REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	2. REPORT DATE 26.Jul.04	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED MAJOR REPORT

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
EXAMINING THE STRUCTURE OF THE SCHEDULE OF SEXIST EVENTS:
REPLICATION AND EXTENSION

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

6. AUTHOR(S)
CAPT MATTESON ALICIA A

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

CI04-508

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AFIT/CIA, BLDG 125
2950 P STREET
WPAFB OH 45433

10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Unlimited distribution
In Accordance With AFI 35-205/AFIT Sup 1

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT *(Maximum 200 words)*

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20040730 055

14. SUBJECT TERMS	**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 35
	16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

Running head: THE STRUCTURE OF THE SCHEDULE OF SEXIST EVENTS

\

Examining the Structure of the Schedule of Sexist Events:

Replication and Extension

Alicia V. Matteson

Bonnie Moradi

University of Florida

Abstract

The current study reexamined the factor structure of the Lifetime and Recent scales of the

Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995) and conducted the first factor

analysis of the SSE-Appraisal scale (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). Factor analyses conducted with

data from 245 women yielded, for SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Appraisal scales, two reliable factors

that can be scored as "Intimate and Personal Experiences of Sexist Events" and "Unfair

Treatment across Public Contexts" subscales. Data from the SSE-Recent scale yielded three

factors that can be scored as "Sexist Degradation and Its Consequences," "Unfair and Sexist

Events at Work/School," and "Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships" subscales.

Recommendations are made for the future use of these proposed subscales in conjunction with

total scale scores in research using the SSE to examine links between reported experiences of

sexist events and women's health and well-being.

Examining the Structure of the Schedule of Sexist Events: Replication and Extension

A sizable body of literature documents the frequency of women's experiences of specific

and often blatant forms of sexist events such as rape and sexual assault (e.g., Koss, 1988; Koss,

1990; Koss et al., 1994), abuse by male partners (e.g., Browne, 1993; Carden, 1994), and sexual

harassment and discrimination in the workplace (e.g., Fitzgerald, 1993; Fitzgerald & Omerod,

1993). Until the past decade, however, the literature had been limited on the impact of daily

sexist events on women's lives and mental health. Klonoff and Landrine (1995) suggested that

the lack of such empirical literature was due to the absence of an instrument to assess and

quantify every-day experiences of sexist discrimination. To address this gap in the literature,

Klonoff and Landrine (1995) developed the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE) to operationalize

women's reports of every-day experiences of sexist events. They hoped that by facilitating

empirical examination of the prevalence and psychosocial and health correlates of subtle and

daily sexist discrimination, the SSE could impact social change and advance the scientific

literature on women's experiences, health, and well-being.

The SSE was designed to assess daily occurrences of sexist events across a range of

domains. Klonoff and Landrine (1995) defined sexist events as "discriminatory acts or events

that happen to women because they are women" (p. 440). They used the extensive theoretical

and empirical literature on daily hassles and stressful life events (e.g., Dohrenwend, Krasnoff,

Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978; Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981; Lazarus, 1966;

Lazarus, DeLongis, Folkman, & Gruen, 1985,) to inform the development of the SSE (Klonoff &

Landrine, 1995). As such, they conceptualized sexist events as occurring frequently or

infrequently, and as acute (recent) and chronic (lifetime). Based on their review of the literature

and 120 women's written descriptions of "the worst things that has every happened or been done

to them *because they are women"* (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997, p. 12, italics in original), the authors developed items to assess the frequency of daily sexist events. They submitted these items to factor analysis and eliminated three items that did not load on any factor. The resultant SSE consisted of 20 self-report Likert-type items that assess the frequency of perceptions of lifetime and recent (i.e., past year) experiences of daily sexist discrimination across a range of contexts (e.g. "How many times have you heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes?" "How many times have people failed to show you the respect that you deserve because you are a woman?"). Landrine and Klonoff (1997) added an appraisal dimension to the original SSE to assess the perceived stressfulness of sexist events.

Since its development, the SSE has proven to be a critical tool in advancing the literature on women's mental health and well-being and its use has resulted in the proliferation of empirical studies on the prevalence and correlates of daily sexist events in women's lives (e.g. Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000; Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, & Lund, 1995; Lott, Asquith, & Doyon, 2001; Moradi & Subich, 2002a; Moradi & Subich, 2003). Use of the SSE in research has generated important descriptive data about daily sexist events in women's lives. For example, in the SSE's inaugural publication, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found that fully 99% of their large sample of women (N=631) reported experiencing sexist events at least once in their lifetime and 97% reported experiencing sexist events at least once within the past year. More specifically, the largest proportions of women in their sample reported being forced to listen to sexist or sexually degrading jokes (94%), being sexually harassed (82%), being called sexist names (82%), and being treated with a lack of respect (83%) at least once in their lives. Similarly, large proportions of their sample reported being forced to listen to sexist or sexually degrading jokes (83%), wanting to tell someone off for being sexist (72%), and being treated

unfairly by people in service jobs (62%) at least once in the past year. Findings across studies consistently have suggested that younger women report more frequent sexist events then older women (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Lott et al., 2001; Moradi & Subich, 2002a). Some evidence also suggests that Women of Color and unmarried women may report more frequent sexist events than White/European American women and married women (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), but these differences have not emerged consistently across samples (e.g., Lott et al., 2001; Moradi & Subich, 2002a). Lott et al. (2001) examined women's responses to sexist events assessed with the SSE and found that their sample's most frequent responses to sexist events included ignoring the sexist incident (39%), confronting the perpetrator (26%), leaving the site of the incident (22%), and joking about the incident (21%).

