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Abstract
Scholars have argued that much of the sexism literature has not acknowledged diversity among women, and they have called for more attention to the intersectionality of the multiple marginalized identities of sexual minority women of color (WOC) in particular. With a sample of 182 sexual minority WOC, we examined (a) the links between perceived lifetime and recent sexist events and psychological distress and (b) the potential moderating role in these relations of womanism (a perspective of feminism that recognizes the roles of both gender and race/ethnicity in the lives of WOC). Findings from our Internet survey indicated that lifetime and recent sexism were related significantly and positively to psychological distress. Womanism was also associated positively with both forms of sexism and psychological distress. In partial support of study hypotheses, womanism moderated the relationship between perceived lifetime sexist events, but not recent sexist events, and psychological distress. More specifically, the link between lifetime sexist events and psychological distress was significant and positive for sexual minority WOC with lower levels of womanism and not significant for those with higher levels of womanism. With regard to practice implications, assessing and exploring sexist events, placing these experiences in a larger sociocultural context of oppression, connecting with the legacy of social activism of marginalized groups, and encouraging supportive networks may diminish distress.
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Accumulating research supports the link between everyday perceived sexist events and psychological distress with women (e.g., Fisher & Bolton Holz, 2007, 2010; Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). However, much of the existing empirical literature investigating the relationship between sexist events and psychological distress has focused on the experiences of predominately White and/or heterosexual women (Moradi & DeBlaere, 2010). Greene (2003, p. xvii) commented, “For the most part, women’s mental health problems are discussed as if women were a homogenous group and as if sexism were the same for all of them.” Indeed, in a search of the PsycINFO database, Moradi and DeBlaere (2010) found that of the articles identified using the terms “gender discrimination,” “sexism,” “sexist events,” or “sexist discrimination” in their abstracts, only 20% also mentioned a marginalized group defined by either race/ethnicity (i.e., “African American,” “Black,” “Asian,” “Asian American,” “Hispanic,” “Hispanic American,” “Latina,” “Latino,” “Native American,” or “American Indian”) or sexual orientation (i.e., “lesbian,” “gay,” “bisexual,” or “homosexual”). These trends highlight the need for additional research on the link between perceived sexist events and psychological distress with racial and ethnic and sexual minority samples. Because sexual minority women of color (WOC) represent the intersection of oppressed gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation identities, examination of the sexism—distress link with this sample could contribute to a more comprehensive and inclusive understanding of the impact of sexist events on the lives of diverse women. Furthermore, because much of the developing body of literature on sexual minority people of color focuses on male samples (Huang et al., 2009), empirical research with sexual minority WOC is needed.

In addition to investigations of the direct links between sexist events and psychological distress, scholars have also called for examination of potential protective factors in the discrimination-mental health relation (e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2010).
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Sexual minority WOC as well as the potential moderating role of womanism in these links.

**The Sexism—Distress Link**

Prior quantitative studies, utilizing in-person survey methods with primarily White and heterosexual (or sexual orientation not reported) college women, have found a consistent and positive link between sexist events and distress (Moradi & DeBlaere, 2010). In addition, this link persists even after accounting for the role of other key variables (e.g., age, socioeconomic status; Moradi & Subich, 2002). For instance, with their sample of predominantly White women (sexual orientation not reported), Fischer and Bolton Holz (2007) reported that perceived recent sexist events were related significantly and positively to psychological distress beyond the indirect effects of recent sexist events to psychological distress through multiple aspects of self-esteem. An analogous unique relationship between recent sexist events and distress was found beyond the indirect effects of recent sexist events to depression and anxiety through fairness beliefs and perceived personal control (Fischer & Bolton Holz, 2010). Similarly, recent sexist events explained unique and significant variance in psychological distress with another sample of predominately White and heterosexual women seeking therapy, accounting for important correlates of distress (i.e., perceived social support, self-esteem, empowerment; Moradi & Funderburk, 2006).

Although investigations of the sexism experiences of predominantly White and heterosexual women continue to be important, the need to acknowledge and examine the experiences of WOC and sexual minority women is being increasingly highlighted (Bowleg, 2008; Cole, 2009). Intersectionality theory argues that social identities interact to form novel experiences that are distinct from the individual constituent identities themselves or their sum (Warner, 2008), and researchers are attending to these intersections in more recent studies of the relationship between sexism and distress. For instance, a growing number of quantitative studies, employing in-person and Internet survey methods, have examined the link of perceived recent sexist events to psychological distress considering other discrimination variables (i.e., racism, heterosexism) with samples of African American college and community women (predominately heterosexual or sexual orientation not reported; Moradi & Subich, 2003; Szymanski & Stewart, 2010) and predominately White sexual minority women (Szymanski, 2005; Szymanski & Owens, 2009). These studies, with their diverse samples, found that sexism was significantly and positively related to psychological distress. In addition, these authors reported significant and positive correlations between sexism and other discrimination variables.

