</p>
Sample items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employers, bosses and supervisors because you are black? ■ How many times have you been treated unfairly by your coworkers, fellow students and colleagues because you are black?
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	African Americans (can be adapted for other minority populations)
Translations & cultural adaptations available	Similar in format and conceptualization to the Schedule of Sexist Events (See entry for Klonoff & Landrine, 1995.)
How developed	The items were written by the authors based on the literature on racism. They conceptualize racist events as analogous to the generic life events and hassles as assessed by popular measures of stressful events. Also, they view racist events as culture-specific, negative life events (i.e., culturally specific stressors). Thus, they modeled their scale after other major general measures of the frequency and appraisal of stressful events.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 153
<i>Description</i>		Students, faculty, & staff of large university
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	15-70
	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	30.14 (11.66)
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 83
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 66
	<i>Missing</i>	<i>n</i> = 4
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>African American</i>	100%
<i>Annual Income</i>	<i>Range</i>	\$0 – \$80,000
	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	\$21,451 (\$17,175)
<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>n</i> = 40
	<i>Single</i>	<i>n</i> = 85

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

SCHEDULE OF RACIST EVENTS (SRE)

VALIDITY

Concurrent Validity

The authors examined the relationships between the scores of the SRE, and the African American Acculturation Scale (AAAS; Landrine & Klonoff, 1994). Mean scores on the SRE subscales are presented below according to AAAS cluster (traditional or acculturated).

<i>SRE</i>	<i>AAAS</i>	
	<i>Traditional</i> (<i>n</i> = 61)	<i>Acculturated</i> (<i>n</i> = 75)
<i>Subscale</i>		
<i>Recent Racist Events</i>	46.32	38.67
<i>Lifetime Racist Events</i>	60.62	46.86
<i>Appraised Racist Events</i>	57.59	46.79

RELIABILITY

<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Cronbach's α</i>	<i>Split-half reliability</i>
<i>Recent Racist Events</i>	.95	.93
<i>Lifetime Racist Events</i>	.95	.91
<i>Appraised Racist Events</i>	.94	.92

Comments

- Each of the SRE subscales was higher on average in participants with high stress-related symptoms as measured by the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL-58; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974); and higher among cigarette smokers, considered a stress-related behavior.

<i>Subscale</i>	<i>HSCL High</i> (<i>n</i> = 53)	<i>HSCL Low</i> (<i>n</i> = 53)	<i>Nonsmokers</i> (<i>n</i> = 113)	<i>Smokers</i> (<i>n</i> = 24)
<i>Recent Racist Events</i>	46.73	37.95	41.23	44.66
<i>Lifetime Racist Events</i>	59.17	46.84	50.53	62.61
<i>Appraised Racist Events</i>	58.62	43.83	49.42	61.53

- There is also evidence of a relationship between SRE and mental health among African Americans (Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999).
- Huebner (2002) adapted this scale to measure discrimination against gay and bisexual men (alpha = .92) and found scores correlated with both physical and mental health outcomes.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Ullman, J. B. (1999). Racial discrimination and psychiatric symptoms among blacks. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 5(4), 329-339.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

SCHEDULE OF RACIST EVENTS (SRE)

Klonoff, E., & Landrine, H. (1999). Cross-validation of the schedule of racist events. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 25(2), 231-254.

Contact Information

Elizabeth A. Klonoff
Department of Psychology
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-4611, USA

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MODERN RACISM SCALE

Source/Primary reference	<p>McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends upon who is asking and what is asked. <i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>, 25, 563-579.</p> <p>McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. Dovidio & S. Gaertner (Eds.) <i>Prejudice, discrimination and racism</i> (pp. 91-125). San Diego: Academic Press.</p>
Construct measured	Racial attitudes toward blacks based on four tenets: 1) discrimination is a thing of the past, 2) blacks are pushing too hard, too fast, 3) these tactics are unfair, 4) thus recent gains are undeserved.
Brief description	<p>This measure includes 14 items along two dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Old-Fashioned Racism (7 items)2. Modern Racism (7 items that ask respondents to what extent they agree or disagree with a set of beliefs that follow the four tenets outlined above)
Sample items	<p>Old-Fashioned Racism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ It is a bad idea for blacks and whites to marry one another.▪ Black people are generally not as smart as whites. <p>Modern Racism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve. (agree-disagree)▪ It is easy to understand the anger of black people in America. (disagree-agree)▪ Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect for blacks than they deserve. (agree-disagree)▪ How many black people in XX County do you think miss out on good housing because white owners won't rent or sell to them? (from many to none)
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Adolescents or adults
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MODERN RACISM SCALE

How developed

The authors began with the Old-Fashioned Racism (OFR) Scale but found that the items were so reactive that they pulled for socially desirable responses and were so blatant that some study participants refused to answer them. By 1976, there had been enough experience with these items to formulate a general definition of *symbolic racism* or *modern racism* to include components of racial attitudes missed by the OFR scale. A new set of items was generated from this definition.