In addition to describing the frequency of reported sexist events and responses to these incidents, researchers have used the SSE to examine the relationship between reported sexist events and women's psychological symptomatology and identity. For example, Landrine et al. (1995) found that sexist discrimination accounted for significant and unique variance in women's symptoms (e.g., premenstrual, depressive, obsessive-compulsive, somatic, overall symptomatology) above and beyond variance accounted for by generic stressors. Extending these findings, Klonoff et al. (2000) argued that some gender differences in psychological symptomatology might be explained by women's experiences of sexism. Indeed, these authors found that women reported significantly more sexist events than men. Furthermore, compared to men in general, women who reported high levels of sexist events reported higher levels of depressive, anxious, and somatic symptoms whereas women who reported low levels of sexist events did not differ from men in level of symptoms.

Moradi and Subich (2002a) further extended the research on the relationship between reported sexist events and psychological symptoms by controlling for possible covariates and socially desirable responding in their tests of hypotheses. These authors found that recent reported sexist events accounted for unique variance in women's psychological distress beyond that accounted for by demographic covariates, social desirability, feminist identity development attitudes, and lifetime sexist events. The finding that recent sexist events emerged as a unique predictor is consistent with Landrine et al.'s (1995) conceptualization of lifetime sexist events as distal predictors and recent sexist events as proximal predictors of psychological symptoms.

Moradi and Subich (2003) also investigated the sexist events-distress relationship with African American women. They found that both sexist and racist events correlated positively with psychological distress. When examined concomitantly, however, only sexist events emerged as a unique predictor of psychological distress. Based on findings of a high correlation between reports of racist and sexist events and the overlap in their relations to psychological distress, these authors suggested that the constructs of racism and sexism might overlap for African American women.

In a recently published article, Moradi and Subich (2004) examined the possibility that self-esteem serves as a buffer in the sexist events-symptoms relationship, again, using the SSE to operationalize sexist events. Indeed, they found that self-esteem moderated the links of psychological distress to frequency of lifetime and recent sexist events and the appraisal of those events as stressful. More specifically, greater lifetime and recent frequency and the appraisal of sexist events as stressful each were related positively and significantly to psychological distress for women with low self-esteem but unrelated to distress for women with high self-esteem.

Whereas the aforementioned studies focused on psychological symptoms, a few additional studies used the SSE to examine the relationship between sexist events and women's identity development. For example, in a 5-month longitudinal study, Anthis (2002) found that recent sexist events (as measured by SSE-Recent) at Time 1 significantly predicted level of identity exploration at Time 2 (i.e., 5 months later) beyond identity exploration at Time 1. In addition, Fischer et al. (2000) found that reports of more frequent recent and lifetime sexist events were related to lower levels of identity achievement. These studies' findings are consistent with Kroger and Green's (1996) expansion of Marcia's (1966) adult identity development theory and the notion that sexist events are stressful life events that might provoke women to increase exploration and decrease commitment in their identity development.

In another study involving women's identity development, Moradi and Subich (2002b) examined relationships of reported sexist events to attitudes reflective of Downing and Roush's (1985) feminist identity development model. SSE Recent, Lifetime, and Appraisal scores were related in the expected directions to feminist identity attitudes. More specifically, reported sexist events were correlated negatively to Passive Acceptance (characterized by a denial of sexism) and positively to all other feminist identity attitudes (characterized by a recognition and understanding of sexism). Fischer et al. (2000) reported links between feminist identity development and reported sexist events that were quite consistent with these findings. Finally, Moradi and Subich (2002a) found that Passive Acceptance attitudes moderated the link between reported sexist events and psychological distress such that the sexism-distress link was stronger for women with high Passive Acceptance attitudes than for women with low Passive Acceptance attitudes.

Taken together, the findings of the studies reviewed thus far document the prevalence of reported sexist events and suggest that reported sexist events are important correlates of women's psychological distress and identities. Furthermore, these studies demonstrate the increasing use of the SSE in extant literature and provide evidence of convergent validity for the SSE. Extant research with the SSE has relied almost exclusively, however, on using total scores from the Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal scales of the SSE in analyses. This is the case despite the fact that factor analyses conducted during the initial development of the SSE suggested that the SSE-Lifetime and the SSE-Recent scales were multidimensional (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). Although use of total SSE scores is appropriate in studies examining global outcome variables, the potential multidimensionality of SSE scores suggests that total scores might blur important distinctions in specific dimensions of perceived sexist events and specific dimensions of sexist events may be differentially related to some outcome variables (e.g., relationship outcomes, work-related outcomes).

For example, Yoder and McDonald (1998) examined the link between the Recent Sexist Discrimination in the Workplace subscale (scored based on Klonoff and Landrine's [1995] 3-item workplace discrimination factor and an additional SSE item that Yoder and McDonald deemed relevant) and occupational stressors in nontraditional occupations for women (e.g., perceptions of heightened visibility of mistakes, unfavorable colleagueship, role assimilation, feeling devalued in one's work team, and experiences of sexual harassment). They found that scores on the Sexist Discrimination in the Workplace subscale correlated significantly and in the expected direction with seven of eight measures of tokenism. Scores were unrelated, however, to a measure of the frequency of sexually harassing experiences. These findings suggested that the Sexist Discrimination in the Workplace subscale of the SSE Recent scale captures a broad range

of work-related sexist events that are distinct from sexual harassment. The correlation between sexist discrimination in the workplace and the work-related outcomes assessed by Yoder and McDonald may have been masked, however, if only SSE Recent total scores were examined.

