General Diversity Measures, Diversity Climate, Multiple Isms

TITLE OF MEASURE	HOMOPHOBIA AND RACISM SCALES

Source/Primary reference	Diaz, R. M., Ayala, G., Bein, E., Henne, J., & Marin, B. (2001). **The impact of homophobia, poverty, and racism on the mental health of gay and bisexual Latino men: Findings from 3 US cities.** *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(6), 927-932.
Construct measured	Experiences of homophobia and racism both as children and as adults
Brief description	The Homophobia scale included 11 items and the Racism scale 10 items. Both scales were rated on a 4-point *never* to *many times* scale.
Sample items	Homophobia: ▪ As you were growing up, how often did you feel that your homosexuality hurt and embarrassed your family? ▪ As an adult, how often have you had to pretend that you are straight to be accepted? Racism: ▪ How often have you been turned down for a job because of your race or ethnicity? ▪ In sexual relationships, how often do you find that men pay more attention to your race or ethnicity than to who you are as a person?
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Non-majority, non-heterosexual adults
Translations & cultural adaptations available	English and Spanish versions available
How developed	Qualitative studies preceded the quantitative survey. Approximately 300 gay and bisexual Latino men were interviewed, in a total of 26 focus group discussions, in three cities. The focus group transcripts were used to develop the items for the quantitative survey. The items were refined through pilot testing.

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

Participants	Demographics	
Sample Size	*n* = 912	
Description	Latino, non-heterosexual men entering social venues in the cities of New York (n = 309), Miami (n = 302), and Los Angeles (n = 301)	
Age	*Mean*	31.2
Education	*Some college or more*	64.2%
HIV Status	*HIV-positive*	21.8%
	HIV-negative	67.3%
	Do not know	10.9%

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

39

TITLE OF MEASURE | HOMOPHOBIA AND RACISM SCALES

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's α coefficient for Homophobia and Racism scales.

Scale	α =
Homophobia	.75
Racism	.82

Comments

- Other than face validity, there is minimal information about concurrent or construct validity.

- Participants were patrons of Latino gay venues – findings may not apply to men who do not attend gay venues or to men who prefer to attend mainstream gay venues.

- Participants were mostly immigrants; the findings may not apply to the experience of U.S.-born Latinos.

- Survey data were solely based on self-reports. Thus self-report biases are possible, including the tendency to underreport stigmatized behavior.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Diaz, R. M., Ayala, G., & Bein, E. (2004). **Sexual risk as an** outcome of social oppression: Data from a probability sample of Latino gay men in three US cities. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10*(3), 255-267.

Zea, M. C., Reisen, C. A., Poppen, P. J., & Diaz, R. M. (2003). Asking and telling: Communication about HIV status among Latino HIV-positive gay men. *AIDS and Behavior, 7*(2), 143-152.

Contact Information

Rafael M. Diaz
Center for Community Research
San Francisco State University
3004 16th St., Suite 301
San Francisco, CA 94103, USA

e-mail: rmdiaz@sfsu.edu

TITLE OF MEASURE	**MODIFIED GODFREY-RICHMAN ISM SCALE (M-GRISMS-M)**

Source/Primary reference

Godfrey, S., Richman, C., & Withers, T. (2000). Reliability and validity of a new scale to measure prejudice: The GRISMS. *Current Psychology, 19*(1), 8-13.

Construct measured

Stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination towards various ethnic and religious groups, as well as sexist and heterosexist attitudes

Brief description

This revised scale includes 33 items. Response options include yes/no, standard Likert ratings, and rankings. It consists of four subscales:

1. Racism subscale (attitudes toward African Americans, Latinos/ Hispanics, Asian Americans, Native Americans, European Americans, as well as general racism)

2. Religion subscale (attitudes towards Christian, Jewish, Moslem, agnostic/atheist persons, as well as general religion questions)

3. Sexism subscale (attitudes toward males and females)

4. Heterosexism subscale (attitudes toward gay men and lesbians as well as general heterosexism)

Sample items

- Native American men are more aggressive and brutal than other men.

- Christians are intolerant of people with other religious beliefs.

- Sexism was created by women as an excuse for their lower level of success in the business world.

- Heterosexual men have a strong desire to dominate and take advantage of women.

- Homosexuals should be permitted to teach children in schools.