The first version of the MRS was used with adult community residents (Studies 1 and 2 below). Another version of the scale was used in several college student samples (Study 3). Over the years, the scale has been further refined.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>	<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>	<i>Study 3</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>	<i>n</i> = 879	<i>n</i> = 709	<i>n</i> = 167
<i>Description</i>	White adults (18 years and older) residing in Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, 1976	White adults (18 years and older) residing in Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, 1977	White undergraduate students, enrolled in introductory psychology classes at Duke University, 1984
<i>Gender</i>	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

A number of factor analyses were performed on various combinations of Modern and Old-Fashioned Racism Scale items. Across analyses, the Modern Racism items loaded most highly on one factor, while the Old-Fashioned items loaded on another factor. These results support the notion that Modern Racism is distinct from Old-Fashioned Racism, although correlated ($r = .68, .70, .59$ in the three study samples, respectively).

The Modern Racism Scale correlated with strength of opposition to busing in Louisville in surveys done during the conflict there in 1976 ($r = .511$) and 1977 ($r = .391$).

The scale also correlated significantly with voting preferences for a black candidate versus a white incumbent for mayor of Los Angeles in both 1969 and 1973 (McConahay & Hough, 1976). Those whites scoring high on the scale were more likely than those with low scores to vote for the white candidate in 1969 ($r = .365$) and 1973 ($r = .338$), and these correlations were still significant after controlling for political

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MODERN RACISM SCALE

conservatism (partial $r = .309$ and $.300$, respectively). All correlations were statistically significant.

Concurrent Validity

The Modern Racism Scale correlated with several other scales designed to assess related constructs.

<i>Scales</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>r =</i>
<i>Sympathetic Identification with the Underdog (Schuman & Harding, 1963)</i>	Louisville adults	-.299
<i>Antiblack Feeling measured by the Feeling Thermometer (Campbell, 1971)</i>	Louisville adults	.383
<i>Feeling Thermometer</i>	College students over 16 years	Average $r = .441$

Scores on the Modern Racism Scale did not correlate with the Just World Scale in repeated college student samples. Because the Feeling Thermometer and the Old-Fashioned Racism Scales are accepted as face-valid measures of racism and the belief in a just world has been proposed as an alternative explanation for high scores on the moralistic items in the scale, this is strong evidence for the concurrent/criterion validity of the Modern Racism Scale.

The strongest evidence for the validity of the Modern Racism Scale emerged from an experimental study of simulated hiring decisions using white college student participants, in which MRS scores were related to evaluations of the black candidates (McConahay, 1983).

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Study 1</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 2</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 3</i> $\alpha =$
<i>Modern Racism</i>	.75	.79	Range: .81 - .86

Test-Retest Reliability

Ranges from .72 to .93 across a number of samples.

Comments

- This scale assesses a component of racist attitudes that is particularly relevant to work situations in that it gets at assessments of and reactions to progress in the recent past.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MODERN RACISM SCALE

- It has been shown to be related to work behaviors in hiring simulations.
 - Given the hypotheses, the study samples were 100% white by design. However, it would be useful to assess the scale's validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups.
 - Gender is not reported and thus applicability of the scale for women is unknown.
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

McConahay, J. B. (1982). Self-interest versus racial attitudes as correlates of anti-busing attitudes on Louisville: Is it the buses or the blacks? *Journal of Politics*, 44, 692-720.

McConahay, J. B. (1983). Modern racism and modern discrimination: The effects of race, racial attitudes, and context on simulated hiring decisions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9(4), 551-558.

Contact Information

John B. McConahay
Public Policy Studies
Box 90245
Duke University
Durham, NC 27706, USA
Tel: 919-613-7324
e-mail: mcconaha@pps.duke.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

PERCEIVED RACISM SCALE

Source/Primary reference	McNeilly, M. D., Anderson, N. B., Armstead, C. A., Clark, R., Corbett, M., Robinson, E. L., Pieper, C. F., & Lepisto, E. M., (1996). The Perceived Racism Scale: A multidimensional assessment of the experience of white racism among African Americans. <i>Health, Ethnicity and Disease</i> , 6, 154-166
Construct measured	Perceived exposure to racism
Brief description	<p>PRS is a 51-item instrument. The first section has 43 items and asks the respondents to rate the frequency with which they have been exposed to racist events in four domains: job, academic, public, and racist statements (0 = not applicable, 7 = several times a day).</p> <p>The second section includes 8 items, which require respondents to indicate the emotional appraisal of each event (e.g., angry, frustrated, sad, powerless, etc.).</p> <p>Section three requires respondents to indicate coping strategies that have been used for each event (e.g., speaking up, ignoring it, etc.).</p>
Sample items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Because I am black, I am assigned to the jobs no one else wants.▪ I have been made to feel uncomfortable in the classroom.▪ I have been refused housing because I am black.▪ When I go shopping, I am often followed.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	African-American adults (can be adapted for other minority populations)
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known
How developed	Items for the scale were empirically derived by collecting data from 165 African American psychology students at North Carolina Central University (108 females, 57 males) and 25 individuals from the community (15 females, 10 males). The age range of the participants was 18-46 (M = 21, SD = 4.8). They were asked to list their personal experiences of racism and the feelings related to these experiences. Their responses were then categorized into four domains: 1) on the job; 2) in academic settings; 3) in the public realm; 4) exposure to racist statements. The items most frequently mentioned were selected for the scale. The new instrument was piloted with 10 students and 10 individuals from

