Published in final edited form as:

Int J Cult Ment Health. 2018 ; 11(2): 208–219. doi:10.1080/17542863.2017.1356337.

The Development and Initial Validation of the Child Perceived Discrimination Questionnaire

S. R. LaFont, E. Brondolo, A. K. Dumas, N. C. Lynk, B. B. Gump

Syracuse University

Abstract

Perceived discrimination can affect psychological and physical health, starting in childhood. Yet, the measures that exist for measuring perceived discrimination among children have methodological limitations and structural/theoretical inconsistencies. The Child Perceived Discrimination Questionnaire (CPDQ) fills the gaps of the current measures by assessing two dimensions of everyday discrimination from both child and adult sources. To assess the reliability and validity of the CPDQ, we examined data from 163 participants, aged 9–11, 52.15% female, 57.67% Black. Results indicated that the CPDQ has good to excellent internal consistency and provided preliminary support for an a priori hypothesized factor structure. The CPDQ also discriminated between different race groups and demonstrated construct validity. Future research should seek additional evidence of reliability and validity for the CPDQ, though this preliminary evidence suggests that the CPDQ is appropriate for assessing perceived discrimination in children.

Keywords

Perceived discrimination; children; assessment; racial discrimination

Perceived discrimination can lead to poor psychological and physical health (Pascoe & Richman, 2009). Perceived discrimination involves exposure to a broad range of experiences including those related to stigmatization, exclusion, social distancing, harassment, or violent acts within individual or institutional contexts, committed by peers and non-peers (Brondolo et al., 2005). Bullying, which involves peer-to-peer maltreatment and is typically assessed for occurrence in the school or as committed by peers from school, may also be a function of discrimination (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011). Although prevalence rates differ across racial/ethnic groups, research suggests that children across all groups report discrimination. For example, in a study of over 5,000 fifth grade students from three U.S. metropolitan cities, 20% of Black children, 15% of Latino children, and 7% of White children reported that they had been treated badly because of their race/ethnicity (Coker et al., 2009).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sarah R. LaFont, Department of Psychology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244. srlafont@syr.edu.

Sarah R. LaFont, Department of Psychology, Syracuse University.

Elizabeth Brondolo, Department of Psychology, St. John's University.

Amy K. Dumas, Nicole C. Lynk, Brooks B. Gump, Department of Public Health, Food Studies, and Nutrition, Syracuse University.

Furthermore, research has demonstrated that perceived discrimination is associated with psychological health problems among children. In their review, Pachter&Coll (2009) concluded that perceived racial/ethnic discrimination was positively associated with depression and anxiety and negatively associated with self-esteem and self-worth among pre-adolescent children. Coker et al. (2009) found that children who had ever been discriminated against because of their race/ethnicity had a higher likelihood of having mental health problems, including depression, oppositional defiant disorder, attention deficit disorder, and conduct disorder. The association between perceived discrimination and psychological health problems may be stronger among children than among adults (Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, & Garcia, 2014), and the effects of early life discrimination may persist into adulthood (Gee, Walseman, & Brondolo, 2012; Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006).

Though the existing literature has yielded important findings regarding perceived discrimination among children, the measures used in these studies have limitations. Literature reviews have noted that among children, discrimination is often measured with developmentally inappropriate methods (e.g., using the word “discrimination”), with single-item measures, or with measures designed for adolescents or adults that have not been validated in children (Acevedo-Garcia, Rosenfeld, Hardy, McArdle, & Osypuk, 2013; Pachter&Coll, 2009). Furthermore, pre-adolescent children may not be able to make the attributions necessary to effectively report on different causes of discrimination (Brown, Bigler, & Chu, 2010; Verkuyten& Thijs, 2001).

There is no consensus on the best methods to assess perceived discrimination among children. For example, some measures categorize discrimination by contextual locations (e.g., school, neighborhood, playground, etc.;Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000; Wiehe, Aalsma, Liu, &Fortenberry, 2010).Some measures do not specify the source of the discrimination (Noh &Kaspar, 2003)and others separate items by discrimination from other children and from adults(Greene et al., 2006; Rosenbloom & Way, 2004). The strategy of separating the assessment of experiences of discrimination by other children versus adults is best supported by the literature, as perceived discrimination by peers and adults are associated with different negative outcomes. For example, previous research has found that discrimination by teachers was associated with poorer academic performance, whereas discrimination by peers was associated with anxiety, depression, and lower self-worth (Benner & Graham, 2013).

