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Abstract

Microaggressions, which are commonplace behavioral or verbal actions that communicate disrespect based on one’s group membership, have historically been conceptualized only in the context of race. This study examined self-investment (an aspect of identification with an important in-group), public self-regard (an aspect of collective self-esteem), and personal self-esteem as predictors of anger and dejection in response to perceived microaggressions on the basis of religious group affiliation, specifically the American Muslim community. Participants completed a survey prompting them for an experience in which they felt disrespected on the basis of their membership in the Muslim community. Results indicated that anger was felt more intensely than dejection. Self-investment served as the only significant predictor of negative emotional response to microaggressional discrimination.
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Introduction

On March 22, 2010, Jessica Stern of Harvard Law School, a so-called “Terrorism Expert,” was interviewed on National Public Radio’s *Here and Now.* Stern discussed Muslims in the United States in the context of two terrorist attacks by American-born Muslim women, both with “blonde hair and blue eyes.” Stern maintained that while Muslim immigrants to the United States are “completely integrated,” American-born Muslims might be dangerous due to their interest in “faddish jihad,” to which Stern attributed to a strong desire to identify with militant Islam as a social identity. She claimed, “they [American Muslims] are being recruited or recruiting themselves into a movement where they have a kind of collective identity, and that is key. This idea of jihad is providing that identity to some of these people” (Young, 2010). What is notable about this assessment of American Islam is the emphasis on group identification and membership within a specific religiously-based community. This thinking reflects the growing importance placed on group-based identity as a factor in inter-group relations.

Simultaneously, the discourse of Stern’s argument is problematic in the prejudicial ways by which it evaluates the American Muslim identity. The reference to the hair and eye color of the two American Muslim terrorists places Whiteness in conflict with the American notion of Islamic terrorism, implying that a White Muslim is contradictory in and of itself. This slight demeans the identity of White Muslims. Further, the notion of jihad, a central tenant of Islam that in many cases does not indicate militancy or violence (Netton, 1992), as “faddish” is a minimization of the
experiential reality of both White Muslims and Muslims of color, and a dismissal of
the importance of that religion and culture. In contrast, her assessment of Muslim
immigrants to the United States as completely acculturated denies the uniqueness and
cultural heritage of American Muslim communities. In doing this, Stern conveyed a
type of covert prejudice. Stern’s subtle yet destructive delegitimization of American
Muslim cultures and cultural values can be understood as a type of discrimination
called microaggression, first documented by Derald Wing Sue and his colleagues
(2007a; 2007b; 2008a; 2008b; 2008c; 2009).

Microaggressions, as a form of prejudice, are especially relevant in
contemporary U.S. society. Researchers have documented a change from a more
blatant way of expressing prejudice to a more covert way of expressing prejudice.
Microaggressions are “brief, commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental
indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile,
derogatory, or negative slights and insults toward a person” based on his/her
perceived group membership (adapted from Sue’s definition of racial
microaggressions; Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, & Nadal, 2007a, p. 271). This thesis focuses on microaggressions toward a specific religious minority in
the United States: Muslims. We examine the extent to which Muslims experience
microaggressions, as opposed to other, more blatant forms of prejudice and
discrimination, as well as how Muslims emotionally respond to microaggressions
against their group. We also examine the extent to which various components of
social and personal identities act as predictors of this emotional response to
discrimination.
Stern’s argument encompasses many of the ideas and concepts that are currently being investigated in contemporary prejudice studies. She is correct in placing importance on collective identity as a central tenant of the ways by which religious group members position themselves in relation to outside communities. She also aptly illustrates the type of discriminatory discourse that expresses subtle prejudices, which can be recognized as religious microaggressions directed towards Muslims in the United States.
Religious Microaggressions

Literature Review

Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination

In 1954 Gordon Allport described prejudice as, “an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group” (Allport, 1954, p. 9). Though this definition may now appear a bit antiquated, his influential conceptualization of prejudice allows for the isolation of several distinct factors that continue to be examined in research today (e.g. group identity and emotion).

Prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping are intricately related social phenomena. They differ in that stereotyping can be viewed as the more cognitive component, prejudice as the affective component, and discrimination as the behavioral component of evaluating individuals seen as markedly different from one’s self and group (Fiske, 1998; Mackie & Smith, 1998). Despite the damaging nature of such phenomena, all three persist because they are to some degree automatic as well as socially pragmatic (Fiske, 1998).

Stereotypes are generalizations about a group or person as a member of that group. These assumptions can be either positive or negative, though they usually manifest as negative, such as in the context of prejudicial thinking and actions (Plous, 2003). Stereotyping can be destructive in that it may allow for incorrect assessments of individuals based on their group membership, or because it provides the cognitive

---

1 Allport’s usage of male pronouns itself embodies one well-recognized form of prejudice (Hyde, 1984).
structure for prejudice and discrimination (Fiske, 1998; Plous, 2003). A prevalent stereotype held about Muslims, for example, is that they are dangerous and extremist (Sides & Gross, 2007).

Many times discrimination co-occurs with stereotyping and prejudice. Discrimination can be viewed as the behavioral enactment of internal thoughts and beliefs. Scott Plous (2003), editor of the book *Understanding Prejudice and Discrimination*, defines discrimination as “putting group members at a disadvantage or treating them unfairly as a result of their group membership” (p. 4).

Discrimination, according to Plous, can be understood as falling into two categories: personal (discrimination exhibited by the individual) and institutional (discrimination as an organized policy or practice). Various disenfranchised groups in the United States may be subject to one or both types of discrimination on a regular basis.²

Stereotypes and prejudices create bias in the way individuals think about other people that they see as different from themselves. The bias that prejudices and stereotypes maintain may take either an explicit or implicit form. While explicit biases are a visible and easily communicable form of prejudice, implicit biases are unseen in the sense that a person may utilize stereotypes about a group, but may not realize the stereotypes’ presence or behavioral effect (Banaji, Hardin, & Rothman, 1993). An example of an explicit bias is if an individual responds “no” to the question “Would you vote for a Black president?,” while implicit bias could manifest as an internal reluctance to vote for a Black presidential candidate, based on his or her race,

---

² For a better understanding of these concepts, Henkel, Dovidio, and Gaertner (2006) provide an excellent account of the interaction between various types of discrimination, including institutional discrimination, subtle contemporary biases [see below], and racial mistrust, in the post-Hurricane Katrina recovery efforts.
despite professing willingness to have a Black president. Often times, while implicit bias may be a product of the cognitive process of stereotyping, explicit bias may result from the affective prejudice. By extension, implicit bias may be shown more through subtle behavior, while explicit bias may be seen through espoused beliefs (Amodio & Devine, 2006).

As social consciousness becomes a larger concern in American culture, explicit forms of prejudice become less socially acceptable and hence, less prevalent. In contrast, prejudices are more likely to be disguised or covert. Specifically, in relation to racial prejudices, Sue et al. (2007a) write that “racism…has evolved from the ‘old fashioned’ form, in which overt racial hatred and bigotry is consciously and publicly displayed, to a more ambiguous and nebulous form that is more difficult to identify and acknowledge” (p. 272). This phenomenon has led to a shift in the focus of research from explicit to implicit displays of prejudice.

Research in this area first developed when national survey research showed that the opinions of White Americans on issues such as school integration, Black presidential candidacy, and cross-racial marriage have changed drastically from the 1940’s to 1980’s on (Schuman, Steeh, & Bobo, 1985). Despite these overt attitudinal changes, subtle markers of White prejudice towards Black Americans persisted. Crosby, Bromley, and Saxe (1980) performed a comprehensive review of “unobtrusive studies,” specifically examining helping behaviors, aggression, and nonverbal behaviors, which displayed the prevalent nature of anti-Black prejudice in white Americans. This discrepancy in professed beliefs and behaviors, suggested the

---

3 Public approval of these issues rose during this time interval.
importance of the distinction between explicit and implicit bias, and focused attention on a new area of study in social psychology: subtle racism (Fiske, 1998).