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

PERCEIVED RACISM SCALE

the community, who provided feedback on content, wording, response format, and instructions.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Student Sample 1</i>	<i>Community Sample</i>	<i>Student Sample 2</i>	<i>Student Sample 3</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 110	<i>n</i> = 104	<i>n</i> = 59	<i>n</i> = 32
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	18-35	18-73	18-39	-
	<i>M (SD)</i>	21.2 (2.9)	33.7 (12.48)	21.6 (4.17)	21.6 (3.5)
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 73	<i>n</i> = 84	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 28
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 37	<i>n</i> = 20	<i>n</i> = 18	<i>n</i> = 4

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

Exploratory principal component factor analyses were performed using both orthogonal and oblique rotations. The items were divided according to their type: frequency of exposure (43 questions) and emotional and coping responses (8 questions). The samples that were used in these analyses were student samples 1 and 2 and the community sample.

Both orthogonal and oblique rotations resulted in very similar factors. Factor rotations for over the past year, for over one's lifetime, and for the frequency of exposure were nearly identical. Five factors emerged for the exposure items (racism on the job, racism in academic settings, overt racism in public, subtle racism in public, and racist statements), and nine factors for the emotional and behavioral coping (anger/frustration, depressed affect, feeling strengthened, trying to change things, avoiding/ignoring, praying, forgetting it, getting violent, and speaking up).

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Internal consistency was assessed based on the responses from student samples 1 and 2 plus the community sample (*n* = 273):

<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Scale</i> $\alpha =$	α for the <i>individual factors</i>
<i>Frequency of Exposure Domains (items 1-43)</i>	.96	.84-.93
<i>Emotional and Behavioral Coping Responses (items 44-51)</i>	.94	.64-.95

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

PERCEIVED RACISM SCALE

Test-Retest Reliability

Student sample 2 was tested over an interval of two weeks. The researchers asked student sample 3 to think of a racist event that happened to them in each domain and to complete the emotional and coping subscales with the incidents in mind. They were asked to recall the same incidents when completing the scale two weeks later.

<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Inter-class Correlations</i>	
	<i>Student Sample 2</i>	<i>Student Sample 3</i>
<i>Frequency of Exposure</i>	.70-.80	-
<i>Emotional Responses</i>	.50-.78	.43-.87
<i>Coping Responses</i>	.59	.60

Comments

- Includes items related to discrimination at work
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information

Maya Dominguez McNeilly
Box 3003
Duke University Medical Center
Durham, NC 27710, USA
e-mail: maya@geri.duke.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MOTIVATION TO RESPOND WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Source/Primary reference	Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 75(3), 811-832.
Construct measured	Sources of internal and external motivations to respond without prejudice toward blacks
Brief description	<p>The final scale consists of 10 items, rated on a 9-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 9 = strongly agree.</p> <p>There are two subscales:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice (IMS), with 5 items2. External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice (EMS), with 5 items
Sample items	<p>The IMS subscale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ I attempt to act in non-prejudiced ways towards black people because it is personally important to me.▪ Being non-prejudiced towards black people is important to my self-concept. <p>The EMS subscale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ I attempt to appear non-prejudiced towards black people to avoid disapproval from others.▪ I try to act non-prejudiced toward black people because of pressure from others.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	White or non-black adults
Translations & cultural adaptations available	Similar scales adapted from the original have been used to measure motivation to respond without sexism, prejudice toward fat people, and prejudice toward homosexuals.
How developed	<p><u>Phase 1</u>: In the first phase, an initial 19-item questionnaire was created by the authors.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u>: The final scales were developed using exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Two factors – the IMS and EMS subscales</p>

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MOTIVATION TO RESPOND WITHOUT PREJUDICE

- emerged. The discriminant and convergent validity of the IMS and EMS were examined by comparing them to other measures.

Phase 3: The final phase involved demonstrating the predictive validity of the IMS and EMS by examining (i) people's affective reactions to living up to own-based (internal) and other-based (external) standards for how blacks should be treated, and (ii) the extent to which people reported endorsing the stereotype of blacks under either private and anonymous or public conditions.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES:

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Sample 1</i>	<i>Sample 2</i>	<i>Sample 3</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 135	<i>n</i> = 245	<i>n</i> = 1,363
<i>Description</i>		Introductory psychology students	Introductory psychology students	Introductory psychology students
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Females</i>	78%	74%	60%
	<i>Males</i>	22%	26%	40%
<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>Whites</i>	94%	84%	85%
	<i>Non-whites</i>	6%	16%	15%

Samples 1 & 2: The first two samples completed the initial 19-item questionnaire in medium-sized groups and received an extra course credit for their participation.