Finally, discrimination based on characteristics other than race or ethnicity may also harm children (e.g., Bos& van Balen, 2008; Funderburk, McCormick, & Austin, 2007). For example, perceived stigma about epilepsy has been found to be negatively associated with positive self-concept among children with epilepsy (Funderburk et al., 2007).In a study of internationally adopted children, discrimination based on adoption status was positively associated with internalizing and externalizing behaviors (Lee, 2010).Furthermore, among children of lesbian parents, discrimination about children’s parents’ sexual orientation was negatively associated with self-esteem in girls and positively associated with hyperactivity in boys (Bos& van Balen, 2008).Hence, children experience discrimination based on a variety of characteristics. As such, a new measure is needed to assess broadly defined perceived discrimination among children. The Child Perceived Discrimination Questionnaire (CPDQ)

was developed to fill this need and overcome the limitations within existing measures (reviewed above). The CPDQ assesses everyday discrimination across races/ethnicities, inquiring about discrimination received from adults and from children. The CPDQ also inquires about two dimensions of discrimination: exclusion and threats/harassment. In this paper, we present the development and initial validation of the CPDQ.

Methods

CPDQ Measure Development

We developed the CPDQ by modifying existing items from the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire—Community Version (PEDQ-CV; Brondolo et al., 2005). Our aim was to modify existing PEDQ-CV items to make them appropriate for use with children rather than to create new items. In order to assure items were modified appropriately, we conducted two focus groups with 17 children aged 9–11 years. We chose the focus group format as it is recommended over an interview format for elaborating upon existing ideas with child participants (Heary & Hennessy, 2012). A local school district granted permission for the study team to recruit 5th grade students from one of its schools for the focus groups. Any student whose parent provided consent was included in the focus group. Our aim was to recruit 15–20 students; 17 children were included in the focus groups, and each participant was compensated \$5. One focus group consisted of 13 participants (10 White, 3 Hispanic/Latino; 8 females) and the other consisted of 4 Black participants (1 female). The focus groups were conducted by two White female researchers. During the focus groups, children were interviewed as a group about the various types of discrimination they have experienced. To start, the children were provided a definition and example of discrimination, then were asked the following questions: *Discrimination happens every day in all sorts of places, have you ever felt left out or excluded? What were the reasons? What happened? Who made you feel this way?* Following this, the researchers encouraged participation and provided reflective statements.

Each focus group discussion was audio recorded then transcribed to text. An expert in the field of perceived discrimination (Brondolo) reviewed these transcriptions to assess the degree to which children's perceived discrimination experiences match those in the PEDQ-CV. Consistent with the PEDQ-CV and adult discrimination literature, the focus groups revealed that children's descriptions of their experiences of perceived discrimination reflected episodes of both exclusion and threats/harassment (Brondolo et al., 2005; Kwok et al. 2011). The expert also concluded that children reported experiencing discrimination from both children and adults, which is consistent with the literature (Benner & Graham, 2013; Greene et al., 2006; Rosenbloom & Way, 2004). Existing PEDQ-CV items were modified to create CPDQ items based on these themes and to make the language and content more suitable for children. Whereas some CPDQ items were retained as they are written in the PEDQ-CV, others were tailored so that the language and/or content was more appropriate for child participants (see Table 1).

The final version of the CPDQ consists of 16 items (Table 2). Participants in the present study rated each item on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = Never, 3 = Sometimes, and 5 = Very Often. The items were administered with the following prompt: *Think about the kinds*

of experiences you have at school, at home, or in all your other activities. How often have you had any of the following experiences?

Based on the literature, structure of previous measures, and focus group results, we hypothesized that the CPDQ would comprise four factors, including Exclusion by Children, Threats/harassment by Children, Exclusion by Adults, and Threats/harassment by Adults. We tested this using a confirmatory factor analysis. To assess the reliability of the CPDQ, we examined the internal consistency of the scale. We conducted tests of known groups differences, hypothesizing that Black children will report more perceived discrimination than White children. To assess construct validity, we examined associations between the CPDQ and a number of theoretically related emotional, health behavior, and social variables which have been shown to be related to discrimination in studies of children and adults (Paradies et al., 2015; Pascoe & Richman, 2009).

Participants

Study participants were from the ongoing Environmental Exposures and Child Health Outcomes (EECHO) study, a research project investigating the relationships among exposures to environmental toxicants and cardiovascular risk indices in 9–11 year old children living in low- to middle-income neighborhoods in a midsize city in upstate New York. Participants' parents select into EECHO by contacting the research team in response to study advertisements or referrals from other participants. The EECHO sample contains an approximately equal number of Black/African American and White/European American, male and female children. The study excludes any children who are not self-identified as either Black or White, are not 9–11 years old, do not meet zip code residence selection criteria, who have serious medical or developmental disabilities, and those who take medications that might affect their cardiovascular system. Data for this paper was from the first 163 children recruited into EECHO who were administered the CPDQ, as the EECHO is ongoing and only data from the first 163 participants are currently available for analysis.

