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This dissertation explored the relationships among three variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. The relationships were examined to attempt explaining two central themes: professional citizenship and otherness leadership. A sampling of graduate students from business and education colleges at a Midwestern public institution was surveyed online with the Otherness Development Survey. The survey instrument had 104 items in four parts. Part one addressed meaning in life (as in spirituality) with ten items; part two had six managerial-based scenarios with several subsections to measure moral reasoning; and part three had 15 items measuring universal diversity competencies. The last part was a demographic survey.

The results from the survey showed a low response rate, which imposed some limitations on the subsequent data analyses. The study limitations, including instrumentation and administration, are worth noting. However, the descriptive statistics and a limited inferential statistics yielded interesting results. Overall, the relationships among the main variables showed no statistical significance. But there were interesting relationships among the various subsections that were discussed. Practical applications of the present study focused on the discussions on such concepts as spirituality, morality, and diversity in both business and education. Importantly, the interrelationships of meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies were discussed for pedagogical development in higher education. The interplay of these concepts was recommended for the creation of purpose, moral responsibilities, and altruism and constructive appreciation of otherness in a cultural heterogeneity among college graduates.
Finally, further recommendations were discussed for adulthood literature, pedagogical studies, and scholarship on professionalism and otherness leadership. In particular, it is recommended that curricula in business and education should be holistic, facilitate the processes of civic consciousness, and promote inclusiveness. The present study has set the agenda for further explorations and discussions on the two themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Adult development theories support relationship building as part of adulthood. Purposeful relationships lead to effective leadership and civility in every society. A purposeful relationship can be maintained by “understanding of the fundamental human aspirations that connect leaders to constituents [others]” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 23). Such relationships create an avenue for valuing one another in a diverse or multicultural environment. To value each other, to have respect for diversity, and to understand differences are bases for otherness development (Chavez, Guido-DiBrito & Mallory, 2003). An individual can develop otherness leadership competencies. Chavez and colleagues suggested that individuals learn to develop this otherness competence within the framework of individual diversity development (IDD).

The concept of otherness development, within the framework of adulthood, is the ability of an individual to demonstrate diversity competencies that affect his or her relationships, leadership, and citizenship. Relationships are important in adulthood (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004), and also in the art of influence (Blanchard, 1999). Diversity is evident in any relationship; diversity is in any multicultural environment, which calls for the enhancement of diversity of contact, relativistic appreciation, and comfort with differences (Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000). The National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC, 2008) maintained that multicultural competence is developed at both the individual and organizational levels.

In addition, as adults certain moral standards are imposed on professional relationships. At both individual and organizational levels, adults are expected to demonstrate a duty of professionalism that can be attributed to moral expectations (Ellin, 1988). Most researchers
attribute consistent high level of professional behaviors to high levels of moral reasoning development (Ellin, 1988; Forte, 2004, 2005; Ryan, 2001). A person’s levels of otherness and moral responsiveness can be evaluated to show a developmental progression; subsequently, this developmental progression demonstrates a person’s ability in leadership and citizenship. Otherness is more than simply an understanding of the other(s) in diversity (Chavez et al.); it is the value of others; and it is an indication of a moral appreciation of natural and cultural differences.

In a broader perspective, otherness development involves the understanding of personal meaning in life regarding values and belief systems. Meaning in life helps people to value others (Baumeister, 1991; Fry, 2000; Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006). According to Fry, personal values are more evident in spirituality. Spirituality has been studied most often in association with interconnection, religiosity, and faith development in the supernatural (Delgado, 2005). In this case, the meaning factor in spirituality affects an individual’s purpose in reaching out to others (relationships) and the value the individual attaches to others (with regard to otherness leadership and professional citizenship). Meaning becomes important in leadership. Additionally, personal meaning accentuates the value of others if that person’s worldview (or the internal model) is respected (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004). In effect, personal meaning helps an individual (as a leader and a citizen) to establish a relationship based on commonalities, a shared vision, and a collective sensitivity (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997).

