2007

Measuring diversity management skill: Development and validation of a situational judgment test

Andrew Biga
University of South Florida

Measuring Diversity Management Skill:

Development and Validation of a Situational Judgment Test

by

Andrew Biga

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Joseph A. Vandello, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Walter C. Borman, Ph.D.
Michael T. Brannick, Ph.D.
Kristen Salomon, Ph.D.
Sally Riggs Fuller, Ph.D.

Date of Defense:
November 1, 2007

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Measuring Diversity Management Skill:
Development and Validation of a Situational Judgment Test

Andrew Biga

ABSTRACT

As a result of both demographic and social changes in the U.S., organizations have become much more diverse. Diversity presents unique challenges for management as it is linked to both positive and negative organizational performance outcomes (Mannix & Neale, 2005). Diversity, by itself, may not be sufficient to achieve competitive advantage. Effective diversity management becomes an important issue for organizations to consider. The current research uses Situational Judgment Test (SJT) methodology to develop an assessment measuring Diversity Management Skill. The development of a SJT involves a three-step process: Creation of critical incidents, generation of response options, and use of SME response option ratings to determine scoring. The Diversity Management Skill SJT displays promising results and is an effective predictor of diversity performance.

Introduction

With the changing demographics of the U.S. workforce in recent years, diversity has become an increasingly important issue for organizations. Women make up more than 43% of the labor force (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006). By the year 2050, racial minorities are expected to comprise close to half of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Due in part to these demographic trends, organizations have placed a greater emphasis on diversity initiatives. In addition, social changes in the U.S. have elicited new attitudes towards diversity related issues. For example, the expression of racism has changed dramatically over the last century. Current social norms dictate that overt forms of racial prejudice are unacceptable (Dovidio, 2001). Racial attitudes among Whites have generally become more liberal in the past half-century, and it is now the norm to support broad principles of equality (Schuman & Krysan, 1999; Crandall, Eshleman, & O'Brien, 2002). As egalitarian beliefs among Whites have become more prominent, obvious discrimination against minorities has become intolerable by today's legal and social standards depicted by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

As a result of both demographic and social changes, organizations within the United States have become much more diverse (Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand, 1993). In addition to these changes, organizations have also become less hierarchical and the use of teams has increased (Ilgen, 1999; Tolbert, Andrews, & Simmons, 1995). The modern organization has greater levels of interpersonal contact and

interdependent work assignments, which compounds the impact of diversity related work issues. Diverse teams present unique challenges for management, as they are linked to both positive and negative performance outcomes. As effective management of a diverse workforce is a necessity for many organizations, there exists a need for better assessment of diversity related skill sets.

The goal of the present research is to develop and validate a *situational judgment test* (SJT), a scenario-based skill assessment instrument, intended to measure effective diversity management as an individual difference variable. Currently, there exists a minimal amount of assessments measuring diversity management. Diversity management is an important skill relevant to many organizations. The SJT developmental method is appropriate for examining job knowledge or expertise (Hanson, Horgen, & Borman, 1998), and should provide useful job related information concerning diversity issues encountered at work.

Definition of Diversity

The term "diversity" was not widely used until the mid 1980s. In a review of the management literature, Edelman, Fuller, and Mara-Drita (2001) show the rise of diversity rhetoric started in 1987 and peaked in the early 1990s. A multitude of factors have been included in the definition of diversity, and definitions can be extremely broad, such as, "any attribute that another person may use to detect individual differences" (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998, p.81). Broad inclusive definitions of diversity have been shown to have a positive influence on perceptions of diversity programs (Rynes & Rosen, 1995; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). However, the utility of overly broad definitions is questionable, as it makes diversity difficult to

measure and study effectively. On the other hand, more narrow definitions can undermine the intent of diversity initiatives, as excluded groups become alienated. A balance will be attempted by breaking down diversity into more useful categories while incorporating a broad overall inclusive definition of diversity.

Although individuals can differ across a wide variety of categories, researchers have made a distinction between visible and non-visible characteristics (Milliken & Martins, 1996). Visible categories include, but are not limited to, age, ethnicity, gender, and race. Less visible categories include, but are also not limited to, physical abilities, educational background, sexual orientation, geographic location, income, marital status, parental status, and religious beliefs. Beyond this dichotomy, diversity has been divided into surface-level and deep-level categories in order to describe the functional difference that diversity presents (Phillips & Loyd, 2006). Surface-level diversity refers to demographic characteristics, such as race and gender, while deep-level diversity explains functional differences, such as work experience.

The current research will consider diversity broadly as any relevant categories that can affect workplace interactions. This definition allows for a comprehensive review of factors that influence diverse interpersonal interactions at work. Some researchers have suggested that every dimension of diversity, regardless of how it is defined, has the potential to facilitate or inhibit group performance (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000). From a pragmatic standpoint, development of a diversity related measure that limits the definition of diversity could easily overlook important dimensions that affect workplace interactions. The subject matter experts used to create the items for the diversity situational judgment test used in this research were

not be given a formal definition of diversity. This served to eliminate any artificially placed boundaries and enhance creativity for the item generators.

Diversity and Organizational Functioning

The relationship between diversity and organizational functioning is complex, potentially affecting performance, cohesion, job satisfaction, and morale. Diversity training programs are a common initiative implemented by organizations to resolve potential issues with diversity. In order to determine the effectiveness of these training programs, a need exists for an accurate assessment of diversity management skills. The benefits of diversity are often cited as reasons to support various company initiatives. The research on the effects of diversity is more complicated than many of diversity proponents would lead you to believe (Mannix & Neale, 2005).

From a research standpoint, diversity can be a complex issue with many facets. Due to the current political discourse, many organizations feel compelled to support diversity initiatives, and there exists a tendency to over emphasize the positive findings from diversity related research (Mannix & Neale, 2005). Often cited benefits of diversity include higher quality decision making, improved creativity, and enhanced marketplace understanding (Robison & Dechant, 1997). In contrast to these positive outcomes, research based on social identity and self-categorization theories have shown that diversity can have negative effects on organizations. In an attempt to reconcile these two divergent lines of research, contingency theories have been used to explain the complexities of diversity and organizational performance. A brief review of three theoretical frameworks will summarize the current literature on the relationship between diversity and

organizational effectiveness: resource based theories, social identity theories, and contingency theories.

Diversity as a Resource: The Business Case for Diversity

Resource-based theories view diversity as a resource that adds to performance through cognitive benefits. Such theories predict higher levels of performance from a diverse organization and view diversity as a business necessity. These theories extend the current business philosophy that views effective human resource management as a key to corporate success (Barney, 1991; Barney, Wright, & Ketchen, 2001; Wright & McMahan, 1992). From this perspective, a diverse workforce gives organizations additional resources such as cognitive benefits, resistance to groupthink, and access to minority markets. Appositely, a recent trend in management is a push for a more diverse workforce.

Research has shown that diverse groups demonstrate cognitive benefits that can ultimately increase overall group and organization performance. Diverse groups of people are better able to engage in more realistic decision-making (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Research on small work teams has shown that diversity increases problem solving effectiveness (Hoffman, 1959; McLeod, Lobel, & Cox, 1996; Sawyer, Houlette, & Yeagley, 2006). Diverse groups bring multiple perspectives and broad background knowledge to these work teams eliciting higher quality solutions. Other research has shown diverse work groups enhance creativity (Kurtzberg, 2005; Triandis, Hall, & Ewen, 1965; Yap, Chai, & Lemaire, 2005). Although diversity can lead to tension and conflict in groups, these factors can facilitate the creative process. One caveat is that the majority of these findings come from laboratory research and

rely on definitions of diversity that focus on functional differences, such as personality, expertise, and educational background (Mannix & Neale, 2005). However, a study by Watson, Kumar, and Michaelsen (1993) showed that ethnically diverse work groups also demonstrate cognitive benefits. In an increasingly unpredictable and complex work environment, the resource-based theory would predict an advantage for those corporations that are able to capitalize on the benefits of enhanced problem solving.

Another benefit that coincides with improved decision-making is the prevention of groupthink. Groupthink is described as a drive for consensus at any cost that stifles dissent and evaluation of other options in highly cohesive groups (Janis, 1972). Heterogeneous groups are less likely to fall victim to groupthink than homogeneous groups (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). This is due in part to high group cohesion being a main contributing factor to groupthink errors. Increased levels of diversity will theoretically keep groups from becoming too cohesive; this level of cohesion will help to deter groupthink, while promoting a higher quality of problem solving. Heterogeneous group members are more likely to generate a variety of choices. These groups are more likely to evaluate which is the best option, irrespective of what the other group members propose because they do not necessarily identify with these other perspectives.

Diversity is often cited as a strategy to gain access to new markets (Kochan, Bezrukova, Ely, Jackson, Joshi, Jehn, Leonard, Levine, and Thomas, 2003; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). A workforce that is similar to its customer base can enhance the organization's ability to market its products effectively. The different cultural and

social dimensions of minority communities must first be understood before an effective harnessing of minority purchasing power can occur. Majority members typically do not have the ability, or the past experiences, to accomplish this task. Diverse organizations that utilize minority managers may have an edge in approaching minority markets over more homogeneous organizations (Milliken & Martins, 1996).