Since the 1970’s, when subtle racism first became a popular area of research, many theories have been proposed to explain how and why contemporary prejudices manifest themselves in this way. Popular theories have included “modern racism” (McConahay, 1983), which proposed that white Americans perceived Blacks as gaining undeserved privilege and status as a minority, and that discrimination towards Blacks was no longer an issue in American society; “ambivalence racism” (Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986), which viewed white Americans as having conflicting sympathetic and antagonistic views towards Black Americans; and “aversive racism” (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), which maintained the outwardly egalitarian tendencies of white Americans, but posited a cognitive bias in American culture that results in an antagonism towards Blacks.4

Aversive racism, is, in a sense, the early precursor to the microaggressions research being conducted today. Susan Fiske (1998), in her excellent history of Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination research, writes of aversive racism,

“Because aversive racists are concerned with their own egalitarian self-images, they avoid acting in overtly discriminatory ways. But when their behavior can be explained away by other factors (i.e. when they have a nonracial excuse)...then aversive racists are most likely to discriminate overtly because they can express their racist attitudes without damage to their nonracist self-concept.”

What is significant about this development in the early theoretical understanding of subtle prejudice is the recognition that, when discrimination occurs, there is a drive to

4 Later models have expanded from just white anti-Black sentiments to examining several dominant majorities’ views of and behavior towards various oppressed minorities [e.g. the Modern Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995)].
create an ambiguous situation in which the target of the discrimination need not perceive the event as discriminatory. Implicit in this theory is the importance not only of the intentions of the prejudiced individual, but also the situational context within which discrimination occurs. Research on aversive racism may have, then, facilitated a methodological shift of focus from the privileged White, cognitively motivated subject, the “stereotyper,” to the underprivileged target, the “stereotyped.” This change in direction is important, as it empowers and gives voice to those who are routinely damaged by subtle forms of prejudice, and validates their experiences as such.

Microaggressions

Microaggressions are a particular type of discrimination that results from a contemporary manifestation of prejudice similar to subtle prejudice. Presently, research on microaggressions has extended only into the realm of race-based discrimination (e.g. Sue et al. 2007a). Sue et al. (2007a) define racial microaggressions as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults towards people of color” (p. 271). Racial microaggressions can manifest in a variety of different forms, including the assumption that a person of color is foreign-born, unintelligent or uneducated, dangerous or criminal. Racial microaggressions can also occur when a white person claims to be “colorblind” or minimizes other cultural communication styles (Sue et al., 2007a).
Sue et al. (2007a) specify three subcategories into which Microaggressions may fall: microinsult, microassault, and microinvalidation. Table 1 presents the defining characteristics for each type of microaggression.

**Table 1: Types of Microaggressions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Microaggression</th>
<th>Microinsult</th>
<th>Microassault</th>
<th>Microinvalidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressor’s Intention/Awareness</td>
<td>Often Unconscious</td>
<td>Often Conscious</td>
<td>Often Unconscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Behavioral/verbal remarks or comments that convey rudeness, insensitivity, and demean a person’s heritage or identity</td>
<td>Explicit derogations characterized primarily by a violent verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the intended victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful attacks</td>
<td>Verbal comments or behaviors that exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples (from the African-American Experience)</td>
<td>A White person clutching their wallet as a person of color approaches or passes</td>
<td>Racial or Ethnic slurs</td>
<td>Claims to “colorblindness,” like “When I look at you, I don’t see color”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Sue et al.’s “Categories of and Relationships Among Racial Microaggressions” and “Examples of Racial Microaggressions” (Sue et al., 2007a, Figure 1 and Table 1)

It is expected that different targeted groups experience different types of microaggressions with different themes. For example, while there is research to suggest that Asian Americans experience microinvalidations based on the theme of foreignness, Black individuals may be more prone to victimization via microinsults related to criminality (Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007b; Sue et al., 2007a; Sue, Capodilupo, Holder, 2008a). Hence, the type of microaggressive action displayed depends on the feature(s) of the victim’s perceived identity, and the
stereotypes that accompany that identity, for which they are being discriminated against.

Microaggressions, as opposed to the more explicit forms of racial discrimination of the past, may pose much more of a threat to the target’s emotional wellbeing (Sue, 2003). Sue et al. (2007a) cite two studies as examples of the detrimental effects of more extreme implicit discrimination. In one study by Plant and Peruche (2005), law enforcement officers were found to fire their guns more often at Black criminal suspects than at White criminal suspects. In another study by Blair, Judd, and Chapleau (2004), afrocentric facial features were found to result in longer prison sentences. Most significantly, in both cases “law enforcement officials had no conscious awareness that they responded differently on the basis or race” (Sue et al. 2007a, p. 277). The absence of explicit beliefs in these studies displays the dangerous consequences of implicit bias. Thus, the redirection of focus in research from more overt to more subtle forms of prejudice is an important step in combating the dangerous effects of discrimination.

Almost every interracial encounter is prone to microaggressions (Sue et al., 2007a). This is because microaggressions have the capacity to become automatic due to cultural conditioning, as well as due to the possibility that they may be neurologically or cognitively linked to the ways in which the brain processes emotions related to prejudice (Abelson, Dasgupta, Park, & Banaji, 1998; Sue et al., 2007a). Despite this, microaggressions have not been routinely incorporated into studies of racial, as well as other, prejudices. Sue et al. (2007a) argue that the absence of research implies that covert forms of discrimination are considered to be
unimportant or invalid because they are less easily identifiable and quantifiable than overt prejudice. But the maladaptive effects of covert prejudices, including but certainly not limited to stress, distress, depression, shame, anger, self-doubt, frustration, and isolation, have been well documented (Carter, 2007; Katz, Joiner, & Kwon, 2002; Pierce, 1995; Solorzano, Ceja, & Yosso 2000; Sue et al., 2008a) and are hence equally, if not more, deserving of future research than overt prejudice.

Research on microaggressions poses important methodological challenges due to the often unconscious nature of this form of prejudice. Because perpetrators are often not aware of their own biases and prejudices, microaggressions are often committed unconsciously. It is therefore hard to identify and quantify them. In addition, the target of a microaggression is often unclear about the intentions of the aggressor because a defining feature of microaggressions is their ‘covert’ character (Harris, 2008; Sue et al., 2007a). Additionally, victims may feel pressure not to acknowledge when a microaggression has been committed, or to “let it go.” Sue et al. (2007a) write,

“This response occurs because persons of color may be (a) unable to determine whether a microaggression has occurred, (b) at a loss for how to respond, (c) fearful of the consequences, (d) rationalizing that ‘it won’t do any good anyway,’ or (e) engaging in self-deception through denial (‘It didn’t happen.’)” (p. 279).

Thus, the target of the microaggression may determine that it would better serve his or her interests not to acknowledge or respond to the situation.
Methods to Study Microaggressions

Methods that have been successful in identifying and categorizing instances of microaggressions include focus group analysis of semi-structured interviews (Sue et. al., 2007b), and focus group interviews (Solorzano et al.; 2000; Sue et al. 2008a). As far as we know, there has never been a study on microaggressions utilizing self-report data, either from the target or the aggressor.⁵

An apparent limitation in the research thus far has been its limited focus on race. The vast majority of literature on microaggressions⁶ does not examine other types of inter-group prejudice, and hence minimizes the importance of other such interactions (Thomas, 2008). There are many prevalent types of discrimination based on factors other than race. We believe that the capacity for discrimination in the form of microaggressions is likely to be present in other inter-group interactions that are not necessarily racially divided. In particular, given the prejudice directed toward Muslims in the United States (see below), we believe there is likely a relatively high rate of religious microaggressions committed against this group.

