READINESS AND SELECTION ASSESSMENT OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ADVISORS

Dr. Alan L. Witt
Hobby School for Public Affairs
University of Houston

Dr. Daniel P. McDonald, Director
Hope Research Center
Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

September 2020

DEOMI PRESS

SFR Tracking No. 20-01

Abstract

In its pre-COVID-19 structure, the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute's (DEOMI) Equal Opportunity Advisor Course and Equal Opportunity Advisor Reserve Component Course training program allocated a substantial amount of time to activities in which students were challenged to (a) increase self-awareness (e.g., become aware of their personalities and biases) and (b) leverage that increased self-awareness to identify how their personalities and biases affected their performance as equal opportunity professionals. This time-intensive approach has required considerable effort on the part of DEOMI training staff. This paper considers an alternative in which an assessment might be employed to ascertain either who might be an appropriate equal opportunity advisor (EOA) trainee or one needing remedial training. This paper reports a study in which the relevant literature was reviewed, 25 relevant assessments available in the literature were considered, and two commercially available assessments were recommended: Aon's ADEPT-15® personality test and a fully customizable biodata test. Consideration of all available instruments took into account the assessment of prospective EOA trainees, EOA trainees, and EOA trainers.

Readiness and Selection Assessment of Equal Opportunity Advisors

In its pre-COVID-19 structure, the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute's (DEOMI) Equal Opportunity Advisor Course (EOAC) and Equal Opportunity Advisor Reserve Component Course (EOARCC) training program allocated a substantial amount of time to activities in which students were challenged to (a) increase self-awareness (e.g., become aware of their personalities and biases) and (b) leverage that increased self-awareness to identify how their personalities and biases affected their performance as equal opportunity professionals. This time-intensive approach has required considerable effort on the part of DEOMI training staff. An alternative might be to employ an assessment to ascertain either who might be an appropriate EOA trainee or one needing remedial training.

Accordingly, this paper considers assessments that might serve four purposes. One could be to employ as a screening device for selecting candidates for the EOAC/EOARCC training program. A second could be applied if DEOMI eliminated or reduced the self-awareness/socialization activities in the curriculum. In such a scenario, the assessment could serve to identify candidates needing remedial training. A third might be to provide feedback to students—feedback that could be applied to constructing individual development plans. Fourth, the assessment patterns of scores across students and cohorts might inform curriculum development. The profile of the effective performers among EOAs likely overlaps with the profile of effective performers among EOA trainers. Therefore, consideration of the characteristics of EOA trainers was taken into account. All subsequent references to EOAs are intended to imply reference to EOA trainers as well as EOAs.

Characteristics of Effective EOAs

This section presents a brief review of characteristics thought to be common among effective equal opportunity trainers and EOAs. Appendix A presents a list of characteristics that are thought to be facilitators of cross-cultural competence—knowledge and cognition, skills and abilities, affect and motivation, and personality or dispositional traits. Some of these characteristics are discussed in this section.

Cross-Cultural Competence

Clearly, cross-cultural competence is a primary competency needed for professionals in the field. Cross-cultural competence consists of two important components: cultural agility and cultural learning. While cultural agility is the ability to respond effectively in cross-cultural contexts, cultural learning positions personnel to understand the socio-cultural aspects of situations. Both observational and experiential learning help develop these capabilities.

Caligiuri and Tarique (2009) coined the phrase "cultural agility" to better describe the three processes in which individuals engage to operate effectively in cross-cultural situations. These functions are cultural adaptation, cultural minimalism, and cultural integration. Cultural adaptation refers to the need for personnel to be sensitive to and make efforts to adapt to cultural differences. Cultural minimalism involves the need for personnel to reduce the influence of cultural differences in their own behavior or others' behavior; it is sometimes needed to play down cultural differences. Cultural integration refers to understanding the cultural differences of each individual within a cross-cultural context, then making efforts to initiate new norms of interactions—norms that may need to combine many different cultural perspectives.

Cultural agility and cultural learning work together in at least three ways. First is reading the situation to accurately assess the meaning of behavioral cues, given the context. Second is

effectively responding in the situation. Does one adapt to the local norm (cultural adaptation) or

maintain counter-culture standards (culture minimalism), select a response incorporating both or

develop a new set of behaviors (cultural integration)? Third is anticipating and addressing

challenges from the responses by others in the situation. Anticipating the reactions of others

(e.g., resistance) and making changes in the moment require a sophisticated and nuanced level of

cultural competence.

Knowledge of cross-cultural information is not the only key to being an effective EOA.

