

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT INVENTORY (IDI)

The IDI represents a valid and reliable method of measuring individual and group orientations toward cultural differences as described in the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) theory. Items on the IDI are actual statements selected from interviews of a sample of 40 respondents representing cross-cultural and situation diversity (i.e., not limited to university students). Therefore, the items of the IDI are statements that reflect a wide range of cultural perspectives. All statements about cultural differences from the initial interviews were categorized using the DMIS theoretical framework by four raters with an inter-rater reliability of .85-.95 (Spearman's rho). Cross-cultural experts then reviewed the item pool and items were deleted which were not similarly categorized by five of the seven experts. Additional pilot tests were then conducted with a culturally diverse sample to insure item clarity, and a preliminary 60-item instrument based on this initial research was extensively field-tested.

The latest validation sample for a revised IDI consisted of 591 respondents from diverse backgrounds who responded to both original and revised items from the interview statements. Confirmatory Factor Analysis established that 50 items constituted the following dimensions or scales with their corresponding item reliabilities (coefficient

alpha) that meet or exceed standard reliability criterion for individual and group psychometric diagnosis (Nunnally, 1978; DeVellis, 1991):² DD (denial/defense) scale, 13 items, alpha = .85; R (reversal) scale, 9 items, alpha = .80; M (minimization scale), 9 items, alpha = .83; AA (acceptance/adaptation) scale, 14 items, alpha = .84; and EM (encapsulated marginality) scale, 5 items, alpha = .80.

Validity of the IDI was established in several ways. Content validity was established by using actual statements drawn from interviews, along with reliable categorization of these statements by both raters and the "panel of experts." Construct validity was established by correlating the IDI with the Worldmindedness scale (Sampson & Smith, 1957; Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989)³ and with the Intercultural Anxiety scale, a modified version of the Social Anxiety scale (Gao & Gudykunst, 1990).⁴ All construct validity tests supported the validity of each of the IDI scales.⁵

Finally, no significant differences were found on the IDI scales for age, education, gender, or social desirability. Overall, the development and testing of the IDI for reliability and validity reveals the instrument to be a robust measure of the cognitive states described by the DMIS, these identified worldviews are associated with stable orientations toward cultural differences, and the instrument is generalizable across cultures.

1 Bennett, M.J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 179-195.

Bennett, M.J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Hammer, M.R. (1998). A measure of intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In S. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.), *The Intercultural sourcebook: Volume 2* (pp. 61-72). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Hammer, M.R., & Bennett, M.J. (1998, 2001). *The Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: The Intercultural Communication Institute.

Hammer, M.R., Bennett, M.J., & Wiseman, R.L. (in press). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Special Issue*.

2 Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill; DeVellis, R.R. (1991). *Scale development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

3 Sampson, D.L., & Smith, H.P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 99-106; Wiseman, R.L., Hammer, M.R., & Nishida, H. (1989). Predictors of intercultural communication competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 349-370.

4 Gao, G., & Gudykunst, W.B. (1990). Uncertainty, anxiety and adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 5, 301-317.

5 For further data on the latest IDI reliability and validity studies, see M.R. Hammer, M.J. Bennett, & R.L. Wiseman (in press). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Special Issue*.