Otherness development implies a moral responsibility, a shared value of one another, and a professional citizenship toward people who are considered culturally different. According to conventional wisdom, a leader cannot influence others without a moral authority, and this moral authority is demonstrated through moral judgment or reasoning (Riaz, 2007). In this case, moral
reasoning is a person’s response to a moral dilemma through actions and behaviors (Rest, 1980). According to Rest, moral reasoning is part of the moral development that individuals achieve cognitively, and demonstrate behaviorally. So, otherness and citizenship behaviors are related to the moral responsibility demonstrated through moral reasoning, with respect to decisions, which affect a person’s people skills in relationships, influence in leadership, and moral authority.

Thus, it follows that otherness development can be affected by personal meaning in life, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. The same can be said of professional citizenship. Among these three constructs, diversity or multicultural competencies are closely related to the framework of individual diversity skills or the concept of otherness (Castellanos, Gloria, Mayorga, & Salas, 2007; Chavez et al., 2003; Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004; Reynolds & Pope, 1991). Importantly, Chavez et al.’s exposition on individual diversity development (IDD) entailed multicultural appreciation, understanding of differentiation, and competencies in the value of otherness. Castellanos and colleagues believe in multicultural competencies measured by awareness, knowledge, and skills. However, it is also true that both meaning in life and moral reasoning can affect otherness leadership; for they can affect professional citizenship; and they can impact relationships in diversity too. Yet, the intertwining relationships among these three constructs (meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies) as related to professional citizenship and otherness leadership development have not been fully investigated.

**Meaning and Multiculturalism**

There is a growing need for meaning in multicultural organizations due to changing trends. For example in a 1999 cover story in BusinessWeek, Williams (2003) stated “A spiritual revival is sweeping across corporate America . . . that spiritually minded programs in the workplace not only soothe workers’ psyches but also deliver improved productivity” (p. 1).
Thus, Williams (2003) linked productivity to spiritual revival, a compliment of a presence and a search for meaning, and the desire for a better understanding of humanity. According to Williams, this is soothing in the demographically changing workplace. Many researchers support this notion of spiritual awakening and have urged for more research in the area of spirituality in leadership (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Bolman & Deal, 2001). However, the relationship between meaning in life (what is meaningfulness) (Steger et al., 2006) and the learning to value “other(s)” (otherness) in a multicultural environment has not been fully explored in research.

In addition, the relationship between meaning and diversity competencies helps people to share values and a purpose in any given organization. First, meaning gives rise to the spirited environment within each person; it helps people to share values, integrity, and sensibility. Meaning helps develop a purposeful relationship for a collective gain (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997). Second, meaning can be the basis for a collective understanding in an environment of cultural differences and change (Bolman & Deal, 2001). Third, shared meaning in a multicultural environment can bring together value systems, collectiveness, and an integration of cultures. Both meaning and diversity/multicultural competencies can help to build cohesion in an organizational culture (Schein, 2004). Hence, Schein, without direct reference to meaning (as in spirituality), explained that the inexplicable, as part of an organizational culture, is the driving force behind any effective organizational development in a multicultural environment. Meaning in life gives stability to natural tendencies of inherent change in culture (Baumeister, 1991).
Moral Reasoning and Multiculturalism

Moral reasoning is fundamental for any multicultural environment. First, morality helps bring credibility and integrity. Second, moral reasoning is part of an adult’s moralization; it develops over time and changes in situations (Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982; Rest, 1980); and therefore gives credibility to cultural integrations. According to Rest, moral reasoning encompasses the decisions and actions that a person takes in a situation that affect others. Moral reasoning is demonstrated in character (Bricker, 1993). Moral reasoning leads to appreciation of the multicultural environment (Tirri, Tallent-Runnels & Nokelainen, 2005). According to Tirri and colleagues, moral reasoning of a person affects relationships with others in a divergent culture. Thus, moral reasoning relates to the multicultural competencies of an individual.

Moral reasoning also affects an individual’s responsibilities toward others. Many studies have shown a relationship between morals (or ethics) and multiculturalism regarding how people are treated (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005; Stables, 2005; Starratt, 1991; Tirri, Tallent-Runnels & Nokelainen, 2005). For example, Stables studied multiculturalism and moral education in the United Kingdom. The results: moral or ethical reasoning accounted for differences in care, justice, and responsibility shown toward others. There is an element of diversity in moral reasoning. Gilligan (1987) theorized that there are gender differences in moral reasoning, which could, hypothetically, result in differences in care and justice.