Not surprising to anyone on the DEOMI training staff, predisposition—or motivation—is

critical. Hence, curiosity is important. Not everyone is interested in learning about other people.

Empathy is also relevant. Not everyone is interested in the problems of other people. Some

people enjoy judging others, but a willingness to suspend judgment is important. Indeed, as the

saying goes, it's not about you; it's about them. Unlike math, engineering, chemistry, and

physics problems, cross-cultural problems rarely have one right answer to solve interpersonal

difficulties in a certain situation. Therefore, EOAs need to have a tolerance for ambiguity and

uncertainty. Often, circumstances may not make sense in the moment; sometimes, EOAs need

time to process and interpret events to find the actual meaning.

Trainer Characteristics

EOAs have a substantial portion of education and influence. Hence, it is perhaps useful to

identify characteristics of trainers that are consistent with the profile of success.

1. Trainer characteristics that predict success for general training interventions are as follows.

   a. Well-organized and expressive trainers yield more information recall by trainees. Trainer

      clarity and expressiveness affect trainee recall and learning outcomes (Towler &

      Dipboye, 2001).

b. Trainer delivery affects the trainee motivation and performance; high organization in

delivery is better (Towler & Dipboye, 2001).

c. Holladay and Quinones (2008) reported that when the training focused on similarities,

trainees expected fewer instances of backlash and were more effective at resolving

conflicts than when the training focused on differences among individuals.

d. Reactions typically include trainee perceptions of the trainer's competence, credibility,

and experience, as well as the usefulness of the training overall (Bezrukova, Jehn, &

Spell, 2012; Holladay & Quinones, 2005; Rynes & Rosen, 1995).

e. Exemplary trainers are responsive and show interest in the learner through listening,

accommodating them, and establishing rapport. They show concern for the trainees, are

receptive to comments and questions, and generate discussion. They are energetic and

enthusiastic (create an up-beat climate for trainees). Effective trainers display humor and

can relax the trainees. They demonstrate sincerity and honesty, providing honest answers

and feedback. They are flexible and know when to eliminate or change the training

program and materials or explore a different topic that was not in the original plan.

Effective trainers demonstrate patience, maintain their composure, and can resolve

conflicts (Leach, 1996).

f. Great trainers are warm, open, outgoing, and positive (Leach, 1996).

g. Interpersonal skills are important; it is important that the trainees have an interactive

training session so they can better understand and retain the material. The trainer also

needs to have the knowledge to answer questions and react to any doubts.

h. Trainer competence is important to signal to trainees that the trainer is knowledgeable on

the topic. Trainer directiveness (behaviors that structure learning, outline goals, and

provide feedback to trainees) is also important. This contrasts with a collaborative style that assumes a learner has a lot of expertise. Trainer directiveness is related to training transfer and satisfaction (Harris et al., 2014).

    i.   Transfer of training is higher when trainers have a higher level of education, occupy a higher level in the organization, and know more about research-based transfer findings (Hutchins & Burke, 2007).

2. Trainer characteristics relevant specifically to diversity training are as follows.

    a. Trainer culture is important. International trainers may not be as effective due to the disconnect between the trainer's culture and the trainee's culture (Holladay & Quinones, 2005). A cultural mismatch between the trainer and trainee can reduce training effectiveness because it inhibits the trainer's ability to deliver the material in an effective way (Holladay & Quinones, 2005, 2008; Osman-Gani & Zidan, 2001).

    b. Gebert et al. (2017) outlined four different diversity training models, their objectives, and corresponding trainer beliefs for implementing each one. They advocated the inclusion model, which includes emphasizing a spirit of inquiry where individuals express their differences and others do not accept them blindly but engage in a dialogue to better understand one another.

        1) There are two barriers to learning that typically result in unsuccessful diversity training initiatives. One is that dogmatic communication patterns can occur in groups. Another is that trainees may say what they think they should say to be politically correct instead of saying what they want to say.

           i.   These barriers occur because trainers ignore, misinterpret, or reinforce these two phenomena.

    ii.   A tolerance-centered diversity training design helps reduce these two issues. However, the word "tolerance" implies that there is something wrong with others that trainees should tolerate. Hence, revisiting the application of "tolerance," per se, might be of utility.

2) A training (inclusion-based) model that is process oriented, as opposed to outcome oriented, is reportedly most effective.