In order to take advantage of these new and emerging markets, corporations will need to adjust their human resources to match that of these target markets. The additional resources gained from heterogeneous work groups are thought to give these organizations an advantage in outperforming the competition.

Diversity: Social Identity Theories

Alternative theoretical approaches focus on the potential disadvantages of diversity. Social identity theories (Tajfel, 1978, 1982) and self-categorization theories (Turner, 1985) describe how individuals come to define their self-concept through group membership. Individuals are motivated to enhance positive self-esteem through identification with various social groups (Tajfel, 1982). Self-categorization into these social groups occurs within a hierarchy, as some group identities are more important to our self-concepts. The social context, such as racial group composition, influences the saliency of group identification and can ultimately lead to different behaviors (Markus & Cross, 1990). Stroessner (1996) found that demographically heterogeneous groups are more likely to categorize group membership for themselves and others along these salient differences.

These theories help to explain difficulties that diversity presents in the organizational context. An increase in the racial diversity of an organization would increase the number of interactions between in-group and out-group members. These interactions could lead to more conflict. It is this conflict that could reduce the performance of organizations or, on a smaller scale, the performance of teams. In support of this theory, Thomas (1999) found that culturally homogenous groups had higher performance than culturally heterogeneous groups did on multiple tasks in a laboratory setting. Additional research investigates exactly how diversity could elicit lower performance. One important factor that has been examined is the relationship between diversity and conflict.

Pelled, Eisenhardt, and Xin (1999) make an important distinction between emotional conflict and task-related conflict. Task conflict is characterized by disagreements in task related decisions, procedures, goals, and other issues directly related to the actual work being performed. Emotional conflict is more complex and is seen as centering on non-task related issues. One relevant factor could be stereotyping of out-group members. Out-group members are seen as more homogenous than in-group members (Judd & Park, 1988). Mackie and Smith (1998) showed that out-group members are judged in stereotypic terms more quickly than in-group members. The use of stereotypes has been linked to discriminating behaviors and differential treatment of out-group members (McGrath et al., 1995). The effects of stereotypes could be especially important for newly formed work groups or when diversity increases at a rapid pace in an organization. There is evidence supporting the idea that racial diversity is linked to emotional conflict, but not task-related

conflict (Pelled et al., 1999). The relationship between diversity and task conflict appears to be more intricate.

An interesting finding is the interaction between racial diversity and functional background on task conflict (Pelled et al., 1999). Task conflict is often associated with lower organizational and/or team performance. Aversive racism may explain the interaction between race and functional background on the amount of task conflict. Aversive racism is thought to describe many Whites who consciously hold egalitarian beliefs, but also harbor negative emotions towards minorities. Aversive racism is most likely to occur when there are not clear social norms that dictate how to interact (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). This ambiguity allows aversive racists to act in a discriminatory fashion because these individuals can attribute their decisions to other non-prejudiced criteria (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Because there are strong societal norms that prohibit the overt expression of racial prejudice, individuals may only discriminate when they view their actions as being the result of another factor, in this case, functional background. There appears to be evidence for the idea that diversity fosters some level of conflict, whether emotional or task related. This conflict could result in lower performance for diverse organizations or teams.

Additional research shows that the rate of turnover and absenteeism is significantly higher for women and minorities (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Individuals in heterogeneous work groups demonstrate less attachment to one another and less commitment to the organization (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). The link between organizational commitment and turnover has been established by previous research (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). In addition, job satisfaction among women and

minorities is often lower than that of their male and majority counterparts (Cox &

Blake, 1991; Tuch & Martin, 1991). Furthermore, increases in diversity may also be

associated with emotional conflict, as research has linked group diversity with

decreased satisfaction and lower levels of cohesion (Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand,

1993). If racially heterogeneous groups do not have as much unity as homogeneous

groups, it is plausible that dissimilarities are driving the disagreements among the

group members. Social identity and self-categorization theories are useful

frameworks to help understand why diversity can lead to lower performance among

organizations. In-group members are motivated to enhance their self-image through

the identification and promotion of their own group (Tajfel, 1982). This process

offers one explanation for how diversity may decrease the performance of an

organization or group.

Although social identity theories and self-categorization theories are often

used to show the potential negative consequences of having a diverse workforce,

research has shown that individuals are capable of identifying with a superordinate

category instead of these subgroup identities (Huo, 2003). Effective diversity

management may be able to incorporate self-categorization into a positive outcome

for the organization by fostering a strong identification with the organization itself, an

identity shared by all members. If an organization is effective at establishing a strong

identity for all of its employees, the possible negative consequences of diversity may

be avoided.

Given the social identity and resource-based perspectives, one might predict

either benefits or disadvantages of diversity in organizations. Research has shown

mixed results when examining the effects of diversity on organizational outcomes (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). Webber and Donahue (2001) conducted a meta-analysis on the effects of diversity on performance and work group cohesion. The meta-analysis included seventy-six studies that focused on work groups. Diversity did not have a main effect on either performance or cohesion. Another meta-analysis by Bowers, Pharmer, and Salas (2000) showed only a small effect size on performance in favor of heterogeneous work groups while Williams and O'Reilly (1998) found no consistent effects of diversity on firm performance. The relationship between diversity and performance appears to be much more complex than predicted by the resource-based or social identity perspectives. More recent approaches to the study of diversity and organizational functioning have focused on contingency-based models that incorporate additional factors to determine this relationship.

Diversity: Contingency Theories

Contingency focused theories examine contextual factors that interact with diversity to impact organizational performance. Diversity is thought to interact with a number of factors (e.g. communication, conflict, and cohesion) that ultimately influence organizational outcomes. Organizations that understand these processes should be able to manage a diverse workforce more effectively.

Richard (2000) examined the effects of racial diversity on a business firm's performance. This study found that growth strategy moderated the effect of racial diversity on the organization's performance. Growth strategy was compared with downsizing and referred to the number of mergers and acquisitions the firm engaged

in compared to a computed average. The results showed that firms with high levels of racial diversity that employed a growth strategy resulted in higher levels of performance than firms with less diversity that employed a growth strategy. In contrast, firms that had high levels of diversity that were involved in downsizing of the workforce experienced much lower levels of performance than firms with low racial diversity that were involved in downsizing. The influence of the firm's growth strategy could have affected the overall climate of the organization. Organizations experiencing downsizing may not have the capabilities to effectively manage a diverse workforce, while organizations that are expanding may have the additional resources needed to gain a competitive advantage from its diverse workforce. Additional factors, such as increased stress often associated with downsizing, could also impact the effectiveness of diversity management.

In a follow up study Richard, McMillan, Chadwick, and Dwyer (2003), examined the effects of racial diversity on performance, while studying innovation as an organization practice. Innovation, at the organizational level, is defined by the willingness of an organization to engage in creative and alternative methods to problem solving. The firms' levels of innovation moderated the effect of racial diversity on performance. Higher levels of diversity had a positive effect on performance when the firms were also high on innovation. High levels of diversity had a negative effect on performance when the firms were low on innovation. Essentially, the different strategies employed by an organization appear to have an interactive effect with diversity. This suggests that it may be important to utilize a diverse workforce in a specific manner to maximize the benefits of having a

heterogeneous group. This research also suggests that diversity is potentially damaging, as a heterogeneous workforce could lead to reduced levels of performance when innovation is not used or when a firm is downsizing. In short, having a diverse workforce could have negative consequences if it is not managed properly with the appropriate business strategies.

Effective management of diversity elicits an array of vague definitions in the popular and scientific literature. Many organizations strive for effective diversity management without clear goals in place. The issue of diversity management forces organizations to expand on the objective of attracting and retaining a diverse workforce and include a solution to effectively deal with potential problems that a diverse workforce presents. One solution to the problem of diversity management is diversity training.

Diversity Training

There are two types of diversity-training programs identified in the literature, awareness-based programs and skill-based programs (Agocs & Burr, 1996). Awareness- based programs focus on educating people about diversity issues in the workplace and the underlying assumptions individuals hold about various groups. Employees with greater diversity awareness should be able to function more effectively in a heterogeneous workplace. Skill-based diversity training programs focus on developing skills designed to improve the management of diversity. The types of skills that are taught often include cross-cultural understanding, intercultural communication, facilitation skills, flexibility, and adaptability (Battaglia, 1992). Both of these training programs are intended to improve interactions between groups of

diverse people. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of any training program, evaluation criteria need to be developed and administered (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003). Diversity training may lack objective skill-based criteria that can be used to assess training effectiveness. Overall, there is a need for improved measurement in the area of diversity assessment.

Although there is some recognition that diversity management is a skill that can be developed, there is a lack of research in the industrial/organizational psychology literature regarding diversity management as an individual difference variable. Some individuals are likely better able to interact with diverse populations than others. Other fields of psychology, such as counseling and clinical psychology, have placed a higher emphasis on training and professional development in regards to diversity issues. Specifically, the idea of a multicultural competency is an integral part of many counseling/clinical psychology programs (Liu, Sheu, & Williams, 2004). Some researchers have taken on the task of assessing multicultural competency in graduate students, staff, and diversity educators (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, & Corey, 1998).