Sample 3: The third sample completed the final set of 10 items (refined questionnaire), and received an extra course credit for their participation. A sub-sample of Sample 3 filled out the IMS and EMS scales 9 weeks after the mass testing session to examine the test-retest reliabilities.

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

An exploratory factor analysis for Sample 1 revealed that there were two strong factors and two weak factors with eigenvalues over 1.00. The first factor accounted for 28% of the variance (eigenvalue 5.33) and consisted of items about internal motivation to respond without prejudice. The second factor accounted for 20% of the variance (eigenvalue 3.74) and included items that assessed external motivation to respond without prejudice. Four items were dropped because they either (i) loaded on both factors, possibly not differentiating internal from external motivation to respond without prejudice, or (ii) failed to load on either of the factors with a loading of .50 or above.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MOTIVATION TO RESPOND WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Confirmatory factor analysis across all three samples revealed that the two-factor model provided a significantly better fit of data than the one-factor model.

Concurrent Validity

Correlations between the IMS and EMS as well as other measures

Measure	IMS	EMS
Motivation measures		
▪ IMS	-	-.15*
▪ EMS	-.15*	-
Prejudice measures		
▪ Modern Racism Scale (McConahay et al. 1981)	-.57**	-.22**
▪ Pro-black Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988)	.24**	.03
▪ Anti-black Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988)	-.48**	.12
▪ Attitude Toward blacks Scale (Brigham, 1993)	.79**	-.27**
▪ Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 1981)	-.24**	.13*
▪ Protestant Work Ethic Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988)	-.18*	.12
▪ Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988)	.45**	-.09
Social evaluation and self-perception measures		
▪ Fear of Negative Evaluation Questionnaire (Leary, 1983a, & Watson & Friend, 1969)	.11	.14*
▪ Interaction Anxiousness Scale (Leary, 1983b)	-.03	.16*
▪ Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960)	-.07	-.11
▪ Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986)	-.02	-.01

N = 247

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

Correlations between the IMS, the EMS, the Attitude Toward blacks Scale (ATS), and the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPR)

Measure	IMS	EMS	ATS
Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPR; Dunton & Fazio, 1997)	.22*	.36**	.20*
▪ Concern with acting prejudiced	.38**	.26*	.35**
▪ Restraint to avoid dispute	-.21**	.35**	-.20*
Attitude Toward blacks Scale (ATS) (Brigham, 1993)	.72**	-.33**	-

N = 119

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

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MOTIVATION TO RESPOND WITHOUT PREJUDICE

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Reliability

Cronbach α reliability coefficients of the IMS and EMS across all three samples, as well as the IMS and EMS test-retest correlation coefficients

<i>Subscales</i>	<i>Sample 1 (n = 135) $\alpha =$</i>	<i>Sample 2 (n = 245) $\alpha =$</i>	<i>Sample 3 (n = 1,352) $\alpha =$</i>	<i>Test-retest reliability (sub-sample of Sample 3) (n = 159) r =</i>
<i>IMS</i>	.85	.84	.81	.77
<i>EMS</i>	.79	.76	.80	.60

Comments

- The scales measure mostly independent constructs and have good convergent and discriminant validity.
- The different studies of this measure support the argument that there are distinct internal and external motivations underlying people's desire to avoid prejudiced responses.
- Correlations of the IMS and EMS with measures of racial attitudes suggest that traditional attitude measures are more strongly related to internal than external motivation to respond without prejudice.
- Although the EMS subscale seems to be somewhat related to traditional measures of prejudice and social anxiety, it appears to measure something beyond social anxiety.
- During the predictive validation study of Phase 3, where the participants were asked to report the extent to which they endorsed stereotypes of Blacks, the experimenter was an advanced student at the University who was likely to be perceived as a representative of the campus and its well-understood non-prejudiced standards. When reporting responses directly to this person, it is possible that the respondents would be more likely to comply with normative expectations and, thus, avoid prejudiced responses.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Devine, P. G. (2003). Individual differences in the activation and control of affective race bias as assessed by startle eyeblink responses and self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 738–753.

Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., Amodio, A. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Vance, S. L. (2002). Exploring the relationship between implicit and explicit

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

MOTIVATION TO RESPOND WITHOUT PREJUDICE

prejudice: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 835-848.

Plant, E. A. (2004). Responses to interracial interactions over time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1458-1471.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2001). Responses to other-imposed pro-black pressure: Acceptance or backlash? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 486-501.

Plant, E. A., Devine, P. G., & Brazy, P. C. (2003). The bogus pipeline and motivations to respond without prejudice: Revisiting the fading and faking of prejudice. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 187-200.