Responses to Microaggressions: Affective Implications

As mentioned before, microaggressions are particularly hard to identify because the aggressor’s motivations may be unclear (Harris, 2009). This obscurity of intention is known as attributional ambiguity. Many factors influence how a target

---

⁵ A search of the database Psycinfo was performed. All articles containing the term “microaggression” or “microaggressions” were examined. Of the various methods used in all articles and studies, none employed self-report data.

⁶ Minimal, non-empirical work has also been done suggesting the presence of microaggressions on the basis of gender and sexuality (Sue, 2010).
perceives a discriminatory act against them, as well as if the act is or is not perceived as such. When a target is faced with a type of social rejection by an out-group member, the target may understand the event in many ways, on both personal and/or group levels, including feeling one’s self was rejected, feeling one’s group was rejected, or feeling that the offender was biased by prejudice (Mendes, Major, McCoy, & Blascovich, 2008). A key factor in the extent to which a target’s psychological well-being is adversely affected by one instance or repeated instances of discrimination is the target’s self-esteem.

Self-Esteem can be defined and studied at two different levels of analysis. While personal self-esteem may refer to one’s stable sense of personal worth as derived from one’s own personal characteristics (Rosenberg, 1965), self-esteem at the group level, also known as collective self-esteem, describes one’s self-concept and self-worth as a member of a specific social group. Luhtanen and Crocker (1992), creators of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, write, “…whereas personal self-esteem tends to moderate the use of self-enhancement tactics, collective self-esteem may be an important moderator of in-group bias, in-group-serving attributions, and other collective, or group-level, strategies discussed in social identity theory” (p. 302). Further, people with high personal self-esteem exhibit more in-group bias than do people with low self-esteem, indicating the two concepts are interconnected (Aberson, Healy, & Romero, 2000).

Collective Self-Esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) is measured using four subscales: membership, importance, public regard, and private regard. Membership examines one’s perceptions of his/her contribution to an important in-group.
Importance refers to how central being part of the group is to one’s identity. Public regard, or public collective self-esteem, measures how one perceives outsiders viewing one’s social group. Private regard, or private collective self-esteem, gauges how one thinks about and what one believes about his/her own group. These measures, taken together, provide an account of how one’s social identity is defined by his/her membership in a given social group. Collective self-esteem, thus, can serve as a tool in evaluating and responding to prejudice on the basis of one’s self-worth in relation to his/her membership in a group (Cassidy, O’Connor, Howe, & Warden, 2004). Of special importance to responses to prejudice is public self-regard, as this component of the collective self-esteem construct refers to how much an individual believes an important in-group is respected and valued by the larger society.

In a study in which they examined the emotional, physiological, and behavioral responses to social acceptance and social rejection from same-race or different-race evaluators, Mendes, Major, McCoy, and Blascovich (2008) found that social rejection from out-group evaluators, as opposed to from in-group evaluators, was more likely to be attributed to discrimination, and hence, more likely to produce detrimental responses in the target. In other words, the target is more likely to perceive prejudice exhibited by people outside of his/her social group, and will react accordingly. Thus, group identification may determine how the target of disrespect assesses an indignity, as well as how she/he reacts.
Group Identification

Group identification describes one’s membership in a specific social group, one’s in-group. Belonging to an in-group affects how individuals see themselves and others (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Weetherell, 1987). The extent to which a one feels a part of one’s in-group affects the ways in which one perceives and experiences interactions with people that one sees as different from one’s self and one’s social group, members of an out-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). By extension, a one’s identification with an in-group determines how one experiences, cognitively and affectively, inter-group relations, that is, interactions between one or more in-group members and one or more out-group members (Jackson, 2002), as well as how one perceives one’s own group (Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1995; Jackson, 2002).

Leach, van Zomeran, Zebel, Vliek, Pennekamp, Doosje, and Ouwerkerk (2008) have developed a framework to conceptualize and measure the ways by which a person identifies as a member of a given in-group. Leach et al. (2008) identified two major theoretical dimensions of group identification: self-definition at the group level, which is demonstrated by the individual’s perceptions of themselves in relation to the average in-group member, and self-investment in the group, which accounts for the individual’s positive feelings about and bondedness with the group.

Five distinct components measure these two dimensions as they comprise group identification: individual self-stereotyping, in-group homogeneity, satisfaction, solidarity, and centrality. Self-stereotyping occurs when an individual perceives him/herself as similar to the prototypical group member. In contrast, while individual self-stereotyping examines the individual in comparison to the average group
member, in-group homogeneity refers to an individual’s degree of perceived similarity among in-group members. Satisfaction describes the individual’s positive and negative feelings about the group and membership within it. Solidarity examines the bond between the individual and other group members, or the level of commitment to the group. Centrality is the subjective importance that the individual assigns the in-group.

Leach et al. (2008) conducted seven studies to demonstrate the validity of this model of in-group identification. Of particular relevance to the present study are three studies that examined membership in and identification with threatened in-groups. Various subscales of Leach et al.’s scale were partially correlated with the conceptually equivalent subscales in Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) Collective Self-Esteem scale (see below). Thus, Leach et al.’s most recent method to measure group identification represents a conceptually connected, yet distinct, method of measurement.

*Inter-group Emotion*

Inter-group relations describe the dynamics enacted through different interactions between members of in-groups and out-groups. Inter-group relational

---

7 One study was an examination of “the tension between Muslims and the Western World since the 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States.” Another was an examination of how ethnic Dutch participants assessed the cultural threat of Islam. The last study looked at European attitudes towards Rwandan asylum seekers. Though the purpose of these studies served the larger purpose of testing the Leach et al.’s (2008) group identification model, as opposed to focusing specifically on the inter-group dynamics specific to these various cultural interactions, the fact that this model is built off research conducted using prejudice provides better support for its use in the present study.
theory is increasingly used in conference with theories of emotion to understand the ways by which members of these groups appraise and react to outside interactions (Iyer & Leach, 2008).

Emotions, including anger, operate at both the individual and group levels (Smith, Seger, & Mackie, 2007). While one may feel emotion on behalf of oneself, one may also feel it on behalf of, or in relation to, the group to which one belongs. As previously discussed, when an individual identifies with a group, that in-group becomes a part of him/herself. This group identification holds both social and emotional significance, and will thus affect the way individuals experience events that trigger both their membership in an in-group and, by extension, certain group level emotions. Smith (1993) proposed that people can also appraise situations and experience emotions as members of social groups. Thus, one’s cognitive evaluation of a situation involving prejudice comes from the perspective of that individual’s target’s in-group and the individual relies on her/his group identification to understand the situation, and to feel and act accordingly (Yzerbyt & Kuppens, 2009). Further, the degree to which an individual defines him/herself as a member of his/her group is a key factor in determining not just if emotion is felt, but also the type and intensity of the emotion (Parkinson, Fischer, & Manstead, 2005). This premise is called Inter-group Emotions Theory (Mackie & Smith, 2002; Mackie, Silver, & Smith, 2004; Smith, 1993), and it is supported by much empirical research, notably three studies by Mackie, Devos, and Smith (2000).

Smith et al. (2007) identified four criteria that define group-level emotions: “group emotions are distinct from the same person’s individual level emotions,
depend on the person’s degree of group identification, are socially shared within a group, and contribute to regulating intra-group and inter-group attitudes and behavior” (p. 431). Given an inter-group encounter, individual group members can experience group-level emotions about their in-group, an out-group, and the inter-relation between the in- and out-groups (Mackie & Smith, 2002).

