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Abstract

**Purpose** – Openness to diversity is the acceptance of similarities and dissimilarities between the individuals or a group one belongs to. Based on the literature on Openness to Diversity, the purpose of this paper is to develop and validate a scale on Openness to Diversity among individuals.

**Design/methodology/approach** – In this study, scale development procedure is followed comprising with the steps of item generation and selection, scale refinement and scale validation. The methodology entailed the compilation of a literature review and conduction of qualitative interviews and expert ratings to generate and modify items. This study conceptualizes the construct of Openness to Diversity and generated an initial 29-item OPD scale. A total of 253 responses are collected from a three-month internet-based and personal based survey. Kaiser-Meyer Olkin test and Bartlett’s test were conducted for sampling adequacy and sphericity of data and construct validity was done by factor analysis. Based on the sample data, this study provides an empirical validation of the OPD construct and its underlying dimensionality and develops a generic OPD scale with desirable psychometric properties, including reliability, content validity, criterion-related validity, convergent validity, discriminant validity.

**Findings** – A final 12-item OPD scale covering three dimensions of Openness to Diversity has been developed.

**Originality/value** – The paper describes the construction and validation of a new scale measuring Openness to Diversity. The instrument can be used by the policy makers and human resource practitioners. OPD scale provides practitioners and researchers with a promising tool, with implications for measuring the openness of the professional for promoting diversity at workplace and also how individuals identify with each other and see the world at a global level.
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"Understand the distinctions; follow up on the shared characteristics." - Andrew Masondo, African National Congress
"Quality lies in contrasts, not in likenesses" — Stephen R. Brood

Introduction:
In a very recent incident Uber's CEO, Travis Kalanick apologized for diversity failings at his organization after a previous employee claimed for being tortured and discriminated while working there. The CEO, apologizes for the absence of diversity in the organization's workforce and for not reacting to employees grievances. In front of everyone he told that “as a leader he will be working on the diversity issues at workplace and improve the environment”. There have also been many questions related to gender diversity among Uber’s technology teams. At this he mentioned that “ he will be creating a workplace where a deep sense of justice can be seen among employees, and every Uber employee will feel proud of the culture that will be embedded by employees combined efforts to set a new standard for justice in the workplace (Source: Bloomberg Technology and Mashable.com, 2017). This could question for lack of capability to handle diversity. This critical incident leads the globalised world to the importance of openness to diversity and developing capabilities towards managing diverse work force in organizations. Openness to diversity has become a pertinent requisite for organisations post-globalization. Diversity is encouraged by personalities like NR Narayana Murthy of Infosys and the late legendary Steve Jobs of Apple who put their personal reputations at stake to promote diversity (Source: Bloomberg Technology).

In recent years, many organizations have had to adjust their human resource management strategies in response to both domestic workforce diversity and global business expansion (Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991; Tung, 1986). Both of these environmental factors, domestic diversity and global competition, have given rise to the need for a new type of employee in organizations. The organizations of today needs individuals who are open and responsive to diversity and can wholeheartedly accept diversity as a competitive gains for their associations. At a very fast pace organizations are extending their operations worldwide, they too have a rising requirement for representatives who can work adequately in foreign conditions, with remote partners, customers, and so forth. Both intra-national and worldwide diversity, accordingly, have encouraged the requirement for employees who have the adaptive personalities which would empower them to culturally assimilate in diverse circumstances. In this paper we endeavour to study openness to diversity with reference to how open people are in regards to their inclination for novel experiences and interactive over contrasts; which is likely to involve engaging in new activities, aesthetics, visiting new places, and/or trying new cuisines. This scale is likely to have implications for organisations in how an employee open to diversity fits into the organization and adjust itself with the differences in context of culture, personality, gender, language, religion, etc. Thus an employee would show high individual and team performance in the organization which in turn would help management organizations understand the increasing importance of openness to diversity in multicultural settings.

Diversity and its Dimensions
The term diversity refers to personal differences relating to gender, ethnicity, culture, age and disability (EEO Trust 2008; Milliken and Martins 1996). Nkomo and Taylor define diversity as "a blend of individuals with various gathering of personalities inside a similar social framework" (Nkomo and Taylor, 1999). Loden and Rosener's (1991) divided diversity into two parts: Primary and secondary dimensions. He clarify the primary dimensions as the unchangeable contrasts that are inborn and importantly affect our improvement in early socialization and for our progressing life (Loden and Rosener, 1991). These would incorporate age, sex, ethnicity, physical components, race and sexual
introduction. The secondary dimensions are clarified as things that can be changed, for example, geographic area, marital status and religious beliefs. Loden and Rosener (1991) underscore that these two measurements are both vital to how individuals identify with others and see the world at a global level (Loden and Rosener, 1991).