Measures

Demographics.—Participants' parents reported participant race, age, and gender. Participants' parents also reported their annual household income and the occupation and education level of both the participants' parents. Parental education level was based on a 1–7 scale and parental occupation was based on a 1–9 scale, as described in Hollingshead (1975). Parental income was based on a 1–10 scale and adjusted by dividing income by the square root of the number of people living in the household (cf. Rognerud&Zahl, 2006). Occupation, income, and education data from each of these three indices were averaged across parents if data from both parents was available. The income, education, and occupation data were each converted into a *z*-score; these three *z*-scores were averaged for each participant to form an SES index score.

Depression.—The Child Depression Inventory (CDI; Kovacs & Beck, 1977) is a 27-item scale that assesses depressive symptoms in children over the past two weeks. The CDI has demonstrated good internal consistency among previous samples (Saylor, Finch, Spirito, & Bennett, 1984) and in the current sample ($\alpha = .80$).

Emotion Regulation.—The 36-item Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2003) measures a variety of emotion regulation difficulties and has been validated among adolescents (Neumann, van Lier, Gratz, & Koot, 2010) and evidenced good internal consistency in the current sample ($\alpha = .88$).

Externalizing & Internalizing Symptoms.—The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, 1991) is a parent-reported questionnaire that measures a number of behavioral and emotional problems among children aged 6–18, including internalizing and externalizing symptoms ($\alpha = .89$ for internalizing symptoms and .94 externalizing symptoms in the current sample).

Hostility.—The Cook-Medley Hostility Index – Youth Version is a self-report measure consisting of 26 items in a true/false response format that was developed by Woodall & Matthews (1989; see also Räikkönen, Matthews, & Salomon, 2003) from the adult version (Cook & Medley, 1954) to assess hostile attitudes among children ($\alpha = .79$ in the current sample).

Social Skills.—Seven items were selected from The Social Skills Rating System (SSRS; Gresham & Elliott, 1990) self-control subscale in order to assess the participants' social skills, as rated by their parent ($\alpha = .84$ in the current sample). Greater scores on this index indicate better social skills.

Health & Risk Behaviors.—The Risky Behavior Protocol (RBP; Conger & Elder, 1994) asks children to rate the frequency in which they engage in a number of risky behaviors (e.g., smoking cigarettes, smoking marijuana, carrying a weapon, etc.). Participants were asked to rate the frequency in which they engaged in 19 risky behaviors the past year. In the current sample, the internal consistency was good ($\alpha = .88$).

Statistical Analyses

The confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using Mplus Version 7. Internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's alpha (α), construct validity correlations were measured using Pearson's Product Moment correlations (r), and known group comparisons were assessed using analysis of variance (ANOVAs) using SAS version 9.4. For the known group comparisons, we hypothesized that Black children would report higher perceived discrimination than would White children, since prevalence rates of perceived discrimination are higher among ethnic minority groups (Coker et al., 2009). For the construct validity correlations, we hypothesized that perceived discrimination would be negatively associated with SES, age, and social skills (Coker et al., 2009). We also hypothesized that perceived discrimination would be positively associated with depressive symptoms, difficulties in emotion regulation, internalizing and externalizing symptoms, hostility, and self-reported risky behaviors, due to the established association between perceived discrimination and mental health problems (Pascoe & Richman, 2009).

Results

Sample Characteristics

The sample consisted of 163 children with an average age of 10 ($SD = .82$), 57.67% were Black, 42.33% were White, and 52.15% were female. The sample was diverse in terms of household income and parental education (see Table 3).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Since we hypothesized that experiences of exclusion might be distinct from those of threats/harassment and that discrimination by adults might be distinct from discrimination by children, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), examining the factor structure of the 4 hypothesized factors: Exclusion by Children, Threats/harassment by Children, Exclusion by Adults, and Threats/harassment by Adults. The CFA was analyzed with a maximum-likelihood estimation. Results from the CFA demonstrated that experiences of perceived discrimination tended to cluster into our hypothesized subscales (see Table 4). In an exception, two items, 15 and 16, loaded poorly onto their respective factors. Given that these two items were written in language requiring a higher reading levels than other items, we excluded participants younger than 10 and re-ran the CFA. As a result, the loadings improved to .840 and .805, respectively.