Multicultural Competency

Pope and Reynolds (1997) conceptualize multicultural competency as "the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to work effectively and ethically across cultural differences" (p. 270). Multicultural awareness refers to attitudes and beliefs that influence the interaction of heterogeneous groups. One aspect that is incorporated into this facet is self-awareness of cultural values. The ability to examine one's own culture from an outsider's perspective should enhance

interactions with out-group members. Multicultural knowledge refers to an informed understanding of cultures that differ from your own. This understanding involves familiarity with the history, values, and traditions of various groups. Multicultural skills refer to the behaviors that influence effective interactions of culturally heterogeneous groups. This last facet appears most relevant to managerial positions. The behaviors that influence diverse group interaction may be appropriate dimensions to select or train employees.

Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, and Wise (1994) developed the Multicultural Counseling Inventory, which utilizes Likert type responses to a variety of questions. A sample item asks participants to agree or disagree with the following statement, "I have difficulties communicating with clients who use a perceptual, reasoning, or decision-making style that is different from mine." Another item asks participants to agree or disagree with the following statement, "When working with minority clients, I am able to quickly recognize and recover from cultural mistakes or misunderstandings." The validity of such measures is still being established (Liu, Sheu, & Williams, 2004). This measure appears to focus on self-perception of multicultural competency and less on the actual behavior of individuals. The usefulness of a similar measure applied to the workplace setting instead of the counseling community is unknown. One major drawback is the possible relationship between multicultural assessments and self-efficacy in dealing with diverse clientele. Assessments that overlap with self-efficacy constructs may not be as useful in predicting workplace behavior.

Multicultural competency is an interesting and relevant topic to diversity management. However, multicultural competency, as conceptualized by Pope and Reynolds (1997), does not specifically address the behaviors useful in multicultural interactions in the work setting. In addition, the use of the term *multicultural competency* may be too narrow of a definition for effective diversity management. There exist multiple definitions of diversity in the I/O and management literature. Limiting the definition of diversity to only cultural factors is problematic. The current development and validation of a situational judgment test to assess management of diversity as a skill will address these two deficiencies. First, the procedures used to develop an SJT should allow for specific job-related scenarios and behaviors to be identified that affect interactions among diverse populations. Second, the procedures used to develop an SJT should capture much more than just cultural competence and will broaden the scope of diversity assessment to all relevant categories that may affect workplace interactions. In addition, an SJT approach does not rely on individuals' self-reports of competence, but instead tests competence in comparison to experts' ratings.

Although there is a void of research in the academic I/O literature regarding the assessment of diversity management as a skill set, many organizations and consulting firms have engaged in this process. There are a variety of assessments available. Each assessment views the facets of diversity management in a different manner, but none (to my knowledge) have assessed diversity management utilizing a situational judgment test.

Situational Judgment Tests

Situational judgment tests (SJTs) have a long history in organizations (File, 1945; Mowry, 1957) and have been gaining popularity (Weekley & Polyhart, 2006). These assessments present individuals with job related scenarios and a list of possible solutions for each scenario. The goal of the assessment is to gain insight into how the individual would behave in a similar situation on the job. This information is used primarily for selection and training purposes. SJTs have measured a variety of skill sets, but these assessments are typically designed for managerial level positions. This assessment process is seen as low-fidelity work simulations and has shown solid criterion related validity with measures of job performance. A meta-analysis done by McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, and Braverman (2001) shows a mean uncorrected correlation of .26 with job performance. Weekley and Jones (1997) found a .35 correlation with job performance.

One reason for the popularity of SJTs is the high level of face validity. Job applicants and incumbents are able to see the connection between the items, which depict realistic job related scenarios, and information that is necessary to complete the job. The connection between cognitive ability and personality tests are not as apparent for many job applicants/incumbents. Research has shown that job applicants react more favorably to SJTs than to other assessment methods (Chan & Schmitt, 1997). Moreover, SJTs are associated with lower levels of adverse impact than cognitive ability tests and other selection measures (Hough, Oswald, & Polyhart, 2001).

The development of a SJT involves a three-step process. Each step utilizes subject matter experts (SMEs) that have specific job knowledge/experience for the job being assessed. SMEs can include job incumbents, supervisors, and other individuals with some level of expertise in the specified area. If the assessment is designed for a more general competency, a variety of SMEs should be used in the developmental stages. In addition, individuals with limited job experience (novices) may be utilized in latter stages of development in order to compare expert opinion to novice opinion.

The first step involves creation of critical incidents. These critical incidents are situations, or stories, that represent realistic scenarios that could occur on the job. However, the explicit use of the term "critical incident" should be avoided in instructions to the SMEs, as it typically elicits negatively toned scenarios. The instructions to SMEs can also vary in specificity. For general competencies, instructions should only incorporate general rules for situation generation. For specific competencies, instructions should address the exact nature of the competency in question. For example, an assessment designed to measure leadership should incorporate a conceptual definition of leadership in the instructions for SMEs.

The purpose of the second step is to produce possible solutions to the situations generated. This can be accomplished with the same group of SMEs used in stage one, or this can be accomplished with a new group. The solutions to the generated situations should be realistic and varied. Variety is necessary in order to decipher the correct response in the next step. Novice employees can be utilized at this stage of development. Responses generated by a novice group of employees

should differ from responses generated by the SMEs. This variety in response options should help individuals clearly identify the correct response.

The third step entails identification of the most appropriate solution to the situation. There are several possibilities for this step. One possibility involves ratings from an SME group. Consensus from an SME group on the most effective option should help researchers determine the benchmark to use for scoring purposes. Job applicants/incumbents scores can be compared to the SME ratings to determine each individual's score for the SJT. In order to determine the usefulness of each item, a comparison should be made between a SME group's consensus choice and a novice group's consensus choice. Items that differentiate between the SME opinion and the novice opinion are seen as good items. Items that do not elicit consensus from either the SME group or the novice group should be considered for elimination.

Scoring options can vary in their presentation to both SME raters and novice raters (typically job applicants). Individuals can be asked to identify the best and worst solution to the scenario. This allows for more exact measurement of what a person should, and should not do, on the job. Another option is to have individuals rate each response on a Likert scale in attempts to gauge the appropriateness of each response item. In this manner, each response item will have a numerical value associated with it. There is some evidence to indicate that Likert scale ratings produce better results (Polyhart & Ehrhart, 2003), but more research is needed in this area.

In addition to variation in scoring, the instructions presented to the final group of participants can differ. The instructions to participants either contain a phrase that

requests what the respondent "would do," or what a person "should do." The latter is less susceptible to faking (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). For example, job applicants might pick an answer that represents an option that they would not likely engage in because they think it is the correct or most appropriate response. Some authors have advocated for the use of the "should do" instructions, instead of "would do" instructions (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001) because there is evidence for higher validity with situational judgment tests that are less fakeable (Reynolds, Sydell, Scott, & Winter, 2000). In contrast, other research has shown that "would do" instructions offer a variety of benefits over "should do" instructions. Polyhart and Enrhart (2003) showed that "would do" instructions resulted in higher criterion related validity, greater variance, and more-normal distributions. In addition, SJTs using "should do" instructions are more cognitively loaded than SJTs with "would do" instructions, resulting in greater adverse impact (Nguyen & McDaniel, 2003). Overall, it seems that "would do" instructions are a more appropriate fit for the Diversity Management SJT. The concern over intentional distortion is less applicable for the intended purposes of the present SJT as it is being developed for training assessment purposes only and is not intended for use in selection.

Situational judgment tests can be used to assess a variety of abilities. Similar to interviews and other selection methods, SJTs do not necessarily assess one unitary construct. Overall, situational judgment tests are related to cognitive ability. McDaniel et al. (2001) found a .36 correlation (.46 corrected correlation) with cognitive ability in a meta-analysis of situational judgment tests. The high verbal component involved with many SJTs may account for this relationship. The

21

cognitive saturation of the SJT is related to adverse impact as SJTs with less cognitive

saturation result in less adverse impact (Nguyen & McDaniel, 2003). Besides

cognitive ability, SJTs have also been linked to different personality dimensions.

Gibson and Schmitt (2002) showed that SJTs are positively related to

conscientiousness (r = .23), extraversion (r = .24), agreeableness (r = .29), and

negatively related to neuroticism (r = -.20). Other research has shown more moderate

relationships with the Big 5 and SJTs (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001).

In addition, job knowledge is seen as a possible correlate of SJTs (Motowidlo,

Borman, & Schmit, 1997). One way to measure job knowledge is through job

experience. There is evidence for a positive relationship between SJTs and overall

job experience (Weekley & Jones, 1999). Borman, White, Pulakos, and Oppler

(1991) showed that job knowledge mediates the relationship between cognitive ability

and performance. Job experience provides the individual with job relevant

information that can be used to decipher the correct answer. Although the exact

process in which SJTs predict performance is still not entirely understood, research

has shown SJTs to be a valuable assessment tool in predicting performance. Overall,

SJTs represent a method for assessment (Schmitt & Chan, 2006). The exact nature of

the assessment used may differ depending on the intended use and the development

of the SJT. The present research will capitalize on this flexibility in developing a

situational judgment test to measure diversity management skill.