Taken together, these investigations of the sexism—distress relation lead to two important observations. First, sexism consistently emerged as a unique predictor of psychological distress controlling for demographic variables and other forms of discrimination with samples of predominately White and heterosexual or sexual minority women (or sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2002; Szymanski & Owens, 2009) and predominately heterosexual African American women (or sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2003). Given this consistent link, it follows that sexism could be an important predictor of psychological distress for sexual minority WOC as well and thus should be investigated. Second, in examinations of the links of multiple discrimination experiences and distress, sexism was found to be significantly and positively correlated with other measures of discrimination with medium to large effects (Moradi & Subich, 2003; Szymanski & Owens, 2009; Szymanski & Stewart, 2010). These results suggest that the construct of sexism may overlap with other forms of discrimination for WOC and sexual minority women (Moradi & Subich, 2003). Qualitative and mixed methods investigations with Black sexual minority women seem to support this contention (Bowleg, 2008). It could also be the case that WOC or sexual minority women who perceive sexist events are more likely to perceive other forms of discrimination as well. Consequently, the investigation of prospective moderating variables in the sexism—distress link with this population should consider the potential presence or relevance of other forms of perceived discrimination pertinent to sexual minority WOC’s multiple marginalized identities.

**The Moderating Role of Womanism**

Feminist consciousness or feminist identity has been proposed to buffer the sexist events—distress link (e.g., Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). It has been suggested that a feminist identification may provide women with a way to conceptualize sexist events that allows them to externalize these events and subsequently evade the harmful effects of these experiences (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). A few quantitative studies, utilizing in-person survey methods, have directly examined the potential moderating role of feminist identity in the sexism—distress link. These studies conceptualized feminist identity as the connection of “attitudes and values about
feminism to attitudes about oneself as a woman and/or feminist” (Moradi & Subich, 2002, p. 46). For instance, Sabik and Tylka (2006) found that synthesis and active commitment, two styles of feminist identity representing positive views of women and a belief in gender equality (Downing & Rousch, 1986), buffered the sexist events—disordered eating relation with a sample of predominantly White college women (sexual orientation not reported). It was found that perceived lifetime and recent sexist events were related significantly and positively to disordered eating when women’s synthesis and active commitment identities were lower, but unrelated when these identities were higher. Relatedly, tentative support for the moderating role of passive acceptance (i.e., denial that sexism exists) in the relation between recent sexist events and psychological distress was reported with another sample of predominately White women (sexual orientation not reported; Moradi & Subich, 2002). Moradi and Subich (2002) suggested that denial of sexism may exacerbate psychological distress.

An important extension of previous investigations of the moderating role of feminist identities and attitudes in the sexist events—distress link is to replicate these relations with samples of WOC and sexual minority women. However, some scholars have argued that feminist perspectives may not be inclusive of the experiences of women from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds (e.g., Henley, Meng, O’Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 1998). Womanism, defined by Brown (1989, p. 613) as “a consciousness that incorporates racial, cultural, sexual, national, economic, and political consideration,” has been presented as an alternative to feminist perspectives that emerged from the White Women’s Movement (Henley et al., 1998). It is important to highlight that this definition of womanism is distinct from the concept of womanist identity development presented by Helms (1990, as cited in Carter & Parks, 1996). Although the term womanist was borrowed from Black feminist writers (e.g., Alice Walker, 1983), womanist identity development describes the developmental process whereby women transition from externalized societal definitions of womanhood to internalized personally relevant definitions of womanhood, rather than an explicit consciousness related to the intersection of multiple marginalized identities (Moradi, 2005; Ossana, Helms, & Leonard, 1992). In one of the few studies to empirically examine the concept of womanism as defined in our study, King (2003) found that womanism was correlated positively with both feminist ($r = .44$) and ethnic ($r = .27$) consciousness. These findings support the conceptualization of womanism as an identity or perspective that is inclusive of gender and racial/ethnic identities.