Child Perceived Discrimination Questionnaire Descriptive Statistics

Table 5 contains descriptive statistics for the total CPDQ score as well as the Child and Adult subscales. The mean score for the total CPDQ was 1.62 (range = 1 to 5). This is comparable in magnitude to the mean ethnic discrimination scores found in adult samples (Brondolo et al., 2005; Kwok et al., 2011). Most children reported *some* discrimination, as only 13.04% ($N = 21$) of participants reported no discrimination (rated 1 or “Never” for all 16 items). The distributions of the subscales and total scales tended to be positively skewed and leptokurtic. The CPDQ total, Discrimination by Children, and Discrimination by Adults scale scores were not significantly correlated with age (all $ps > .05$). Boys reported significantly higher Discrimination by Adults than did girls ($F(1, 161) = 4.52$, $p < .05$). There were no gender differences in CPDQ total and Discrimination by Children scores. SES was significantly negatively correlated with all CPDQ total and subscale scores except Exclusion by Children (see Table 6). Hence, when examining correlations between the CPDQ and all indices used to evaluate construct validity, we tested both bivariate correlations and partial correlations that controlled for SES.

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alphas are listed in Table 7 and reveal good to excellent internal consistency. The total CPDQ Cronbach's alpha was .92, suggesting that the CPDQ has excellent internal consistency. The Cronbach's alphas for Discrimination by Children and Discrimination by Adults subscales were .87 and .88, respectively, indicating that these also have excellent internal consistency. When the Cronbach's alphas were assessed separately for Black and White participants, the Cronbach's alphas for all scales remained high in both groups.

Known Group Comparisons

We conducted a set of known group comparisons to test whether racial groups hypothesized to differ on measures of perceived discrimination in fact differed in these areas. Consistent with our hypothesis, Black participants reported significantly higher Discrimination by Adults ($F(1,161) = 4.42, p < .05$) than did White participants. Inconsistent with our hypotheses, Black participants and White participants did not differ in their ratings for total CPDQ and Discrimination by Children (all $ps > .05$).

Construct Validity

Correlations of the CPDQ total and subscale scores with demographic, emotional, social, and health risk behavior measures are reported in Table 6. In general, associations emerged as expected, including associations between CPDQ scores and depression, emotion regulation, externalizing symptoms, and self-reported risky behaviors. However, some sets of correlations between CPDQ variables and other measures did not consistently follow expected patterns. Hostility was positively correlated with all types of perceived discrimination except exclusion by children. Social skills were negatively associated with perceived threats/harassment by both adults and children, but not with exclusion by children or adults. Finally, internalizing symptoms were significantly correlated with perceived discrimination by children but not by adults.

The associations between CPDQ scores and depression, externalizing symptoms, and self-reported risky behaviors were robust even when controlling for SES. However, several of the significant associations between CPDQ scores and social skills, hostility, and emotion regulation were reduced in magnitude and no longer statistically significant when controlling for SES. Interestingly, the nonsignificant association between perceived discrimination by adults and internalizing symptoms increased in magnitude and became statistically significant when controlling for SES.

Discussion

The results of the current analyses suggest that the CPDQ has good psychometric properties and shows preliminary evidence of validity. The prevalence rate of perceived discrimination in our sample (86.96%) was greater than that of previous samples of perceived ethnic discrimination in children (e.g., 7–20% in Coker et al., 2009). This was expected since the CPDQ is not limited to racial/ethnic discrimination. Analyses revealed that, overall, the CPDQ has good to excellent internal consistency. Of note, the skewed CPDQ scores may have affected the present results by reducing the magnitude of the correlation coefficients (Goodwin & Leech, 2006). However, we log-transformed the perceived discrimination variables, which resulted in improvement in both skew (previous range for the whole sample = 1.45 to 2.14 (see Table 5); range for transformed variables = 0.71 to 1.16) and kurtosis (previous range for the whole sample = 1.65 to 5.43 (see Table 5); range for transformed variables = -0.62 to 0.66) values. Then, we re-tested the correlations in Table 6 using the log-transformed scores and found that the results were essentially unchanged (e.g., no significant correlations became nonsignificant, no nonsignificant correlations became significant, and correlation coefficient magnitudes were equivalent or only slightly

different). The known group comparisons also did not change when computed using the transformed perceived discrimination variables.

The results of the CFA provide preliminary support for the hypothesized 4-factor structure of the CPDQ and provide support for distinguishing between exclusion and threats/harassment as well as discrimination by children and adults. Follow-up analyses in which we excluded 9-year-old participants from analyses suggested that the CPDQ may be most appropriate for children 10 and older.