Diversity Management Skill: A Situational Judgment Test

The situational judgment test methodology is appropriate for examining job

knowledge or expertise (Hanson, Horgen, & Borman, 1998). Due to demographic

and social changes within the United States, diversity related knowledge/expertise is now relevant to many jobs and organizations. The lack of assessment in the area of diversity management makes measuring the effectiveness of diversity initiatives, such as training, difficult. The present scale development and validation will hopefully prove useful in determining skills and behaviors associated with effective diversity management.

Method

Stage 1: SJT Development

Item Generation. Over thirty MBA students from a "Managing Diversity"

course in the Business Administration College generated diversity-themed scenarios.

In addition, managers from TECO Energy generated diversity scenarios. These

participants were asked to draw on their own experiences with diversity in the

workforce to create realistic "what would you do?" work-related scenarios. See

Appendix A for exact instructions. Each participant was asked to create three to four

situations resulting in a total of 99 job related scenarios. In order to allow for greater

creativity, diversity was not explicitly defined for the item generators. The 99

scenarios were edited for clarity and similar items were combined to yield 30

workplace diversity situations that comprised the final set of items.

Item Response Option Generation. Twenty I/O graduate students generated

response options for the situations. Two students were assigned to each scenario and

each student was asked to generate 3-4 response options. Participants generating

response options were asked to ensure that each option was practical and could be

answered by anyone (e.g. no race-specific or gender-specific responses). In addition,

the response option generators were asked to vary options on two dimensions:

effectiveness and diversity-mindedness. Effectiveness was defined as a response

option providing a viable option that solves the problem presented in the scenario.

Diversity-mindedness was defined as a response that promotes diversity within the

workforce. Response options were written such that most diversity-minded response options were not necessarily the most effective. Although diversity mindedness is a unique construct, SME ratings of diversity mindedness should be at least somewhat related to effectiveness scores. This process yielded at least six viable response options for each situation. These options were evaluated by the principle researcher and narrowed down to four response options for each final item.

Item Response Option Ratings. Five graduate students (who did not participate as response option generators) served as subject matter experts (SMEs; selected based on each individual's past experience with SJT development and interest in diversity-related topics) to determine diversity-mindedness and effectiveness ratings for each response option generated (using 5-point Likert scale). The SME ratings on diversity-mindedness and effectiveness were modestly correlated, $r = .26$. Only the diversity-mindedness rating was used for scoring key development. A crossed design, fixed effects model was used such that each SME rated all of the response options. Intraclass correlations were calculated to determine reliability of the SME ratings; for diversity mindedness, one random judge, ICC(2, 1) $= .62$; one fixed judge, ICC(3, 1) $= .63$. The Spearman Brown correlation, $r = .90$, for all judges in this study was acceptable.

Scoring Key Development. SME ratings of diversity-mindedness were used to create the scoring key. Response options with a mean diversity mindedness score greater than 4 (on a 5 point scale) were scored as +1 point. Response options with a mean diversity score less than 4 were awarded zero points. For any single SJT scenario, it was possible for more than one, or no, response options to be awarded a

score of +1 points. The total SJT score for a participant was calculated as an

aggregate of the points for each of the SJT items. SJT scenarios that did not have a

+1 response option were kept in the measure to ensure that any interactions between

items remained consistent in the operation of the final measure.

Stage 2: Construct Validation

Participants and Procedures

The psychology online participant pool was used to collect data for construct

validation. Undergraduate participants were able to participate in two separate online

surveys, one containing the diversity SJT items and another containing multiple

scales assessing constructs related to diversity management (e.g. sexism, political

skill). In order to limit the ability of students to connect the two surveys, each survey

was presented to participants as a separate study. Participant responses were tracked

using the experimentrak identification number (given to each registered student) and

data from separate collection efforts were combined using this number.

1065 participants completed the online diversity SJT assessment. The average

response time for an SJT item was 32.17 seconds (SD = 17.15, min. = .46, max. =

99.62). To help ensure that participants were attentive while completing the online

SJTs, response times under 10 seconds were scored as missing values. This

procedure eliminated about 15% of the participants from each SJT item.

868 participants completed the online battery of scales. The average response

time for a scale item was 6.86 seconds (SD = 3.75, min. = .49, max. = 30.03). To

ensure that the participants read each item before responding, response times under 2

seconds were scored as missing values. This procedure eliminated about 10% of the participants from each item. Participants were eliminated at the item level.

The final dataset comprised 601 participants who completed both the online SJT and online battery of scales in an acceptable time frame. The sample was predominately female (83%), ethnically diverse (White, 64%; Hispanic, 15%; Black, 10%; Asian or Asian American, 4%; Other, 7%), young (49% between 18 and 20 years; 38% between 21 and 25), and predominantly heterosexual (87% exclusively heterosexual).

Measures

The following scales were administered to participants online to explore construct validation of the SJT.

Political Skill Inventory (PSI). The Ferris et al. (2005) measure was used to assess political skill and its dimensions. Specifically, the scale contains four dimensions including social astuteness (5 items), interpersonal influence (4 items), networking ability (6 items), and apparent sincerity (3 items). The PSI demonstrated acceptable reliability, coefficient alpha = .88. See Appendix B for a complete list of PSI items.

Self-monitoring. Self-monitoring was measured using Snyder's (1987) 18-item scale. Self-monitoring refers to the extent to which individuals monitor and control their self presentation in social situations. The scale demonstrated moderate internal consistency (α= .65). The measure can be found in Appendix C.

Social Desirability. The 10-item version of the Marlow-Crowne Social

Desirability Scale (1960) was used. The Social Desirability scale demonstrated poor

reliability (α = .53). See Appendix D for the scale items.

Emotional Intelligence. The Wong and Law EI Scale (WLEIS; 2002) was

used to measure emotional intelligence. It consists of 16 items that ask participants to

indicate how much they agree or disagree (using a 7-point Likert scale) with each

statement. The EI scale demonstrated acceptable reliability (α= .87). See Appendix

E.

Intelligence. The Shipley Institute of Living Scale (SILS) was used to

measure intelligence. It consists of a 40-item vocabulary section and a 20-item

abstraction section, with a 10 minute time limit for each section (Zachary, Crumpton,

& Spiegel, 1985). The SILS was developed in the 1930s with a sample of 462

students and typically correlates with other measures of intelligence ($r =$.49-.78). The

SILS has previously shown solid test-retest reliabilities consistently above .70 with

up-to 16 week intervals between testing.

Race Anxiety/Avoidance. Modified versions of the Plant and Devine (2003)

Intergroup Anxiety and Avoidance scales was used to measure race

anxiety/avoidance. This scale was altered to address racial anxiety and racial

avoidance directed towards out-group members instead of only Blacks. Both scales

demonstrated acceptable reliability (Inter-group Anxiety, α= .86; Inter-group

avoidance, α= .89). See Appendix F.

Ethnic Identity. The Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) 16-item scale was used to

measure collective group self esteem. This scale consists of four dimensions: private

esteem, public esteem, membership esteem, and identity. The total scale

demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, α= .83. See Appendix G.

Motivation to Respond without Prejudice. A modified version of the Plant

and Devine (1998) scale was used. The scale was altered so that it addressed

prejudice directed towards out-group race members instead of only Blacks. The scale

is divided into two dimensions, internal and external motivation to respond without

prejudice, and both dimensions demonstrated acceptable reliabilities (Internal

motivation, α= .80; External motivation, α= .74). See Appendix H.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. Glick and Fiske's (1996) 22 item scale was

used to assess views towards women. This scale has two components: hostile sexism

and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism is conceptualized as antipathy directed

towards women. Benevolent sexism is a set of attitudes that characterize women in a

stereotypical manner that restricts their roles in society. These sub-scales

demonstrated acceptable reliability (Hostile Sexism, α= .82; Benevolent Sexism, α=

.75). See Appendix I.

Empathy. This scale was taken from Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, and

Freifeld's (1995) Prosocial Personality Battery and consists of 12 items. Initial

reliability for this measure was low, α = .38, with multiple items (i.e., 6, 7, 10, 12)

displaying negative item total correlations. A principle components exploratory

factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to investigate the factor structure of

the measure. Based on results of this analysis, these four items were eliminated

because of their negative or near zero level loadings on the primary factor. Upon

revision of the scale, it displayed acceptable reliability (α = .71). See Appendix J.