3) Trainer beliefs are key to effective diversity and inclusion training. According to Gebert et al. (2017), ideal trainers do the following.

    i.   Perceive and emphasize that their own (and others') values are discretionary, socially constructed, and historically dependent (i.e., not the one and only truth). This allows trainees to view everyone's values as plausible and justifiable, encouraging tolerating, accepting, or embracing others' views. Intolerance occurs when one views their values as definitive truth and universally valid, which might lead trainers to stop others from articulating their values.

    ii.   Deal with different identities by understanding.

    iii.   Display an inquisitive and balancing teaching method.

    iv.   Refrain from superiority claims to prevent feelings of exclusion.

    v.   Focus on opposing values.

    vi.   View a relationship between "me" and "we" as compatible only if tolerance is high.

Summary: Literature on Trainer and Diversity Trainer Characteristics

1. Common sense is not always common practice. Effective trainers are high in openness to experience and competent in the topics they discuss. Effective equal opportunity trainers and EOAs have superior cross-cultural competence, which includes capability and motivation.

2. They display empathy, sincerity, honesty, and tolerance by refraining from viewing their own or others' views/values as the one and only truth.

3. Effective trainers and advisors spur conversation and encourage questions, show interest by listening to the trainees, and proactively resolve conflicts.

4. Lastly, they manifest a high level of self-reflection and perspective-taking by asking questions and spurring conversation that fosters critical thinking among trainees.

<div align="center">

Optional Approaches for Assessing EOAs

</div>

The descriptions above, the information provided in Appendix A, the documentation provided in DEOMI training materials, and anecdotal data collectively provide a rich source of understanding of what EOAs do and how they are trained. Consequently, further discussion of their characteristics is likely of limited utility. Accordingly, attention now focuses on how DEOMI might conduct the assessments, which existing and relevant assessments were examined, and what assessments are recommended for consideration by DEOMI leadership.

As mentioned previously, four purposes of assessments are considered in this paper: (a) as a screening device for selecting candidates for the EOAC/EOARCC training program; (b) to identify candidates needing remedial training (to be applied if DEOMI eliminated or reduced the self-awareness/socialization activities in the curriculum); (c) to provide feedback to students, which could be applied to constructing individual development plans; and (d) to assess patterns of scores across students and cohorts that might inform curriculum development. This paper

considers six approaches: simulations, knowledge assessments, biodata, self-report measures, situational judgment tests, and behavioral ratings by others.

Simulations

As used in assessment centers, this approach is very expensive but typically yields strong prediction of actual subsequent behavior. Individuals receive scenarios in which they must act out a role requiring them to respond to others acting in roles that represent multicultural situations. This approach offers a highly realistic assessment format that can closely match actual situations that EOAs are likely to experience. Because the situation is happening in real time, each respondent must provide a behavioral response as opposed to selecting their preferred option from a list of possible responses. Note that evaluating these responses necessitates highly trained observers. While developing the scenarios and testing protocol is time-consuming and requires rigorous methodological approaches, it may be that the DEOMI research and training staff personnel currently possess the expertise to produce such simulations.

Knowledge Assessments

DEOMI can ascertain knowledge of cross-cultural and other forms of information relevant to EOAs by such traditional modes of assessment as multiple-choice knowledge questions, short-answer exams, essay exams, etc. Licensing exams for many critical professions rely primarily on knowledge assessment.

Biodata

Biographical data—or biodata—report historical experiences, personal preferences, personality, cognitive ability, and other constructs relevant to identifying the characteristics of effective EOAs. The recommendations section presents more detail on biodata.

Self-Report Measures

Researchers typically assess cross-cultural competence, personality, and related constructs through self-report measures (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). The Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey is a self-report measure. With this methodology, respondents typically rate the degree to which they agree with statements reflecting various issues. This approach is relatively inexpensive and easy to implement and administer. Unfortunately, efforts to engage in strategic self-presentation tend to influence self-report data (Tesser & Paulhus, 1983). Anecdotal data from DEOMI trainers indicate that faking and acting are nontrivial problems in the training courses.

Situational Judgment Tests

This methodology involves presenting a realistic scenario to participants (Motowidlo, Dunnette, & Carter, 1990). Participants select or generate what they consider to be the appropriate response. For DEOMI purposes, participants would receive a narrative description of a cross-cultural situation, followed by multiple-choice response options. Participants would select the option that most closely fits with what they would do in such a situation. Alternatively, respondents would provide open-ended responses; however, this would require highly trained evaluators to score responses. Again, this is an expensive approach, but doing so is not beyond the expertise of current DEOMI training and research staff members.