Wellner (2000) defines diversity as speaking to a large number of individual contrasts and likenesses that exist among individuals. Diversity can envelop a wide range of human attributes, for example, race, age, doctrine, national starting point, religion, ethnicity, sexual introduction. The attributes speaking to differing qualities are shown in Gardenswartz and Rowe's (1994) Four Layers of Diversity Model. Gardenswartz and Rowe (1994) portrayed diversity as resembling an onion, having layers that once peeled away uncovers the centre. As per Gardenswartz and Rowe (1994) the four layers of diversity are organizational factors, internal factors, external factors, and individual identity.

There are various factors that contribute to difference among individuals. The two main models are: The Iceberg Model given by Bryant Rollins & Shirley Stetson which describes two levels of diversity, one is below the water line (religion, attitude,) and other is above (Race, gender, age). The second model is: Diversity Wheel which was given by Marilyn Loden & Judy Rosener (1991) which describes three dimensions of diversity and it includes, Primary/Internal Dimension Exert primary influence on one’s identity (race, gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, physical ability ); Secondary/External Dimension less visible, add more subtle richness to the primary dimensions of diversity (religion, education, geographic location, status, income, group membership ) and Tertiary/Organizational Dimension (work location, professional affiliation, union status, management status, work field ).

**Diversity in Indian Context:**

Indian culture is an amalgamation of several cultures and is one of the oldest and unique cultures. India is a culturally diversified country. Diversity includes cultural factors such as race, gender, age, colour, physical ability, ethnicity, etc. (Kundu and Turan, 1999). The north, south, east, west and central regions have their own distinct culture. It is a birthplace of Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism and Christians. Different religions have different cultures. The way of greeting differ across different state and religion, e.g. in northern region we have Namaste (Hindi), Sat Shri Akal (Punjabi, used by followers of Sikhism), in southern region we have Namaskar (Marathi), Namaskara (Kannada), Namaskaram (Telugu, Malayalam), Vanakkam (Tamil), Nomoskar (Assamese), in west we have Nomoshkaar (Bengali), Jai Shri Krishna, Ram and Jainendra a common greeting used across Jain community, Jai Bhim used by Buddhist ( Jyoti & Kaur, 2015).

Indian states and regions have local festivals depending on prevalent religions and linguistic demographics. Popular religious festivals include the Hindu festivals of Navratri, Diwali, Holi, Dussehra, MahaShivatri, Durga puja, etc. Sikh festivals include Guru Nanak Jayanti, Baisakhi, etc. Islamic festival includes Eid-up-Fitr, Eid-ul-Adha, Muharram, Shab-e-Barat, etc. Christian celebrates Christmas and Good Friday.

Food is an integral part of human culture. Indian food is as diverse as India. Indian cuisine varies from region to region, cultural diversity and varied demographics of the country. Indian cuisine can be split into five categories – northern, southern, eastern, western and north-eastern. People from northern region consumes rice, wheat and dal and fish-based cuisine are common in eastern states of India. People from southern states mostly consume food made from rice (Idle, Dosa, Utapam, Upma, etc.) and they use coconut oil for preparing almost every cuisine.
Dress in India enormously fluctuates across over various parts of the nation and is impacted by neighbourhood culture, topography, atmosphere and provincial/urban setting. Ladies in northern India wear Salwar-Kameez and men wear Kurta-Pyajama; in southern locale ladies wear Sari and men wear Lungi-Kurta; in western area ladies wear Lengha-Choli and men wear Dhoti-Kurta.

Likewise a language in India also varies across different religion and states. Hindi is often associated with Hinduism, Urdu is generally associated with Muslims, Tamil is spoken in Tamil Nadu, Punjabi in Punjab, Bengali in Bengal, Gujarati in Gujarat, etc. Therefore, we can find diversity in almost every aspect in India. India is one of the diverse countries in the world. Its diversity aspects are rooted in the socio-cultural factors and emerging trends in demography. The diversity dimensions are discussed under two heads: socio-cultural dimensions and demographic dimension.

