

# The Intercultural Development Inventory

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was formulated by Dr. Mitchell Hammer (1998) in cooperation with Dr. Milton Bennett. The IDI is a 60-item, theory-based paper and pencil instrument which measures five of the six major stages of the DMIS. The instrument is easy to complete, and it can generate a graphic profile of an individual's or group's predominant stage of development and a textual interpretation of that stage and associated transition issues. Knowledge of an individual's or group's predominant orientation toward cultural difference is extremely valuable for personal or organizational needs assessment, for education and training design, and for the evaluation of program effectiveness.

Most other tests of "intercultural competence" are criterion-referenced, in that they measure how close the respondent matches a set of characteristics or behaviors thought to be associated with intercultural competence. It is difficult to establish reliability and validity for such tests. As a theory-based test, the IDI can meet the standard scientific criteria for a valid psychometric instrument. Further, the IDI measures cognitive structure rather than attitudes. Thus, the instrument is less susceptible to situational factors, it is more stable, and it is more generalizable than other tests commonly in use.

Reliability of the IDI is extremely high. Items on the IDI are actual statements selected from interviews of a directed sample of 40 subjects representing cross-cultural and situational diversity (i.e., not limited to university students). All statements about cultural difference from the initial interviews were categorized by four raters with an inter-rater reliability of .85-.95 (Spearman's rho). Experts then reviewed the item pool and items were deleted which were not similarly categorized by five of the seven experts. The resulting 145-item inventory was then administered to 226 respondents from diverse backgrounds. Factor analysis established that the items constituted six discrete dimensions that corresponded to five of the six DMIS stages (Denial, Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, and two forms of Adaptation; the last stage, Integration, was not measured). Items constituting the six unidimensional scales of the final IDI obtained coefficient Alpha levels of .80 or better, meeting or exceeding the standard reliability criterion for individual and group psychometric diagnosis (Nunnally, 1978; DeVellis, 1991).

Validity of the IDI has been established in several ways. Content validity was established by using actual statements drawn from interviews, along with the reliable categorization of these statements by both raters and experts. Construct validity was established by correlating the IDI with the Worldmindedness Scale (Sampson and Smith, 1957; Wiseman, Hammer, and Nishida, 1989) and with the Intercultural Anxiety Scale, a modified version of the Social Anxiety Scale (Gao and Gudykunst, 1990). As expected, the IDI Ethnocentric Scales (Denial, Defense, and Minimization) correlate negatively with Worldmindedness and positively with Intercultural Anxiety, and conversely, the IDI Ethnorelative scales (Acceptance, Cognitive Adaptation, and Behavioral Adaptation) correlate positively with Worldmindedness and negatively with Intercultural Anxiety. Finally, the assumption that DMIS stages are sequential is supported in both the construct validity tests and by examining the internal correlation of the IDI scales.

Based on the exhaustive development and testing of the IDI for reliability and validity, it is fair to conclude that the instrument is measuring the cognitive states described by the DMIS, that those cognitive states are indeed associated with certain stable orientations toward cultural difference, and that development of intercultural sensitivity and competence actually occurs in the sequence suggested by the model.

## References

- Bennett, M.J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations 10 (2), 179-95.
- Bennett, M.J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), Education for the intercultural experience. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- DeVellis, R.F. (1991). Scale development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gao, G., & Gudykunst, W.B. (1990). Uncertainty, anxiety and adaptation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5, 301-317.
- Hammer, M.R. (1998). A measure of intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In S. Fowler & M. Fowler (Eds.), The intercultural sourcebook: Volume 2. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 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.