In an effort to operationalize the construct of womanism, Henley et al. (1998) developed the WOC subscale. This subscale is part of a larger measure assessing attitudes toward women, the Feminist Perspectives Scale (FPS), and represents a perspective of feminism intended to capture the intersectionality of gender and race and ethnicity across racial and ethnic groups. The other FPS subscales include conservatism (supports maintenance of traditional gender roles), liberal feminism (views principles of equality as the mechanism of social change and promotes the rights of the individual), radical feminism (argues that the oppression of women is the most salient form of oppression), socialist feminism (views all forms of oppression as negative and in need of political consideration), and cultural feminism (a desire to transform society to reflect women’s values, such as caring for others). Henley and McCarthy (1998) noted that individuals may hold attitudes and values consistent with multiple feminist perspectives, but they asserted that womanism is a perspective more likely to be endorsed by WOC. In addition, the WOC subscale includes the only FPS item pertaining to antigay prejudice, “Antigay and racist prejudice act together to make it more difficult for gay male and lesbian people of color to maintain relationships.” Hence, the WOC subscale effectively operationalizes the construct of womanism as representative of women’s multiple identities and oppressions with regard to gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

In addition, given that reports of sexist events by WOC and sexual minority women have been found to be positively related to racism and heterosexism experiences, correspondingly, the WOC subscale seems ideally suited to serve as a moderator in the sexism—distress link with our sample of sexual minority WOC. We contend that womanism provides sexual minority WOC with a framework that aids in their ability to contextualize and identify their sexist experiences which, in turn, allows them to externalize and minimize the negative effects of these experiences (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997; Moradi & Subich, 2002). More specifically, drawing from critical race theory, womanism allows sexual minority WOC to identify and analyze the “structural, cultural, and interpersonal aspects” of society that maintain oppressive systems (Solórzano, 1998, p. 123). In this way, overt and covert sexism can be placed within a broader historical and cultural context, which can provide women with the knowledge to deconstruct their experiences. Solórzano (1998) emphasized that the seemingly simple act of “naming” oppression can be a powerful first step for individuals from marginalized groups.

The Present Study

The current study aims to replicate and extend a prior model (e.g., Moradi & Subich, 2002) examining the moderating role of feminist identity in the sexist events—psychological distress relation with a sample of sexual minority WOC, utilizing a measure of womanism that is believed to be inclusive of sexual minority WOC’s multiple and intersecting identities. Based on the literature reviewed here, we investigate the direct links between perceived lifetime and recent sexist events and psychological distress as well as the potential moderating role of womanism in these links. To address these aims, the present study tests two hypotheses: (a) perceived lifetime and recent sexist events are each related significantly...
and positively to psychological distress and (b) womanism moderates the perceived sexism—psychological distress association such that the relation between lifetime and recent sexist events and distress for women reporting lower levels of womanism is significant and positive and the link for women reporting higher levels of womanism is not significant.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Analyses were conducted with a sample of 182 sexual minority WOC. Demographic data for the sample can be found in Table 1. (Approximately 10% of respondents did not complete the demographic questionnaire; percentages cited capture responses by those participants who responded to demographic questions.) Data for this study were collected via an Internet survey. This methodology is argued to be ideal for collecting data with sexual minority individuals because it increases accessibility to a less visible and decentralized population (Riggle, Rostosky, & Reedy, 2005). Additionally, results from Internet studies that are not compromised by repeat responses or participants answering at random are consistent with outcomes from traditional pen-and-pencil methods (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004). Recruitment e-mails detailing the study’s purpose (investigating the life experiences and well-being of lesbian and bisexual WOC), inclusion criteria (18 years of age or older, residing in North America, identify as a lesbian or bisexual woman of color), and the study’s survey link were sent to listservs, discussion groups, and virtual/online communities (groups of individuals sharing common interests via the Internet) aimed toward sexual minority WOC (e.g., radicalwomenla@earthlink.net). Directors of counseling and clinical psychology training programs were also contacted via e-mail and asked to distribute the study’s recruitment announcement to any appropriate program and/or student listservs. Upon clicking on the link provided, participants were directed to the survey, which consisted of an informed consent reiterating the study’s inclusion criteria, the study measures, and a debriefing form.

Four validity questions were strategically placed throughout the survey to ensure that participants were not responding at random (e.g., Please mark strongly agree). Although 430 individuals accessed the survey, 248 entries were not usable because they had only answered one question, had only looked at the survey but had not answered any questions, or were missing more than 25% of survey data (excluding demographic questions). Due to the anonymity of the survey, the proportion of these participants who may have returned to complete the survey at a later time cannot be determined. The data were screened to identify participants who did not meet inclusion criteria or missed more than one validity check item.