Despite the potential utility of subscales for the SSE scales, the factor structure of the SSE has not been evaluated with a sample independent from the scale development sample. Thus, the replicability of the factor structure obtained with the scale development sample is unknown. In addition, using criteria to obtain stable and reliable factor solutions is necessary to maximize the utility of factor analytic results for scoring SSE subscales in future research. More specifically, Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) highlighted that factor solutions that have four or more well-defined loadings are likely to be more stable than factors with fewer weakly defined (i.e., loading ≤ .40) loadings. Some of the factors obtained with the scale development sample had only three items and yielded lower than conventionally accepted alphas (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), highlighting the importance of examining the replicability of these factors in an independent sample (Gaudagnoli & Velicer). Thus, future use of the SSE can be guided by a reanalysis of the factor structure of SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent that examines the replicability of Klonoff and Landrine's findings and uses guidelines to maximize the stability and reliability of the obtained factor solutions. Furthermore, research has been conducted and published using the Appraisal scale of the SSE without information about its factor structure/dimensionality.

The current study addressed these gaps by using a sample that is independent from that used in the development of the SSE to (a) reexamine the factor structure of SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent scales, (b) provide the first examination of the factor structure of the SSE-Appraisal scale, and (c) use analytic strategies and criteria that maximize the potential reliability and replicability of factor solutions. Findings from the present study can advance the literature on

women's reported experiences of sexist events by informing future use of SSE scales and subscales.

Method

Participants

The current study's analyses were conducted with data from a larger study (Moradi & Subich, 2002b). Women (N=245) from a large Midwestern university were recruited to participate in this study. To increase the diversity of the sample and capture a wide range of reported experiences of sexism, both faculty/staff (86) and undergraduate students (159) were recruited to participate in the study. Participants ranged in age from 16 to 67 years (Mean=30.24, SD=12.68). The majority of the sample (79%) identified as White, 13% African American, 4% Asian American, 2% Latina, 2% Multiracial or other racial/ethnic group, and less than 1% Native American. Most women (57%) reported being single and 42% reported being married or in a committed relationship. In terms of socioeconomic status, 47% of the sample identified as middle class, 31% as working class, 17% as upper-middle class, 4% as lower class, and less than 1% identified as upper class. Most participants (62%) had a high school degree, 12% had a bachelor's or an associate degree, 17% had a master's degree, and 9% had a doctorate.

Instruments

The Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE; Landrine & Klonoff, 1997), with the SSE-Lifetime, SSE-Recent, and SSE-Appraisal scales, was administered to all participants. Consistent with procedures for administering the SSE, participants responded to each of the 20 Likert-type (1 = the even never happened to 6 = the event happened almost all [i.e., more than 75%] of the time) items three times; twice to assess the frequency of perceived sexist events (a) in respondent's life (SSE-Lifetime), and (b) within the past year (SSE-Recent), and once to assess the perceived

stressfulness of the event (SSE-Appraisal). Item 20, which assesses how different the respondent believes her life would have been if she had not experienced sexism, is only rated for SSE-Recent and Lifetime. For each scale, item ratings are added to yield a scale score and higher scores indicated greater levels of reported sexist events.

Klonoff and Landrine (1995) reported that in their samples, SSE-Lifetime and Recent yielded Cronbach's alphas of .92 and .90, respectively. When the SSE-Appraisal Scale was added, Landrine and Klonoff (1997) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .93 with their sample. Comparable to these values, alpha coefficients for the current sample were .92 for SSE-Lifetime, .90 for SSE-Recent, and .92 for SSE-Appraisal scores. In terms of validity, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found that SSE scores correlated significantly and positively with reported frequency of daily hassles and major stressful life events. Furthermore, Fischer et al. (2000) reported non-significant or negligible correlations between SSE scores and self-deceptive enhancement and impression management dimensions of social desirability. In addition to responding to the SSE, all participants provided demographic information.

Procedures

Undergraduate women were recruited from psychology courses and given extra credit towards their course grade for participating in the study. They completed the survey packets individually or in small groups. Faculty and staff women were randomly selected from the university directory, mailed a survey packet, and invited to participate in the study. For faculty/staff women, the incentive to participate was entrance in to a lottery for five $50 cash awards. All faculty and staff women were sent three reminder letters, which were mailed 2 to 3 weeks apart. The return rate of faculty/staff questionnaires was 28%. For all participants,

procedures for completing the questionnaires were explained in writing and written consent was

obtained. Participants were debriefed (verbally or in writing) after completing the questionnaires.

Results

Descriptive data, reliabilities, and intercorrelations obtained with the current sample for

SSE-Lifetime, SSE-Recent, and SSE-Appraisal are displayed in Table 1. Means and standard

deviations obtained with our sample for SSE-Lifetime (M = 49.10, SD = 16.29), SSE-Recent (M

= 38.70, SD = 14.40), and SSE-Appraisal (M = 46.68, SD = 18.89) were comparable to those

obtained by Fischer et al. (2000) for SSE-Lifetime (M = 47.40, SD = 16.00) and SSE-Recent (M

= 38.00, SD = 14.00) and means reported by Landrine and Klonoff (1997) for SSE-Lifetime

(M=43.91), SSE-Recent (M=35.03), and SSE-Appraisal (M=48.00). Fischer et al. did not use

SSE-Appraisal and Landrine and Klonoff did not report standard deviations, thus these values

could not be compared with those in our sample.

Examining the Suitability of Data for Factor Analyses

Several guidelines in the literature indicated that the sample size (N = 245) of the current

study was appropriate for obtaining stable factor solutions. Arrindell and van der Ende (1985)

demonstrated that when samples are approximately 20 times the number of factors drawn, stable

factor solutions are obtained. Based on Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) findings, the largest

expected number of factors was four, therefore the current sample size was at least three times

the minimum size recommended. Furthermore, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) reported that about

150 cases should be sufficient when solutions have several high loading marker variables. Many

of the loadings obtained in this study were substantial, (i.e., in the high .70s). Thus, the current

sample exceeded this recommendation as well.