The specific group-level emotions that the individual may experience can predict both emotional and behavioral responses to the inter-group interaction (Mackie & Smith, 2002; Parkinson et al., 2005). Iyer and Leach (2008) outlined a typology to aid in the evaluation and classification of group-level emotions. At the most basic level, the subject is an individual who identifies as a member of a group, feeling on behalf of themselves or their group (Parkinson et al., 2005). Thus, the individual has the capacity to feel emotion at the personal as well as the group level (Smith, 1993). The type of emotion (individual or group) is partially determined by the extent to which the individual is thinking and acting on behalf of him/herself or on behalf of his/her group-based identity (Turner et al., 1987).

The next level is the object, the entity to which the emotion is directed (Parkinson et al., 2005), which can be an in-group, out-group, or individual (Iyer & Leach, 2008). Emotions directed at groups, no matter the subject, may be classified as inter-group emotions (Parkinson et al., 2005). Together the permutations of group-level and individual-level subject/object create the categories of group-based emotions listed in Table 2 below:
Table 2: Individual and Group-Based Emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Subject: Group</th>
<th>Subject: Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-Group</td>
<td>Inter-group emotions</td>
<td>Personal emotions directed at out-groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Group</td>
<td>Group-based emotions directed at in-groups</td>
<td>Personal emotions directed at in-groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Group-based emotions directed at individuals</td>
<td>Interpersonal emotions*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*adapted from Iyer and Leach, 2008
*not an inter-group emotion

Affective Responses to Discrimination: The Importance of Anger

Much research supports the notion that anger is the emotion most evident when a target perceives discrimination (Crocker & Major, 1994; Gill & Matheson, 2006; Mendes et al., 2008; Swim, Hyers, Cohen & Ferguson, 2001). Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, and O’Connor (1987) used a prototype approach to characterize anger in its different forms. Using a hierarchical cluster analysis of 135 emotion names, Shaver et al. found that the primary emotion category of anger can be subdivided into the following traits: irritation, exasperation, rage, disgust, envy, and torment. They also found that the most frequent cognitive antecedent that initiates the anger process is viewing the event as illegitimate (i.e., “that the situation is contrary to what it ought to be” [Shaver et al., 1987, p. 1077]). In writing this, Shaver assigns a certain ethic to anger as an emotion that enforces the notion of a just ideal. The seemingly moral implications of the anger situation are most likely relevant to the experiences of disrespect, given that a key component of prejudice is its “unfair” nature (Plous, 2003). After a “reversal or sudden loss of power, status, or respect; insult,” the target of discrimination will likely experience anger “to rectify injustice - assert power or status” (Shaver et al, 1987, p. 1078). In fact, a recent study on
emotional responses to religious discrimination showed anger to be the negative emotion most intensely felt (compared to, for example, humiliation and shame) among British Muslims and Danish Muslims (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010). Hence, we will examine anger as a central feature of the target’s emotional response to discrimination.

Furthermore, group identification should influence the intensity of felt anger in response to discrimination. Yzerbyt, Dumont, Wigboldus, and Gordijn (2003) found that when participants were asked to report the intensity of their anger in response to a prejudicial event committed against someone else in their in-group, they reported greater anger when the victim was explicitly identified as part of their social group. This suggests that the presence and activation of shared social identity may affect the experience of anger at the group-level (see also Hansen & Sassenberg, 2006). In particular, higher levels of in-group identification should be associated with more intense anger in response to perceived discrimination.

The Muslim Community

Muslims were chosen as the subjects of this study because of their under-representation in contemporary psychological research. While social conditions for American Muslims have worsened due to the effects of September 11th and the surrounding discourse on terrorism, Muslim experiences of this rise in hostility has not been well documented (Abdo, 2006). Given that there is dispute regarding whether the increasingly difficult social conditions following September 11th have unified the American Muslim community by increasing solidarity and supporting the
process of Muslim social identity formation (Bradford, 2009; Sheikh, 2008; Widjanarko, 2008), more research is necessary to better understand the Muslim community in the United States today (Leonard, 2003).

Substantial research has been conducted with the finding that Muslims in the United States are routinely the targets of discrimination. Specifically, in academia a majority of college-aged Muslims report prejudice and discrimination as common phenomena (Omeish, 1999). With the exception of a study by Park, Malachi, Orit, and Tevet (2007) examining subtle prejudice against people with Muslim-sounding names, as opposed to European American names, in hiring practices, no research exists examining the presence of more covert forms of discrimination and disrespect, such as microaggressions, against Muslims. In order to account for and combat the rise of American Islamophobia (Gottschalk & Greenberg, 2007), more research is necessary to discover the ways in which American Muslims experience being the targets of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping.

Muslims are also a useful group to examine in furthering the field’s knowledge of inter-group relations because Muslims appear to show high levels of identification with their in-group. Developmental research suggests Muslim children develop strong in-group biases, evident by their ability to identify themselves as members of their group and evaluate their group positively early on in their lives (Mishra & Bano, 2003). These high levels of in-group identification may be connected to the fact that Muslim students assign greater importance to religious obligations and commitments than to other matters, suggesting that religion may serve as an identity-forming feature for them (Omeish, 1999). Muslim religiosity is
positively correlated with in-group and ethnic identification (Ali, 2007). Further, higher levels of ethnic and religious identification in Dutch Muslims are associated with perceived social rejection on the basis of religion (Verkuyten & Yilditz, 2007). Interestingly though, one study shows a positive correlation in American Muslims of Middle-eastern descent between perceived discrimination and acculturation (Awad, 2010). These collected findings demonstrate that Muslims are a unique social group to study as both the target of discrimination and as the agent of social identity formation.

The research on Muslims’ religious and ethnic identity formation has been particularly inconsistent. These irregularities in both methods and theories most likely exist because the Muslim American identity is dynamic and multidimensional, and dependent on many factors including but not limited to generation, nationality, age, socioeconomic status, religiosity, and gender (Britto, 2008). Additionally, it is unclear as to whether the category of “Muslim,” as a target of discrimination, should be regarded as a race, ethnicity, or religious group (Leonard, 2003; Meer, 2008). The inconsistency in research methods employed to understand how Muslims are targeted through discrimination necessitates future research in this domain. Thus, the questions remaining to be answered include: how do Muslims experience discrimination and disrespect, and does the microaggressions model of subtle discrimination accurately describe the type of discrimination being experienced in this community? Further, how do Muslims’ religious group identification impact the ways in which they experience and react to such events?
Overview of The Present Study

As mentioned before, microaggressions research has focused primarily on issues of race (Thomas, 2008), and more specifically on African-American and Asian Americans as targets of covert prejudice from White aggressors. The limited scope of this research, we believe, is not because the theoretical framework of microaggressions research necessitates race acting as the most prominent motivator of discrimination. That is, there is no aspect of microaggressions theory that is better suited to address race than, say, gender or religion. Rather, research on microaggressions and covert forms of prejudice and discrimination in general may have centered on inter-group relations across racial lines because racism has historically been the central focus of prejudice research. This focus on racism, both overt and covert, may account for the apparent hole in the microaggressions research (Thomas, 2008). But, the microaggressions model of conceptualizing contemporary forms of prejudice and instances of discrimination may also be promising in understanding how other forms of oppression are constructed and maintained. Thus, the present study served as an investigation into the existence and prevalence of microaggressions based on the target’s religious group. Specifically, it examined the existence of microaggressions directed towards members of the Muslim Community in the United States.

As far as we know, there has never been a study on microaggressions utilizing self-report data, either from the target’s or aggressor’s perspective. The present study employed a new multi-method approach in order to contribute to the pre-existing set of methodologies already present in the field of microaggressions research, through
the addition of narrative analysis as well as combined qualitative and quantitative self-report data from the target’s perspective. Specifically, the study asked participants about a recent instance in which they felt disrespected on the basis of their membership in the Muslim community. This question served as the basis for analysis of microaggressional events.