Behavioral Ratings by Others

Others who have had exposure to the EOA trainees or prospective trainees can provide assessments. This would require a major project of DEOMI training and research staff to identify the criteria and develop response options, most likely in the form of behavioral anchors. A typical problem, however, with behavioral ratings provided by others is that raters often are

motivated to provide ratings consistent with their agendas (e.g., the desire for a particular member of the team to be transferred to DEOMI) rather than a genuine response to the issues asked.

Issues in Assessment Development

This section addresses four issues: standards necessary for the assessment to reach from a professional perspective, mode of administration, reactions of test-takers, and psychometric issues.

Given the importance of the EOA role, it is likely that tests used to assess or pre-assess EOAs should meet requirements of the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, which is a joint publication of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). However, this is optional; DEOMI might deem lower standards acceptable, depending on resources available to implement the assessment.

A second issue involves the mode of administration: paper and pencil, online, proctored or un-proctored, and synchronous or asynchronous provision of instruction. Clearly, security is an issue. However, the nature of the assessment may not require high-level security applications, which might work out fine (e.g., Nye, Do, Drasgow, & Fine, 2008).

A third issue involves reactions among the test-takers. Negative reactions to assessments can reduce test-taker motivation to perform well on the test (Arvey, Strickland, Drauden, & Martin, 1990) and subsequent motivation on the job (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991). As it is important for EOAs to buy into the concept of being EOA and supporting the DEOMI mission, it is of utility to not alienate EOA trainees and prospective trainees. Therefore, it is important that the assessment has a high level of face validity as well as yields perceptions of procedural

fairness. The use of an assessment that test-takers do not see as fair would likely be very problematic in any environment, but it would likely be particularly problematic in a curriculum that addresses interpersonal and procedural justice issues.

A fourth issue involves psychometric issues. The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association et al., 2014) provides definitive guidelines for the development and implementation of assessments. These guidelines involve more than simply reliability and validity. Any assessment DEOMI implements should manifest evidence of both content validity and criterion-related validity at minimum.

Available Assessments Considered

The study considered 25 available measures. Appendix B provides very brief descriptions. The focus was on five categories of assessments: measures of (a) inclusion, intrapersonal skills, and cultural competence; (b) unconscious bias; (c) sexism; (d) modern racism; and (e) communication styles. While some of these measures likely have some utility, it is most likely that a comprehensive assessment designed to predict specific criteria reflecting effective EOA performance would be the optimal solution. Nevertheless, below is a list of the existing measures considered to be relevant and, therefore, considered in this study:

Measures of Inclusion, Intrapersonal Skills, and Cultural Competence

1. Inclusion Skills Measurement Profile
2. Cultural Intelligence measure
3. Tolerance scale
4. Intercultural sensitivity scale
5. Individual authenticity measure at work
6. Basic Empathy Scale

7. Interpersonal Reactivity Scale

8. Tolerance for Ambiguity Scale

9. Self-Reflection and Insight Scale

10. A measure of openness to experience, such as available in the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)

11. A measure of agreeableness, such as available in the IPIP

12. A measure of emotional stability, such as available in the IPIP

Measures of Unconscious Bias

13. Implicit Association Test

14. Affect Misattribution Procedure

15. Weapons Identification Task

Measures of Sexism

16. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

17. Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale

18. Modern Sexism Scale

19. Neosexism Scale

Measures of Modern Racism

20. Modern Racism Scale

21. Symbolic Racism Scale

Measures of Communication Styles

22. Communication Styles Inventory

23. Perceived Managerial Communication Styles scale

24. Communication Flexibility Scale

25. Interpersonal Reactivity Index

Assessment Recommendations

Before hiring a vendor or purchasing services or an existing assessment, it DEOMI must achieve three objectives. First, DEOMI needs to explicitly identify the specific purpose or purposes of the assessment. As mentioned previously in this paper, there are at least four possible purposes of EOA assessments that are likely to be considered: (1) as a screening device for selecting candidates for the EOAC/EOARCC training program; (2) to identify candidates needing remedial training (to be applied if DEOMI eliminated or reduced the self-awareness/socialization activities in the curriculum); (3) to provide feedback to students, which could be applied to constructing individual development plans; and (4) to assess patterns of scores across students and cohorts that might inform curriculum development. This paper considers six approaches: simulations, knowledge assessments, biodata, self-report measures, situational judgment tests, and behavioral ratings by others.

A second objective is to develop an explicit and definitive consensus as to what constitutes effective and ineffective performance among the EOAs. What outcomes and behaviors reflect success and failure? While a carefully conducted study is likely to expand and develop a nuanced understanding of what constitutes effective performance, at least a politically agreed upon definition is necessary. Before the study begins, only with that clarity can we found a detailed application of performance criteria to develop and validate the assessments. These definitions may include clarification of key competencies, such as cross-cultural competence and related interpersonal skill constructs.