The data-cleaning procedures resulted in 182 participants. Among these participants, analysis of the patterns of missing data indicated that 4.82% of all items for all cases were missing and that every item was missing data for at least one case. With regard to individual cases, 152 (83.52%) participants were missing no data. Additionally, no item had more than 11.0% missing values. Excluding demographic variables, the range of missing data for items defining our variables of interest was 0.50% (Hopkins Symptom Checklist-21 [HSCL-21], Items 1–21) to 6.60% (Schedule of Sexist Events [SSE]-Recent, Item 20). Finally, Little’s Missing Completely at Random analysis was conducted and an insignificant chi-square statistic $\chi^2(3, 342) = 3.47, p = .94$ was obtained, signifying that data were missing at random. Consistent with Schlomer, Bauman, and Card’s (2010) recommendations, prior to computing scale scores, item-level missing data were imputed based on expectation maximization parameters using NORM.202 (Schafer, 1997, 2010). These procedures were conducted with only the variables of interest (sexism, womanism, and psychological distress) and not the demographic variables. Demographic variables were excluded because there were not a priori expectations of an association between the variables of interest and our demographic variables. Furthermore, several of the demographic variables were categorical variables (e.g., race and ethnicity) for which imputation of dummy coded variables would have had no conceptual meaning and obfuscated the demographic data. It should be noted that because mean imputation of this data set was conducted with only the variables of interest, the bivariate correlations (excluding age) were conducted with the entire sample ($N = 182$) whereas the moderation analyses, which included age as a covariate, were conducted with a smaller sample without missing age data ($N = 163$).

Instruments

Perceived sexist events. Perceived sexist events were assessed with the SSE (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). The SSE is a 20-item, Likert-type, self-report measure that assesses the frequency of perceived sexist events. Item ratings are added or averaged to obtain total scores; higher scores indicate greater perceived frequency of sexist events. A sample item is, “How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers or professors because you are a woman?” Participants responded to the items on the 6-point continuum: 1 (the event has never happened) to 6 (the event happened almost all [more than 70%] of the time). Participants rate the items once for the frequency of sexist events within one’s lifetime (SSE-Lifetime) and once for the frequency of sexist events in the past year (SSE-Recent). Landrine and Klonoff (1997) obtained acceptable Cronbach’s $\alpha$ reliability estimates for the SSE lifetime (.92) and recent (.90) versions with their subsample (36%) of racially and ethnically diverse women (African American, Asian American, Latina, Other; sexual orientation not reported). In terms of validity, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found that SSE scores correlated significantly and positively with frequency of daily hassles and...
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Our Survey Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American/Black (n = 67)</th>
<th>Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander (n = 33)</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latina (n = 25)</th>
<th>Multiracial (n = 25)</th>
<th>Native American/American Indian (n = 3)</th>
<th>Other Race/Ethnicities (n = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively lesbian/gay</td>
<td>25 (37%)</td>
<td>9 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly lesbian/gay</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>10 (30%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>18 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly heterosexual</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>65 (97%)</td>
<td>30 (91%)</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other genders</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attraction to same gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high to high</td>
<td>62 (93%)</td>
<td>25 (76%)</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
<td>22 (88%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low to moderate</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional attraction to same gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high to high</td>
<td>62 (93%)</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
<td>22 (88%)</td>
<td>24 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low to moderate</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating, casual</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating, long term</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>12 (18%)</td>
<td>10 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnerships (nonlegal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic partnership (legal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (legal)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>20 (30%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>33 (49%)</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>11 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–65</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/technical school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>14 (42%)</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some professional/graduate school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/graduate school</td>
<td>31 (46%)</td>
<td>12 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>31 (48%)</td>
<td>15 (46%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>20 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>5 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>20 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>10 (15%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>24 (36%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>10 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>16 (24%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40 (60%)</td>
<td>24 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (56%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>22 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Prior definitions of life stages were used to form the age groups (Levinson, 1986; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1976). Not all columns sum to 100% due to rounding error.
stressful life events. Cronbach’s α values of .95 (SSE-Life-
time) and .94 (SSE-Recent) were obtained with the current
sample.

Womanism. Womanism was assessed with a modified ver-
sion of the WOC subscale of the FPS (Henley et al., 1998).
The last question was altered to be inclusive of all WOC
rather than only African American women; the original item,
“The tradition of Afro-American women who are strong
family leaders has strengthened the Afro-American commu-
nity as a whole,” was modified to read: “The tradition of
women of color who are strong leaders (e.g., Gloria Anzal-
dúa, bell hooks) has strengthened communities of color as
a whole.” The WOC subscale is a Likert-type scale consisting
of 10 items. Item ratings are added or averaged to obtain total
scores; higher scores indicate greater womanism. A sample
item is, “Racism and sexism make double the oppression for
WOC in the work environment.” Participants respond to
items on a 7-point continuum: 1 (strongly disagree) to 7
(strongly agree). A Cronbach’s α reliability estimate of .75,
a 2-week test–retest reliability estimate of .85, and a
4-week test–retest reliability estimate of .80 were obtained
with the racially and ethnically diverse scale development
sample (53%–57% people of color: African American, Asian
American, Latina, Native American, Other; 59% women,
sexual orientation not reported; Henley et al., 1998). Validity
data for WOC scores include significant and positive correla-
tions with degree of feminism and number of women’s
studies courses taken, as well as a negative correlation with
political conservatism (Henley et al., 1998). A Cronbach’s
α of .83 was obtained with the current sample.