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)

Adults

Translations & cultural adaptations available

None known

How developed

An original GRISMS was developed with 90 items (1995, unpublished). It had high reliability and subscale concurrent validity in comparison with other measures of racism, sexism, and heterosexism (Pearson r's ranged from .65 to .76). However, it was very long and time-consuming to complete. Thus the authors worked to develop a 50-item version, called the M-GRISMS. During the study described below, a new revised version (M-GRISMS-M) was developed by eliminating additional items to optimize the internal reliability of each subscale.

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

41

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

Participants	Demographics	
Sample Size	*n* = 131	
Description	Introductory Psychology Students	
Age Range	18 to 23	
Gender	Female Male	*n* = 71 *n* = 60
Race/Ethnicity	European-American	93%
	African American	5%
	Asian or Native American	2%

VALIDITY

Concurrent Validity

The M-GRISMS was compared to the Modern and Old Fashioned Racism Scale (McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981), the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS, Spence, Helmrich, & Strapp, 1973), and the combined Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuality (HATH Scale, Larsen, Reed & Hoffman, 1980) and Index of Homophobia (IHP, Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) scales.

M-GRISMS Subscale	Modern Racism $r =$	AWS $r =$	HATH/ IHP $r =$
Racism	.60 ***		
Sexism		.41 ***	
Heterosexism			.76***

***p < .001

M-GRISMS-M Subscale	Modern Racism $r =$	AWS $r =$	HATH/IHP $r =$
Racism Subscale	.75***		
Sexism Subscale		.55 ***	
Heterosexism Subscale			.77***

***p < .001

<u>RELIABILITY</u>

Internal Consistency

Scale	M-GRISMS $\alpha =$	M-GRISMS - M $\alpha =$
Full Scale	.77	.89
Racism Subscale	.52	.64
Religion Subscale	.17	.40
Sexism Subscale	.44	.52
Heterosexism Subscale	.72	.82

Test-retest Reliability

Scale	M-GRISMS $r =$	M-GRISMS-M $r =$
Full Scale	.66	.89
Racism Subscale	.58	.80
Religion Subscale	.34	.75
Sexism Subscale	.37	.77
Heterosexism Subscale	.66	.81

Comments

- Although the authors have worked to shorten their scale, it remains long, requiring college students about 30 minutes to complete.

- It was developed and tested with college students, so its generalizability to working populations is unknown. However, on the surface, the items would seem transferable.

- It was also developed with a predominantly Euro-American sample, thus usefulness with other groups needs further assessment.

- Internal reliability of the Religion Subscale is quite low and that of the racism and sexism subscales is somewhat marginal.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information

Charles L. Richman
Department of Psychology
Wake Forest University
P.O. Box 7778 Reynolds Station
Winston-Salem, NC 27109, USA
Tel: (336) 758-6134

e-mail: richman@wfu.edu

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

43

TITLE OF MEASURE	*PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY DISCRMINATION*

Source/Primary reference

Jeanquart-Barone, S., & Sekaran, U. (1996) Institutional racism: An empirical study. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(4), 477-482.

Construct measured

Supervisor discrimination and perceived unfair treatment

Brief description

The scale includes 8 items that describe ways discrimination may manifest. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The questions can be asked both as they relate to race discrimination and as they relate to gender discrimination.

Sample items

I believe my RACE/GENDER has had an influence on:

- my performance evaluations (being judged more critically than others).

- the number of (increased) responsibilities assigned to me.

- the types of jobs given to me (e.g. harder, dirtier work).

- the way I am treated in general.

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)

Non-majority adult workers

Translations & cultural adaptations available

None known

How developed

The survey items were based on the seven ways that discrimination may manifest itself that have been identified by the Institute of Social Research (ISR).

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLE

Participants		Demographics
Sample Size		*n* = 173
Description		Members of a national minority organization
Race/Ethnicity	*Blacks*	*n* = 146
	Others (Asian, Hispanic, American Indian)	*n* = 30
Gender	*Female*	40%
	Male	60%
Education	*College*	30%
	Some College	45%
Occupation	*Managers*	9%
	Clerical workers	26%
	Others (consultants, technicians, superintendents, nurses)	65%

TITLE OF MEASURE	PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY DISCRIMINATION

VALIDITY

Concurrent Validity

The results of a regression analysis indicate that perceived supervisory discrimination (intervening variable) had a significant path to institutional racism (dependent variable) as measured by Barbarin and Gilbert's (1981) scale. The path coefficient was .404 ($p < .000001$). Higher levels of perceived supervisory discrimination were associated with respondents' perceptions of higher levels of institutional racism.