Results

The average score for the Diversity Management Skill SJT was 9.65 (SD =
5.5, min. = 0, max. = 21). Females (mean = 12.05, SD = 3.15) scored slightly higher
than males (mean = 11.59, SD = 3.4), although this difference was not significant, F
= 2.24, p = .135. Thirty-one to 35 year olds scored the highest, although there was
not an overall age difference, F = 2.04, p = .071. African American/Blacks (mean =
12.25, SD = 3.3) and Hispanics (mean = 12.19, SD = 3.16) scored the highest,
although there was not an overall difference in scores by race, F = 1.26, p = .266.
There was a significant difference in Diversity Management Skill SJT score by sexual
orientation, F = 2.53, p = .039. Post hoc comparisons using both LSD and Bonferroni
analysis revealed that individuals identifying as exclusively homosexual score
significantly higher than the other categories of sexual orientation (exclusively
heterosexual, mostly heterosexual, mostly homosexual), except for individuals who
responded as bisexual.

Please see table 1 for descriptive statistics of the construct validation scales
and table 2 for correlation matrix of the construct validation scales. The diversity SJT
significantly correlated with inter-group anxiety, inter-group avoidance, internal
motivation to respond without prejudice, benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, and
empathy. These correlations are in the expected direction.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for construct validation measure

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Diversity SJT	832	0	21	9.65	5.54
Political Skill	855	2	7	5.43	0.72
Self-Monitoring	849	0	1	0.52	0.18
Social Desirability	832	0	1	0.43	0.21
Emotional IQ	830	2	7	5.55	0.70
IQ	204	100	124	111.99	5.12
Inter-group Anxiety	810	1	7	2.19	1.11
Inter-group Avoidance	809	1	7	2.20	1.11
Ethnic Identity	828	1	7	5.10	0.84
Internal Motivation	810	1	7	5.72	1.00
External Motivation	811	1	7	3.91	1.23
Benevolent Sexism	826	1.13	7	4.19	0.93
Hostile Sexism	828	1	7	3.86	1.01
Empathy	820	2	7	5.26	0.74

Table 2

Correlation matrix.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Diversity SJT	--													
2. Political Skill	0.04	--												
3. Self-Monitoring	0.01	0.18**	--											
4. Social Desirability	0.00	0.07*	-0.19**	--										
5. Emotional IQ	0.03	-0.51**	0.00	-0.32**	--									
6. IQ	0.05	0.08	0.24**	0.00	0.06	--								
7. Inter-group Anxiety	-0.10*	0.22**	-0.05	0.15**	0.28**	-0.11	--							
8. Inter-group Avoidance	-0.11**	0.24**	-0.05	0.15**	0.28**	-0.06	0.74**	--						
9. Ethnic Identity	0.08	-0.19**	0.10**	-0.07*	-0.22**	-0.06	0.07*	0.11**	--					
10. Internal Motivation	0.14**	-0.21**	0.09*	-0.16**	-0.24**	-0.06	0.49**	0.64**	-0.06	--				
11. External Motivation	-0.03	-0.04	-0.11**	0.06	0.04	-0.14	0.31**	-0.30**	-0.05	0.17**	--			
12. Benevolent Sexism	-0.16**	-0.05	0.01	-0.05	-0.08*	0.04	-0.07	-0.07	-0.19**	0.08*	-0.20**	--		
13. Hostile Sexism	-0.12**	-0.05	-0.11*	0.10**	0.06	-0.01	-0.09*	-0.11**	-0.03	0.20**	-0.18**	-0.24**	--	
14. Empathy	0.13**	-0.31**	-0.02	-0.23**	-0.37**	0.03	0.27**	0.29**	-0.04	-0.36**	0.18**	0.08*	0.14**	--

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Stage 3: Criterion Related Validity

Participants and Procedures

Three different working populations were targeted for the criterion-related validation: undergraduate students at a large southeastern university, MBA students at a large southeastern university, and managers working at a large multinational midwestern corporation. There were a total of 206 undergraduates students who worked more than 20 hours a week. Due to similarities in age and job categories, MBA students and corporate employees were combined into one data set. Fifty-eight MBA students and corporate employees completed the online SJT. Each participant was given the Diversity SJT and two criterion measures: task performance and diversity performance. Participants were asked to rate each response option on the SJT regarding the likelihood that they "would do" each action. In addition, participants were asked to forward a survey (either a paper copy via mail or a link via email) to their supervisor to provide ratings of their performance.

The psychology online participant pool was used to contact undergraduate students to complete the performance ratings and intelligence testing. Only students who worked 20 hours a week or more were eligible for the lab study. Participants first took the Diversity SJT online and then came into the lab to complete self-evaluations of task and diversity performance. After completing the self-evaluations, students were given a survey for their supervisor to fill out. Along with the supervisor survey, participants were given a stamped envelope to mail the information back to the researcher. The students' experimentrak identification numbers were used to match the Diversity SJT scores to the criterion.

MBA students were approached while attending class and asked to complete the Diversity SJT and criterion measures online. There were no incentives offered to this population. Business managers were approached and asked to fill out the Diversity SJT online and send the link to any other employees interested. In addition, each participant was asked to fill out the two criterion scales online and to forward a link to their supervisor to provide ratings of their performance. This information was tracked using a special code given to each participant through the online survey format (www.surveymonkey.com).

The undergraduate student sample was predominantly female (76%), ethnically diverse (White, 56%; Hispanic, 19%; Black, 19%; Asian, 4%), and young (54% 18-20 years old, 37% 21-25 years old). The applied sample of MBA students and business managers was evenly split between males (51%) and females (49%) and ethnically diverse (White, 68%; Hispanic, 16%; Black, 9%; Asian, 5%). The average age of the applied sample was 31 years (min. = 22, max. = 66, $SD = 9.05$).

Measures

Task Performance. The last 7 items of Williams and Anderson's (1991) Organizational Citizenship scale were used to measure task performance and demonstrated acceptable reliability for self ratings, $\alpha = .82$, and supervisor ratings, $\alpha = .76$. See Appendix K.

Diversity Performance. These items were generated by the researcher to measure participant's self-ratings and supervisor ratings of their ability to work with diverse populations. The 14-item scale demonstrated good reliability for self-ratings, alpha = .90, and supervisor ratings, $\alpha = .93$. See Appendix L.

Criterion Related Results

See table 3 for descriptive statistics and table 4 for correlations of Diversity SJT with performance measures for the undergraduate student population. Please see table 5 for descriptive statistics and table 6 for correlations of Diversity SJT with performance measures for the applied sample including MBA students and business managers. The diversity SJT significantly correlates with self-rated job and diversity performance for the undergraduate population. Supervisor ratings were in the expected direction, but were not significant. For the applied sample, the diversity SJT only correlates with diversity performance. Only 10 supervisor ratings were given for the applied sample and limited results in this area.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics for undergraduate sample.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Diversity SJT	832	0.00	21.00	9.65	5.54
Job Performance	206	1.00	6.00	5.46	0.55
Diversity Performance	206	1.18	6.00	5.32	0.61
Supervisor Ratings JP	103	3.00	6.00	5.36	0.66
Supervisor Ratings DP	103	1.83	6.00	5.36	0.65

Table 4

Correlation matrix for undergraduate students.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Diversity SJT	--				
2. Job Performance	0.21*	--			
3. Diversity Performance	0.19*	0.55**	--		
4. Supervisor Ratings JP	0.13	0.02	-0.08	--	
5. Supervisor Ratings DP	0.11	0.02	0.03	0.61**	--

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5

Descriptive statistics for applied sample.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Diversity SJT	58	0.00	21.00	12.05	3.62
Job Performance	57	4.67	6.00	5.65	0.43
Diversity Performance	56	3.73	6.00	5.36	0.51
Supervisor Ratings JP	10	4.17	6.00	5.29	0.70
Supervisor Ratings DP	10	4.75	6.00	5.43	0.47

Table 6

Correlation matrix for applied sample.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Diversity SJT	--				
2. Job Performance	0.05	--			
3. Diversity Performance	0.29*	0.45**	--		
4. Supervisor Ratings JP	-0.19	0.59	0.46	--	
5. Supervisor Ratings DP	0.04	0.44	0.46	0.73*	--

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Discussion

The Diversity Management Skill SJT is an effective predictor of self-rated diversity performance (for both undergraduate and applied populations). It also shows promise for predicting supervisor ratings of diversity performance, as the results were in the anticipated direction (though not statistically significant) for the undergraduate student population. For the applied sample, the diversity SJT displayed convergent validity through its relationship with self-rated diversity performance and discriminant criterion-related validity as it was not highly correlated with self-rated job performance. Overall, the SJT demonstrated potential as a measure of individual differences in diversity management skill.

Results from construct validation efforts are less conclusive. The DMS SJT did not correlate highly with the variables measured (political skill, self-monitoring, social desirability, emotional intelligence, intelligence, inter-group anxiety, inter-group avoidance, ethnic identity, external motivation to respond without prejudice, benevolent sexism and hostile sexism). The Diversity SJT did, however, display significant negative correlations with inter-group anxiety, inter-group avoidance, benevolent sexism, and hostile sexism, and significant positive correlations with empathy and internal motivation to respond without prejudice. These significant relationships are all in the anticipated direction.