Contact Information

E. Ashby Plant
Department of Psychology
102d Psychology Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1270, USA
Tel: 850-644-5533
e-mail: plant@psy.fsu.edu
www.psy.fsu.edu/faculty/plant.dp.html

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

ACCULTURATIVE STRESS SCALE (ACS)

Source/Primary reference

Salgado de Snyder, V. N. (1987). Factors associated with acculturative stress and depressive symptomatology among married Mexican immigrant women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*, 475-488.

Construct measured

Stress associated with acculturation

Brief description

The ACS scale is a 12-item measure which assesses stressors in the familial, marital, social, financial, and environmental domains. For each item, the respondent is asked whether she has experienced the potential stressful situation in the last three months. If the answer is affirmative, people are asked to further respond on a 4-point Likert-type scale to indicate the degree of stressfulness in each situation (0 = not stressful at all to 4 = very stressful). A high score indicates high stress.

Sample items

- Not having enough money to pay debts.
 - Not being able to communicate in English.
 - Being discriminated against because of being Mexican.
 - Having accented speech in English.
-

**Appropriate for whom
(i.e. which population/s)**

Adult Spanish-speaking immigrant women

**Translations & cultural
adaptations available**

Spanish translation

How developed

The ACS items were derived from the original 172-item Latin American Stress-Inventory (LAS-I) developed by a research group of the Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center (Cervantes, Padilla, & Salgado de Snyder, 1987).

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

ACCULTURATIVE STRESS SCALE (ACS)

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 140
<i>Description</i> Selected from the files of 1984-1985 marriage licenses of the County of Los Angeles.		Married Mexican immigrant women, who are married for the first time and not born earlier than 1950.
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	17-49
	<i>Mean</i>	25.7
<i>Children</i>	<i>Children ranging from 2 months to 19 years of age</i>	50%
	<i>No children</i>	50%
<i>Religion</i>	<i>Catholic</i>	87.1%
	<i>Protestants, Baptists, and Jehovah's Witness</i>	12.8%
<i>Language skills</i>	<i>Fluent in spoken English</i>	21.4%
	<i>Speaking knowledge of English</i>	57.8%
	<i>Only Spanish and no English</i>	20%
<i>Education</i>	<i>Range</i>	0-20 years
	<i>Mean</i>	9.4
<i>Employment status</i>	<i>Housewives</i>	50%
	<i>Employment outside homes</i>	50%
	<i>- skilled</i>	33%
	<i>- semi-skilled</i>	59%

VALIDITY

Concurrent Validity

A significant correlation between acculturative stress and depressive symptomatology was observed $r = .40, p < .001$.

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's α coefficient of the ACS scale was 0.65.

Comments

- The measure addresses stresses in multiple domains and could be adapted to be more specific to the work setting.
- There were problems locating potential participants and the response rate was 21.5%. Due to the limitations of the sampling criteria and a self-selection bias, the results of the study must be interpreted with caution.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

ACCULTURATIVE STRESS SCALE (ACS)

- The author notes that a strict random sampling procedure is not possible when doing research with undocumented immigrants because of their clandestine status and fears about the consequences of participating in a study.
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information

Dra. V. Nelly Salgado de Snyder
Directora de Salud Comunitaria y Bienestar Social
Investigadora en Ciencias Medicas "F"
Centro de Investigación en Sistemas de Salud
Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública, Mexico
Tel: +52-777- 329-3019
Fax: +52-777-311-1156
e-mail: nsnyder@insp.mx
www.insp.mx

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

CULTURAL MISTRUST INVENTORY (CMI)

Source/Primary reference	Terrell, F., & Terrell, S. (1981). An inventory to measure cultural mistrust among blacks. <i>The Western Journal of Black Studies</i> , 5(3), 180-185.
Construct measured	Beliefs about the extent to which African Americans should trust Euro-Americans
Brief description	<p>This instrument consists of 48 items, divided into subscales that measure mistrust of blacks toward whites in four different domains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Political and legal system2. Work and business interactions3. Education and training4. Interpersonal and social contexts <p>All items rated on a 9-point scale from 1 = not in the least agree to 9 = entirely agree.</p>
Sample items	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Whites are usually fair to all people regardless of race. (work/business)▪ Black students can talk to white teachers in confidence without fear that the teacher will use it against him or her later. (education)▪ Blacks should be suspicious of a white person who tries to be friendly. (interpersonal)▪ White politicians will promise blacks a lot but deliver little. (political)
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	African American adults (can be adapted for other minority populations)
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known
How developed	<p>The authors reviewed the literature to develop items covering each of four domains: 1) Political and legal system, 2) Work and business interactions, 3) Education and training, and 4) Interpersonal and social contexts.</p> <p>Four black psychologists independently rated each item for clarity and domain appropriateness. The items that were considered unclear or inappropriate were rewritten or eliminated. This process continued until all judges agreed on the 81 items that composed the initial Cultural</p>

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

CULTURAL MISTRUST INVENTORY (CMI)

Mistrust Inventory. Then 23 items were eliminated based on their high correlation with the Social Desirability Scale (Jackson, 1970). An item discrimination analysis led to elimination of 9 additional items that were endorsed by most respondents. Finally, one item was eliminated because it correlated more highly with another subscale than its own.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>	<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>	<i>n</i> = 172
<i>Description</i>	African American first- and second-year male college students

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

An F-test was computed between the Racial Discrimination Index (Terrell & Miller, 1980) quartile groups and scores on the CMI, to test the hypothesis that being a victim of racial discrimination would be associated with scores on the CMI; $F = 14.01$ ($p < .001$).