Preliminary analyses were conducted with data from each of the three scales to determine if factor analyses were appropriate with these data sets. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for SSE-Lifetime, SSE-Recent, and SSE-Appraisal data were .93, .90, and .92, respectively. Probabilities greater than .90 are considered excellent and indicate that data are distributed normally, which is necessary for data to be factor analyzed (George & Mallory, 2003). Furthermore, the Bartlett Test of Sphericity indicated that data from all three scales exceeded criteria for multivariate normality, another indication that the data were appropriate for factor analyses (George & Mallory, 2003). Thus, the sample size, distribution, and normality of these data all indicated the appropriateness of conducting factor analyses with these data.

Factor Analyses

A principal components analysis (PCA) for each of the three scales (SSE-Lifetime, SSE-Recent, and SSE-Appraisal) was conducted according to Tabachnick and Fidell's (1996) recommendations. We chose to conduct PCAs rather than Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) because we did not have clear a priori factor structures for the three SSE scales to test using CFA. Indeed, the factor structure of SSE-Appraisal has not been examined to date and limited or mixed information exist about the factor structure of the SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent. Only one prior study, Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) factor analyses with data from the scale development sample, examined the factor structure of the SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent. This study yielded different factor structures across subsamples for SSE-Lifetime (i.e., four factors for White women, three factors for women of color) and did not examine potential subsample variability in factor structure for SSE-Recent. Thus, we chose to conduct PCAs because we did not have clear a priori factor structures to examine using CFA.

To conduct the analyses for the current study, first, data for each scale were entered into an initial PCA extraction with varimax rotation in order to determine the number of factors to be extracted. Four criteria were utilized to determine the number of factors to be extracted and rotated for the final solutions: (1) eigenvalues greater than 1.0, (2) Cattell's scree test (Field, 2000), (3) percentage of total variance accounted for by each factor, and (4) interpretability of the solution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). A minimum factor loading cutoff of .30 was used and the maximum acceptable cross-loading of .30 was selected (Bryant & Yarnold, 2001). To be retained as interpretable, each factor was required to have at least four loadings that were greater than .40 (Gaudagnoli & Velicer, 1988). Once the number of factors to be extracted was determined, data were entered into additional PCAs with defined number of factors until the solution with the greatest interpretability and consistency was determined. This procedure was repeated for each of the three SSE scales.

Factor Analysis of SSE-Lifetime Data

The initial PCA for SSE-Lifetime data indicated three factors with eignevalues greater than one. Cattell's scree test suggested the retention of two factors. The first factor extracted accounted for 41.24%, the second factor accounted for 9.93%, the third accounted for 5.20%, and the fourth accounted for 4.70% of variance in the data. Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) recommend retaining factors that account for at least 5% of the total variance, thus factors one and two were clearly retainable, factor three was borderline retainable, and factor four was not retainable. Based on these findings, the two- and three-factor solutions were rotated and examined further for interpretability.

Factor intercorrelations for the two-factor (.51) and three-factor (.37, .43, .44) solutions ranged from moderate to high indicating the need to use oblique rotation (Tabachnick & Fidell,

1996). Oblique rotations were conducted using the direct oblimin option in SPSS, which is considered one of the best methods for oblique rotations currently available (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The two-factor oblique solution accounted for 51.17% of the total extracted variance and the three-factor oblique solution accounted for 56.38%. An examination of the factor loadings on both the two- and three-factor solutions revealed that only the two-factor solution had four or more substantial loadings (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). Furthermore, the three-factor solution's third factor had only two items without substantial cross-loadings.

Thus, due to its interpretability and ability to meet the numerous criteria set forth for obtaining stable factor solutions in this study, the two-factor oblique solution (shown in Table 2) was retained as the best solution for SSE-Lifetime data. The first factor accounted for 41.24% of variance in the data, reflected intimate and personal experiences of sexist events, and included eleven items (e.g., "How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick, or other names?" and "How many times have people made inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances to you because you are a woman?") that loaded cleanly without substantial cross-loadings. The second factor accounted for an additional 9.93% of variance in the data, reflected unfair treatment across public contexts, and consisted of eight items that loaded cleanly onto it (e.g., "How many times were you denied a raise, a promotion, tenure, a good assignment, a job, or other such thing at work because you are a woman?" and "How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (by doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, pediatricians, school principals, gynecologists, and others) because you are a woman?"). Item #20 ("How different would your life be now if you had not been treated in a sexist and unfair way?") loaded similarly on both factors. Alphas for factors one and two with the current sample were .89 and .86, respectively.

Factor Analysis of SSE-Recent Data

The initial PCA with SSE-Recent data indicated four factors with eignevalues greater than one. Cattell's scree test supported the retention of two factors. The first, second, third, and fourth factors accounted for 37.31%, 9.45%, 6.67%, and 5.73% of the variance, respectively. Given that each factor accounted for more than 5% of variance, the two, three, and four-factor solutions were evaluated further.

Due to moderate to high factor intercorrelations (.49 for the two-factor solution, .29, .35, and .45 for the three-factor solution, and .22-.38 [*Mdn* = .35] for the four-factor solution) the solutions were further evaluated using PCAs with oblique rotation. After rotation, the two-factor oblique solution accounted for 46.76% of the total extracted variance, the three-factor oblique solution accounted for 53.44% of the variance, and the four-factor oblique solution accounted for 59.17% of the variance in the data.

An examination of the factors' loadings indicated that only the factors on the two- and three-factor solutions met the criterion that retained factors need four or more substantial loadings to maximize reliablility (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). In fact, only two items loaded cleanly, without substantial cross-loadings, onto the fourth factor and Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) reported that factors with only one or two items are unreliable and should not be retained. Thus, the four-factor solution was eliminated from further consideration.