In addition, there may be more differences in moral reasoning associated with sociocultural upbringing. Different cultures have different moral perspectives (Rachels & Rachels, 2007, p. 16). People are naturally different and behave differently because of their sociocultural environments. Socio-racial differences can have an effect on specific awareness, knowledge, and competencies (Castellanos et al., 2007). Leadership literature is full of examples
of the effect that societal values have on morals (see, e.g., Haan, Langer, & Kohlberg, 1976; Kohlberg, 1977; Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982; Weber, 1991). For that matter, there is a mutual relationship between cultures and moral reasoning: i.e., the two constructs may be correlated. Moral reasoning serves an impetus for accepting diversity; multicultural competencies promote moral reasoning for accepting differences in opinions, skills, and abilities.

**Meaning and Moral Reasoning**

There is a relationship between personal meaning in life and moral reasoning that results in good citizenship. Ashley (2000) made a case for social and environmental responsibilities through transformative spiritual values in relations to “morality founded upon imposed notions of duty” (p. 131). Ashley continued that “virtuous” citizenship results from moral reasoning that relates to essential personal meaning. To Ashley, “a process of increasing competency in moral reasoning” takes place with considerable “operative value . . . [that] refers to the values a person may be said to hold” (p. 137). And moral reasoning is considered a factor in organizational citizenship (Ryan, 2001).

Meaning, as in personal values (Fry 2000) and a quest in life (Steger et al., 2006), relates to moral or ethical judgment in many managerial circumstances. Leaders transfer their personal values in situations that call for their judgments. Moral judgment of leaders, of managers, and of professionals, is not void of their own personal values (Payne, 1988). Payne used Gordon’s Survey of Personal Values (SPV) scores to correlate with Rest’s Defining Issues Test (DIT) in his study. His conclusion was that educators could improve students’ sensitivity and judgment of values in any dilemma if attention is given to both constructs. Payne recommended that educators consider the interaction of personal values and personal morals in their instructions for
future business leadership. This will encourage “greater self-inquiry and ethical introspection among business students” (Payne, 1988, p. 276).

Other studies have established a clear relationship between spirituality and moral judgment. Meaning is a factor of spirituality (Fry, 2000), and a quest for the presence of and search for purposefulness in life (Steger et al., 2006). For example, in a study among divinity students, Bunch (2005) noticed a progression in moral judgment through educational experiences, “not simply with maturation” (p. 363), but in line with spiritual awareness. Bunch concluded that his findings are consistent with several studies that occurred in colleges showing spiritual orientations impacting the development of moral reasoning. “There is no universal meaning that can fit everyone’s life” (Steger et al., p. 80); however, there is professional moral expectations befitting for every successful career life; and that “the morality of the professions, rather, is imposed on them [professionals] from above [leadership], by our usual values and common principles” (Ellin, 1988, p. 130). Imperatively, it is these common principles, values, which authenticate leadership expressions of meaning-making and moral responsibility (Drath & Palus, 1994).

Statement of the Problem

The construct of meaning, as in spirituality, in graduate studies has not been deeply focused, particularly with regard to pedagogy and development of graduate students. Other constructs of moral reasoning and diversity/multicultural competencies are also applied. More so, the interrelationships among these three constructs: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies are clearly missing in literature. However, these interrelationships are important, and they remain central to the present study.
Interestingly, most organizations expect diversity competencies among their employees as part of their moral and shared values. Professional and otherness development, which are in congruence with moral responsiveness and individual diversity development (Chavez et al., 2003), is expanded to include the interactions of diversity/multicultural competencies (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004), meaning (Fry, 2000), and moral reasoning (Rest, 1989). In the present study, the proposition is that these three constructs give otherness development a three-dimensional (3D) proportion. In other words, first, most organizations expect employees to have a strong value system (meaning) that is in line with their corporate core values. Secondly, they expect high moral reasoning in terms of professionalism. Thirdly, organizations need people who can understand and function in diversity.

Therefore, these three independent (but related) constructs may explain the need for multifaceted framework of otherness leadership development (Figure 1). The multi-dimensional framework, which examines the relationships among the three study variables, becomes an organizational asset and a propeller for professional citizenship too. There may be other factors that can affect professional citizenship and otherness leadership; yet, this present study is meant to explain the development of these two themes with regard to the relationships among these three constructs: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies.