In regards to the findings involving inter-group anxiety, the ability to make effective decisions about diversity-related issues should be associated with greater

comfort level with out-group members. An individual high in diversity management skill would likely be less anxious and avoidant around members of racial or ethnic out-groups. In order to manage and interact with dissimilar others, anxiety and avoidance behaviors are likely to interfere with positive interactions. Likewise, sexism should be negatively related to this ability. Negative beliefs about women should hurt one's ability to manage diverse groups. Individuals who scored higher in sexism should theoretically be less effective managers in dealing with work life balance issues and hiring/promoting women in organizations as depicted by several SJT items.

Consistent with prediction, the DMS SJT was positively correlated with empathy and internal motivation to appear non-prejudiced. More empathic individuals should have greater diversity management skill. The ability to understand and identify with another person's feelings, thoughts, and attitudes would make it easier to work with and make management decisions that reflect a higher level of diversity management skill. It was also expected that internal motivation to respond without prejudice would positively relate to diversity management skill. The more a person is motivated by an internal pressure to avoid responding in a prejudiced manner should relate to choosing responses that promote diversity in organizations.

Limitations

As indicated above, there are several limitations with the current study. In particular, and despite the relationship between SJT results, self-rated diversity performance and managerial rated diversity performance, SJT results did not display

38

all of the hypothesized relationships with similar and dissimilar measures.   Despite the relationships between the SJT results and self-rated and managerial-rated diversity performance that were consistent with hypotheses, several hypothesized relationships were not supported. Thus, the results from the construct validation effort are somewhat puzzling; however, limitations of the present study may help to elucidate some of the unexpected findings.

The first set of limitations centers around shortcomings of SJTs in general. Specifically, individuals may harbor certain beliefs but may not actually choose the response that aligns with these beliefs. Because SJTs measure decision making ability rather than actual behavior, this is an issue that is difficult to tease apart. In addition, the nature of the present SJT could contribute to the low correlations with other variables. Diversity management skill covers a multitude of behaviors and is a multi-faceted construct. The DMS SJT may not correlate well with other social attitude scales because it is not a unitary construct. Relationships among SJT items are small and are not typically calculated.

Additional study limitations involve the nature of the data obtained and analyzed for the present findings. To begin, this study used a convenience sample of undergraduate and applied respondents. For the applied sample, respondents varied greatly in education, experience, job role, job level and other key variables, making the sample highly heterogeneous. In addition, as the both the applied and student samples came from assorted places of employment, differences in supervisor familiarity with making performance ratings may have contributed to the weak results obtained in the study. This idea is at least partially supported as the job performance

data was negatively skewed and there was limited variability in ratings. This result limited the ability of the SJT to accurately account for desired variance. Finally, the sample size of supervisor ratings for the applied sample was very small (N = 10). Conclusions about supervisor ratings in the applied sample are tenuous at best.

Another limitation of the present study is that this area of research is relatively new, meaning that measurement for certain constructs had to be created specifically for this study. Specifically, a new scale was created to measure diversity performance. Undergraduate, applied, and supervisor respondents may not have been familiar with this type of scale, and this could have affected their responses. This possibility is somewhat unlikely, however, in that the diversity performance scale operated fairly well ($\alpha = .90$) and showed evidence for unidimensionality.

The novelty of the SJT presented to respondents may also have created limitations for the study. Participants may have reacted conservatively to each SJT presented, providing answers they thought would be in line with the sensitive subject matter of the study. Despite these limitations, however, the positive finding between self-rated diversity performance, manager-rated diversity performance and SJT results have implications for continued research on and use of the DMS SJT in industry.

Implications for management and industry

The management literature abounds with theories on how to effectively manage a workforce. Diversity is a hot topic for many organizations and a better understanding of this area of management could have a big impact on workplace

practices. As a result of both demographic and social changes, organizations within the United States have become much more diverse (Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand, 1993) and less hierarchical as the use of teams has increased (Ilgen, 1999; Tolbert, Andrews, & Simmons, 1995). The modern organization has increased levels of interpersonal contact and mutually dependent work assignments, compounding the impact of diversity on organizations. Diversity presents unique challenges for management as it is linked to both positive and negative performance outcomes (Mannix & Neale, 2005). The idea that there is a measurable skill related to the effective management of diversity is a novel concept. The current SJT shows potential for measuring this skill. Incorporation of diversity management skill into management systems could greatly benefit organizations.

Diversity training is one solution that many organizations use to address potential issues around diversity management. The goal of many diversity training programs is to improve interactions between dissimilar others and create an environment where employees feel valued and appreciated. Evaluation criteria need to be developed and administered in order to evaluate the effectiveness of any training program (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003). Diversity training often lacks objective skill-based criteria that can be used to assess training effectiveness. Accurate assessment of diversity management skill through the use of the DMS SJT could serve as a metric to measure the success of current diversity training as well as a guide for development of future diversity training programs.

Another area in which diversity management skill may be relevant is competency modeling. In the current social environment, diversity management skill,

and more general diversity related social skills, could be used to define competencies needed for success in a corporation. Competency models can be used to influence selection systems and performance management tools. In its current state, the diversity SJT is not recommended for use in making external hiring decisions, but future assessment tools could examine this skill as part of interviews and other methods of assessment. The intent of the current diversity SJT is to predict diversity performance, not necessarily overall task related performance. This distinction could lead to a legal issue if the diversity SJT was used to make external hiring decisions. In addition to selection systems, diversity management skill could be incorporated into performance reviews of employees. Tying effective diversity management into how companies evaluate employee performance would greatly influence employee behaviors directed at interactions with dissimilar others.

Finally, many companies struggle with retention of minorities and women in management roles. Organizations that are able to foster a more accepting environment for women and minorities should be able to better retain these groups. Effective diversity management and inclusive people practices based on data driven systems are needed to solve these retention issues. There is a need to cultivate an environment that is inclusive and accepting of differences where all employees feel valued and appreciated. Tracking behavior of managers of others through survey tools, diversity assessments, and other metrics could help to improve retention and avoid regretted losses.

<u>Future research</u>

In order for the above implications for management and industry to become a reality, additional research is necessary. One avenue for future research is to investigate the use of the SJT in diversity training programs. In particular, the SJT could be provided to diversity training participants before and after training to see if the diversity training had a positive impact on diversity management skill. In addition, SJT results could be linked to trainer and supervisor ratings of diversity mindedness as a measure of the training's success and as a check on the self-assessment of the individual undergoing the training.

Another area of research is tied to the domain of external hiring. In order for diversity management skill and other social intelligences related to diversity to be incorporated into a selection system, these skills would need to be identified as an essential skill in a job analysis or competency model. In today's social environment, diversity management skill seems necessary for many managerial positions. The present diversity SJT would need additional modification and the items should be tailored to be organization specific. Validation research in a single organization could help eliminate some of the difficulties experienced in the present research. Other assessments methods may also prove valuable in selecting employees with diversity management related skills. Interviews are a common method and incorporating questions that examine past experiences dealing with diverse populations could be one approach to hiring higher quality candidates who have the ability to effectively interact with dissimilar others. In order to conduct research on any assessment, a valid criterion measure is needed. Efforts should also be made to

better assess effective diversity management in the work performance domain. Improvement on both the selection and criterion side of prediction should improve the overall measurement of these skills.

Future research is needed to improve the assessments on diversity management as a performance metric. An extensive validation of the diversity performance scale was outside the scope of the present research study. Expanding the current view of work performance to include diversity related social skills would greatly enhance the ability of an organization to reward these types of behaviors. Research that demonstrates a link between supervisor ratings of diversity management as a performance variable and financial outcomes for a work group or organization would be extremely powerful. In the academic literature, there has been some debate about the profitability of employing a diverse workforce (Mannix & Neale, 2005). Overall, there are null results shown in regards to diversity and performance (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; Webber & Donahue, 2001). Future research focused on diversity management from the criterion perspective may help to clear up this debate. It may be that diversity by itself is not sufficient for bottom line growth. Effective diversity management is needed to achieve improved financial results.

Conclusion

Overall, the Diversity Management Skill SJT displayed some promising results and was an effective predictor of diversity performance. In addition, the SJT was not related to overall job performance and demonstrated discriminant criterion-

related validity. The area of diversity management poses unique areas of opportunity for many organizations. In order to attract, retain, and promote a diverse workforce, a paradigm shift is needed. Recruiting a diverse workforce is not enough. In order to gain a competitive advantage, organizations must excel in effective management of a diverse workforce. The present development and validation of the Diversity Management Skill SJT is an attempt to further research in this area. Accurate assessment of diversity management skill is crucial to building sustainable diversity management systems.

References

Agocs, C., & Burr, C. (1996). Employment equity, affirmative action and managing diversity: assessing the difference. *International Journal of Manpower, 17*, 30-45.

Arthur, W., Bennett, W., Edens, P. S., & Bell, S. T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 234-245.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*, 99-120.

Barney, J., Wright, M., & Ketchen, D. J. (1998). The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991. *Journal of Management, 27*, 625-641.

Battaglia, B. (1992). Skill for managing multicultural teams. *Cultural Diversity at Work, 4*, 4-12.

Borman, W. C., White, L. A., Pulakos, E. D., & Oppler, S. H. (1991). Models of supervisory job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 863-872.