Psychological distress. Psychological distress was assessed
with the HSCL-21 (Green, Walkey, McCormick, & Taylor,
1988). The HSCL-21 is a truncated version of the 58-item
HSCL (Derogatis, Lipman, Rickels, Uhlenhuth & Covi,
1974). Item ratings are averaged to obtain total scores; higher
scores indicate greater psychological distress. A sample item
is “Blaming yourself for things.” HSCL-21 items are rated
on a 4-point continuum from 1 (not at all) to 4 (extremely).
Participants are asked to rate how distressing each item has
been for them over the past 7 days. With a prior sample of
predominately White sexual minority women, the HSCL-21
yielded excellent internal reliability consistency (α = .91;
Szymanski & Owens, 2009). In terms of validity, HSCL-21
scores were correlated as expected with other measures of
psychological distress with predominately White college
samples of women and men (sexual orientation not reported;
Moller, Fouladi, McCarthy, & Hatch, 2003). The HSCL-21
has also yielded meaningful results with a sample of interna-
tional students (sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Komiya
& Eells, 2001). A Cronbach’s α of .91 was obtained with the
current sample.

Results

Descriptive statistics, internal consistency reliabilities, and
intercorrelations obtained with the current sample for the
variables of interest are reported in Table 2. Overall, the pre-
sent sample’s average scores and standard deviations reported
for lifetime sexist events, recent sexist events, womanism,
and psychological distress were generally comparable to val-
ues obtained in previous studies with racial and ethnic and/or
sexual minority samples. Prior to proceeding with analyses,
the data were examined for univariate normality. The range
of skewness (.56 to −1.06) and kurtosis (−.17 to 1.55) values
for our variables of interest indicated that our data were suf-
ciently univariate normal (Weston & Gore, 2006). With
regard to multivariate normality, residual statistics were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexism (lifetime)</td>
<td>2.91 (.08)</td>
<td>2.54 (.70)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism (recent)</td>
<td>2.13 (.95)</td>
<td>2.10 (.74)</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womanism</td>
<td>5.68 (0.96)</td>
<td>4.57 (.90)</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress</td>
<td>1.75 (0.53)</td>
<td>1.90 (.61)</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (covariate)</td>
<td>30.98 (10.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>−.20*</td>
<td>−.05</td>
<td>−.28**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coefficient αs are presented in parentheses along the diagonal of the correlation matrix. The second column of means and standard deviations presents comparable values from previous studies as cited below.

a Selvidge, Matthews, and Bridges (2008).
b Friedman and Leaper (2010).
c Henley et al. (1998).
d Szymanski and Sung (2010).
*p < .05. ** p < .001.
Step 3, the scores reflecting the interaction between the predictor and womanism were entered in Step 2, predicting psychological distress. In Step 3, the scores reflecting the interaction between the predictor and womanism were entered in Step 1, and the centered predictor (recent sexism or lifetime sexism) and the centered moderator (womanism) were entered in Step 2, predicting psychological distress. Thus, our second hypothesis was partially supported.

The Moderating Role of Womanism
To test our second hypothesis, whether womanism moderated the links of perceived lifetime and recent sexism with psychological distress, Baron and Kenny's (1986) moderator regression procedures were used. In anticipation of the regressions analyses, we examined the relationships between each demographic variables (age, gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status, education, income, social class, region, urban density) and psychological distress to determine whether any covariates should be included in the subsequent regression models (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Based on the number of comparisons being made, a more conservative $\alpha$ of $p < .005$ was utilized. Results indicated that age was the only significant covariate.

Two separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to address potential issues of multicollinearity among interaction terms. Similarly, following the recommendation of Aiken and West (1991), the predictor and moderator variables were centered (mean deviation scores were computed). For each analysis, the covariate (age) was entered in Step 1, and the centered predictor (recent sexism or lifetime sexism) and the centered moderator (womanism) were entered in Step 2, predicting psychological distress. In Step 3, the scores reflecting the interaction between the predictor and womanism were added. Significant moderation or interaction is indicated if adding the interaction term results in a significant change in $R^2$, and the $\beta$ weight for the interaction term is significant. As shown in Table 3, a significant interaction was found for lifetime sexist events and womanism but not for perceived recent sexist events and womanism. Thus, our second hypothesis was partially supported.