The two-factor solution's matrix revealed one item that cross-loaded similarly across both factors ("How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are a woman?") and one item that did not load onto either factor ("How many times have you been treated unfairly by your family because you are a women?"). On the other hand, all items loaded onto a single factor in the three-factor solution and the aforementioned cross-loadings were

eliminated. Thus, the three-factor solution, presented in Table 3, appeared to be the most parsimonious and interpretable solution.

Factor one of the three-factor oblique solution accounted for 37.31% of variance in the data and consisted of eight items that reflected sexist degradation and its consequences (e.g., "How many times have people made inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances to you because you are a woman?"). Factor two accounted for 9.45% of variance in the data and included five items that reflected unfair and sexist events at work and school (e.g., "How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors because you are a woman?"). Finally, factor three accounted for 6.67% of variance in the data and consisted of seven items that reflected unfair treatment in distant and close relationships (e.g., "How many times have you been treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man in your life because you are a woman?"). Alphas of factors one, two, and three with the current sample were .85, .80, and .76, respectively.

Factor Analysis of SSE-Appraisal Data

The initial PCA with SSE-Appraisal data indicated four eigenvalues above 1.0. The scree test supported the retention of two factors. The first, second, third, and fourth factors accounted for 41.44%, 8.98%, 6.14%, and 5.35% of variance, respectively. Given that all factors accounted for more than 5% of the total variance, the two, three, and four-factor solutions were evaluated further. Again, because the factor intercorrelations ranged from moderate to high (.56 for the two-factor solution, .32, .37, and .44 for the three-factor solution, and .28-.39 [*Mdn* = .33] for the four-factor solution) oblique rotation was used. The two-factor oblique solution accounted for 50.42%, the three-factor oblique solution accounted for 56.56%, and the four-factor oblique solution accounted for 61.91% of the variance.

Examination of the four-factor solution's matrix revealed that only two items cleanly loaded onto the fourth factor, thus the four-factor solution was not evaluated further. The three-factor solution included three items that loaded similarly across two factors and the meaning of the factors was substantially compromised if the items were eliminated. The two-factor solution's items all loaded cleanly onto either factor one (e.g., "How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick, or other names?" and "How many times have people made inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances to you because you are a woman?") or factor two (e.g., "How many times were you denied a raise, a promotion, tenure, a good assignment, a job, or other such thing at work because you are a woman?" and "How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs [by doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, pediatricians, school principals, gynecologists, and others] because you are a woman?"). The two factors that emerged were easy to interpret, and paralleled the meaning of the two factors retained with SSE-Lifetime data: (1) intimate and personal experiences of sexist events and (2) unfair treatment across public contexts. In fact, the same items on the SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Appraisal loaded onto factors one and two of both scales. Thus, the two-factor solution (Table 4) was retained for the SSE-Appraisal scale. Alphas of factors one and two with the current sample were .90 and .84, respectively.

Discussion

The present data contribute to the body of literature on women's reported experiences of sexism in several important ways. First, the current study provided an independent reexamination of the factor structure of the SSE-Lifetime and Recent scales. Second, this study provided the first examination of the structure of the SSE-Appraisal scale. Third, criteria used in the present analyses maximize the reliability and stability of the factor solutions obtained.

Thus, the findings of this study can inform and guide future use of the SSE. More specifically, the two-factor structure of SSE-Lifetime (Intimate and Personal Experiences of Sexist Events and Unfair Treatment Across Public Contexts), the three-factor structure of SSE-Recent (Sexist Degradation and its Consequences, Unfair and Sexist Events at Work/School, and Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships), and the two-factor structure of SSE-Appraisal (Intimate and Personal Experiences of Sexist Events and Unfair Treatment across Public Contexts) can inform researchers use of subscale scores that can measure specific dimensions of women's perceptions of every-day sexist events. Furthermore, these subscales can provide practitioners information about their clients' experiences in specific domains. Given the robust links found in extant literature between reported experiences of sexist events and women's psychological distress, understanding and assessing such experiences in working with women seems critical.

Although the use of total SSE scores is appropriate in studies examining global outcome variables, the emergence of SSE factors suggests that total scores might blur important distinctions in specific dimensions of sexist events when specific outcome variables are considered. For example, Recent Unfair Treatment in Distant and Close Relationships may be related to measures of social or relationship satisfaction and Recent Sexist Events at Work/School may be related to work-related and academic satisfaction and retention. The exclusive use of SSE total scores, however, may dilute links between these specific domains of sexist events and related outcomes. Thus, the factors/subscales presented in this study can supplement SSE total scores. Rich information can be gained by empirically examining how specific dimensions of women's reports of daily sexist events are related to specific outcome variables and the subscales offered in this study can infrom the use of the SSE in such research.

Some similarities and differences between the current factor analytic results and those reported by Klonoff and Landrine (1995) are noteworthy. First, both studies identified SSE-Recent factors that reflected sexist degradation and its consequences, sexism in work/school, and sexism in relationship contexts. Although Klonoff and Landrine interpreted two separate relationship factors (i.e., sexism in close relationships, sexism in distant relationships) for their overall sample, in their subsample of women of color, only a single relationship factor emerged that was similar to the relationship factor that emerged in the current sample. The emergence of a three factor solution in Klonoff and Landrine's subsample and the current' study's sample lends support to the stability of the three factors identified across the two studies.

In the case of SSE-Lifetime, fewer factors emerged with our sample than with the scale development sample. One issue to consider in understanding this difference is differences in sample sizes across the two studies. Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) sample size was 631, whereas the current sample size was 245. Although both studies met the sample size criteria detailed in the results section, Bryant and Yarnold (2001) warned that, in studies involving many moderately correlated variables and a large sample, a relatively large number of factors may emerge that actually reflect only a few underlying constructs or dimensions. They called these factors *bloated specifics* and concluded that such factors are not reliable across samples. Consistent with this position, the current study's findings indicated more parsimonious solutions than those found with the scale development sample. Furthemore, Klonoff and Landrine used orthogonal rotations in their factor analyses. High correlations between factors in our data, however, suggested the need for oblique rotations (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Indeed, we found that oblique rotations resulted in cleaner and more parsimonious solutions than did orthogonal rotations.