The present study also examined the occurrence of inter-group relations and emotions in the context of discriminatory behavior, again, from the perspective of the target. Specifically, anger and dejection, as affective responses to discrimination, were measured to assess the emotional impact of the discriminatory experience. Anger was chosen as it is the most common emotional response to discrimination in general (Crocker & Major, 1994), as well as the most intense emotional response to specific forms of religious discrimination towards Muslims (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010).

It was important to contrast anger as an emotional response to religious discrimination with alternative possible negative emotional responses. Dejection was chosen as a basis of comparison for two reasons. First, dejection is a particularly important emotion in response to negative life events (Lewis, Haviland-Jones, & Barrett, 2008). Second, dejection and anger differ in terms of arousal, with the former involving less arousal than the latter (see e.g., Shaver, 1987). This attribute makes dejection less action-focused than anger (Frijda, 1987; Parkinson, Fischer, & Manstead, 2004). This difference has important implications for the emotional meaning of the discriminatory event for the participants. If participants felt more dejected than angry, they would indicate that they felt bad about the event, but not especially motivated to act. By contrast, if participants felt more angry than dejected,
they would indicate greater motivation to respond to the event. In this way, anger indicates a greater desire to do something about the negative event. Thus, anger and dejection, as affective responses to perceived discrimination, were examined in relation to one another.

Additionally, this study investigated how these emotions are contextualized and affected by group identification. Group identification, then, was measured using the Leach et al.’s (2008) Measure of In-Group Identification. In particular, this study employed the self-investment section of the scale, as this dimension is particularly relevant in situations of threat to one’s in-group (Leach et al., 2008).

Both personal and collective self-esteem have been shown to influence the relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological distress (Cassidy et al., 2004; Liang & Fassinger, 2008). Thus, both personal and collective self-esteem were measured as independent factors influencing victims' experiences of microaggressional discrimination. Because components collective self-esteem are better measured by Leach et al.’s (2008) scale than Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) original model, only the Public Self-Regard Scale of the original Collective Self-Esteem Scale was used, in conjunction with Self-Investment as quantified by Leach et al (2008). A shortened version of Rosenberg’s (1965) Personal Self-Esteem Scale was also included, in order to address the last component of self-esteem, personal self-esteem. These three components, self-investment, public self-regard, and personal self-esteem, taken together, tested the ways by which self-concept, in the public,

---

8 This effect was shown to be weaker in women than in men.
private, and group realms, act as predictors of the affective response to perceived discrimination in the form of microaggressions.

We hypothesized that group identification (i.e., self-investment) would be the strongest predictor of affective response to microaggressions for two reasons. First, this study measured the emotions that individuals feel in response being discriminated against on the basis of their group membership. As the participants’ group-level self was involved in their emotional response to the event, their investment in their group should have affected their emotional responses. (Iyer & Leach 2008; Leach et al., 2008) Second, self-investment should act as a stronger predictor of emotional responses than public self-regard or self-esteem, as self-investment refers to how the participants experience their group membership. Public self-regard, by contrast, refers to the participants’ perception of how society views their group, not how they themselves view their group. Finally, personal self-esteem refers to how participants think and feel about themselves, not about their group. For these reasons, we predicted that both personal self-esteem and collective self-esteem would be less relevant than self-investment, and hence act as weaker predictors than self-investment of emotional response to perceived discrimination than self-investment.

Of the two emotions being examined, we hypothesized that anger would be the affective reaction more intensely felt in response to discrimination, given previous evidence suggesting the preeminence of anger as the primary reaction to discrimination (Crocker & Major, 1994; Gill & Matheson, 2006, Mendes et al., 2008; Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010; Swim, Hyers, Cohen & Ferguson, 2001).
Method

Participants

Responses for 80 participants were originally collected. Twenty-five were eliminated because they did not provide an experience in which they felt disrespected on the basis of their membership in the Muslim Community. The remaining participants were 55 Muslims, ranging in age from 18 to 45 ($M = 22.11, SD = 4.99$). 67.3% ($n = 37$) were female and 32.7% ($n = 18$) were male. 83.6% ($n = 46$) were undergraduate or graduate students. All but one identified as a practicing Muslim, and all grew up in Muslim households. 30.9% ($n = 17$) identified as Sunni, 10.9% ($n = 6$) identified as Shiite, and 58.2% ($n = 32$) did not identify with a sect or denomination. 41.8% ($n = 23$) were born in the United States, while 52.7% ($n = 29$) were born in another country.

Participants were recruited by contacting representatives of student groups and local organizations that had interests and goals related to Muslim religion and culture. There was no compensation offered for taking the online survey. Participants were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary, that their responses would remain confidential, and that they were free to withdraw at any point in the study.

---

9 Both sex and gender were asked as separate questions in the survey. To assess biological sex, participants were given the option of selecting “female” or “male.” To assess gender, participants responded to the open-ended question, “What is your gender?” and were provided a line to write in their answer. Sex was asked at the beginning of the survey, while gender was asked at the end, to allow for inconsistency. 100% ($n = 55$) listed a gender identity that was equivalent to the sex they chose. Hence, discussion of gender as a factor will also reference sex from here on out. Gender will be privileged as the factor being examined, as it better accounts for the socially-constructed nature of identity (Lippa, 2005).
process, free of penalty. Data collection was carried out with the assistance of a gatekeeper, a member of the Muslim community in the United States who was a research assistant associated with the project.

*Measures*

The scales used in this study, unless otherwise noted, remained unchanged from the original author’s suggested scales. The order of items within each scale was randomized in the construction of the survey, but remained consistent participant to participant. The scales were presented on the survey in the order in which they are discussed here. (See Appendix B for the full survey.)

Participants were asked first to report their biological sex, age, student status, whether they grew up in a Muslim household, whether they are a practicing Muslim, and the denomination of Islam, if any, to which they belong. After preliminary demographic information was collected, participants were asked to recall an experience in which they felt intentionally or unintentionally disrespected on the basis of their membership in the Muslim community, by answering the question, “Can you remember a recent incident in which you felt another person intentionally or unintentionally disrespected you because you are a member of the Muslim community?”

A content analysis was conducted on the narratives provided in response to this question. The responses were examined to determine if the situation described constituted a microaggression, and were then coded accordingly. Microaggressions were evaluated based on the definitional criteria laid out in the previous section,
adapted from (Sue et al., 2007a). The following categories were created to describe the discriminatory experience from the perspective of the target: *microinsult*, *microassault*, *microinvalidation*, and *unidentifiable*. See Table 3 in Appendix A for definitions and examples for each of these coding categories. Experiences were placed into the category that best described them, utilizing considerations such as intentionality, verbal or behavioral remarks or actions, social context, and the contents of what, if anything, was said. The narratives were coded in isolation from the rest of the data collected.

Next, participants were asked several questions about the incident they had described. We assessed the social context of the disrespect by asking participants about where the disrespect took place and who disrespected them. In particular, participants answered the following questions: “What did you do in response to the incident you just described?”, “Who was the person who disrespected you? What is your relation to him/her?”, “Did this incident occur in a public space?”, and “Were other people present?”

Further, we measured anger by asking participants to rate the extent to which they felt “angry,” “annoyed,” and “irritated” about the incident they had described (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010). We also measured dejection by asking participants to rate the extent to which they felt “sad,” “unhappy,” “down,” “vulnerable,” and “powerless” about the incident they had described (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010).