Bowers, C. A., Pharmer, J. A., & Salas, E. (2000). When member homogeneity is needed in work teams: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research, 31*, 305-327.

Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (1997). Video-based versus paper-and-pencil method of assessment in situational judgment tests: Subgroup differences in tests performance and face validity perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 143-159.

Cox, T., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for
organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 45-
56.

Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the
expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82, 359-378.

Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave.
Journal of Social Issues, 57, 829-849.

Earley, P. C., & Mosakowski, E. (2000). Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical
test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*,
26-49.

Edelman, L. B., Fuller, S. R., & Mara-Drita, I. (2001). Diversity rhetoric and the
managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*, 1589-1641.

Reynolds, D. H., Sydell, E. J., Scott, D. R., & Winter, J. L. (2000, April). Factors
affecting situational judgment test characteristics. Paper presented at the
annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,
New Orleans, LA.

File, Q. W. (1945). The measurement of supervisory quality in industry. *Journal of
Applied Psychology, 29*, 323-337.

Gaertner, J. F., & Dovidio, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions:
1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science, 11*, 315-319.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating

    hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*

    70, 491-512.

Hanson, M. A., Horgen, K., E., & Borman, W., C. (1998). Situational judgment tests

    as measures of knowledge/expertise. Paper presented at the annual meeting of

    the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.

Hanson, M. A., & Ramos, R. A. (1996). Situational judgment tests. In R. S. Barrett

    (Ed.) *Fair employment strategies in human resource management* (pp. 119-

    124). Westoport, CT: Quorum.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography:

    Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group

    cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 96-107.

Hoffman, L. R. (1959). Homogeneity of member personality and its effect on group

    problem-solving. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 58*, 27-32.

Hough, L. M., Oswald, F. L., & Polyhart, R. E. (2001). Determinants, detection and

    amelioration of adverse impact in personnel selection procedures: Issues,

    evidence and lessons learned. *International Journal of Selection and*

    Assessment, 9, 152-194.

Huo, Y. J. (2003). Procedural justice and social regulation across group boundaries:

    Does subgroup identity undermine relationship-based governance.

    Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29, 336-348.

Ilgen, D. R. (1999). Teams embedded in organizations: Some implications.

    American Psychologist, 54, 129-139.

Janis, Irving L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1988). Out-group homogeneity: Judgments of variability at the individual and group levels. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 778-788.

King, P. M., & Howard-Hamilton, M. (2003). An assessment of multicultural competence. *NASPA Journal, 40*, 119-133.

Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D., & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the Diversity Research Network. *Human Resource Management, 42*, 3-21.

Kurtzberg, T. R. (2005). Feeling creative, being creative: An empirical study diversity and creativity in teams. *Creativity Research Journal, 17*, 51-65.

Liu, W. M., Sheu, H., & Williams, K. (2004). Multicultural competency in research: Examining the relationships among multicultural competencies, research training and self-efficacy, and the multicultural environment. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10*, 324-339.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318.

Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (1998). Intergroup relations: Insights from a theoretically integrative approach. *Psychological Review, 105*, 499-529.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. (2005). What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 6, 31-55.

Markus, H., & Cross, S. (1990). The interpersonal self. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 579-608). New York: Guilford.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.

McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational judgment test: A review of practice and constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 103-113.

McDaniel, M. A., Morgeson, F. P., Finnegan, E. B., Campion, M. A., & Braverman, E. P. (2001). Use of situational judgment tests to predict job performance: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 730-740.

McGrath, J., Berdahl, J., & Arrow, H. (1995). Traits, expectations, culture, and clout. In S. Jackson & M. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in workteams* (pp. 47-68). Washington, DC: APA Books.

McLeod, P. L., Lobel, S. A., & Cox, T. H. (1996). Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups. *Small Group Research, 27*, 248-264.

Milliken, F., & Martins, L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 402-433.

Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*, 71-83.

Mowry, H. W. (1957). A measure of supervisory quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 41*, 405-408.

Nguyen, N. T., & McDaniel, M. A. (2003). Response instructions and racial differences in a situational judgment test. Applied H.R.M. Research, 8, 33-44.

Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict, and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*, 1-28.

Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifeld, T. S. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. N. Butcher, & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.) *Advances in personality assessment, (Vol. 12).* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Phillips, K. W., & Loyd, D. L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99*, 143-160.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 811-832.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29, 790-801.

Polyhart, R. E., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2003). Be careful what you ask for : Effects of response instructions on the construct validity and reliability of situational judgment test. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11*, 1-16.

Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*, 266-277.

Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 164-177.

Richard, O., McMillan, A., Chadwick, K., & Dwyer, S. (2003). Employing an innovation strategy in racially diverse workforces. *Group & Organization Management, 28*, 107-126.

Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive, 11,* 21-31.

Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 247-270.

Sawyer, J. E., Houlette, M. A., & Yeagley, E. L. (2006). Decision performance and diversity structure: Comparing faultlines in convergent, crosscut, and racially homogeneous groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99*, 1-15.

Schmitt, N., & Chan, D. (2006). Situational judgment test: Method or construct? In J. A. Weekley and R. E. Ployhart (Eds.) *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schuman, H., & Krysan, M. (1999). A historical note on Whites' beliefs about racial

    inequality. *American Sociological Review, 64*, 847-855.

Sodowsky, G. R., Kuo-Jackson, P. Y., Richardson, M. F., & Corey, A. T. (1998).

    Correlates of self-reported multicultural competencies: Counselor

    multicultural social desirability, race, social inadequacy, locus of control

    racial ideology, and multicultural training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,*

    45, 256-264.

Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of

    the multicultural counseling inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural

    competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 137-148.

Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. C. (1972). Short, homogenous versions of the Marlowe-

    Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28*, 191-

    193.

Stroessner, S. J. (1996). Social categorization by race or sex: Effects of perceived

    non-normalcy on response times. Social Cognition, 14, 247-276.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social*

    psychology of intergroup relations. Oxford, England: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of*

    Psychology, 33, 1-39.

Thomas, D. C. (1999). Cultural diversity and work group effectiveness. *Journal of*

    Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30, 242-263.

Tolbert, P., Andrews, A., & Simmons, T. (1995). The effects of group proportions on

    group dynamics. In S. Jackson & M. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in*

    workteams (pp. 131-159). Washington, DC: APA Books.

Triandis, H., Hall, E., & Ewen, R. (1965). Member heterogeneity and dyadic

    creativity. *Human Relations, 18*, 33-55.

Triandis, H., Kurowski, L., & Gelfand, M. (1993). Workplace diversity, In H.

    Triandis, M. Dunnette, & L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and*

    organizational psychology (Vol. 4, pp. 769-827). Palto Alto, CA: Consulting

    Psychologists Press.

Tuch, S. A., & Martin, J. K. (1991). Race in the workplace: Black/White differences

    in the sources of job satisfaction. *Sociological Quarterly, 32*, 103-116.

Turner, J. (1985). Social categorization and the self concept: A social cognitive

    theory of group behavior. *Advances in group processes* (Vol. 2, pp. 77-121).

    Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004, March 18). U.S. Interim Projections by Age, Sex, Race,

    and Hispanic Origin. Retrieved April 19, 2006, from

    http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2006). Women still underrepresented among

    highest earners. Retrieved April 19, 2006, from

    http://www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils55.pdf

Watson, W., Kumar, K., & Michaelsen, L. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on

    interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and divers

    task groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 590-602.

Webber, S. S., & Donahue, L. M. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 27*, 141-162.

Weekley, J. A., & Jones, C. (1999). Further studies of situational tests. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 679-700.

Weekley, J. A., & Polyhart, R. E. (2006). An introduction to situational judgment testing, In J. A. Weekley & R. E. Polyhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application* (pp. 1-10). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Weekly, J.A. & Jones, C (1997). Video-based Situational Testing. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 25-49.

Williams, K., & O'Reilly, C. (1998). The complexity of diversity: A review of forty years of research. In B. Staw & R. Sutton (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 21, pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601-617.

Wong, C., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 243-274.

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management, 18*, 295-320.

Yap, C., Chai, K., & Lemaire, P. (2005). An empirical study on functional diversity

and innovation in SMEs. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 14*, 176-

190.

Zachary, R. A., Crumpton, E., & Spiegel, D. (1985). Estimating WAIS-R IQ from

the Shipley Institute of Living Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41*,

532-540.

Appendices

Appendix A: Instructions to Generate Diversity Situations

The purpose is to generate situations in which a supervisor must deal with a <u>diversity related problem</u>. Please think about the job of a mid-level supervisor and write situations that a mid-level supervisor may encounter on the job.

Important characteristics of good situations:

- It requires a response from a **mid-level supervisor**. The respondent will be asked, "What would you do in this situation?" There should be many possible ways that the issue could be addressed.
- It is **challenging**. Write about situations that are difficult, and not everyone agree upon the answer.
- It is **realistic**. It may be something that happened to you, or you think it could happen.
- It provides **sufficient detail**. This is necessary to help the respondent make a choice between possible actions. Make the situation specific enough, so there is enough clear information to respond.
- It must be **fair**. Avoid situations that require specific job knowledge.
- It must be **brief, but clear**. A response to the situation can be communicated in just a few sentences.