Tests of construct validity followed expected patterns. First, perceived discrimination was negatively associated with SES, indicating that children with lower SES reported greater perceived discrimination. Perceived discrimination was also associated with depressive symptoms, externalizing symptoms, and internalizing symptoms. This indicates that the more discrimination children report, the more emotional difficulties they tend to experience. Social skills, hostility, and emotion regulation were also associated with perceived discrimination, in the expected directions. Interestingly, these associations were accounted for by SES, indicating that SES is a contributor to experiences of discrimination and may also be associated with impairments in social skills, hostility, and emotion regulation. This aligns with existing research (Chen & Miller, 2013). Finally, perceived discrimination was positively associated with self-reported risky behaviors.

The known group comparisons partially followed expected patterns. Although the CPDQ purposely does not indicate the type of discrimination to be reported on, children of different race groups are undoubtedly exposed to different levels of discrimination and this will be reflected in CPDQ ratings. As expected, Black children compared to White children reported more discrimination by adults. Contrary to hypotheses, Black and White participants did not differ in their reports of discrimination by other children. One potential explanation for this is that children socialize in racially homogenous groups and as such experience less discrimination due to their race by other children (Wilson & Rodkin, 2011).

The finding that boys also reported significantly more discrimination by adults than did girls is concerning because research has suggested that boys, especially Black boys, experience disproportionate effects of discrimination by adults in school (Noguera, 2003). For example, being disciplined and graded more harshly, not being called on in class, and being perceived as less intelligent because of race has been found to be associated with lower grade point average and higher depressive symptoms among Black adolescent males (Cogburn, Chavous, & Griffin, 2011).

These analyses suggest that the CPDQ shows evidence of reliability and validity as a measure of perceived discrimination in children. However, there are several limitations to the present findings. For one, our small sample size and small subject to variable ratio make it possible that the present factor analytic results are not reliable. Hence, the present results represent preliminary factor analytic support for the proposed dimensions of discrimination among children. Further tests are needed to confirm these results with larger samples. It is also unclear the extent to which these results from a sample of children living in low- to middle- income neighborhoods in a mid-sized northeast city generalize to the population of

U.S. or international children. Similarly, the EECHO sample only included children aged 9 to 11 for reasons unrelated to the present study. The CPDQ may be more appropriate for children aged 10 and older (see above), though further research is required to determine the exact age range for which the CPDQ is appropriate. Furthermore, since the CPDQ is a measure of everyday perceived discrimination, it does not permit conclusions about specific types of discrimination (e.g., racial/ethnic). However, we are developing a supplemental interview in which we ask the children to make attributions as to the reasons they were discriminated against.

Conclusion

Although previous research on perceived discrimination among children has uncovered important findings, the literature is still hindered by the use of limited measurement tools, with existing measures including items which are developmentally inappropriate or limit participant responding in various ways. The CPDQ is a measure of everyday perceived discrimination among children that assesses discrimination by children and adults. The current analyses demonstrate the CPDQ to be a reliable and valid instrument for assessing perceived discrimination in children. Future research should examine CPDQ's factor structure with additional participants as well as its temporal reliability in order to add to the current findings.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grant R01-ES023252 from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, awarded to Brooks B. Gump.

References

- Acevedo-Garcia D, Rosenfeld LE, Hardy E, McArdle N, & Osypuk TL (2013). Future directions in research on institutional and interpersonal discrimination and children's health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(10), 1754–1763. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.300986 [PubMed: 23409880]
- Achenbach T (1991). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist/4–18 and 1991 profile*. Burlington: University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.
- Benner AD & Graham S (2013). The antecedents and consequences of racial/ethnic discrimination during adolescence: Does the source of discrimination matter? *Developmental Psychology*, 49(8), 1602–1613. [PubMed: 23106845]
- Bos HMW & Van Balen F (2008). Children in planned lesbian families: Stigmatisation, psychological adjustment and protective factors. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 10, 221–236. doi: 10.1080/13691050701601702
- Brondolo E, Kelly KP, Coakley V, Gordon T, Thompson S, Levy E, ... Contrada RJ (2005). The perceived ethnic discrimination questionnaire: Development and preliminary validation of a community version. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(2), 335–365.
- Brown CS, Bigler RS, & Chu H (2010). An experimental study of the correlates and consequences of perceiving oneself to be the target of gender discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 107(2), 100–117. [PubMed: 20538285]
- Chen E & Miller GE (2013). Socioeconomic status and health: Mediating and moderating factors. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9, 723–749.
- Cogburn CD, Chavous TM, & Griffin TM (2011). School-Based Racial and Gender Discrimination among African American Adolescents: Exploring Gender Variation in Frequency and Implications for Adjustment. *Race and Social Problems*, 3(1), 25–37. 10.1007/s12552-011-9040-8 [PubMed: 22837794]

