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Problem and purpose

• Problem
  • Despite the proliferation of diversity and inclusion (D&I) programs and initiatives in both the public and private sectors, there is no broadly accepted empirical instrument shown to measure the tendency of individuals to demonstrate inclusive behavior in an organization.

• Purpose
  1. Survey and analyze the diversity, equity, and inclusion literature, systematically, to understand existing instruments and tools for measuring inclusive behavior in organizations.
  2. Develop advice, guidance, and recommendations for future research and inquiry based on observations from the literature.
Method

- Identified initial articles from Internet search (Turnbull et al., 2011) and developed search criteria for additional sources.

- Searched 6 electronic databases—PsycINFO, JSTOR, ProQuest, Academic Search Premier (EBSCO), ABI/INFORM Global, WorldCat.org—and 1 online search engine, Google Scholar.

- Scanned abstracts for 415 potential sources, selected 34 for detailed review (24 journal articles, 5 dissertations, 3 conference proceedings, 1 book chapter, 1 government report).

- Reviewed refined set of 34 sources in detail, synthesized existing literature, identified relationships and gaps across sources, and developed point of view regarding future research. Also, identified limitations to this study.
Search criteria, delimitations

- Robust and rigorous: Peer-reviewed articles, chapters from textbooks, dissertation (master or doctoral), conference proceedings, government publications.

- Contextually relevant: Published post-9/11. The September 11 attacks radically altered the D&I narrative with respect to race, ethnicity, immigration status, and religious affiliation, particularly in the United States, where most studies on this topic have been conducted (Rodriguez, 2008).

- Both keywords represented in title and abstract: Although inconsistently defined across the literature, when only one term appears prominently, it strongly suggests an incomplete understanding of the concepts.

- Specific focus on measurement: Majority of D&I studies are statistical analyses of demographics.
Results, findings, discussion

- Inconsistent definitions.
- Centered Whiteness and proactively managed White Fragility (DiAngelo, 2011).
- Most instruments were created by the researcher(s), lack longitudinal results and often demonstrated poor reliability, validity, generalizability.
- Heavy on opinion, light on substance (Eagly, 2016).
Strengths and limitations

- First-of-its-kind comprehensive review of inclusion measurement tools in the literature.
- Large sample of sources gathered from multiple databases.
- Inconsistency of definitions and frequency of term usage presented coding challenges.
- US-focused, generalizability unclear.
Avenues of future inquiry

• Formalized definitions of key terms.
• Articulation of policy and practice aims for D&I.
• Mediating Whiteness and White Fragility in D&I studies.
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