Parsimony is important for establishing the replicability and utility of factor solutions. In fact, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) stated, "...if the researcher is interested in using only demonstrably reliable factors, the fewest possible factors are retained" (p. 674). To this end, the current study adhered to Guadagnoli and Velicer's (1988) findings that retained factors need four or more substantial loadings to be reliable across studies. Despite the valuable preliminary information that Klonoff and Landrine (1995) provided about the structure of the SSE with the scale development sample, some of the factors obtained with that sample consisted of only three items and yielded lower than conventionally accepted internal consistency reliability estimates which pose a challenge to using these factors to score subscales in future research. The fewer factors obtained in the current study, however, all had four or more substantial loadings and yielded acceptable alphas facilitating their use to score SSE subscales in future research. Overall, the current study provided a conservative approach to interpreting factor solutions particularly because our aim was to maximize the potential reliability and stability of the factor solutions to facilitate their use in future research.

Items that can be used, based on the findings of the current study, to score each subscale for each of the SSE scales are presented in Tables 2-4. One important note is that item 20, which assesses broadly the extent to which participants believe their life would be different if they had not been treated in a sexist manner, should not be used in subscales given its broad content and the fact that it did not load substantially or cleanly onto a single factor in the analyses. Use of the current findings to score subscales in future samples, however, must be informed by a number of limitations.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

Despite the strengths of the current study, a number of limitations are important to consider when interpreting the current findings. First, the current study did not examine the factor structure and applicability of the SSE subscales with women from a variety of backgrounds. Some prior studies that included more diverse samples indicated significant differences in SSE scores across racial/ethnic, age, and community versus university groups (e.g. Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Lott et al., 2001; Moradi & Subich, 2002a). Furthermore, Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) analyses for White women and Women of Color suggested some differences in the structure of the SSE across groups. For instance, for SSE-Lifetime, they found that three factors emerged for Women of Color whereas four factors emerged for White women. Furthermore, some items with substantial factor loadings in the entire sample did not load on any factor for Women of Color.

Thus, group differences may exist in the factor structures of SSE scales. The homogeneity of the current sample (i.e., primarily White university students and faculty/staff), however, did not allow for examination of such potential group differences. Further research is clearly needed to examine the factor structure of the SSE scales in more diverse samples. Such research should attend to the diversity among "Women of Color" (e.g., African American women, Asian American women). Research is also needed to explore the extent to which the SSE captures lesbian and bisexual women's experiences of daily sexist events and whether the factors obtained in the current study apply to these women. The findings of the current study should not be assumed to generalize to all women, rather the generalizeability of the current findings to women from diverse backgrounds should be examined empirically in future research.

Another limitation of existing data on the factor structure of SSE scales is that all existing analyses (those in the current study and prior research) have relied exclusively on exploratory

procedures (e.g., PCA). When developing an instrument, however, a two-step procedure with two subsamples is recommended (Bryant & Yarnold, 2001; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). First, with data from one subsample, an exploratory factor analysis procedure such as PCA is used to discover a feasible factor structure. Next, CFA is conducted with the remaining subsample to verify the factor structure discovered with the first subsample.

In the current study, we chose to conduct PCAs rather than CFAs because to date only Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) study with the scale develoment sample reported information about the structure of the SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent. Thus, we had no available information about the structure of the SSE-Appraisal, limited information (i.e., a single analysis) existed about the structure of the SSE-Recent, and analyses of the structure of SSE-Lifetime yielded different solutions across subsamples. Given the lack of clearly established structural models to be tested with CFA, we chose to allow factor structures to be determined from our observed data *a posteriori* using PCA as opposed to imposing a factor model *a priori* using CFA (Bryant & Yarnold, 2001). In light of the cumulation of information from the current study and Klonoff and Landrine's work on the structure of SSE scales, however, we encourage future researchers to use a combination of exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic procedures to examine the replicability of extant structures across diverse sample.

An additional issue that needs to be explored is the utility of the separate SSE scale scores. High correlations among SSE scales found in the current study (see Table 1) and prior research, as well as similar factor structures that emerged for SSE-Lifetime and Appraisal data raise questions about the distinctiveness of the three SSE scales (Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal). The literature is currently unclear on this issue. While high scale intercorrelations have been reported in numerous studies (in fact, Landrine and Klonoff (1997) reported

correlations very similar to those reported in the current study), researchers have used this information differently. Some researchers used all three scales despite the high correlations, whereas others decided that the high intercorrelations reflected scale redundancy and chose to use only one scale. Thus, clarifying the structural and predictive distinctiveness or redundancy of the three SSE scales is an important focus for future research as well.

A final point worth highlighting about the current study and about the larger body of literature on reports of discrimination experiences (e.g., racist events, sexist events) is assessment of individual's *perceived* experiences of discrimination, which could be affected by response-style and attribution of respondents. Klonoff and Landrine (1995) offered three reasons for the validity of individual's self-reports of experiences of sexist events. First, they argued that frequencies of sexist events reported on the SSE are consistent with non-self-reported data from other studies. Second, they stated that the patterns of self-reports they obtained using the SSE were neither random nor extreme. Finally, they highlighted that other instruments that assess the frequency of stressful events use self-report data and are treated as factual, accurate descriptions of events in people's lives. In fact, it is the current mode of operation to assess experiences of a variety of discrimination experiences (e.g., racism, heterosexism/homophobia, sexism) through self-reports of experiences perceived as or attributed to discrimination or prejudice (e.g., Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998; Waldo, 1999).