- Conger RD, & Elder GH (1994). *Families in troubled times: Adapting to change in rural America*. New York, NY: de Gruyter
- Coker TR, Elliott MN, Kanouse DE, Grunbaum JA, Schwebel DC, Gilliland MJ, ... Schuster MA (2009). Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination among fifth-grade students and its association with mental health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(5), 878–884. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.144329 [PubMed: 19299673]
- Cook W, & Medley O (1954). Proposed hostility and pharisaic-virtue scales for the MMPI. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55, 211–235.
- Fisher CB, Wallace SA, & Fenton RE (2000). Discrimination distress during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29(6), 679–695.
- Funderburk JA, McCormick BP, & Austin JK (2007). Does attitude toward epilepsy mediate the relationship between perceived stigma and mental health outcomes in children with epilepsy?. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 11(1), 71–76. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2007.04.006 [PubMed: 17531540]
- Gee GC, Walseman KM, & Brondolo E (2012). A life course perspective on racism and health inequities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(5), 967–974. [PubMed: 22420802]
- Goodwin L, & Leech N (2006). Understanding correlation: Factors that affect the size of r. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 74(3), 251–266.
- Gratz KL & Roemer L (2003). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26, 41–54.
- Greene ML, Way N, & Pahl K (2006). Trajectories of perceived adult and peer discrimination among Black, Latino, and Asian American adolescents: Patterns and psychological correlates. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(2), 218–236. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.218 [PubMed: 16569162]
- Gresham FM, & Elliott SN (1990). *The Social Skills Rating System*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Hamburger ME, Basile KC, & Vivolo AM (2011). *Measuring bullying victimization, perpetration, and bystander experiences: A compendium of assessment tools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Heary C & Hennessy E (2012). Focus groups versus individual interviews with children: A comparison of data. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 27(1–2), 58–68. doi: 10.1080/03033910.2006.10446228.
- Hollingshead AB (1975). Four factor index of social status Unpublished working paper, Department of Sociology, Yale University.
- Kovacs M, & Beck AT (1977). An empirical-clinical approach toward a definition of childhood depression In Schulerbrandt J & Raskin A (Eds.), *Depression in childhood: Diagnosis, treatment, and conceptual models* (pp. 1–25). New York: Raven Press.
- Kwok J, Atencio J, Ullah J, Crupi R, Chen D, Roth AR, & ... Brondolo E (2011). The perceived ethnic discrimination questionnaire—community version: Validation in a multiethnic Asian sample. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17(3), 271–282. doi:10.1037/a0024034 [PubMed: 21787059]
- Lee RM (2010). Parental perceived discrimination as a postadoption risk factor for internationally adopted children and adolescents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(4), 493–500. doi:10.1037/a0020651 [PubMed: 21058812]
- Neumann A, van Lier PA, Gratz KL, & Koot HM (2010). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation difficulties in adolescents using the difficulties in emotion regulation scale. *Assessment*, 17(1), 138–149. [PubMed: 19915198]
- Noguera PA (2003). The trouble with Black boys: The role and influence of environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. *Urban Education*, 38(4), 431–459.
- Noh S, & Kaspar V (2003). Perceived discrimination and depression: Moderating effects of coping, acculturation, and ethnic support. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 232–8. [PubMed: 12554575]

- Pachter LM, & Coll CG (2009). Racism and child health: A review of the literature and future directions. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 30(3), 255–263. doi:10.1097/DBP.0b013e3181a7ed5a [PubMed: 19525720]
- Paradies Y, Ben J, Denson N, Elias A, Priest N, Pieterse A, ... Gee G (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 10(9), 1–48. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.013851
- Pascoe EA, & Richman LS (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(4), 531–554. doi:10.1037/a0016059 [PubMed: 19586161]
- Räikkönen K, Matthews KA, & Salomon K (2003). Hostility predicts metabolic syndrome risk factors in children and adolescents. *Health Psychology*, 22(3), 279–286. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.22.3.279 [PubMed: 12790255]
- Rognerud MA & Zahl PH (2006) Social inequalities in mortality: Changes in the relative importance of income, education and household size over a 27-year period. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 16(1), 62–68. [PubMed: 16093302]
- Rosenbloom SR, & Way N (2004). Experiences of discrimination among African American, Asian American, and Latino adolescences in an urban high school. *Youth & Society*, 34(4), 420–451.
- Saylor CF, Finch AJ, Spirito A, & Bennett B (1984). The Children's Depression Inventory: A systematic evaluation of psychometric properties. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 52(6), 955–967. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.52.6.955 [PubMed: 6520288]
- Schmitt MT, Branscombe NR, Postmes T, & Garcia A (2014). The consequences of perceived discrimination for psychological well-being: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 921–948. doi:10.1037/a0035754 [PubMed: 24547896]
- Verkuyten M & Thijs J (2001). Peer victimization and self-esteem of ethnic minority group children. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 11(3), 227–234.
- Wiehe SR, Aalsma MC, Liu GC, & Fortenberry JD (2010). Gender differences in the association between perceived discrimination and adolescent smoking. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(3), 510–516. [PubMed: 20075313]
- Wilson T, & Rodkin PC (2011). African American and European American Children in Diverse Elementary Classrooms: Social Integration, Social Status, and Social Behavior. *Child Development*, 82(5), 1454–1469. 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01634.x [PubMed: 21848954]
- Woodall KL, & Matthews KA (1989). Familial environment associated with Type A behaviors and psychophysiological responses to stress in children. *Health Psychology*, 8(4), 403–426. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.8.4.403 [PubMed: 2583078]