The adjusted $R^2$ value for the regression equation examining lifetime sexist events indicated that the main and interaction effects accounted for 17% of the variance in psychological distress. The interaction terms of perceived lifetime sexism and womanism accounted for 2% of the variance in psychological distress. Simple slope analysis exploring the underlying pattern of the significant interaction (Aiken & West, 1991) found that the relationship between lifetime sexist events and psychological distress was significant and positive for sexual minority WOC reporting lower levels of womanism ($\beta = .45, t = 3.94, p < .001$); the link between sexism and distress was not significant for those reporting higher levels of womanism ($\beta = .15, t = 1.55, p = .124$; see Figure 1). In addition, the significance of the interaction term in the test of the moderator effects indicates

Table 3. Moderating Effect of Womanism on the Relation Between Perceived Sexism and Psychological Distress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Total $R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ inc.</th>
<th>$F$ inc.</th>
<th>$df$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link between lifetime sexist events and distress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>3.73***</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>13.95***</td>
<td>1, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived sexism (lifetime)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>3.60***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>9.06***</td>
<td>2, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womanism</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Sexism (lifetime) $\times$ Womanism</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>13.95***</td>
<td>1, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link between recent sexist events and distress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>3.73***</td>
<td>.08***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>13.95***</td>
<td>1, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived sexism (recent)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>3.51**</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>8.73***</td>
<td>2, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womanism</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Sexism (recent) $\times$ Womanism</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1, 158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
that the difference between the two regression lines was also significant (Aiken & West, 1991).

Discussion

The current study extended prior literature by investigating (a) the direct links between perceived lifetime and recent sexist events with psychological distress and (b) the potential moderating role of womanism in these links with a sample of sexual minority WOC, utilizing a measure intended to acknowledge their multiple marginalized identities. With regard to our first hypothesis, we found that both lifetime and recent sexist events were related significantly and positively to psychological distress. These findings, combined with prior literature, which supports identical links with predominately White and heterosexual (or sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Moradi & Funderburk, 2006) or sexual minority women (e.g., Szymanski & Owens, 2009) and predominately heterosexual WOC (or sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Landrine & Klonoff, 1997; Szymanski & Stewart, 2010), point to the perniciousness of perceived sexist events in the lives of diverse women.

Additionally, we found that womanism moderated the relation between perceived lifetime sexist events and psychological distress. These findings are congruent with prior studies investigating the buffering effect of feminist identity in the sexism—distress link with samples of predominately White women (sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Sabik & Tylka, 2006). Our results suggest that as women develop a more advanced understanding of how their multiple identities (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation) can impact their lives, they may be able to better identify their experiences of discrimination and place them in a larger sociocultural context.

Indeed, we found that womanism was correlated positively with lifetime and recent sexist events, suggesting that women reporting higher levels of womanism were also more likely to perceive sexist events. More specifically, if an individual from a stigmatized group can label a perceived negative attitude/event as a form of prejudice or discrimination, they may be more likely to externalize, rather than internalize, the origin of the discrimination experience (Crocker & Major, 1989; Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). Research seems to support this assertion. For instance, Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, and Major (1991) investigated this phenomenon with a sample of college women (race and sexual orientation not reported). Participants who received negative feedback from a male evaluator they learned held sexist views (i.e., participants were allowed to see the evaluator’s attitude survey which indicated that the evaluator possessed sexist attitudes) attributed the feedback to his prejudice. In turn, these women reported less depressed affect than women who received negative feedback from an evaluator who was not prejudiced and held liberal views on women. Importantly, although we combined our participants into a single group of sexual minority WOC in the current investigation, we acknowledge the within-group diversity (e.g., race and ethnicity, sexual orientation) of our sample. Future investigations could compare different racial and ethnic or sexual orientation identity groups on our variables of interest in a single study or focus on the experiences of a specific group (e.g., Latina bisexual women).

The finding that womanism moderated the lifetime sexist events—distress link, but not the recent sexist events—distress link, was unexpected and inconsistent with results reported in previous studies that found a significant interaction between recent sexist events and feminist identity (Moradi & Subich, 2002; Sabik & Tylka, 2006). It is important to note, however, that these previous studies were conducted with samples of predominately White women (sexual orientation not reported). It may be the case that the relations between lifetime and recent sexist events with psychological distress vary with the population of women being investigated. For instance, in one of the few studies to compare the experiences of White women and WOC (sexual orientation not reported), Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, and Lund (1995) found that lifetime sexist events accounted for greater variance in total psychological distress symptoms for WOC than for White women. Additionally, the use of a measure of womanism, which inherently acknowledges multiple marginalized identities, rather than the utilization of a measure that assesses gender experiences alone, may have also contributed to our findings. Perhaps the more distal and cumulative perceptions of discrimination of lifetime sexist events allows sexual minority WOC the time and space necessary to filter these experiences through the lenses of their multiple identities.