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Comments	▪ The instrument was specifically designed to assess the work environment.
	▪ The items can be altered for race or gender discrimination.
	▪ The research included only a small sample of African-Americans. Only 12% responded to the survey, thus the possibility of non-response bias cannot be ruled out.
	▪ Survey data were based on self-reports, thus self-report biases are possible.
Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)	Jeanquart, S. (1991). *Felt conflict of subordinates in vertical dyadic relationships when supervisors and subordinates vary in gender or race.* Doctoral Dissertation. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
	Jeanquart-Barone, S. (1996). Examination of supervisory satisfaction in traditional and nontraditional gender-based reporting relationships. *Sex Roles, 34*(9/10), 717-728.
Contact Information	Sandy Jeanquart Miles, SPHR Professor, Management and Marketing Department College of Business and Public Affairs Business Building South, 413E Murray State University Murray, KY 42071, USA Tel: (270) 762-3401 Fax: (270) 762-3740 e-mail: sandy.miles@murraystate.edu

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

45

TITLE OF MEASURE	***DIVERSITY CLIMATE***

Source/Primary reference	Kossek, E. E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 61-81.

Construct measured	Aspect of the work climate that are supportive of diversity

Brief description	The scale includes 16 items and has 5 subscales:

1. Value efforts to promote diversity (6 items)
   (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

2. Attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities (2 items)
   (5 = much higher, 1 = much lower)

3. Attitudes toward qualifications of women (2 items)
   (5 = much higher, 1 = much lower)

4. Equality of department support of racioethnic minorities (3 items)
   (3 = better chance, 2 = same chance, 1 = less chance)

5. Equality of department support of women (3 items)
   (3 = better chance, 2 = same chance, 1 = less chance)

Sample items	Value efforts to promote diversity

- If organization X is to remain an excellent institution it must recruit more minority faculty.

Attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities
- The scholarly qualifications of minority faculty compared to non-minority faculty in my school/department are _____.

Attitudes toward qualifications of women
- Research productivity of women faculty compared to men faculty in my school/department is _____

Equality of department support of racioethnic minorities
- Compared to non-minority faculty, minority faculty have _____ of having graduate students to assist them.

Equality of department support of women
- Compared to faculty men, faculty women have _____ of getting release from teaching.

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	University administrators, faculty and other staff (could be adapted for other types of work settings)

Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known

TITLE OF MEASURE   DIVERSITY CLIMATE

How developed	Items to assess "diversity climate" were developed by two white female faculty members based on a review of the literature, where 1) climate was conceived as the influence of work contexts on employee behavior and attitudes, which are grounded in perceptions; and 2) it was assumed that people attach meaning to or make sense of clusters of psychologically related events. The survey was submitted for review to a group of senior administrators, who had requested the study. The administrators included white, black, and Hispanic men and white women of various academic ranks.
Psychometric properties	**STUDY SAMPLE** The survey was mailed to all of the office addresses of white women and racioethnic minorities, as well as a random sample of white men with faculty and academic staff status and at least one year's seniority ($n = 1529$). A total of 775 (51%) usable questionnaires were returned.

Population Group	Total Population	Number Sampled	Number Returned	% Returned
Racioethnic Minority Women	87	87	40	46
White Women	629	629	318	51
Racioethnic Minority Men	191	191	83	43
White Men	1,842	600	281	47
Identification Deleted by Respondent			53	
Total	2,749	1,507	775	51

VALIDITY

Construct Validity

Exploratory factor analyses were conducted on 20 items pertaining to diversity. Four distinct factors accounted for most of the variance (66%) among the items. An item was included in a scale if its factor loading exceeded 0.4 and the loading for that item was larger than the loading on any other factor by 0.2. For conceptual reasons, the authors divided a factor related to departmental support into two – one for support of women and one for support of racioethnic minorities. The result was the 5 subscales outlined below.

In multivariate analysis of variance, all five factors were significantly associated with racioethnicity and four with gender (all except attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities).

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

47

TITLE OF MEASURE   **DIVERSITY CLIMATE**

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Subscale	Cronbach's α
Value efforts to promote diversity	.77
Attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities	.71
Attitudes toward qualifications of women	.72
Equality of department support of racioethnic minorities	.74
Equality of department support of women	.90

Comments

- Little empirical study has been conducted on the issue of diversity climates, and this appears to be one of very few scales that tries to directly assess diversity *climate* for workers within an organization.