A third objective would be to ensure that stakeholders across the Services as well as existing EOAs buy into the approach that DEOMI will likely implement. It is not uncommon

for political considerations to negate the implementation of very well-designed assessment tools. Related to this objective is the need to provide documentation regarding the psychometric characteristics of the assessment, including both content and criterion-related validity.

Having raised these three issues, I will offer recommendations for consideration by DEOMI leadership.

Recommended Commercially Available Instrument(s)

There are two approaches that I recommend for focused consideration. One is a fully customized biodata test. The alternative is a commercially available, off-the-shelf instrument that can be partially customized for the EOA job and job family.

ADEPT-15®

Aon's ADEPT-15® is a Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology award-winning personality test. It may be the only personality test that successfully empirically designed to prevent faking. It employs modem data science and advanced psychometric techniques to mitigate socially desirable responding (i.e., prevents people from trying to game the test). Consequently, it likely provides an unusually accurate prediction of on-the-job behavior. Marriott Corporation and other large companies use it worldwide.

It looks at task style, adaptation style, achievement style, teamwork style, emotional style, and interaction style. It can be configured or altered along with other Aon measures to provide a valid psychometric instrument to predict effectiveness among EOA advisors. Anecdotal data from members of style as well as personal experience suggests that Aon's products are the best available in terms of easily customizable, off-the-shelf

psychometric measures as relevant for the needs of DEOMI.

Customized Biodata Test

Biodata tests, or biographical tests, measure multiple constructs and generally are not commercially available off-the-shelf. That is, the most valid biodata tests are custom designed from scratch for a specific organization, job, or job family. Biodata tests may measure personality, unconscious biases, sexism, covert racism, communication styles, personal preference, cognitive ability, and historical behavior.

Historical behavior reflects what people have done earlier in their lives. For example, Caligiuri and Tarique (2011) found that non-work international experiences (e.g., international volunteering) were related to cross-cultural competencies. Empirically identified linkages between experiences and prediction of aspects of criterion job performance are not necessarily grounded in theory. However, the linkages often make intuitive sense. For example, we know that successful information technology programmers typically did well in English and grammar courses; programming requires adapt language skills, so this is not surprising. We know that effective air traffic controllers have a history of interest and success in playing spatial boardgames, such as chess; air traffic control requires understanding where aircraft are in three-dimensional space. We know that people who are likely to quit a job are those who must commute multiple times on the bus to work; it is not surprising that inconvenience and strain from travel yield voluntary turnover.

Historical behavior provides cues to other aspects, such as personality. Items might require respondents to identify five to seven alternatives to how they would respond to an abusive coworker or customer; the options would likely include behaviors reflecting low

agreeableness, low conscientiousness, and/or low emotional stability.

Items might ask respondents to indicate how many clubs they belonged to in high school; this reflects engagement. Data reveal that two is the magic number, as not being in a club or in just one club is a relatively low reflection of engagement. In contrast, some people lie and indicate that they were in a high number of high school organizations; in some cases, they may not be lying but might have joined for purposes of looking competitive on a college application (i.e., not a reflection of engagement in the high school community).

Other items might ask questions about study habits and school experiences in elementary school. For example, we know that there is a magic number of books that elementary students read on average per week and that this number of books is a proxy for cognitive ability in some cases. The point here is that biodata tests include a variety of constructs that can predict multiple behavioral criteria.

Biodata Test Development

The process for developing a biodata test involves four steps.

Step One

First, the test designer would meet with incumbent EOAs as well as with supervisors of the current EOAs. The former meetings would provide the designer with insight into the experiences, personal preferences, and abilities of EOAs. The latter meetings would provide the designer with information on what constitutes effective and ineffective EOA performance. Both are critical because the information from the EOAs will guide the design of the test, and the information from their supervisors will guide the scoring of the test.

Step Two

The second step involves the construction of two psychometric measures. One is the biodata test itself, which typically features items with unique response anchors relevant only to each item. The other is a criterion form that includes behaviors reflecting effective performance. Incumbent EOAs would complete the former measure, and their supervisors would complete the latter measure. In other words, the incumbents would be describing their historical behavior, personal preferences, etc., and the supervisors would be rating the behaviors and performance of each of the incumbents.