Using the following 7-point scale, please indicate how much you agree with each statement about yourself.

		Strongly Disagree					**Strongly Agree**	

Social Astuteness:

1.	I always seem to instinctively know the right thing to say or do to influence others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	I have good intuition or "savvy" about how to present myself to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	I pay close attention to people's facial expressions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	I understand people very well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Interpersonal Influence:

6.	It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I am good at getting people to like me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Networking Ability:

10.	I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	I am good at using my connections and networks to make things happen at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	I have developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who I can call on for support when I really need to get things done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	I spend a lot of time at work developing connections with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	I am good at building relationships with influential people at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Apparent Sincerity:

16.	It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	I try to show a genuine interest in other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	When communicating with others, I try to be genuine in what I say and do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix C: Snyder's (1987) 18 Item Measure of Self-Monitoring

Indicate whether each of the following statements about you are primarily true or false.

		True	**False**
1.	I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people. (F)	T	F
2.	At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like. (F)	T	F
3.	I can only argue for ideas which I already believe. (F)	T	F
4.	I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information. (T)	T	F
5.	I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others. (T)	T	F
6.	I would probably make a good actor. (T)	T	F
7.	In a group of people, I am rarely the center of attention. (T)	T	F
8.	In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons. (T)	T	F
9.	I am not particularly good at making other people like me. (F)	T	F
10.	I'm not always the person I appear to be. (T)	T	F
11.	I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone or win their favor. (F)	T	F
12.	I have considered being an entertainer. (T)	T	F
13.	I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (F)	T	F
14.	I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. (F)	T	F
15.	At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (F)	T	F
16.	I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should. (F)	T	F
17.	I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end). (T)	T	F
18.	I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them (T)	T	F

Appendix D:. Marlowe-Crowne (1960) 10-item Measure of Social Desirability

	True	**False**
1. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. (T)	T	F
2. I like to gossip at times. (F)	T	F
3. I never resent being asked to return a favor. (T)	T	F
4. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. (F)	T	F
5. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. (F)	T	F
6. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. (T)	T	F
7. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. (F)	T	F
8. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (T)	T	F
9. I always try to practice what I preach. (T)	T	F
10. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. (F)	T	F

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I have a good sense of hwy I have certain feelings most of the time.
2. I have good understanding of my own emotions.
3. I really understand what I feel.
4. I always know whether or not I am happy.
5. I always know my friends' emotions from their behavior.
6. I am a good observer of others' emotions.
7. I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
8. I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me.
9. I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them.
10. I always tell myself I am a competent person.
11. I am a self-motivating person.
12. I would always encourage myself to try my best.
13. I am able to control my temper so that I can handle difficulties rationally.
14. I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions.
15. I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry.
16. I have good control of my own emotions.

Inter-group Anxiety

1. I would feel awkward when interacting with a person from a different racial group.
2. I would feel uncomfortable when interacting with a person from a different racial group.
3. When interacting with a person from a different racial group, I would feel relaxed. *
4. When interacting with a person from a different racial group, I would feel nervous.

Inter-group Avoidance

1. If I had a choice, I would rather not interact with a person from a different racial group.
2. If I can avoid interacting with people from different racial groups, I do.
3. I like interacting with people from different racial groups. *
4. I would look forward to interacting with people from different racial groups. *
5. I would want to avoid interacting with a person from a different racial group.

* Indicates reverse scored.

Appendix G: CSE: Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992)

We are all members of certain social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to *gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity,* and *socioeconomic class.* We would like you to consider your membership in your ETHNIC GROUP and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about your ETHNIC GROUP and your membership in it. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale.

(Private Esteem Subscale)
1.   I often regret that I belong to the ethnic group that I do.

2.   In general, I'm glad to be a member of my ethnic group.

3.   Overall, I often feel that being a member of my ethnic group is not worthwhile.

4.   I feel good about my ethnic group.

(Public Esteem Subscale)

5.   Overall, my ethnic group is considered good by others.

6.   In general, others respect my ethnic group.

7.   In general, others think that my ethnic group is unworthy.

8.   Most people consider my ethnic group, on the average, to be more ineffective

       than other ethnic groups.

(Ethnic Identity Subscale)

9.   Overall, my ethnic group has very little to do with how I feel about myself.

10.   My ethnic group is an important reflection of who I am.

11.   My ethnic group is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am.

12.   In general, belonging to my ethnic group is an important part of my self image.

(Membership Subscale)

13.   I am a worthy member of my ethnic group.

14.   I feel I don't have much to offer to my ethnic group.

15.   I am a cooperative participant in my ethnic group.

       16.   I often feel I'm a useless member of my ethnic group.

Appendix H: Motivation to Respond without Prejudice (Plant and Devine, 1998)

Instructions: The following questions concern various reasons or motivations people might have for trying to respond in non-prejudiced ways towards people from different racial backgrounds than our own. Some of the reasons reflect internal-personal motivations whereas others reflect more external-social motivations. Of course, people may be motivated for both internal and external reasons; we want to emphasize that neither type of motivation is by definition better than the other. In addition, we want to be clear that we are not evaluating you or your individual responses. All your responses will be completely confidential. We are simply trying to get an idea of the types of motivations that students in general have for responding in non-prejudiced ways. If we are to learn anything useful, it is important that you respond to each of the questions openly and honestly. Please give your response according to the scale below by writing a number from 1-9 in the space to the left of each statement:

____1.   Because of today's PC (politically correct) standards I try to appear nonprejudiced toward people from different racial backgrounds than my own.

____2.   I attempt to act in nonprejudiced ways toward people from different racial backgrounds than my own because it is personally important to me.

____3.   I attempt to appear nonprejudiced toward people from different racial backgrounds than my own in order to avoid disapproval from others.

____4.   I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be nonprejudiced toward people from different racial backgrounds.

____5.   I try to act nonprejudiced toward people from different racial backgrounds than my own because of pressure from others.

____6.   I try to hide any negative thoughts about people from different racial backgrounds than my own in order to avoid negative reactions from others.

____7.   According to my personal values, using stereotypes about people from different racial backgrounds than my own is OK.

____8.   If I acted prejudiced toward people from different racial backgrounds than my own, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me.

____9.   Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about people from different racial backgrounds is wrong.

____10.   Being nonprejudiced toward people from different racial backgrounds than my own is important to my self-concept.

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale:

____1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

____2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

____3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

____4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

____5. Women are too easily offended.

____6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the opposite sex.

____7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

____8. Many women have a quality of purity few men possess.

____9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

____10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

____11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

____12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

____13. Men are complete without women.

____14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

____15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

____16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

____17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

____18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

____19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

____20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

____21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

____22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Appendix J: Empathy Scale taken from Penner et al.'s(1995)
Prosocial Personality Battery

Below are a number of statements that may or may not describe you, your feelings, or your behavior. Please read each statement carefully and blacken in the space on your answer sheet that corresponds to choices presented below. <u>There are no right or wrong responses.</u>

1.   I sometimes find it difficult to see things form the "other person's" point of view. *
2.   When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
3.   I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective
4.   Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. *
5.   If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't' waste much time listening to other people's arguments. *
6.   When I see someone begin treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.
7.   I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. *
8.   I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
9.   I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.
10.   I tend to lose control during emergencies.
11.   When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.
12.   When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.

**Indicates reverse scored.

Appendix K: Task Performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991)

Please read each item and indicate the amount you agree with it, using the following scale:

I am a person who…

_____1. Adequately completes assigned duties.

_____2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.

_____3. Perform tasks that are expected of him/her.

_____4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.

_____5. Engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance.

_____6. Neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform

_____7. Fails to perform essential duties

_____8. Is a strong performer, overall.

Appendix L: Diversity Performance

Please use the following scale to rate how much you agree with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

_____1. I am considerate of coworker's group differences when I work with them.

_____2. When coworker's religious or cultural habits interfere with their ability to do the job correctly, I do not allow that to interfere with my work.

_____3. When coworkers choose family responsibilities over work responsibilities, I do not allow that to interfere with my work.

_____4. I find it hard to take orders from managers of certain ethnic, religious, age, or gender groups.

_____5. I work well with diverse coworkers.

_____6. I am able to connect with coworkers who are different from me.

_____7. I am able to establish working relationships with diverse coworkers.

_____8. I can handle myself at work with others who are different from me.

_____9. I am able to establish rapport with clients/customers from diverse backgrounds.

_____10. I excel in diverse work groups.

_____11. I get along with people from diverse backgrounds.

_____12. I can communicate effectively with individuals from diverse backgrounds.

About the Author

Andrew Biga received a Bachelor's Degree in Psychology from the University of Nebraska in 2002 and a M.A. in Industrial Organizational Psychology from the University of South Florida in 2004. His research and work at Procter and Gamble is focused on diversity related topics and aims to improve the work lives of employees through implementation of effective, data driven, diversity management strategies and inclusive people practices.