These two central themes (professional citizenship and otherness leadership) are important in organizational development. For example, according to Connerley and Pedersen (2005), many Fortune 500 companies in the United States are spending millions of dollars to promote diversity awareness; others such as Coca-Cola Co. and Boeing Co. are promising a remedy after multimillion-dollar settlements of racial discrimination (p. 25). Also, in a post-Enron era, companies are experiencing the challenge of raising business citizenship as part of
their moral responsibility. And many organizational developments (OD) practices, whole system changes, are organized around individual values, individual moral responsiveness, and the collective engagement of organizations in diversity of opinions, perspectives, and interests (Cady, 2007).

Furthermore, the researcher believes that professionalism and otherness leadership are affected by variance of the three study variables. The variances in meaning development (Fry, 2000; Milacci, 2006), moral reasoning (Rest, 1980), and multicultural competencies (Pope, Reynolds & Mueller, 2004) are believed to have impact on otherness development. Similarly, these variations may help to explain the variance in professional citizenship. The present study is based on the assumption of plausible correlations among the three study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies (see Figure 1). In the present study, it is assumed that these relationships exist, and their correlations may explain the professional citizenship and otherness leadership of graduate students in business and education programs.
Rationale of the Study

The abilities of graduate students to value the differences of others and, hence, to influence those constituents are affected by several factors. First, these factors include the variations of meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity/multicultural competencies. Second, as Sturges, Simpson and Altman (2003) reported, business graduates (and possibly, education students too) benefit significantly from people skills they acquired at college. Thus, there is the need for otherness development that involves people skills or soft skills in diversity. Third, more organizations are looking for professionals or leaders who possess personal values (Hesselbein, 1997, 1999) and morals, alongside the traditional technical and managerial skills (Sturges et al., 2003). Clearly, these skills are linked to professionalism and otherness development.

Figure 1. The interrelations of the three study variables.
Within graduate colleges such as the College of Education and Human Development and the College of Business Administration, any study related to professional citizenship and otherness leadership can add value to graduate education. The present study will contribute to policy-making abilities of business and education professionals. Imperatively, the skills of both professionalism and otherness leadership of graduate business and education students can impact their morale, motivation, and career advancement. This study, however, is just the beginning of a relevant area in literature. As such, the responses from graduate students have much to contribute empirically to the topic of discussion on professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

Therefore, as a rationale, this study started with the following questions: Is there a significant relationship between meaning and moral reasoning? Is there a significant relationship between moral reasoning and diversity competencies? Is there a significant relationship between meaning and diversity competencies? And finally, how can these relationships help explain such phenomena as professional citizenship and otherness leadership development? Presumably, the study results will recommend answers for these questions and a plausible consideration of multidimensional frameworks for professional citizenship and otherness leadership development for further research.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this correlational study was to examine the relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies as an exploratory study in an attempt to explain the themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership among graduate students in a medium-sized Midwestern public university. To achieve this purpose, the three study variables were defined as:
• Meaning is a factor of spirituality (Fry, 2000) and a personal quest (presence and search) in life (Steger, et al., 2006). It is measured quantitatively by the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Steger and colleagues.

• Moral reasoning is the respondents’ judgment based on cognitive socio-moral understanding and interpretation of professional or managerial moral dilemmas. It is measured by the Managerial Moral Judgment test (MMJT), which comprises of a test of initial decisions, simple sum scores, and P-scores (Loviscky, Trevino, & Jacobs, 2007).

• Diversity competencies are defined as respondents’ levels of understanding universal differences in cultures: i.e., diversity of contact, relativistic appreciation, and comfort with differences. These are measured using the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scales-Short (M-GUDS-S) (Fuertes et al., 2000).

Thus, professional citizenship is to be explained within the framework of social and corporate responsibilities (Neron & Norman, 2008), social entrepreneurship (Wood & Logsdon, 2008), and the moral context of professionalism (Ellin, 1988; Hamann, 2007). Otherness leadership is to be explained within the framework of the individual diversity development (IDD) levels, and how it affects the influence of others and harness acceptable differences (Chavez et al., 2003). And for all these constructs, it is assumed that the explanation lies with the variance of interrelationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies.