Step Three

The third step consists of scoring the biodata test that would be used for selecting EOAs. This is a lengthy and complicated procedure in which the test is scored multiple times—one time for each criterion variable. In other words, many of the items can be used to predict different behavioral outcomes, but they must be scored differently. Examples of different outcomes include cultural agility, agreeableness, problem identification, emotional stability, listening skills, empathy, and conscientiousness. The test developer would examine the profile of responses of the EOAs who the immediate supervisor rated as effective or ineffective (these ratings are in a continuum) on each of the behavioral outcomes. Hence, high scores on the test would reflect that the test-taker has a similar profile to existing successful EOAs. In contrast, low scores on the test would reflect that the test-taker has a similar profile to existing unsuccessful EOAs. This is what is unique about biodata tests and makes them more potent and accurate than off-the-shelf or slightly customized measures. The downside, of course, is that biodata tests are only as accurate as the quality of criterion data that they get from supervisors and biodata that they get from

incumbents. In other words, the quality of the biodata test produced is a function of the quality of information provided by incumbents and their supervisors.

Step Four

The final step would consist of validating the test on existing incumbents who were not part of the test construction project. Those incumbent EOAs would take the customized test, and their supervisors would rate their effectiveness on the relevant performance and behavioral criteria. This step would allow the test developer to ensure that the test scoring protocol is accurate and valid. This step is necessary for both legal and psychometric reasons.

Validity of Biodata Tests and Summary

As reflected in the academic articles accompanying this report, well-designed biodata tests are accurate, reliable, and valid. They contribute unique variance over-and-above the variance contributed by off-the-shelf measures of personality and cognitive ability.

There are three main problems with biodata tests. First, they are not inexpensive to develop because of the required amount of time on the part of test developers to collect and gather data, as well as to design, score, and validate the test. Second, biodata tests may degrade in their capacity to predict behavior, particularly when the definition of success on the job changes. Third, developing biodata tests requires considerable time, although it usually can be done within one quarter of a calendar year.

The primary advantages of the biodata test designed for EOAs are twofold. First, the test is likely to be considerably stronger in prediction than other available tests. Accordingly, a biodata test is likely to better screen out potentially dysfunctional EOAs. Just one dysfunctional EOA can fail to prevent to a hostile work environment that yields nontrivial negative impacts on uniformed personnel—negative impacts that can yield very expensive litigation, incredibly

unflattering press coverage, and early retirements for multiple officers in the chain of command.

Second, biodata tests often have greater face validity among applicants and among decision-

makers, such that all stakeholders tend to have confidence in the selection system. Notably,

biodata tests typically yield no evidence of adverse impact against minorities.

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National

Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and*

psychological testing. American Educational Research Association.

https://www.testingstandards.net/uploads/7/6/6/4/76643089/standards_2014edition.pdf

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of

cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*(1), 100–123.

Arvey, R. D., Strickland, W., Drauden, G., & Martin, C. (1990). Motivational components of test

taking. *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 695–716.

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have

been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(2),

207–227.

Caligiuri, P., & Tarique, I. (2009). Developing managerial and organizational cultural agility. In

C. Cooper & R. Burke (Eds.), *The peak performing organization*. Routledge Publishers.

Caligiuri, P., Noe, R., Nolan, R., Ryan, A., & Drasgow, F. (2011). *Training, developing, and*

assessing cross-cultural competence in military personnel. (Technical Report No. 1284)

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Cameron, C. D., Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., & Payne, B. K. (2012). Sequential priming measures of

implicit social cognition: A meta-analysis of associations with behavior and explicit

attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *16*(4), 330–350.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). *The development and validation of the Intercultural*

Sensitivity Scale. University of Rhode Island.

Crano, W. D. & Prislin, R. (2006). Attitudes and persuasion. In S.T. Fiske, A. E. Kazdin, & D. L. Schacter (Eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology* (pp. 345–374). Annual Reviews.

Dahlstrom, W. G., Welsh, G. S., & Dahlstrom, L.E. (1975) *An MMPI handbook: Vol. 2. Research applications*. University of Minnesota Press.

Dasgupta, S. A., Suar, D., & Singh, S. (2014). Managerial communication practices and employees' attitudes and behaviours: A qualitative study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 19*(3), pp. 287–302. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-04-2013-0023

Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10*, 85.

de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Konings, F. E., & Schouten, B. (2013). The communication styles inventory (CSI) a six-dimensional behavioral model of communication styles and its relation with personality. *Communication Research*, *40*(4), 506–532.

Gebert, D., Buengeler, C., & Heinitz, K. (2017). Tolerance: a neglected dimension in diversity training? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *16*(3), 415–438.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491–512.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. *Personality Psychology in Europe*, *7*(1), 7–28.