For example, Bowleg (2008) recounted the narrative of a Black queer woman and described that in the course of her discussion of her experiences with sexism, the narrative developed into an analysis of her multiple and intersecting identities. It may be the case, then, that sexual minority WOC
require time to metabolize their discrimination experiences within their womanism framework. Future studies are needed to further elucidate the potential moderating role of womanism in the relation of both proximal and distal forms of discrimination and psychological distress with other samples of women with multiple marginalized identities. Conceivably, the examination of potential moderating variables that represent more immediate forms of intervention (e.g., social support) could yield an alternative pattern of results. For instance, involvement in feminist activities was found to moderate the relationship between recent sexist events and psychological distress with predominately White sexual minority women (Szymanski & Owens, 2009). Such findings reinforce the importance of continuing to investigate mechanisms through which sexism relates to indicators of mental health with diverse women.

Finally, although not part of our original hypotheses, we found that womanism was also correlated significantly and positively with psychological distress. This finding is comparable to other studies that suggest that certain feminist identity attitudes (e.g., Revelation) are related to greater psychological distress with predominantly White women (sexual orientation not reported; e.g., Fischer & Good, 2004; Moradi & Subich, 2002). Thus, despite prior conceptualizations of feminist identity/womanism as a protective factor in the sexism—distress link (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997) and accumulating evidence to support this conceptualization (Sabik & Tylka, 2006), it seems that the very same mechanisms that protect women from the negative consequences of gender oppression can also be distressing. More specifically, these results suggest that an increased awareness and even hypervigilance about the pervasiveness of oppression (e.g., sexism, racism, heterosexism) can be quite stressful in and of itself. This is not altogether surprising, given that oppression represents an attack on fundamental and immutable aspects of the self (e.g., gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation). In apparent support of this assertion, Landrine and Klonoff (1997) found that participants who responded affirmatively to the question, “Are you a Feminist?” rated perceived sexism as more stressful than women who did not identify as feminist with their sample of racially and ethnically diverse women (sexual orientation not reported). Similarly, African American college student women who endorsed womanism were more likely to appraise a negative intergroup interaction (e.g., prejudice event) as personally relevant (King, 2003). Because stressors appraised as more personally relevant are better predictors of emotion (e.g., anger, anxiety, sadness; Smith, Haynes, Lazarus, & Pope, 1993), King (2003) inferred that women with higher womanism identity would report greater levels of stress associated with their awareness of multiple discrimination experiences and inequality. Our results provide empirical support for this supposition. Nevertheless, research confirms that an established feminist identity is associated with greater well-being for women than antifeminism (Yoder, Snell, & Tobias, 2012). Additional studies are needed to explore the myriad ways in which feminism and womanism influence diverse women’s mental health.

**Practice Implications**

With regard to practice implications, the results of the current study suggest several helpful approaches to intervention. First, our findings indicate that it continues to be essential for practitioners to attend to sexist experiences in counseling with women of diverse backgrounds. However, recognizing that sexist events are shaped by other social identities is critical in conceptualizing these experiences (Greene, 2003). Previous scholars have discussed the importance of directly assessing and inquiring about women's experiences of discrimination and working with women in therapy to develop ways of coping with these events (e.g., Szymanski, 2005; Szymanski & Owens, 2009). Our finding that womanism moderated the relationship between lifetime sexist events and psychological distress could inform this process.

For example, utilizing a womanism (as defined in the current study) framework, Williams (2005) named specific psychotherapy strategies for working with African American women that could apply to sexual minority WOC as well. These include “Contextualizing the Problem,” “Drawing on the Legacy of Social Justice Activism,” and “Creating Networks of Support and Connection” (pp. 280-281). Consistent with critical race theory (Solórzano, 1998) and classical feminist therapy (Fischer & Bolton Holz, 2010), womanism and the ability to contextualize the problem may relieve women’s distress by allowing them a means of elucidating the broader social and historical underpinnings of their reported oppression experiences.