Inter-scale correlation coefficients were low (ranging from 0.11 to 0.23), supporting the notion of four separate domains.

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Internal reliability was assessed by computing Pearson item-total scale score correlations; all items had statistically significant correlations ($p = 0.05$).

Test-Retest Reliability

Test-retest reliability was measured over a two-week interval ($n = 69$) with a result of 0.86 (statistic not specified).

Comments

- Need for further research, including a factor analysis of the domains of this inventory.
- Although the measure is somewhat old (1980), most items still seem relevant today.
- The study samples were 100% male. It would be important to assess applicability and norms for women.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

CULTURAL MISTRUST INVENTORY (CMI)

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Thompson, C. E., Neville, H., Weathers, P. L., Poston, W. C., & Atkinson, D. R. (1990). Cultural mistrust and racism reaction among African American students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 162-168.

Contact Information

Francis Terrell
University of North Texas
Department of Psychology
P.O. Box 311280
Denton, TX 76203-1280, USA
Tel: 940-565-2671
e-mail: terrellf@unt.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

RACISM REACTION SCALE (RRS)

Source/Primary reference	Thompson, C. E., Neville, H., Weathers, P. L., Poston, W. C., & Atkinson, D. R. (1990). Cultural mistrust and racism reaction among African American students. <i>Journal of College Student Development</i> , 31, 162-168.
Construct measured	Sense of being differentially treated
Brief description	The inventory includes 6 statements related to a sense of being personally threatened, differentially treated, or singled out for differential treatment. Each item is rated on a 7-point scale from 1 = strongly agree to 7 = strongly disagree.
Sample items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ I have to be prepared to deal with a threatening environment. ■ Other students are surprised to learn that I have some of the same feelings and goals that they have.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Students (can be adapted for use in a work setting)
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known
How developed	Initially, 19 items were chosen from the statements of racism reactions made by African American students who participated in a racial awareness program at a predominantly white university. The statements were reworded to conceal references to race.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>	
<i>Sample Size & Description</i>		African American <i>n</i> = 87	Euro-American <i>n</i> = 70
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 49	<i>n</i> = 39
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 37	<i>n</i> = 31
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	17-42	
	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	21 (4.2)	
<i>Academic Level</i>	<i>Freshman</i>	<i>n</i> = 35	
	<i>Sophomore</i>	<i>n</i> = 41	
	<i>Junior</i>	<i>n</i> = 38	
	<i>Senior</i>	<i>n</i> = 43	

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

The scores were compared between African American and Euro-American students, using t-test for independent means. Scores were higher in the former group for 16 of 19 items. Six differences had a

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

RACISM REACTION SCALE (RRS)

statistical significance exceeding a .05 alpha level and were chosen for inclusion in RRS.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>African American: Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Euro-American: Mean (SD)</i>
<i>People keep asking me about my manner of grooming.</i>	2.7 (1.9)	2.1 (1.8)
<i>I have to be prepared to deal with a threatening environment.</i>	4.6 (2.1)	3.3 (1.9)
<i>Other students are surprised to learn that I have some of the same feelings and goals that they have.</i>	3.6 (2.0)	2.8 (1.7)
<i>When I walk into class, everyone turns his or her head to look at me.</i>	3.5 (2.1)	2.4 (1.4)
<i>Professors don't expect me to perform as well as other students.</i>	2.2 (1.6)	1.4 (1.0)
<i>The other students expect me to do poorly in our classes.</i>	2.0 (1.5)	1.6 (1.2)

Concurrent Validity

Pearson correlations were calculated between the RRS and the 3 subscales of the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI) (Terrell & Terrell, 1981).

	<i>CMI Subscale</i>		
	<i>Interpersonal Relations</i>	<i>Education & Training</i>	<i>Combined</i>
<i>Scale</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
RRS	.22	.43	.34

Comments

- Although the scale was developed for use with students, it could be adapted for use with a broader adult working population.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information

Chalmer E. Thompson
 Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology
 Indiana University
 201 N Rose Ave., Room 4054
 Bloomington, IN 47405, USA
 Tel: 812-856-8319
 e-mail: chathomp@indiana.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INDEX OF RACE-RELATED STRESS (IRRS)

Source/Primary reference

Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1996). Development and validation of the Index of Race-Related Stress (IRRS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(4), 490-501.