**Socio-Cultural Dimension**

Socio-Cultural dimensions include caste, religion and language Caste has always been a major source of diversity in Indian society and therefore in Indian organizations. A caste is one of the traditional social classes into which people are divided in a Hindu society and any of the four major hereditary classes, namely the Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaisya, and Sudra into which Hindu society is divided. Religion is one of the key facets of diversity, along with race, gender, disability and age. India is a secular, multi-religious and multicultural country. It's a land from where important religions namely Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism and Jainism have originated at the same time have flourished and survived the influence of religions like Islam and Christianity and is home to several indigenous faiths tribal religions. Indian work places are as well multi-religion, demonstrating the population from various regions of India. Further, given the centuries of assimilation and accommodation, diversity in religion is acceptable in Indian workplaces and does not create conflict (Rao, 2012, Gebert, 2011). People are directly affected by the religious beliefs, norms and practices of others and need to develop awareness of the issues, and processes to manage religion at work. Religion determines the work culture and behaviour of individuals too. India is a multilingual country and the constitution accords to protect the multilingual nature of India. In terms of linguistic diversity, it has a variety of languages and dialects. People are identified with certain linguistic, ethnic, religious or cultural groups through ones mother tongue (Budhwar, 2003).

**Demographic Dimension**

Demographic dimensions include gender, age and region. India is a large country having continental dimensions and comprising 29 States/regions and 7 Union Territories. Regionalism in India has roots pre-independence when it was used as tool to keep India divided. These regions vary by languages, topographic and climatic variations along with differences in the settlement pattern. Each of these regions is a distinct cultural region with distinct cultural heritage, folklore, myths, symbolism and historical traditions. These are the areas with distinct geographical boundaries and have common cultural elements (Bhattacharyya, 2005). Women, constitutes nearly 50% of India’s population. According to the provisional population totals of Census 2011, women make 48.46% (586.5 Million) of Indian population. According to Census 2011, the proportion of economically active population (15-59 years) has increased from 53.4 to 56.3 percent during 1971 to 1981 and 57.7 to 62.5 per cent during 1991 to 2011. Of which 19.2% of population is in the age group of 15-24 years. And India’s median age has risen from around 22 years in 2001 to over 24 years in
Age groups have their own unique attitudes, ambitions, views, motivation tools, mind-sets, communication styles and approach toward work and career. This makes it an important dimension of workforce diversity to give attention and a challenge to create a harmonious workplace. The current workforce has the largest pool of young generation, which has highly differentiating characteristics particularly in India as they are grown in the era of liberalization from 1991 and has seen abundance options and affluence early in life due to globalization. The contemporary Indian organizations have interesting mix of baby Boomers (most of those would be holding top positions and leadership roles or joining post retirement), Gen X (most of those would be senior professionals and managerial positions) Gen Y (the youngest workforce at all entry levels), would be working side by side (Budhwar, 2003).

Cultural and Linguistic Diversity
Cultural diversity is characterized as the presence of various distinctive nationalities among the staff. Cultural diversity could be portrayed as a type of deep-level heterogeneity (Jackson et al., 1995) and might be seen as a task-relevant differing qualities in organizations since worldwide individuals have been attracted to the association to utilize their particular capacities and along these lines may offer complimentary data and aptitudes. Linguistic diversity is conceptualized as the nearness of a huge number of speakers of various national dialects in a similar work assemble. Constructive outcomes of phonetic differing qualities in non-English talking settings could be the incorporation of association individuals with unrivalled English dialect aptitudes that could be utilized as a part of universal courses and in worldwide production procedures (Lillis and Curry, 2006).

Openness to Diversity
Many authors have given definitions from different perspectives. Sawyerr et al. (2005) define openness to diversity as an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both similarities and differences that exist among people. They examined openness to diversity on the following dimensions: linguistic, visible, value, and informational diversity. Linguistic diversity represents the communicative dimension of dissimilarity which is often ignored in diversity studies (Jonsen et al., 2011). When individuals are open to linguistic diversity, they are accepting of each other's varying language proficiency, vocabulary, and accents (Klitmøller and Lauring, 2013; Lauring and Selmer, 2012). Visible diversity is representative of the surface-level of demographic heterogeneity (Harrison et al., 1998). When individuals are open to visible diversity, they show no discriminatory attitudes toward those who look different, e.g., are of a different gender, race, or age group. Value diversity, on the other hand, is a deep-level type of diversity (Tyran and Gibson, 2008). Openness to other individuals’ different values means tolerance for differences in opinions, world view, and cultural behaviours. Finally, informational diversity represents the variations in knowledge that are often described as the true value of diversity (Ely and Thomas, 2001). When individuals show openness to informational diversity, they are inclusive of different information and different sources of knowledge available within the group (Homan et al., 2007).