Table 1.**Modification of PEDQ-CV Items to CPDQ Items**

PEDQ-CV Item	CPDQ Item
Been nice to face, but said bad things behind back	Other children texted or talked badly about you behind your back
Called you bad names	Other children called you names
Hinted you must be lazy	A teacher or other adult assumed bad things about you
Hinted you are stupid	
Hinted you must not be clean	
Hinted you were dishonest	
Thought you couldn't do things/handle a job	
Hinted you must be violent	
Not trusted you	A teacher or other adult did not trust you
Ignored you	Other children excluded you online
	A teacher or other adult excluded you from something
	A teacher did not call on you in class
	You were left out by other children
	Other children picked you last for a team or group
	A teacher or other adult ignored you or did not pay attention to you
Threatened to hurt you	Other children threatened to hurt you
	Other children threatened or harassed you online
	A teacher or other adult threatened to hurt you
Boss or supervisor unfair	A teacher or other adult unfairly punished you
Treated unfairly by teachers	A teacher or other adult treated you unfairly
Actually hurt you	Other children actually hurt you or tried to hurt you
Actually damaged your property	-
Threatened to damage your property	-
Made you feel like an outsider because of appearance	-
Those speaking a different language made you feel like an outsider	-
Clerk or waiter ignored you	-
Made rude gestures	-
Not taken you seriously	-
Treated unfairly by coworkers	-

PEDQ-CV = Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire - Community Version (Brondolo et al., 2005). – Indicates that the PEDQ-CV item was deemed not applicable to the CPDQ.

Table 2.

CPDQ Items

CPDQ Item	Item Mean	Item SD
<i>Discrimination by Children</i>		
1. Other children picked you last for a team or group	1.87	1.19
2. Other children called you names	1.88	1.24
3. Other children texted or talked badly about you behind your back	1.71	1.15
4. Other children threatened to hurt you	1.61	1.12
5. Other children actually hurt you or tried to hurt you	1.62	1.06
6. You were left out by other children	1.86	1.33
7. Other children threatened or harassed you online	1.22	0.74
8. Other children excluded you online	1.28	0.80
<i>Discrimination by Adults</i>		
9. A teacher did not call on you in class	2.12	1.31
10. A teacher or other adult unfairly punished you	1.80	1.19
11. A teacher or other adult ignored you or did not pay attention to you	1.78	1.19
12. A teacher or other adult did not trust you	1.73	1.15
13. A teacher or other adult assumed bad things about you	1.39	0.89
14. A teacher or other adult threatened to hurt you	1.17	0.70
15. A teacher or other adult excluded you from something	1.51	1.02
16. A teacher or other adult treated you unfairly	1.55	1.07

Table 3.

Sample Demographic Characteristics

Variable		N (%)
Participant Age		$M = 10.51$; $SD = 0.92$
Gender		
	Female	30 (52)
	Male	78 (48)
Race		
	Black	94 (58)
	White	69 (42)
Highest Level of Parental Education		
	No high school degree	16 (9.81)
	High school degree	31 (19.02)
	Some college	48 (29.45)
	College degree	27 (16.56)
	Some graduate school	6 (3.68)
	Graduate degree	30 (18.40)
Household Income		
	< \$15,000	52 (31.90)
	> \$15,000, < \$35,000	50 (30.67)
	> \$35,000	56 (34.36)

5 participants' parents declined to provide income and education data.