Given that emotions caused by stereotypes and perceived threat may be experienced at the group-level or at the individual-level (Iyer & Leach, 2008), it may be unclear which levels of emotion (individual or group) are at work. Thus, this study primed
participants to express emotions at the group-level by reminding them of their membership in the Muslim community. Care was taken to ask participants how they currently felt about the incident in order to avoid memory effects on emotional self-reports. Participants rated their anger and dejection on separate 7-point scales, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely).

We also measured participants’ identification as Muslims in order to examine how different aspects of identification influence angry responses to disrespectful treatment. As self-investment is relevant to situations of threat, we included measures of solidarity, centrality, and satisfaction, the three components that form the self-investment dimension of identification (Leach et al., 2008). The embedded measures were structured as follows: Solidarity (3 items; e.g. “I feel a bond with Muslims”), Satisfaction (4 items; e.g. “I am glad to be Muslim”), and Centrality (3 items; e.g. “Being Muslim is an important part of how I see myself). Participants were asked to report the extent to which they disagree or agree with a number of statements on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Additionally, we examined how participants thought the larger society viewed their group, by using the public self-regard subscale from Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES). The items specifically addressed participants’ perceived relation to United States society (e.g. “In general, American society views Muslims in a positive way”). Participants were asked to report the extent to which they disagree or agree with a number of statements on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).
Finally, we measured participants’ self-esteem with a shortened version of the Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (RSE). This scale measures participants’ personal sense of global self-esteem. Six items provided participants with a seven-point scale with which to evaluate a statement addressing their self-worth (e.g. “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”), with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree.
Results

Reliability Analyses

New clusters consolidating the emotional response to the discriminatory event, anger and dejection, were formed based on precedent (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010) indicating that several variables measuring emotion may be consolidated into one parsimonious cluster. Anger was calculated using the mean of the following emotion variables: angry, annoyed, irritated. The new cluster, anger, had a Cronbach alpha of .84. Dejection was measured using the following emotion variables: sad, unhappy, down, vulnerable, and powerless. The Cronbach alpha for the new dejection cluster was .88.

Additionally new clusters were created to look at the antecedents to the discriminatory event. Following Leach et al.’s (2008) model of in-group identification, as dictated in the method’s section of this study, reliability tests showed centrality, solidarity, and satisfaction to have Cronbach alphas of .794, .750, and .726, respectively. In this study, satisfaction, as a cluster, was reformulated from Leach et al.’s (2008) original model. The response to the statement “It is pleasant to be Muslim” was extracted from the satisfaction cluster, as its inclusion lowered the reliability ($\alpha = .67$) of the cluster. Group identification was measured by taking the mean of the centrality, solidarity, and satisfaction clusters.

Another new cluster, public self-regard, a subscale of the collective self-esteem scale that measures how the participant perceives that others view the Muslim community (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), was created. A reliability analysis
determined that the cluster had a Cronbach alpha of .756. A final cluster, personal self-esteem, was created in accordance with Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Scale, and showed a Cronbach alpha of .747.

The Effect of Gender

We examined gender as an effect on both the antecedents as well as on the affective responses. The multivariate effect of gender on centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and public self-regard was not significant, $F(4, 49) = 2.02, p = .11$. See Table 4 for means and standard deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent (M, SD)</th>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Public Self-Regard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>6.60, 0.65</td>
<td>6.27, 0.83</td>
<td>6.82, 0.37</td>
<td>2.99, 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6.14, 1.44</td>
<td>5.82, 1.40</td>
<td>6.29, 1.07</td>
<td>2.97, 1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A between-subjects analysis of variance was conducted to test the effect of gender on the affective responses of anger and dejection. The effect of gender was not significant at the $p < .05$ level, $F(2, 52) = 1.26, p = .29$. The anger and dejection means for females were 5.27 ($SD = 1.62$) and 4.39 ($SD = 1.82$) respectively, and the anger and dejection means for males were 5.30 ($SD = 1.61$) and 3.79 ($SD = 1.62$), respectively.

Another analysis of variance was conducted to compare the effect of gender on personal self-esteem. The mean level of personal self-esteem was 5.94 ($SD = .78$) for males and 6.14 ($SD = .86$) for females. There was not a significant effect of gender on personal self-esteem, $F(1,53) = .66, p = .42$. 
**Anger and Dejection**

A one-way within-subjects analysis of variance was conducted to compare the levels of anger and dejection exhibited by each participant. The mean level of anger was 5.28 with a standard deviation of 1.60. The mean level of dejection was 4.19, with a standard deviation of 1.76. Anger levels were found to be significantly higher than dejection levels, $F(1, 54) = 31.69, p < .001$.

**Centrality, Solidarity, Satisfaction, and Public Self-Regard**

Another one-way within-subjects analysis of variance was conducted to determine the difference in the extent to which participants felt centrality of, solidarity with, and satisfaction with the Muslim community, as well as how they felt the Muslim community was viewed by others (their public self-regard). Of the measures presented, satisfaction ($M = 6.65, SD = .70$) was ranked the highest, followed by centrality ($M = 6.46, SD = .98$), then solidarity ($M = 6.13, SD = 1.05$), and ranked lowest was public self-regard ($M = 2.97, SD = 1.08$). The difference in means was statistically significant, $F(3, 51) = 157.06, p = .00$.

**Microaggressions**

Of the 55 discrimination narratives examined, 36.4% ($n = 20$) were classified as microinsults, 45.5% ($n = 25$) as microassaults, and 10.9% ($n = 6$) as microinvalidations. 7.3% of the responses ($n = 4$) did not provide enough information to determine either if it constituted a microaggression or into what category of microaggression it would fall.
The intensity of emotions experienced in reaction to the event varied depending on the type of microaggression that occurred. While microassaults elicited the highest intensity of both anger ($M = 5.81$, $SD = 1.48$) and dejection ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.83$), microinvalidations elicited much less anger ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.83$) and dejection ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.88$), comparatively. See Table 5 for full list of means and standard deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: The Effect of Type of Microaggression on Emotional Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY OF EMOTION ($M, SD$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the effect of the type of microaggression on emotional reaction, a between-subjects multiple analysis of variance was conducted. The multivariate effect of type of microaggression on emotion was statistically significant, $F (6, 100) = 2.75$, $p = .02$. In univariate terms, the type of microaggression had an effect on anger $F (3, 100) = 3.96$, $p = .01$, as well as dejection $F (3, 100) = 3.89$, $p = .01$.

Correlations and Regressions

All three group identification clusters (centrality, solidarity, and satisfaction) were strongly correlated with each other. Public self-regard and personal self-esteem were not correlated with any of the group identification clusters, but were weakly negatively correlated to each other, $r (52) = -.230$, $p = .095$ (See Table 6).
Table 6: Correlations of Group Identification, Public Self-Regard, And Personal Self-Esteem. \( df = 52 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Public Self-Regard</th>
<th>Personal Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Self-Regard</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, two separate regression models tested the ability of self-investment, public self-regard, and personal self-esteem to predict dejection, as well as their ability to predict anger. We downsized the three self-investment variables (centrality, solidarity, and satisfaction) into the single cluster “self-investment” by taking the mean of the three sub-clusters. We did this in order to avoid multicolinearity, given that the three were all highly correlated with each other.

The regression model for personal self-esteem, self-investment, and public self-regard as predictors of dejection explained \( r^2 = 18.3\% \) of the variance in the affective response of dejection. Only one predictor, self-investment, significantly predicted dejection, \( \beta = .419, t (50) = 3.27, p = .02 \). The \( \beta \) for personal self-esteem was \( .076, t (50) = .575, p = .57 \). The \( \beta \) for public self-regard was \( .067, t (50) = .507, p = .61 \).