In addition, a number of studies have demonstrated that women fail to perceive and report the discrimination that they face, even when they are exposed to blatant discrimination in a laboratory setting (e.g., Crosby,1984; Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam, & Lalonde, 1990). Instead, there is a tendency to blame poor outcomes on individual attributes as opposed to discrimination (Major et al., 2002). Specific moderators, such as a person's belief in individual upward mobility

within a status hierarchy and ideologies that legitimize the status quo have been shown to impact the relationship between experiencing discrimination and reporting it as such (Crocker & Major, 1994; Major, et al., 2002). Crosby (1984) eloquently documented this phenomenon and offered support for numerous cognitive and emotional barriers to acknowledging personal experiences of discrimination (e.g., belief in a just world, avoidance of confronting one's own victimization). Overall, extant literature suggests that women do not over-report personal experiences of discrimination; on the contrary, they might underreport such experiences.

One way to view the *perceived* versus *actual* discrimination experiences question is to acknowledge the difficulty (perhaps impossibility) of distinguishing *perceived* from *actual* discrimination events given the subjectivity of such attributions. However, pursuing research on both pre and post attribution processes is important given that different attributions and perceptions of events may have different interpersonal and mental health consequences for targets of discrimination. Potential areas for intervention can be implemented at both pre- and post attribution and should be explored. In addition, research that examines how individual differences and contextual variables shape persons' attributions and perceptions of events can further inform educational and therapeutic interventions.

Summary

The current research replicated and extended Klonoff and Landrine's (1995) important work on the structure of the SSE. More specifically, the current study provided empirical evidence of the multidimensionality of the three SSE scales (Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal). Researchers can use the present findings to inform their decisions about using subscale and/or scale scores in their research with the SSE. Subscale scores might be particularly useful when research questions involve specific domains of women's reported experiences of sexist events

and specific outcomes variables. Thus, use of SSE subscale scores could advance the literature by encouraging the examination of a wider range of outcome variables beyond general mental health and identity development (e.g., interpersonal relationships, work-related outcomes). Total SSE scores can continue to be used to provide information about women's reported experiences of sexist events in general and may be appropriate to use when general outcome variables are of interest.

References

Anthis, K.S. (2002). The role of sexist discrimination in adult women's identity development. *Sex Roles, 47*, 477-484.

Arrindell, W.A., & Van der Ende, J. (1985). Cross-sample invariance of the structure of self-reported distress and difficulty in assertiveness. *Advances in Behaviour Research & Therapy, 7*, 205-243.

Browne A. (1993). Violence against women by male partners: Prevalence, outcomes, and policy implications. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1077-1087.

Bryant, F.B., & Yarnold, P.R. (2001). Principal-components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 99-136). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Carden, A.D. (1994). Wife abuse and the wife abuser: Review and recommendations. *Counseling Psychologist, 22*, 539-582.

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1994). Reactions to stigma: The moderating role of justifications. In M.P. Zanna & J.M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 7, pp.289-314). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Crosby, F. (1984). The denial of personal discrimination. *American Behavioral Scientist, 27(3)*, 371-386.

Dohrenwend, B.S., Krasnoff, L., Askenasy, A.R., & Dohrenwend, B.P. (1978). Exemplification of a method for scaling life events: The PERI Life Events Scale. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19*, 205-229.

Downing, N.E., & Roush, K.L. (1985). From passive acceptance to active commitment:

A model of feminist identity development for women. *The Counseling Psychologist, 13*, 695-709.

Field, A. (2000). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS for windows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Fischer, A.R., Tokar, D.M., Mergl, M.M., Good, G.E., Hill, M.S., & Blum, S.A. (2000). Assessing women's feminist identity development: Studies of convergent, discriminant, and structural validity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 15-29.

Fitzgerald, L.F. (1993). Sex harassment: Violence against women in the workplace. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1070-1076.

Fitgerald, L.F., & Ormerod, A.J. (1993). Breaking the silence: The sexual harassment of women in academia and the workplace. In F.L. Denmark & M.A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (pp. 553-581). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows: Step by step* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W.F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 265-275.

Kanner, A.D., Coyne, J.C., Schaeffer, C., & Lazarus, R.S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*, 1-39.

Klonoff, E.A., & Landrine, H. (1995). The Schedule of Sexist Events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 439-472.

Klonoff, E.A., Landrine, H., & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 93-99.

Koss, M.P. (1988). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. In A.W. Burgess (Ed.), *Rape and sexual assault* (Vol. 2) (pp. 3-25). New York: Garland.

Koss, M.P. (1990). The women's mental health research agenda: Violence against women. *American Psychologist, 45*, 374-380.

Koss, M.P., Goodman, L.A., Browne, A., Fitzgerald, L.F., Keita, G.P., & Russo, N.F. (1994). *No safe haven: Male violence against women at home, at work, and in the community*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kroeger, J., & Green, K.E. (1996). Events associated with identity status change. *Journal of Adolescences, 19*, 477-490.

Landrine, H., Klonoff, E.A., Gibbs, J., Manning, V., & Lund, M. (1995). Physical and psychiatric correlates of gender discrimination: An application of the Schedule of Sexist Events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 473-492.

Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E.A. (1996). The Schedule of Racist Events: A measure of racial discrimination and a study of its negative physical and mental health consequences. *Journal of Black Psychology, 22*, 136-160.

Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E.A. (1997). *Discrimination against women: Prevalence, consequences, remedies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lazarus, R.S. (1966). *Psychological stress and coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lazarus, R.S., DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Gruen, R. (1985). Stress and adaptational

outcomes: The problem of confounded measures. *American Psychologist, 40,* 770-779.

Lott, B., Asquith, K., & Doyon, T. (2001). Relationship of ethnicity and age to women's

responses to personal experiences of sexist discrimination in the united states. *The*

Journal of Social Psychology, 141, 309-315.