Another nomenclature that has emerged in the understanding of the term diversity and openness to diversity are sensitivity to diversity, cultural diversity, linguistic diversity, age diversity etc. At last, enlightening assorted qualities speaks to the varieties in learning that are frequently depicted as the genuine estimation of differing qualities (Ely and Thomas, 2001). At the point when people demonstrate openness to educational diversity,
they are comprehensive of various data and diverse wellsprings of information accessible inside the gathering (Homan et al., 2007).

**Sensitivity to Diversity**

Sensitivity to diversity can be characterized as individual contrasts in their inclination to notice contrasts inside one's gathering. It has been contended that such propensities speak to an inside condition of individual characteristic. Very much same as identity qualities, the attribute of sensitivity to differences may begin in a social learning process through which individuals discover that they will fulfill certain inborn needs from specific sorts of behaviour and experiences (House et al., 1996). A man may build up his/her sensitivity to differences attribute during the time spent reacting to external stimuli, for example, numerical uniqueness, character primes, and preferences (Randel, 2002). At the point when the resulting social order in view of that specific character expands a man's self-regard, social support, and so forth he/she might probably see that personality later on and utilize it as the reason for social arrangement. After some time, it forms into general behavioural and intellectual propensities of the person. In fact, this social learning procedure is referred to as a redefinition procedure that impeded individuals experience to develop positive social personalities (Atewologun and Singh, 2010; Kyriakidou, 2012). The broad definitions on diversity, openness to diversity, sensitivity to diversity and assorted attributes of diversity together throw up a number of categories such as cultural diversity, age diversity, linguistic diversity, gender diversity etc., under which the diversity area of study has progressed.

Table 1: Prior Research on Scale of Openness to Diversity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Diversity and Challenge (1996)</td>
<td>Pascarella and colleagues</td>
<td>openness to diverse cultures, races, ethnicities, and values as well as individuals’ willingness and enjoyment of having their ideas challenged by different values and perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University Diversity Awareness Scale (MUDAS)</td>
<td>Mosley-Howard et al. (2011)</td>
<td>This instrument measures five factors that assess valuing diversity, seeking out general knowledge of diversity, having personally interacted with different cultures, seeing the need for social justice, and seeing the need for professors to have knowledge of diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Attitudinal and Behavioral Openness Scale (ABOS) | Paula M. Caligiuria, Rick R. Jacobsb, James L. Farrb, 2000 | Measures four theoretical dimensions of openness: attitudes, participation in cultural activities, past experiences, and comfort with differences

Openness to diversity was represented by four constructs: Openness to linguistic diversity | Harzing and Feely (2008) and Hobman et al. (2004) | Linguistic diversity is likely to play an important role in knowledge-sharing behavior in multicultural settings

Openness to social category diversity | Hobman et al. (2004) | Social category diversity refers to variance in visible or surface characteristics such as race, gender, and age

Openness to value diversity | Hobman et al. (2004) | Openness to value diversity relates to the way in which individuals approach the different beliefs, perspectives, and behaviors among group members.

Openness to informational diversity | Hobman et al. (2004) | Diversity in an organization’s knowledge base increases its ability to exploit internal and external knowledge resources.

Sensitivity to gender and race/ethnicity diversity | Lu Zhang Caren Goldberg, 2014 | Sensitivity to gender diversity & Sensitivity to race/ethnicity diversity

Cognitive diversity: Cognitive Group Diversity (CGD). | Van der Vegt and Janssen’s (2003) | Cognitive diversity measure asks team members to rate the extent to which members of their group differ in their way of thinking, their skills and knowledge, the way they view the world, and their beliefs on what is right and wrong