Grant, A. M., Franklin, J., & Langford, P. (2002). The self-reflection and insight scale: A new measure of private self-consciousness. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *30*(8), 821–835.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in

    implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of personality and social*

    psychology, *74*(6), 1464.

Haines, E. L., & Sumner, K. E. (2013). Digging deeper or piling it higher? Implicit measurement

    in organizational behavior and human resource management. *Human Resource*

    Management Review, *23*(3), 229–241.

Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M., J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The

    Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,*

    27, 421-443.

Harris, T. B., Chung, W., Hutchins, H. M., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2014). Do trainer style and learner

    orientation predict training outcomes? *Journal of workplace learning, 26*(5), 331–344.

    https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1108/JWL-05-2013-0031

Herman, J. L., Stevens, M. J., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (2010). The tolerance for

    ambiguity scale: Towards a more refined measure for international management research.

    International Journal of Intercultural Relations, *34*(1), 58–65.

Holladay, C. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2005). Reactions to diversity training: An international

    comparison. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *16*(4), 529–545.

Holladay, C. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2008). The influence of training focus and trainer

    characteristics on diversity training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Learning &*

    Education, *7*(3), 343–354.

Hutchins, H. M., & Burke, L. A. (2007). Identifying trainers' knowledge of training transfer

    research findings—closing the gap between research and practice. *International Journal*

    of Training and Development, *11*(4), 236–264.

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale. *Journal of Adolescence*, *29*(4), 589–611.

Kleinpenning, G., & Hagendoorn, L. (1993). Forms of racism and the cumulative dimension of ethnic attitudes. *Social psychology quarterly, 56*(1), 21–36. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/2786643

Leach, J. A. (1991). Characteristics of excellent trainers: A psychological and interpersonal profile. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *4*(3), 42–62.

Leach, J. (1996). Training, migration, and regional income disparities. *Journal of Public Economics*, *61*(3), 429–443.

Martin, M. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1994). Development of a communication flexibility measure. *Southern Communication Journal*, *59*, 171–178.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Academic Press.

Motowidlo, S. J., Dunnette, M. D., & Carter, G. W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 640–647.

Nye, C. D., Do, B.-R., Drasgow, F., Fine, S. (2008). Two-step testing in employee selection: Is score inflation a problem? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 16*, 112–120.

Osman-Gani, A. M., & Zidan, S. S. (2001). Cross-cultural implications of planned on-the-job training. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *3*(4), 452–460.

Rynes, S. L., Bretz, R. D., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 487–521.

Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(2), 247–270.

Spoor, J. R., & Lehmiller, J. J. (2014). The impact of course title and instructor gender on student perceptions and interest in a women's and gender studies course. *PloS ONE*, *9*(9), e106286. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0106286

Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *68*(2), 199.

Tesser, A. & Paulhus, D. (1983). The definition of self: Private and public self-evaluation management strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 672–682.

Towler, A. J., & Dipboye, R. L. (2001). Effects of trainer expressiveness, organization, and trainee goal orientation on training outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(4), 664.

Turnbull, H., Greenwood, R., Tworoger, L., & Golden, C. (2011). The inclusion skills measurement profile: Validating an assessment for identification of skill deficiencies in diversity and inclusion. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, *15*(1), 11–24.

Van den Bosch, R. & Taris, T.W. (2014), Authenticity at work: Development and validation of an individual authenticity measure at work. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, *15*(1), 1–18. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10902-013-9413-3

Volpert-Esmond, H. I., Scherer, L. D., & Bartholow, B. D. (2020). Dissociating automatic associations: Comparing two implicit measurements of race bias. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(4), 876–888.

Wentura, D., & Degner, J. (2010). A practical guide to sequential priming and related tasks. In B

Gawronski & B. K Payne (Eds.), *Handbook of implicit social cognition: Measurement,*

theory, and applications (pp. 95–116) The Guilford Press.

Appendix A

Cross-Cultural Competence Facilitators

Facilitating/Inhibiting Factors in Developing Cross-Cultural Competence	Dimensions	How Are These Acquired?
Knowledge and Cognition	• Self-awareness – have and desire greater personal insight with respect to how one is perceived and one's influence on others • Geopolitical issues • Global history • Culture knowledge • Regional knowledge	Learning
Skills and Abilities	• Cognitive ability • Communication • Negotiation • Influence • Diplomacy • Language skills	Learning may be influenced by natural ability or personality
Affect and Motivation	• Willingness and motivation to develop oneself, interact cross-culturally, and gain the skills to be effective in intercultural and multicultural situations • Willingness to suspend judgment and operate without racism (or other -isms)	Personality and learning
Personality or Dispositional Traits	• Openness, intellectual curiosity, and curiosity about others • Sociability and extraversion • Emotional strength and stability • Flexibility • Tolerance of ambiguity	Relatively stable personality characteristics, relatively difficult to change through intervention; some may be shaped, over time, by reinforcing behaviors that are consistent with the characteristics

Source: Caligiuri et al. (2011).