Major, B., Gramzow, R.H., McCoy, S.K., Levin, S., Schmader, T., & Sidanius, J. (2002).

Perceiving personal discrimination: The role of group status and legitimizing ideology.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82, 269-282.

Marcia, J.E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.

Moradi, B., & Subich, L.M. (2002a). Perceived sexist events and feminist identity

development attitudes: Links to women's psychological distress. *The Counseling*

Psychologist, 30, 44-65.

Moradi, B., & Subich, L.M. (2002b). Feminist identity development measures:

Comparing the psychometrics of three instruments. *The Counseling Psychologist,*

30, 66-86.

Moradi, B., & Subich, L.M. (2003). A concomitant examination of the relations of perceived

racist and sexist events to psychological distress for African American women. *The*

Counseling Psychologist, 31, 451-470.

Moradi, B., & Subich, L.M. (2004). Examining the moderating role of self-esteem in the link

between experiences of perceived sexist events and psychological distress. *Journal of*

Counseling Psychology, 51, 50-56.

Swim, J.K., Cohen, L.L., & Hyers, L.L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and

discrimination. In J.K. Swim, & C. Stangor, (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's*

perspective (pp. 37-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., Moghaddam, R.M., & Lalonde, R.N. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group but not myself to be a target of discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16*, 254-262.

Waldo, C.R. (1999). Working in a majority context: A structural model of heterosexism as minority stress in the workplace. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 218-232.

Yoder, J.D., & McDonald, T.W. (1998). Measuring sexist discrimination in the workplace. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 487-492.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for and Intercorrelations Among SSE-Lifetime, Recent, and Appraisal

Scales

Scale	1	2	M	SD	α
1. Lifetime			49.10	16.29	.92
2. Recent	.81		38.70	14.40	.90
3. Appraisal	.76	.67	46.68	18.89	.92

Note. All correlations were significant at $p < .001$

Table 2

SSE-Lifetime Items and Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Solution with Oblique Rotation

Abbreviated items	Factor 1 Intimate/Personal Sexist Events M = 2.67 SD = .47 α = .89	Factor 2 Unfair Treatment in Public Context M = 2.07 SD = .10 α = .86
16. Been called a sexist name	.83	
11. Made inappropriate/unwanted sexual advances to you	.81	
19. Heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes	.78	
13. Wanted to tell someone off for being sexist	.78	
12. Failed to show you the respect you deserve	.76	
17. Gotten into an argument or fight about something sexist	.74	
14. Been really angry about something sexist	.73	
18. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit or threatened with harm	.60	
8. Treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man	.50	
15. Forced to take drastic steps such as filing a grievance or lawsuit, quitting	.48	
10. Treated unfairly by your family	.41	
20. How different would your life be now	.40	.39
9. Denied a raise, promotion, tenure…or other such thing at work		.79
2. Treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors		.78
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs		.74
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors		.71
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors		.66
3. Treated unfairly by co-workers, fellow students or colleagues		.63
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs		.57
5. Treated unfairly by strangers		.53

Note. Factor Loadings $\leq |.30|$ have been omitted from this table.

Table 3

SSE-Recent Items and Factor Loadings for Three-Factor Solution with Oblique Rotation

Abbreviated items	Factor 1 Sexist Degradation & its Consequences M = 2.67 SD = .47 α = .89	Factor 2 Unfair/Sexist Events at Work/ School M = 2.07 SD = .10 α = .86	Factor 3 Unfair Treatment in Distant & Close Relationships M = 1.70 SD = .13 α = .76
17. Gotten into an argument or fight about something sexist	.80		
16. Been called a sexist name	.78		
13. Wanted to tell someone off for being sexist	.74		
14. Been really angry about something sexist	.73		
19. Heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes	.73		
11. Made inappropriate/unwanted sexual advances to you	.72		
12. Failed to show you the respect you deserve	.68		
18. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit or threatened with harm	.57		
2. Treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors		.80	
9. Denied a raise, promotion, tenure…or other such thing at work		.75	
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors		.61	
3. Treated unfairly by co-workers, fellow students or colleagues		.55	
20. How different would your life be now		.44	
8. Treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man			.66
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs			.66
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors			.66
10. Treated unfairly by your family			.63
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs			.63
5. Treated unfairly by strangers			.49
15. Forced to take drastic steps such as filing a grievance or lawsuit, quitting			.37

Note. Factor Loadings $\leq |.30|$ have been omitted from this table.

Table 4

SSE-Appraisal Items and Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Solution with Oblique Rotation

Abbreviated items	Factor 1 Intimate/Personal Sexist Events M = 2.71 SD = .17 α = .90	Factor 2 Unfair Treatment in Public Contexts M = 2.10 SD = .16 α = .84
16. Been called a sexist name	.89	
17. Gotten into an argument or fight about something sexist	.82	
13. Wanted to tell someone off for being sexist	.81	
11. Made inappropriate/unwanted sexual advances to you	.76	
14. Been really angry about something sexist	.75	
19. Heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes	.75	
12. Failed to show you the respect you deserve	.74	
18. Been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit or threatened with harm	.52	
8. Treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man	.47	
15. Forced to take drastic steps such as filing a grievance or lawsuit, quitting	.35	
10. Treated unfairly by your family	.35	
1. Treated unfairly by teachers or professors		.72
6. Treated unfairly by people in helping jobs		.71
4. Treated unfairly by people in service jobs		.69
9. Denied a raise, promotion, tenure…or other such thing at work		.69
7. Treated unfairly by neighbors		.67
2. Treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors		.65
3. Treated unfairly by co-workers, fellow students or colleagues		.60
5. Treated unfairly by strangers		.59

Note. Factor Loadings $\leq$|.30| have been omitted from this table.