While diversity is a pertinent and contemporary body of research, to the best of our knowledge all work is limited to contextualizing not much has been done empirically to test these various conceptual frameworks. A scale for ODC has been developed by Pascalella and colleagues (1996). Openness to Diversity and Challenge Scale measures a student’s openness to cultural and racial diversity as well as the extent to which one enjoys being challenged by different perspectives, values, and ideas. Universal-diverse orientation (UDO), which is defined by the Miville et al. (1999) as “an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people” (p.291). Following three subscales were created to measure the behavioral, cognitive, and emotional components of UDO. Scores on M-GUDS helps in estimating student’s behaviour in college, their attitudes towards people from different culture and program in college setting and their academic self-confidence. Miami University Diversity Awareness Scale (MUDAS) by Mosley-Howard et al. (2011) is designed to measure students’ level of knowledge about culture, intergroup interaction, appreciation of diversity, and social justice. Appreciation of diversity and their willingness to share that appreciation with others. The Attitudinal and Behavioural Openness Scale by Paula M. Caligiuria, Rick R.
Jacobs, James L. Farrb, (2000) was developed on the premise that there are certain behaviours individuals exhibit and attitudes individuals hold which would indicate the presence of the underlying personality characteristic of openness and the presence of openness would relate to positive outcomes requiring sensitivity to cultural differences. Cognitive diversity scale by Van der Vegt and Janssen’s (2003) measures and asks team members to rate the extent to which members of their group differ in their way of thinking, their skills and knowledge, the way they view the world, and their beliefs on what is right and wrong. Sensitivity to diversity scale by Lu Zhang Caren Goldberg, (2014) Measures perceived cohesiveness, group commitment, and satisfaction with coworkers based on gender diversity and race/ethnicity diversity.

In order to develop a broad scale of openness to diversity in Indian context. As India diverse country and there is not only one culture but it has many sub-cultures. Every state of India is seen as a different country and thus differences and cultural variations are important aspect. From the prior research it has been found that no such scale is developed in Indian context which measures individual’s openness towards differences while moving from one state to another. So we define Openness to diversity in Indian context as “Openness to diversity as the acceptance of similarities and dissimilarities between the individuals or a group one belongs to. When people show openness they become culturally intelligent and also in acceptance of others. Openness to diversity helps individuals to express their feelings, emotions, beliefs, values so that they can play their role effectively and can respond accordingly to the social realities around them”.

Scale Development Methodology:
The methodology for this study follows Hinkin’s (1995) scale development paradigm. As per Hinkin (1995), the first stage of scale development is the generation of items to assess the construct under examination. The items are developed on the basis of a strong theoretical foundation and definition of the construct. After understanding the theoretical foundation, we have followed deductive approach to develop the preliminary items. The deductive approach is followed when the theoretical foundation and definition are used as a guide to develop items.

In the case of the deductive approach, the theoretical work on diversity and prior research on scales of openness to diversity was examined and extended to generate items under the three dimensions proposed by them. A total of 29 initial items were developed through this approach.

Scale Construction
To satisfactorily operationalize a construct with appropriate measures and determine construct validity, the proposed scale must demonstrate content validity, test criterion-related validity, and internal consistency (Hinkin, 1995, 1998). The details of this process for the Openness to Diversity construct included item generation, expert opinion, interratings and refinement, assessment of the final scale’s psychometric properties, and development of a test criterion-validity.

Questionnaire development
The survey instrument was developed on the basis of inferences drawn from the deductive (literature review) approach. The instrument consisted of 29 statements. Each of the items was evaluated on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Phase I: Item generation
An initial pool of 33 scale items was generated on the basis of the literature review, exploratory interviews, and qualitative studies. The items were measured on five-point Likert-type scales bounded by “strongly agree” (=1) and “strongly disagree” (=5).

**Expert opinion**

The instrument consisting of 33 items generated from the use of the deductive approach was subjected to an expert review in order to determine their validity. “Content validity” refers to the degree to which the elements of the instrument represent the domain of the concept under investigation (Talavera, 2004). In order to establish the content validity, the instrument was validated through expert opinion of ten participants, three academicians and ten practitioners from different organizations. The academicians held important positions like the head of the department and director of the organisations. The practitioners also had over 15-20 years of experience in their respective organisations. The participants were asked to assess the instrument for its comprehensibility, bias and appropriateness of the items.

In the next stage, 23 experts from different organizations rated and items having more than 75% frequency were retained out of which 4 items were dropped as they had less 75% frequency. The 29 statements were retained and were taken to the second stage.