- While developed for employees within an academic environment, the scale could be adapted for use in other types of organizations.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information

Ellen Ernst Kossek
School of Labor & Industrial Relations
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

48

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

TITLE OF MEASURE	**WORKFORCE DIVERSITY QUESTIONNAIRE (WDQ)**
Source/Primary reference	Larkey, L. K. (1996). The development and validation of the Workforce Diversity Questionnaire: An instrument to assess interactions in diverse workgroups. *Management Communication Quarterly, 9*(3), 296-338.
Construct measured	Interactions in diverse workgroups
Brief description	The Workforce Diversity Questionnaire (WDQ) consists of 15 items in four subscales that reflect the dimensions of expected behavioral responses to perceived cultural diversity: 1. inclusion (4 items) 2. ideation (4 items) 3. understanding (3 items) 4. treatment (4 items) Items appear to be agree-disagree statements but the scale is not stated explicitly.
Sample items	Inclusion/Exclusion ▪ If someone who is not included in the mainstream tries to get information or makes a request, others stall or avoid helping them out in subtle ways. ▪ It seems that the real reason people are denied promotions or raises is that they are seen as not fitting in. Varied/Conforming Ideation ▪ When people from different backgrounds work together in groups, some people feel slighted because their ideas are not acknowledged. ▪ People are reluctant to get involved in a project that requires them to balance ideas from different gender and racial points of view. Understanding/Misunderstanding ▪ When people who are culturally different or of different genders work together in our group, there is always some amount of miscommunication. ▪ Women and people of color are interpreted differently than white males, even when they say the same thing. Positive/Negative Treatment ▪ Some people in our group are "talked down to" because they are different. ▪ People's different ways of talking or acting cause them to be treated as less competent or smart.

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

49

TITLE OF MEASURE	***WORKFORCE DIVERSITY QUESTIONNAIRE (WDQ)***

**Appropriate for whom
(i.e. which population/s)**

Working adults (men and women of all ethnic groups, by design)

**Translations & cultural
adaptations available**

None known

How developed

Dimensions were derived from existing theoretical literature. Key statements within each dimension were identified through interviews with 15 employees of a high-tech manufacturing firm and 20 from a consumer products manufacturer/distributor. Of the 35 volunteers, 18 were female; 18 were from managerial positions; 16 (46%) were Caucasian, 10 (29%) Hispanic, 7 (20%) African American, and 2 (6%) Asian American.

Questions were designed to generate both positive and negative experiences to gain insight into both poles of each theoretically proposed dimension. Two people coded the interview descriptions of interactions into five theoretically derived dimensions and listed separately any other comments. Inter-rater agreement was 64% in the first set of interviews and 84% in the second set. Six interaction dimensions (including "required work" to describe mundane requirements of the job) were finalized in four context categories. Interviews were repeated until no new statements were generated. In all, 56 items were written, comprising:

13 for inclusion/exclusion,

14 for convergence/divergence (later dropped),

11 for varied/conforming ideation,

7 for understanding/misunderstanding, and

11 for positive/negative evaluation (later termed "treatment").

Based on the results of surveys distributed to a snowball sample of students, further wording changes were made to a subset of items, primarily to reflect group observations rather than personal experiences. The resulting instrument was pilot-tested with employees of a high-tech consumer product manufacturer, a social service agency, and a hospital (Pilot Study, see below); further revised to resolve consistency and parallelism issues; and re-evaluated among undergraduate college students (Validation Study).

TITLE OF MEASURE   WORKFORCE DIVERSITY QUESTIONNAIRE (WDQ)

Psychometric properties

<u>STUDY SAMPLES</u>

Participants	Pilot Study	Validation Study	Participants
Sample Size	n = 280	n = 182	Sample Size
Age	Mean (range)	39 (20-70)	31 (15-62)
Gender	Female/Male	45% / 55%	49% / 50%
Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian	57%	70%
	Hispanic	23%	22%
	African American	10%	2%
	Native American	4%	0%
	Asian American	0%	6%
Position	Hourly wage	35%	
	Salaried	62%	

<u>VALIDITY</u>

Construct Validity

Pilot Study: In factor analysis, the four scales retained were represented by items with strong factor loadings and Cronbach's alpha coefficients between .69 and .80.