Similarly shifting the focus from the self to others, the act of drawing on the legacy of social justice activism of predecessors has been identified as an especially effective intervention for WOC (e.g., Civil Rights Movement, Women’s Movement, Gay Rights Movement; Williams, Frame, & Greene, 1999). Specifically, this approach encourages WOC to explore methods used by other WOC to inform their own actions and strategies for addressing oppression. Counselors may provide readings to facilitate this process (e.g., Sister Outsider by Audre Lorde, 1984) or organize screenings of films that underscore the social justice contributions and achievements of sexual minority WOC (Fischer & Bolton Holz, 2010). In addition, researchers have discussed that coping strategies developed to address one form of oppression can be effectively applied to other forms of discrimination experienced by sexual minority people of color (Moradi et al., 2010). Finally, assisting clients with the development of social networks can contribute to the “wholeness” identified by Alice Walker (1983, p. xi) as essential to womanism. Counselors can encourage sexual minority WOC clients to seek out personal and professional groups that may provide valuable support. Support seeking has been identified as a means of “psychological resistance to oppression” (Williams, 2005, p. 281) and feeling a sense of connection with
other women has been found to promote personal empowerment (Yoder et al., 2012). Counselors should have resources (e.g., group names and contact information) readily available to facilitate this process.

Thus, assisting clients in their development of womanism could be important for counselors to consider in their clinical work with sexual minority WOC clients. This recommendation is tempered, however, by our finding that greater womanism can be related positively to psychological distress. Counselors should be vigilant about monitoring, exploring, and processing the impact of developing greater social consciousness on the client. For instance, Yoder et al. (2012) suggested that a greater awareness of the broad objectives of gender equity could be related to feelings of anger and uncertainty about one’s ability to act as a change agent.

Limitations

The findings of our study should be interpreted in light of certain limitations. Due to our nonlongitudinal design, causation cannot be inferred. Also, although our sample was diverse with regard to race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, region, and urban density, access to the Internet is differential (Suarez-Balcazar, Balcazar, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2009). Similar to previous research with sexual minority persons that utilized Internet surveys (e.g., Lehavot & Simoni, 2011; Szy manski & Owens, 2009), the majority of our participants had professional or graduate degrees and willingly disclosed their sexual identity. Furthermore, recruiting some participants through directors of training programs in applied psychology programs may have resulted in a sample with more psychological insight or socially desirable responding. As a consequence, our findings may not generalize to all sexual minority WOC.

The current study also utilized self-report measures, which may not be accurate reflections of actual experiences (Szy manski, 2005). In addition, although our measure of womanism did include a single item attending to sexual minority identity, it may not have integrated the sexual orientation identities of our sample to the full extent possible. Finally, the intention of our study was to replicate and extend the results of prior studies that examined the potential moderation role of feminist identity in the sexism—distress link. Accordingly, sexism was the only form of discrimination assessed. We reasoned that other forms of discrimination (i.e., racism and heterosexism) likely overlapped in some way with our sample’s conceptualization and reporting of their sexism experiences, but explicit assessment of racist and heterosexist events with this sample could have more fully accessed our participants’ experiences with oppression.

Conclusion

Extending the literature on the sexism—psychological distress link, which has tended to focus on the experiences of predominately White and/or heterosexual samples (Moradi & DeBlaere, 2010), we found in the current study that both recent and lifetime sexist events were related significantly and positively to distress. In addition, womanism moderated the relationship between lifetime sexism and psychological distress such that the link between lifetime sexist events and psychological distress was significant and positive for sexual minority WOC with lower levels of womanism and not significant for those with higher levels of womanism. These results suggest that sexist events continue to be important to explore in counseling with diverse women. Furthermore, it may be helpful for counselors to facilitate the development of womanism with their WOC clients as a means of placing their discrimination experiences in a larger sociocultural context. With regard to research, additional studies are needed to investigate the construct of womanism and its potential buffering role in the discrimination—distress link with other samples of women with multiple marginalized identities.

Finally, in our review of literature for our study, we noted the inconsistent reporting of key demographic information (e.g., sexual orientation). We would like to encourage researchers to consistently report both race/ethnicity and sexual orientation identity data with their samples of women. Consistent reporting of these important identity variables acknowledges those individuals who, due to their multiple marginalized identities, have been relegated “to a position of acute social invisibility” (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008, p. 381).
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Notes

1. The term sexual minority women was selected to be inclusive of the multiple self-identifications of sexual orientation present with this sample (e.g., lesbian, bisexual, queer, same-gender loving; Fassinger & Arseneau, 2007).
2. The current study’s analyses were conducted with data from sexual minority WOC (N = 182) recruited as part of a prior study currently under review (DeBlaere, Brewster, Bertsch, DeCarlo, Kegel, & Presseau, in press, n = 134) and an ongoing study (n = 48) examining sexual minority WOC’s experiences and mental health.
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