Appendix B

Possible Assessments: Measures of Inclusion, Intrapersonal Skills, and Cultural

Competence

1. The Inclusion Skills Measurement Profile (Turnbull, Greenwood, Tworoger, & Golden, 2011). This tool recognizes the skills gaps in organizational members (e.g., diversity sensitivity, valuing differences and key competencies, team inclusion, resolving conflict over differences, etc.).

2. The Cultural Intelligence measure (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006). This assesses cultural competence and sensitivity.

3. The Tolerance scale (Dahlstrom et al., 1975), assesses one's tolerance for others' views and beliefs (honesty and good faith, treating people fairly and compassionately, caring for others, trusting in fairness and justice).

4. The Intercultural sensitivity scale (Chen & Starosta, 2000).

5. The Individual authenticity measure at work (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2014).

6. The Basic Empathy Scale (Joliffe & Farrington, 2006).

7. The Interpersonal Reactivity Scale (Davis, 1980) measures perspective-taking, empathic concern, and compassionate feeling for others.

8. The Tolerance for Ambiguity Scale (refined version for international management; Herman et al. 2010).

9. The Self-Reflection and Insight Scale (Grant et al., 2002).

10. A measure of openness to experience, such as available in the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999).

11. A measure of agreeableness, such as available in the IPIP (Goldberg, 1999).

12. A measure of emotional stability, such as available in the IPIP (Goldberg, 1999).

Measures of Unconscious Bias

13. The Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). This is perhaps the most common and popular measure of unconscious bias. It assesses unconscious bias based on race, gender, sexual orientation, and national origin.

14. The Affect Misattribution Procedure (Payne et al., 2005). This sequential priming task briefly presents faces (Black or White person) at a subliminal level, followed by positive or negative words for participants to evaluate. The participant must determine if the word presented was a word or just a string of letters (nonword).

15. The Weapons Identification Task (Payne, 2001). This presents a prime (a picture of a Black or White person), followed by a target (a gun or a tool like a wrench), followed by a visual mask. Each visual is displayed for less than a second. Participants then have to categorize the target as a gun or a tool.

Measures of Sexism

16. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This assesses benevolent sexism, a framework which states that there are two components to sexism (hostile and benevolent). Hostile sexism refers to negative stereotypes (e.g., women are emotional), whereas benevolent sexism consists of seemingly positive views of another gender that actually are harmful (e.g., assuming a woman needs help with something).

17. The Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) was adapted from McConahay's (1986) scale. This one is about overt sexism; it is unlikely that people would endorse any of the items.

18. The Modern Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) was adapted from McConahay's (1986) scale. This one is comparatively more subtle than the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale.

19. The Neosexism Scale (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995) is presented in the context of Canada.

Modern Racism

20. The Modern Racism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) was adapted from McConahay's (1986) scale.

21. The Symbolic Racism Scale (Kleinpenning & Hagendoorn, 1993). Symbolic racism refers to perceptions that discrimination is a thing of the past, minorities' situations are a result of their unwillingness to work hard, minorities already received more than they should have, and they make too many demands.

Communication Styles

22. The Communication Styles Inventory (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings, & Schouten, 2011) includes 96 communication behavior items that assess 6 domain-level scales (expressiveness, preciseness, verbal aggressiveness, questioningness, emotionality, and impression manipulativeness). This is a general communication styles assessment that people use for different purposes.

23. The Perceived Managerial Communication Styles scale (Dasgupta, Suar, & Singh, 2013) features three dimensions—passive, aggressive, and assertive. Respondents answer these about their supervisor.

24. The Communication Flexibility Scale (Martin & Rubin, 1994) assesses interpersonal and communication skills. It applies scenarios that can reveal the individual's communication

styles that are relevant to EOAs. Participants receive a list of scenarios of communication styles. They indicate how much their behavior would be in line with the one described in the scenario (1–5).

25. The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980) measures fantasy scale, perspective taking, empathic concern, and personal distress.

Commercially Recommended Solutions

26. A custom-designed biodata measure.

27. Aon's ADEPT-15®, which is personality-based.