Validation Study: The scales were correlated with each other; however, confirmatory factor analysis on all items of the four factors showed that the items did not represent the same factor. The authors also considered that the scales could be ordered by underlying "diversity climate" processes such as dominating attitudes, organizational culture patterns, or situational factors governing the perception of and reactions to those who are different. In a structural equation model, each of the four WDQ factors was indeed found to be influenced by the underlying factor of diversity climate.

Concurrent Validity

Pilot Study: Inclusion, ideation, understanding, and treatment were significantly and positively correlated with 2 "outside" scales: job load ($r = .26, .28, .26,$ and 29, respectively) and color-blindness ($r = .35, .46, .44,$ and .46, respectively).

Validation Study: Of the four "outside" scales included in the instrument, the two scales expected to correlate were strongly associated (power was correlated negatively and cohesion positively with all of the scales), whereas the two scales predicted not to correlate (detail and values) showed only small, mostly nonsignificant correlations.

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

51

TITLE OF MEASURE   **WORKFORCE DIVERSITY QUESTIONNAIRE (WDQ)**

RELIABILITY

Internal reliability

Validation Study: Cronbach's α values remained high in this sample:

Subscale	Cronbach's α
Inclusion	.75
Ideation	.75
Understanding	.64
Treatment	.74

Comments

- The scale is unique in that it deliberately attempts to assess the interactions among diverse organization members without much reference to race, ethnicity, or culture in the phrasing of the items.

- The development of this instrument was characterized by serious attention to psychometric properties.

- The authors suggest complementing the use of the WDQ with open-ended questions about what specific differences affect group interactions.

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact info & cost

Linda K. Larkey
Director, Women's Cancer Prevention Office
300 N. 18th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006, USA
Tel: 602-462-1005

e-mail: larkeylite@msn.com

TITLE OF MEASURE	QUICK DISCRIMINATION INDEX
Source/Primary reference	Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*, 1016-1031.
Construct measured	Attitudes toward racial diversity and women's equality
Brief description	The QDI includes 30 items in three domains: 1. Attitudes about diversity 2. Personal attitudes about racial diversity 3. Gender-based attitudes Items are rated on a 5-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.
Sample items	Attitudes about diversity: ▪ I am against affirmative action programs in business. Personal attitudes about racial diversity: ▪ Most of my close friends are from my own racial group. Gender-based attitudes: ▪ I think it is more appropriate for the mother of a newborn baby, rather than the father, to stay home with the baby (not work) during the first year.
Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)	Late adolescent and general adult populations
Translations & cultural adaptations available	None known
How developed	Items were generated from the literature on discrimination, prejudice, and "modern racism," and from the development team's experience. An attempt was made to tap both cognitive and affective components of prejudicial attitudes. About 40 statements were initially written. Each item statement was examined by the research team and redundant, unclear, and confusing items were eliminated. Twenty-eight remaining items were placed on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Based on the results of the item content analysis (described below) and factor analysis, two revisions were made. First, the two items having low item-total correlations were closely examined and rewritten. Second, five new items were written, bringing the total item count to 30.

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

53

TITLE OF MEASURE	QUICK DISCRIMINATION INDEX

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

Study 1: Undergraduate and graduate students, local church members, and employees of local businesses, human service agencies, and a police precinct

Study 2: Involved two samples:

- Sample 1: Similar to Study 1; late adolescents and adults in the New York metropolitan area

- Sample 2: 37 college undergraduates at a midsize liberal arts college in the Northeastern U.S.

Study 3: Similar to Study 1; late adolescents and adults in the New York metropolitan area

Participants		Study 1	Study 2		Study 3
Sample		Overall	Sample 1	Sample 2	Overall
Sample Size		n = 285	n = 220	n = 31	n = 331
Age	Range	18-66	16-58	17-50	16-63
	M (SD)	30 (10)	22 (9)	23 (7)	27 (10)
Gender	Female	187	(59%)	16 (55%)	(79%)
	Male	97	(41%)	15 (45%)	(21%)
Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian	66%	60%	†	76%
	African American	21%	10%		5%
	Hispanic Latino Latina	6%	23%		8%
	Asian American	3%	4%		5%
	Native American	1%	0%		0%
	Other	3%	4%		6%

†Not reported

VALIDITY

Content Validity

To address the possible effects of social desirability, about one-half of the items were written in reverse order. Second, the title "Social Attitude Survey" (not "Quick Discrimination Index") appears on the actual instrument to control somewhat for potential demand characteristics and evaluation apprehension.