A regression model for personal self-esteem, self-investment, and public self-regard as predictors of anger was also tested. This regression model explained \( r^2 = 13.8\% \) of the variance in the anger reaction. Again, only self-investment significantly predicted anger, \( \beta = .33, t (50) = 2.52, p = .02 \). The \( \beta \) for personal self-esteem was \( .104, t (50) = .77, p = .44 \). The \( \beta \) for public self-regard was \( -.12, t (50) = -.92, p = .36 \).
Discussion

In response to events viewed as disrespectful based on their membership in the Muslim community, participants felt significantly more angry than dejected, consistent with previous research showing anger to be the emotion most evident when an event is perceived as discriminatory (Crocker & Major, 1994; Gill & Matheson, 2006, Mendes et al., 2008; Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010). Given that “anger is a response to some perceived misdeed” (Averill, 1983, p. 1150), participants were aware of the unjust nature of the situation into which they were placed. Further, this finding is notable in that anger can be construed as an empowering emotion (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2010). The participants assessed the situation as disrespectful, and responded to it emotionally by asserting their disagreement with the disrespect they had experienced (i.e., anger), rather than by feeling despondent and disempowered by the situation (i.e., dejection). Feeling more intense anger than dejection in response to discrimination should also impact willingness to engage in collective action. Gill and Matheson’s (2006) research indicated that sadness should prompt normative actions (reactions that are bound by contextual and societal expectations) while anger should prompt collective actions as a response to perceived discrimination. The intense anger that the Muslim participants experienced in response to the religious microaggressions they reported is likely to lead to collective action response as a way to redress or change the way their group is treated and viewed by society.
It is important to note that participants felt moderate levels of dejection (as indicated by the position of their average scores around the mid-point of the dejection scale) indicating that the experience of being the target of a religious microaggression is an overall negative emotional experience. This suggests that discrimination towards this group is a salient phenomenon, as neutrality towards the event is not apparent. The presence of negative emotions speaks to the harmful nature of such discriminatory events.

The narratives of discrimination presented by participants fit well into Sue et al.’s (2007a) model of covert prejudice in the form of microaggressions. Of the 55 narratives supplied, 92.7% (n = 51) provided enough information about the situation to classify the event as an instance of microaggressional discrimination, as well as to determine into which category of microaggression the event could be classified. This data implies that microaggressions are an accurate way of describing and qualifying the discrimination that Muslims in the United States often face. This study is, then, the first successful expansion of the microaggressions model to a population targeted for their religion, as opposed to their race.

It is also significant to the American Muslim experience that microassaults were the most common form of microaggressions, followed by microinsults, and finally microinvalidations. Microassaults, the most manifest of the three, is also in many cases the most apparent way to make prejudices known. Microassaults are often conscious and intentional on the part of the aggressor. In contrast, microinvalidations are the least blatant of the three. This data suggests that discrimination towards Muslims in the US is not as covert as other forms of racism that have been examined
(Sue et al., 2007b; Sue et al., 2008a). One reason for this may be the relatively recent nature of much of the prejudice and Islamophobia that has developed in this country in response to political and economic tensions as well as prejudicial media reporting such as the instance referred to in the introduction (Young, 2010). Prejudice against Muslims can be viewed in this light as a “new” prejudice, which does not mean that it did not exist at the same time other forms of subtle prejudice were being addressed historically, but rather that it has evolved as a product of more contemporary American sentiment.

The prevalence of microaggressional discrimination against Muslims gains significance in light of the emotional reactions evident in participants. Microassaults, in addition to being the most common type of discrimination experienced, also elicited the most intense affective responses, both in anger and dejection. These findings raise cause for concern, suggesting that the types of prejudice that are most harmful are also those that are most common.

The findings of this study show that self-investment, a dimension of group identification, was the only significant predictor of both emotional responses to discrimination. This research not only supports findings that group identification is strongly correlated with group-level emotion (Mackie et al., 2004; Lickel et al., 2005), but posits group identification as a strong predictor of group-level emotion. This finding is intuitively sound, given that group identity should be triggered when an individual is targeted based on his/her group membership. Naturally, a person that

---

10 Collective self-esteem and personal-self esteem were not shown to be significant predictors.
is more invested in his/her group will take greater offense when that group is threatened.

This finding is also significant in light of the prevalence of the anger response. As higher self-investment predicts higher levels of anger as a response to perceived discrimination, and as anger is more likely to prompt collective action (Gill & Matheson, 2006), Muslims who identify heavily with their group may be more motivated to respond with collective action (van Zomeren, Spears, & Leach, 2008). This motivation is important in that it prompts multiple methods of coping (i.e. emotion-based and problem-based) at the group level, which may serve as healthier way to respond to perceived discrimination (Foster, 2000).

Finally, the results showed that personal self-esteem and public self-regard did not have a significant effect on affective response to perceived discrimination. This implies that personal and collective self-esteem are not strong indicators of group identity, or, alternatively, are not as relevant to perceptions of discrimination.

The findings of this study align with the proposed hypothesis that Muslims would experience meaningful negative emotions in response to such discrimination, and that anger would be the most common response. Further, the study also confirms the hypothesis that group identification would be the strongest predictor of affective responses to religious microaggressions directed towards Muslims in the United States.
Limitations

This research is limited in several ways. First and foremost, many responses were eliminated from the original number of completed surveys because the participant failed to provide an account of a time in which he/she felt discriminated against based on his/her membership in the Muslim community. We believe it would be wrong to assume that this lack of responses indicates that Muslims are not routinely discriminated against as a community, as there is ample research to the contrary (Council on American-Islamic Relations, 2007; Leonard, 2003).

Other factors of the unwillingness or inability of participants to address the prompt may have been the usage of the word “recent,” which may have limited, for some participants, the scope of what they could discuss (e.g. one respondent wrote, “Not recently, the last I can recall is about a year ago.”). This explanation of why participants could or did not provide accounts of discrimination, though, would work against Sue et al.’s (2007a) assertion that microaggressions are an “everyday” event. Other participants, without being prompted, cited this type of discrimination as an everyday occurrence (e.g. “This is an everyday occurrence, but one particular one was last week…”), which supports Sue’s understanding of microaggressions as commonplace.

An alternative reason for participants’ inability or unwillingness to provide an account of discrimination that better fits with Sue’s conception of microaggressions is that microaggressions may occur without the target being able to recognize that such an offense has occurred, or that he/she may be unwilling or unprepared to acknowledge the offense (Sue et al., 2007a). If this is the case, participants may still
have been targets of microaggressional discrimination, but may not be able or willing to cite such events. Future research should address this issue by utilizing alternative methodologies, such as diary studies or direct observation in order to 1) make the participant more aware of these discriminatory events such that they “look out for microaggressions,” 2) prompt them on a more regular basis so that even minor disrespectful events are documented closer to the time at which they occur, or 3) not rely solely on first hand accounts from the targets of microaggressions, but, rather, employ an outside observer who may be better prepared to identify these discriminatory events as they are occurring.

Still Sue et al.’s microaggressions framework (2007a) has an apparent downfall. In the attempt to address the changing needs of various minority groups in relation to the discrimination they face, Sue et al. have developed a method by which to study covert prejudice. However, it appears that their model accounts for overt prejudice as well in that the category of “microassault,” with its obscurity of intentionally and consciousness on the part of the aggressor. Events of microassault may include such minute offenses as whispering “terrorist” under one’s breath, or, say, a more overt act that may resemble a hate crime, such as threatening the target’s safety. The fluidity of this category provides the model with more flexibility in accounting for a wider range of discriminatory acts. What is compromised, though, is the scale’s ability to strictly measure implicit and covert prejudices. By integrating more blatant acts into the microaggressions framework, Sue et al. (2007a) reintroduce the type of prejudice that has been the object of study in social psychology since Allport first wrote about prejudice (1954). Thus, a limitation of this study, as well as
other studies that employ the microaggressional framework, is that it cannot make
claims about covert prejudice as a phenomenon independent of other types of
prejudice without excluding one of the three categories specified by the model. In
fact, the findings of this study, on the contrary, suggest that blatant discrimination
could possibly be dominant manifestation of prejudice towards Muslims in the United
States, given the large number of microassaults reported. Because of the relative
ambiguity of the microaggressions model, though, this notion is still unclear.