**Phase II: Scale Administered**

In this phase the questionnaire of 29 items was administered a five-point Likert scale (where 1 – highly disagree and 5 – highly agree) was constructed. The questionnaire was divided into two sections, where first section dealt with the demographic profile of the respondents as gender, marital status, age, designation, and place and work experience. Second section, comprises 29 items on openness to diversity.

For the preliminary refinement of 29-item instrument, the data was gathered on the new sample of professionals from different organizations from the states like Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Haryana, Punjab, Orrisa, Delhi, Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu, Kerala and Union territory which represents India namely East, West, North and South. The sample included men and women’s working in different sectors like Pharmaceutical, manufacturing, banking, cement, consulting, design, E-Commerce, education, hospital, IT, law, media and telecom. Data was collected through distribution of hard copies of survey questionnaire and also using online version of the questionnaire on Google doc forms. Around 500 employees were contacted, 100 through hard copy questionnaire and 400 were contacted online through emails. 253 questionnaires were returned without any missing items, a response rate of 52% was there as reminder mails were also sent to the respondents for filling the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Below 20 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46 - 50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 3: Data Analysis

(i) Item Analysis
As suggested by Churchill (1979), the first step of scale reliability and consistency involves the computation of internal reliability by using Cronbach’s α. For all 29 items, α came out to be 0.88, which is above 0.7 which shows the scale is reliable. Principal component Factor Analysis (PCA) was used because it shows the theoretical advantages as it is asymptotically efficient estimator. It produces strong factors with the varying loading within the factors. To check the sampling adequacy the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were conducted. KMO of 0.80 for sampling adequacy which shows that data is suitable for factor analysis.

(ii) Exploratory factor analysis
The aim of EFA was to determine the condition where links between the latent and observed variables are uncertain or unknown and principal component analysis (PCA) along with varimax rotation was executed for extracting factors (Costello and Osborne, 2005) through SPSS 19.0 software. A minimum cut off criteria for the deletion of the items was: factor loadings (<0.30) (Karatepe et al., 2005), cross loadings (>0.30) or communalities (<0.30) (Hair et al., 1998). The appropriateness of the analysis was determined by the examination of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic of sampling adequacy. For good factor analysis, the value of KMO must be at least 0.60 and above (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996).
The EFA was performed on 29 items that were retained after scale purification and reliability assessment. The items developed were based on a strong theoretical foundation. Prior to the conduction of EFA, the suitability of the data was checked. This was analysed through the application of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value, which reached 0.798. A KMO value greater than 0.6 is considered appropriate (Kaiser and Rice, 1974). Thus, the KMO value turned out to be acceptable.

The Principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was performed. Factors were extracted as per the MINEIGEN criterion, which means that the eigenvalues of all the factors should be greater than 1. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity also turned out to be significant (p<0.01), indicating that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. The communalities of all the measures were relatively large (greater than 0.5). All the communalities ranged from 0.54 to 0.68. A minimum cut-off criterion for item deletion was that of factor loadings (<0.3) (Hair et al., 2006). After several iterations out of 29 items, 17 items were dropped for two reasons: items had factor loadings below 0.3 whereas some items were cross-loaded on the other factors. Finally, a total of 12 items

The table below presents the scale items, mean, standard deviation, and factor loadings for each factor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valuing Diversity (α=0.67)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to talk to people who speak different language than what I know.</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the accent people have belonging to different regions.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in understanding the rituals of another religions.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy eating different dishes from different regions.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness to Experience (α=0.71)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy festivals of other religions.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I explore and enjoy new places on my vacations</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I travel to different places to find the uniqueness of that place</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During vacations I travel to places that have some cultural and historical background.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfort with Differences (α=0.65)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the involvement of elders in sharing stories and experience are means of unity.</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in inter-caste marriages</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love to try different cuisines existing all over the world</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable working with people whose gender is different from mine.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variance explained is 28.266, 16.319, and 11.095 for the three factors, respectively. The total variance explained is 55.680.
remained after conduction of the factor analysis. The KMO came out to be 0.756 and cronbach alpha came out to be 0.751 which measures the scale reliability. The variance for 3 constructs were found and the values for factor 1 (28.266), factor 2 (16.319) and factor 3 (11.095) respectively.