Construct measured

Stress associated with specific events of racism and discrimination

Brief description

The instrument is a 46-item self-report measure of the stress experienced by African Americans as a result of daily racism and discrimination. The scale is a multidimensional measure (consisting of 4 subscales and a Global Racism measure) that takes into consideration both frequency and appraisal.

1. Cultural Racism Subscale - 16 items intended to measure the experience of racism when one's culture is denigrated
2. Institutional Racism subscale -11 items to assess the experience of racism embedded in institutional policies
3. Individual Racism subscale - 11 items to assess the experience of racism on the interpersonal level
4. Collective Racism subscale - 8 items to assess racism experienced as the concerted efforts of whites/non-blacks to restrict African Americans' rights

Respondents are asked to indicate which of the listed events they (or their family members) have experienced in their lifetimes. Then the chosen events are assessed on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 0 = never happened to 4 = event happened and I was extremely upset. Ratings on items are summed for total IRRS score.

The Global Racism score is derived by weighting each of the subscales and then summing.

Sample items

- While shopping at the store, the sales clerk assumed that you couldn't afford certain items (i.e., you were directed toward items on sale). (Individual racism)
- You have attempted to hail a cab, but they refused to stop; you think because you are black. (Collective racism)
- You seldom hear or read anything positive about black people on radio, TV, newspapers or in history books. (Cultural racism)
- You did not get the job you applied for although you were well qualified; you suspect because you are black. (Institutional racism)

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INDEX OF RACE-RELATED STRESS (IRRS)

Appropriate for whom
(i.e. which population/s)

African-American adults (can be adapted for other minority populations)

Translations & cultural adaptations available

None known

How developed

The initial items were developed based on interviews with male and female African Americans from various backgrounds, literature review, and the personal life experience of the first investigator (an African American male). A total of 74 items reflecting experiences of racism and discrimination were generated, then placed on a 5-point scale. The scale range was 1 = no reaction to 5 = rage. Respondents had to rate only the events they had experienced. Further analysis of two population samples (described below) yielded a final version of the scale with 46 items.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>		<i>Study 2</i>		<i>Study 3</i>	
<i>Sample</i>		Overall		Overall	Subsample	Sample 1	Sample 2
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 302		<i>n</i> = 310	<i>n</i> = 31	<i>n</i> = 31	<i>n</i> = 19
<i>Description</i>		African Americans		African Americans	23 whites 8 Asians	African American college students	African Americans from an adult education program
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	18-61		17-76	17-76	-	-
	<i>M (SD)</i>	26.77 (9.02)		23.38 (7.74)	23.38 (3.79)	20.48 (3.78)	29.42 (9.42)
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	167 (55%)		207 (67%)	16 (55%)	21 (67%)	15 (79%)
	<i>Male</i>	115 (38%)		92 (30%)	15 (45%)	9 (29%)	4 (21%)
	<i>Missing</i>	19 (7%)		11 (3%)		1 (3%)	

VALIDITY

Content Validity

The authors conducted a focus group composed of 5 African Americans to evaluate the content validity of the initial items. As a result, the Likert-type scale was modified to 1 = no reaction to 4 = extremely upset by the event. Some items were rewritten and some omitted.

In the next step, five additional experts judged the domain appropriateness of each item.

A pilot study was conducted throughout the U.S. (*n* = 377: 203 women, 163 men, 11 unknown). This resulted in adding another point (0 = this never happened to me) to the existing Likert scale.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INDEX OF RACE-RELATED STRESS (IRRS)

Construct Validity

Pilot Study: Principal components analysis on 67 items showed that up to four components were interpretable.

Component 1: cultural racism

Component 2: institutional-level racism

Component 3: individual-level racism

Component 4: collective racism (extension of Essed, 1990).

The researchers performed 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-component extractions with both oblique and orthogonal methods. Items with loadings of .35 or higher on a single factor were retained, yielding 59 questions.

Study 1 assessed the principal-component structure of the revised scale. The most interpretable and conceptually supported was the four-component orthogonal solution, which accounted for 38% of the common variance. As a result of these findings, 13 items were eliminated from the scale.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients among the subscales of the IRRS were low to moderate, supporting conceptualization of the subscales as distinct measures of the stress experienced by African Americans.

	<i>Subscale</i>		
	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Subscale</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
<i>1 Cultural Racism</i>	.42**	.56**	.30**
<i>2 Institutional Racism</i>		.57**	.58**
<i>3 Individual Racism</i>			.39**
<i>4 Collective Racism</i>			

** $p < .01$

Study 2: A confirmatory factor analysis of the scale component structure was conducted to investigate the construct validity of the scale. Subscale inter-correlation coefficients remained low to moderate, as in Study 1.