54

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

Study 1: Five individuals with expertise in the topical area and in psychological measurement who were not part of the development team rated each item in the prototype QDI on domain appropriateness and clarity. Items receiving a mean of less than 4.0 for either rating (on a 1-5 scale, with 5 indicating highly appropriate or very clear) were eliminated or rewritten. This procedure resulted in a version with 25 items.

The 25-item QDI was then the subject of a 2-hour focus group conducted by the senior author with seven graduate students in education. Focus group members completed the instrument and then discussed their reactions (both affective and cognitive) to the items, satisfying the authors that the items were clear and served their intended purpose. Focus group members completed the QDI in 6 to 13 minutes.

Study 3: A sub-sample of participants ($n = 151$) completed both the QDI and the Social Desirability Scale (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The correlations between the QDI factors and the SDS were low, indicating that social desirability contamination was not a concern (see table in Concurrent Validity).

Construct Validity

Study 1: Using one-way ANOVA, higher scores were found among women than men; non-Whites (all groups combined) than whites; urban dwellers than suburban or rural; and Democrats than Independents than Republicans.

Study 2: In one-way MANOVAs and ANOVAs, scores were higher among African and Hispanic Americans than white Americans, as well as among women, urban dwellers, and Democrats.

Study 2: In factor analysis, Factor 1 accounted for 25.2% of the variance and loaded highly on nine items, all consistent with general/cognitive attitudes toward multicultural issues. Factor 2 loaded highly on seven items, focusing on more personal/affective attitudes toward racial diversity. Factor 3 loaded highly on seven items concerning women's equality attitudes. Factor inter-correlations were moderate and supported the factor extraction. Also presented below are the Cronbach's α values for Study 2 and Study 3.

Factor	*Factor 1* $r =$	*Factor 2* $r =$	*Factor 3* $r =$	*Study 2* $\alpha =$	*Study 3* $\alpha =$
1		.41**	.47**	.80	.85
2			.35**	.83	.83
3				.76	.65
Total	.83**	.72**	.74**	.89	.88

**$p < .01$

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

55

Confirmatory factor analysis, using structural equation modeling, confirmed the factor structure.

Concurrent Validity

Study 3: A sub-sample of participants ($n = 151$) completed the QDI plus one of two other instruments: the New Racism Scale (NRS; Jacobson, 1985), or the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCAS; Ponterotto et al., 1993).

As expected, the NRS was significantly correlated with all three QDI factors but more highly with Factor 1 and Factor 2 (dealing with race) than with Factor 3 (dealing with women's issues). The correlations with the MCAS factors were generally in the same range.

Scale	Factor 1 r =	Factor 2 r =	Factor 3 r =
NRS	.44**	.44**	.30**
MCAS Knowledge & Skills	.41**	.34*	.23
MCAS Awareness	.50**	.21	.39**
SDS	-.16	-.04	-.19

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$

RELIABILITY

Internal Consistency

Study 1: With the exception of two items, corrected item-total correlations ranged from .20 to .74. The coefficient of variation was 13.4%, within the recommended range of Dawis (1987).

Study 2: Twenty-seven of the 30 items had corrected item-total correlations in the .23 to .62 range. The coefficient of variation was 12.8%. The QDI retained a satisfactory level of internal consistency (see Cronbach's α values above) despite a more diverse developmental sample.

Variable	Study 1	Study 2
# of items	25	30
Mean Corrected Item-total r =	.45	.42

Test-retest Reliability

Study 2: Three college professors distributed the QDI in class during the first and last weeks of the semester. The interval for all three classes was 15 weeks. Test-retest reliability over this interval was high.

56

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

TITLE OF MEASURE	QUICK DISCRIMINATION INDEX

	Mean Stability Coefficient		
Scale	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
QDI test-retest	.90	.82	.81

Comments

Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Contact Information Joseph G. Ponterotto
Counseling Psychology Program
Graduate School of Education
Fordham University at Lincoln Center
113 W. 60th St, Room 1016A
New York, NY 10023, USA

Tel: 212-636-6480

Expanding our Understanding of the Psychosocial Work Environment:
A Compendium of Discrimination, Harassment, and Work-Family Issues

57