Reliability and Validity
The reliability was checked using Cronbach alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) after the finalization of the dimensions. For internal consistency and reliability Cronbach alpha is commonly accepted by the researchers and is considered most strongly for measuring the consistency of a scale with multiple items. It was administered on a sample data of 253 respondents. The Cronbach alpha coefficient values for 3 constructs of the scale was 0.67 for valuing diversity, 0.71 for openness to experience and 0.65 for comfort with differences as mentioned in Table 3. When a scale is developed sometimes index of reliability is considered as a measure of validity (Garrett & Woodsworth, 1981), so the validity was considered to be equal to the reliability scores.

Discussion and Conclusion
The paper on scale development of openness to diversity has been written an aim to develop and validate an instrument to measure individual’s openness towards differences prevailing in Indian culture as it’s a diverse country. This empirical study has been done on the sample of professionals working in different states of India in different sectors. The scale has been developed after completing different phases of the development and validation. In the first phase of content validity and face validity, 29 items were retained out of 33 items based on 75% frequency cut-off results given by opinions of experts. In the next stage 17 items were dropped as they has lower factor loadings and others had cross loadings on other factors. Subsequently, a construct constituting 12 items was put for factor analysis. To explore the suitability of the data for running factor analysis, the Bartlett’s test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure was conducted. The KMO values came out to be 0.756 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity score was 739.409 and thus proved for doing factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was done using principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation. Factor loadings (>0.30) was taken as significant. The 12 items considered for factor analysis has a total variance score of 55.68%.

Finally in the 3 factor scale, the first factor which emerged was labelled as valuing diversity and has four items. Valuing diversity has a cronbach alpha 0.67 and variance explained score of 28.266. Valuing diversity measures how individuals are open towards interacting with diverse people having different backgrounds. It measures up to which level people value the differences in languages, rituals, accent of speaking and different dishes with different tastes. The second factor was labelled as openness to experience and has four items. The score of cronbach alpha was 0.71 and variance explained score was 16.319. Openness to experience measures the willingness of people to be open and explore and enjoy different festivals, new places, finding uniqueness and learning and getting knowledge from historical places. The third factor was labelled as comfort with differences and has four items. The score of cronbach alpha was 0.65 and variance explained score was 11.095. Comfort with differences dimension measures the level of comfort and acceptance of elder’s stories and experiences because of age difference, accepting and believing in inter-caste marriages, trying new cuisines and comfort zone in working with people whose gender is different from ours. Factor loadings and variance percentage of all items presented in Table 3. Indian professionals have to make various adjustments relating to different languages, as India is a multi-lingual and multi-ethnic country and also have to make various general adjustments regarding food, clothing, shopping conditions, etc. The people from the North
India are more relationship oriented, whereas South India are more disciplined and have simple lifestyles, from East India people have intellectual ability and lastly people from Western India are professional and are able to handle situations in better way (Banerjee, 2013) therefore, managers from one region when posted to other region, they have to make various interactional, general as well as work related adjustment. Openness to diversity scale aims to measure the characteristics that makes an individual open to differences, open to new experiences, open to new culture, etc. which further leads to the achievement of desired results by the company by recruiting diverse workforce.

India is a multidimensional society and each of these dimensions has a strong influence on the identity of individual and impacts their work style, work values and their other habits at workplace. Each of the dimensions of diversity brings in various challenges to the organization. Each openness to diversity dimension is a factor of discrimination and impacts the decisions in the organization. These dimensions impact the decisions at various levels such as recruitment, promotions, transfers, cross-cultural management, work-life balance, group communication, team work, social acceptance by colleagues etc. The challenge for strategy makers to manage diversity in Indian context is to understand the multidimensional aspects of diversity. Research is needed to unravel which dimensions has more impact on workplace and the cause and effect relation of each dimension in detail. The study will help HR professionals in their search by selecting, training and developing a more competent workforce. Further, having an openness to diversity helps an individual to become familiar with the value, beliefs, language of the state in which he/she had to work, which help them to adjust and handle stress. It gives them confidence to effectively interact and work in a new and unfamiliar environment which further enhances their performance.

This paper aimed at developing a scale on openness to diversity. This paper contributes to the openness to diversity literature. It is concluded that the individuals who are open to diversity and accept to experience the differences positively contribute to organization performance along with life satisfaction. Further, individuals who have openness towards diversity are better able to adjust themselves in cross-cultural situation and which in turn results in increased performance.
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