Concurrent Validity

Study 2: IRRS scores were compared with a second measure of racism (Racism and Life Experience Scale - RaLES-B, Harrell, 1994) and with a second measure of perceived stress (Perceived Stress Scale - PSS, Cohen, Karmarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). The IRRS subscales and the global (total z-weighted) scores were generally strongly associated with subscales of RaLES-B and the PSS, using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients:

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INDEX OF RACE-RELATED STRESS (IRRS)

<i>IRRS</i>	<i>RaLES-B</i> (<i>n</i> = 57)			<i>PSS</i> (<i>n</i> = 51)
	<i>Self</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Global</i>	
<i>Cultural Racism</i>	.04	.46**	.29*	.31*
<i>Institutional Racism</i>	.39**	.36**	.44**	.15
<i>Individual Racism</i>	.23*	.31**	.31**	.24*
<i>Collective Racism</i>	.25*	-.02	.15	.09
<i>Global Racism</i>	.30*	.38**	.39**	.24*

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

IRRS subscale scores were compared between black and 31 non-black (white and Asian) respondents, using multivariate analysis of variance. Blacks scored significantly higher on each IRRS subscale (all p -values < 0.01).

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Internal consistency was high for each IRRS subscale.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Study 1:</i> Cronbach's α	<i>Study 2:</i> Cronbach's α
<i>Cultural Racism</i>	.87	.89
<i>Institutional Racism</i>	.85	.82
<i>Individual Racism</i>	.84	.84
<i>Collective Racism</i>	.79	.74

Test-Retest Reliability

Test-retest reliability was assessed in Study 3 over a three-week interval for the first sample and a two-week interval for the second sample.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Sample 1</i> <i>Reliability Coefficients</i>	<i>Sample 2</i> <i>Reliability Coefficients</i>
<i>Cultural Racism</i>	.77	.58
<i>Institutional Racism</i>	.69	.71
<i>Individual Racism</i>	.61	.54
<i>Collective Racism</i>	.79	.75

Comments

- Appears to be a reliable and valid measure.
- Addresses the multidimensionality of the experience of race-related stress.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

INDEX OF RACE-RELATED STRESS (IRRS)

- The Institutional Racism subscale, which actually appears to assess individuals' experiences of institutional practices, has the items most relevant to workplace issues.
-

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information

Shawn Utsey & Joseph Ponterotto
Psychological and Educational Services
Fordham University at Lincoln Center
New York, NY 10023, USA

e-mail: utsey@mary.fordham.edu

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

RACE-RELATED STRESS

Source/Primary reference	Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health. <i>Journal of Health Psychology</i> , 2(3), 335-351.
Construct measured	Experiences of lifetime discrimination and everyday discrimination
Brief description	<p>The 12-item instrument includes two sets of questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Discrimination (3 items, count ranging from “none” to “three or more events”)2. Everyday Discrimination (9 items, rated from “never” to “often”) (based on Essed, 1991) <p>Following each section, respondents are asked to rank the three most common reasons for their unfair treatment from a list of nine possible reasons.</p>
Sample items	<p>Lifetime Experiences of Discrimination:</p> <p>Do you think you have ever been unfairly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ not been hired for a job?▪ fired or denied promotion?▪ stopped, searched, questioned, physically threatened, or abused by police? <p>Everyday Discrimination:</p> <p>How often:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ are you treated with less courtesy than others?▪ do you receive poorer service than others in restaurants?▪ do people act as if you are not smart?▪ are people afraid of you?
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Adults
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known
How developed	Items were written by the study authors. No additional detail is provided.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

RACE-RELATED STRESS

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>	Demographics	
<i>Sample Size</i>	<i>n</i> = 1,106	
<i>Description</i>	Adults residing in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties in Michigan, including the city of Detroit	
<i>Gender</i>	Age Range	18 years and older
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i> ‡	<i>Black</i>	<i>Not reported</i> †
	<i>White</i>	<i>n</i> = 586
		<i>n</i> = 520

†While the gender breakdown of the sample was not reported, gender was “controlled for” in regression analyses reported in the article.

‡Although respondents included a total of 33 Asians, Native Americans, and Hispanics, data from these participants were excluded from analyses.

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Cronbach's</i> α =
<i>Everyday Discrimination Scale</i>	.88

Comments

- The Everyday Discrimination scale was associated cross-sectionally with four different indicators of health status and accounted for a large proportion of the differences in health between blacks and Whites, beyond the effect of socioeconomic status (Williams et al., 1997).
- Others have reworded questions to improve clarity (e.g Hughes & Johnson, 2001).
- More psychometric assessment is needed.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(4), 981-996.

Taylor, J., & Turner, R. J. (2002). Perceived discrimination, social stress, and depression in the transition to adulthood: Racial contrasts. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 65(3), 213-225.

Race, Racism, Ethnicity, Racial Discrimination, & Related Measures

TITLE OF MEASURE

RACE-RELATED STRESS

Contact Information

David Williams
Department of Sociology
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, USA
Tel: 734-936-0649

e-mail: wildavid@isr.umich.edu