Table 4.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of 4 CPDQ Factors

Item	1	2	3	4
1. Other children picked you last for a team or group	.725			
6. You were left out by other children	.639			
8. Other children have excluded you online	.651			
2. Other children called you names		.821		
3. Other children texted or talked badly about you behind your back		.755		
4. Other children threatened to hurt you		.833		
5. Other children actually hurt you or tried to hurt you		.678		
7. Other children threatened or harassed you online		.562		
9. A teacher did not call on you in class			.747	
11. A teacher or other adult ignored you or did not pay attention to you			.820	
15. A teacher or other adult excluded you from something			.057	
10. A teacher or other adult unfairly punished you				.582
12. A teacher or other adult did not trust you				.659
13. A teacher or other adult assumed bad things about you				.736
14. A teacher or other adult threatened to hurt you				.651
16. A teacher or other adult treated you unfairly				.178

Factor 1 = Exclusion by Children, Factor 2 = Threats/harassment by Children; Factor 3 = Exclusion by Adults, Factor 4 = Threats/harassment by Adults. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .10 (95% CI = .085, .115); Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .851; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = .817; Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = .065.

Table 5.

CPDQ Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	SD	Kurtosis	Skew
CPDQ Total				
Total sample	1.62	0.72	5.05	2.00
Black Participants	1.72	0.79	3.89	1.76
White Participants	1.50	0.58	6.89	2.26
Discrimination by Children (Total)				
Total sample	1.62	0.77	4.37	1.99
Black Participants	1.69	0.82	2.61	1.63
White Participants	1.54	0.71	7.97	2.60
Discrimination by Adults (Total)				
Total sample	1.63	0.79	4.82	2.02
Black Participants	1.74	0.85	3.79	1.78
White Participants	1.46	0.64	9.65	2.79
Exclusion by Children				
Total sample	1.67	0.84	3.08	1.70
Black Participants	1.66	0.85	2.69	1.63
White Participants	1.66	0.79	4.51	1.85
Threats/harassment by Children				
Total sample	1.60	0.85	3.89	2.00
Black Participants	1.71	0.95	1.81	1.58
White Participants	1.47	0.73	9.54	2.84
Exclusion by Adults				
Total sample	1.81	1.01	1.65	1.45
Black Participants	1.93	1.10	0.95	1.27
White Participants	1.60	0.82	3.73	1.82
Threats/harassment by Adults				
Total sample	1.53	0.77	5.43	2.14
Black Participants	1.62	0.82	4.73	1.95
White Participants	1.37	0.65	9.43	2.83

Table 6.

Construct Validity Correlations

Variable	CPDQ total	Discrimination by Children	Discrimination by Adults	Exclusion by Children	Threats / harassment by Children	Exclusion by Adults	Threats / harassment by Adults
Demographic Variables							
SES	-.34 ^b	-.30 ^b	-.34 ^b	-.19	-.33 ^b	-.34 ^b	-.30 ^b
Age	-.00	.01	.00	.04	-.01	-.06	.05
Emotion Variables							
Depression	.58 ^c / .49 ^c	.58 ^c / .43 ^c	.49 ^c / .50 ^c	.52 ^c / .46 ^c	.53 ^c / .34 ^b	.43 ^c / .47 ^c	.46 ^c / .46 ^c
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation	.40 ^c / .19	.35 ^c / .09	.37 ^c / .25 ^a	.31 ^c / .11	.33 ^c / .07	.38 ^c / .31 ^b	.32 ^c / .17
Internalizing Symptoms	.17 ^a / .23 ^a	.22 ^a / .23 ^a	.12 / .22 ^a	.21 ^b / .16	.17 ^a / .22 ^a	.13 / .20	.09 / .20
Externalizing Symptoms	.40 ^c / .41 ^c	.37 ^c / .38 ^c	.37 ^c / .38 ^c	.31 ^c / .28 ^c	.36 ^c / .40 ^c	.32 ^c / .34 ^b	.35 ^c / .37 ^c
Hostility	.30 ^c / .13	.21 ^b / .08	.34 ^c / .16	.14 / -.02	.21 ^b / .14	.29 ^c / .18	.32 ^c / .12
Social Behaviors							
Social Skills	-.22 ^b / -.16	-.24 ^b / -.12	-.17 ^a / -.18	-.15 / -.04	-.26 ^c / -.16	-.12 / -.17	-.19 ^a / -.19
Health & Risk Behaviors							
Self-reported Risky Behaviors	.48 ^c / .38 ^c	.44 ^c / .32 ^b	.43 ^c / .40 ^c	.37 ^c / .28 ^b	.42 ^c / .30 ^b	.38 ^c / .32 ^b	.41 ^c / .41 ^c

^a $p < .05$.^b $p < .01$.^c $p < .001$. The correlations to the left of the slash mark represent bivariate correlations, the correlations to the right of the slash mark represent partial correlations controlling for SES.

Table 7.

Cronbach's Alphas for CPDQ Total Scores

Variable	Total α	Black Participants	White Participants
Total CPDQ	.92	.92	.90
Discrimination by Children (Total)	.87	.86	.88
Discrimination by Adults (Total)	.88	.87	.86