One final limitation of the current research was that, given the downsized
number of participants once those who did not cite a discriminatory event were
extracted from the sample, the sample size was rather small. It is possible that the
effects of variables such as gender, personal self-esteem, and public self-regard may
have been weakened as a result of this small sample. Future studies should seek a
larger number of participants through more aggressive recruiting strategies.

Future Directions

This research demonstrates that discrimination is a relatively common event in
the lives of Muslims in the United States. Further, this study illustrates well the
negative emotions caused by such events. Future research should look into the
cumulative effects of this type of discrimination over a lifespan perspective,
examining the long-term impact of such discriminatory events, as well as the negative
emotions that accompany such events, on Muslims’ emotional and psychological
well-being. Religious microaggressions research should be expanded out to other
religious minorities that may also be the targets of covert discrimination.
The ways in which Muslim identity, in particular, is presented and perceived varies substantially, even when limited to the United States. This is an issue that may accompany the study of any religious group whose members may identify with other group-based identities, such as race, gender, or nationality, in addition to religious group affiliation (Meer, 2008). In the case of this study, while some aggressors may have been able to identify their target as Muslim because of their target’s presentation (e.g. wearing the hijab), other participants may have been assumed Muslim based on their perceived race or nationality (e.g. Arab). Further, several of the accounts given in this study described discrimination based on intersectional identities, such as being a Muslim woman. Given the complex and intersectional nature of the Muslim identity, future research would be well-suited to examine the multi-dimensional aspects of religious identity, as well as how microaggressions may be a product of perceived race, gender, or nationality, as well as of perceived religion.

With regards to the prominence of self-investment as a predictor of affective response, future studies could employ Leach et al.’s (2008) model of in-group identification to examine the effect of identification on other group-level emotions. This type of research would further our understanding of how membership in various groups influences how emotion is experienced in the social world.
Conclusion

The findings of this study provide empirical evidence for the existence and prevalence of covert prejudice towards Muslims in the United States. Additionally, the high frequency of microassaults, in particular, suggests that overt prejudice may also be a common experience among Muslims in the United States. The microaggressions model, in general, was helpful in quantifying the types of prejudice that the Muslim community encounters, and can be understood as a useful way of identifying and categorizing the different forms of discrimination that result from these prejudices. Anger was the strongest emotion experienced by targets of microaggressions based on their membership in the Muslim community. Identification with the group, and in particular self-investment, was shown to be a strong predictor of affective response to discrimination. Taken together, these findings demonstrate the harmful nature of prejudice as well as the emotional importance of membership within a social group.
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### Appendix A

**Table 3: Types of Microaggressions from The American Muslim Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Microinsult</th>
<th>Microassault</th>
<th>Microinvalidation</th>
<th>Unidentifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressor’s Intention/Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Often Unconscious</td>
<td>Often Conscious</td>
<td>Often Unconscious</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Behavioral/verbal remarks or comments that convey rudeness, insensitivity, and demean a person’s heritage or identity</td>
<td>Explicit derogations characterized primarily by a violent verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the intended victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful attacks</td>
<td>Verbal comments or behaviors that exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of a person</td>
<td>It could not be determined what type of microaggression, if any, was displayed. Respondent’s narrative does not contain enough information to assess aggressor’s behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples (from the American Muslim Experience)</strong></td>
<td>“Where are you from?” or “Where were you born?” (conveys “You are a foreigner/not American.”); being held up by airport security (conveys all Muslims dangerous, anti-American, etc.)</td>
<td>Racial or Religious slurs like “Osama” or “Terrorist” (conveys all Muslims dangerous, anti-American, etc.)</td>
<td>Telling a Muslim woman her religion does not respect her, or “It’s not your fault. You come from a conservative culture.” (conveys non-Muslims know better than Muslims)</td>
<td>Respondent writes, “…the girl that worked there disrespected my cousin and I. My cousin and I wear hijab, so it could be b/c we’re Muslim but I don’t know the real reason why she treated us like that.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Sue et al.’s Categories of and Relationships Among Racial Microaggressions (Sue et al., 2007a, Figure 1 and Table 1)
Appendix B

Survey: “Everyday Experiences of Disrespect”

Feeling disrespected by others is a common human experience. We are gathering stories about people’s everyday experiences of disrespect. We are asking people from different communities to respond to this questionnaire. The Muslim community is very important for our project as this community is underrepresented in research in psychology. With this research project we aim to bring the presence and voice of your community into psychology.

Thank you for taking the time to answer our questionnaire. The questionnaire is anonymous.

We greatly appreciate your contribution to our project and we will be happy to send you information about our results. We provide you with contact information at the end of the questionnaire.

Before you start answering the questionnaire, could you please give us some general information about yourself?

Are you a student? Yes No

If yes, what is your major? ________________

What is your age?_____

What is your biological sex? Female Male

Can you remember a recent incident in which you felt another person intentionally or unintentionally disrespected you because you are a member of the Muslim community? Please tell us as much as you would like about this experience.

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
Thank you for sharing your experience. **Could you please also answer the following questions?**

What did you do in response to the incident you just described?

_____________________________________________________________________

Who was the person who disrespected you? What is your relation to them?

_____________________________________________________________________

Did this incident occur in a public space?  Yes  No

And, were other people present?  Yes  No

If yes, about how many?  

Did this person intend to disrespect you? Was their disrespect intentional?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Yes, certainly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Below is a list of characteristics. **Please rate how well each characteristic fits the incident you described.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmful to Muslims’ social image</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An affront to my reputation</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespectful towards Muslims</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An insult to my identity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An offense to the honor of Muslims</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespectful towards me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonorable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An offense to my honor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful to my social image (i.e., how others think of you)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An affront to Muslims’ reputation in US society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeserved</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An insult to Muslims</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Today, how do you feel about this incident?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humiliated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounded honor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below we present you with a list of statements about what it means for you to be part of the Muslim community. **Please rate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt pride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved by others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that I am Muslim is an important part of my identity.  

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly agree    |   |   |   |   |   | 6 | 7 |

US society respects Muslims.  

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly agree    |   |   |   |   |   | 6 | 7 |
I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about Muslims. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I am glad to be Muslim. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Being Muslim is an important part of how I see myself. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
In general, American society views Muslims negatively. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I feel solidarity with Muslims. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Being Muslim gives me a good feeling. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I have spend time trying to find out more about Muslims, such as their history, traditions, and customs. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I often think about the fact that I am Muslim. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I think Muslim people have a lot to be proud of. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
In general, Muslims are considered good by others in US society. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
It is pleasant to be Muslim. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I feel a bond with Muslims. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I feel committed to Muslims. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
US society views Muslims as an asset. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Below is a list of sentences that describe your general feelings about yourself. Please rate how much you agree or disagree with each sentence.
Religious Microaggressions

I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least one on an equal plane with others.  

I am able to do things as well as most other people.  

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I’m a failure.  

I take a positive attitude towards myself.  

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.  

Thank you for your participation in this study. **Could you please answer these final questions?**  

Your gender: __________________  

Where were you born? _______________________________  

If you were not born in the US, how long have you lived in the US?_____________  

Where was your mother born? _______________________________  

Where was your father born? ________  

Are you a practicing Muslim? Yes No  

Were you raised in a Muslim household? Yes No  

What religious denomination (if any) do you associate yourself with? (question is optional) _______________________________