In addition, part of the purpose of this correlational study is to examine the demographic differences (i.e., gender, race, and career orientation) among these relationships. The demographic data were used to further explain otherness leadership differences, particularly regarding categorical variables such as gender, race, and professions. For example, an exposition of the gender differences was weighed along the lines of IDD levels. While the relationships
among the study variables – meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies – remain the focus of this present study. However, it was anticipated that the examination of the relationships may help explain the professional citizenship and the otherness leadership development among the study participants. Conceptually, for the purpose of this study, effective otherness leadership results from the inter-correlations among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies; the result of these inter-correlations may also explain the differences in professional citizenship.

Study Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between meaning and moral reasoning among graduate students?
2. What is the relationship between meaning and diversity competencies among graduate students?
3. What is the relationship between moral reasoning and diversity competencies among graduate students?
4. Do the relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies differ among different demographics (i.e., gender, race, and career) among graduate students?

Significance of the Study

The study was significant in three areas: otherness leadership, professional citizenship, and developmental literature. First, otherness leadership is important in modern graduate business and teacher education. It begins with the quest for meaning in life (what is meaningful), as defined by Bee and Bjorklund (2004) and Steger et al., (2006). Otherness development helps people skills that are necessary for career advancement and future leadership positions (Sturges et al., 2003). Love and Talbot (1999) stated that meaning (i.e., in spirituality) is essential for students’ emotional and humanistic development. Secondly, otherness leadership entails moral
characteristics; moral character connects people to one another credibly. This study is an opportunity to examine the relationship between meaning and the moral reasoning that appears to relate to the complexities of life in a multicultural environment.

In addition, otherness leadership is significant in today’s multicultural organizations. The multicultural context of the study examines the competencies of the respondents in understanding differentiation. Otherness is important in relationship building among teachers, learning communities, and other professional stakeholders (Parker, Fazio, Volante, & Cherbini, 2008). The importance of multicultural competencies in today’s society cannot be overemphasized. Diversity with respect to gender, race, ethnicity, abilities, and so forth is evident everywhere. Chavez and colleagues (2003) emphasized the need for otherness awareness among organizational leaders. Schein (2004) believed that cultures and subcultures exist in organizations, creating the need for tolerance, appreciation, and understanding of difference. Organizations are full of misconceptions, tendencies to stereotype others, and misunderstandings due to multicultural issues surrounding the devaluation of diversity in others. The lack of diversity competencies among leaders can lead to discrimination, crime against others, and intolerance.

Next, the present study was significant in the area of professional citizenship development. For more than a decade, the debate regarding what constitutes professional citizenship has been discussed in literature (Ashley, 2000; Neron & Norman, 2008; De George, 2008; Graham, 1995; Wood & Logsdon, 2008). Ellin (1988) referred to professional morality as a duty and the definition of professionalism. Ryan (2001) referred to organizational citizenship as a moral responsibility. Others referred to it as corporate citizenship (Hamann, 2007), or a corporate social responsibility (as per United Nation’s CSR) (Idemudia, 2008). Professional
citizenship, in this case, is the moral responsibility exercised with regard to appropriate actions (what professionals do) and appropriate decisions taken in the process of professional duties (how they do it) (Neron & Norman, 2008). Professional citizenship goes beyond the exercise of good deeds, right or wrong actions, and corporate philanthropy. It includes professional-client relationship (Bayles, 1988). Many scholars have asked: what is moral? What can be classified as citizenship? And what is the role of leaders in such areas as professional citizenship? The present study was significant in contributing to the explanation of professional citizenship.

Any possible research in the area of meaning making, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies development is likely to impact professionalism. Professional life cannot be divorced of personal values, professional morality, and the appreciation of differences. The present study will contribute to the scholarly debate by examining how the interaction between personal meaning and moral reasoning, how moral reasoning interacts with diversity competencies, and so forth to explain their professional significance. Significantly, the examination of the relationships among these variables may help to explain professional citizenship from another perspective and for practical purposes. Thus, practically in this context, professional citizenship was seen as related to moral citizenship (Wood & Logsdon, 2008); it involves professional duties towards others (Ellin, 1988); and it involves meaningful relationships in multicultural settings with respect to social enterprise.

Additionally, at the peripheral level, another significance of this study is its focus on graduate students as adults. Adulthood theories are important in the area of leadership development (Rossiter, 1999; Tisdell, 1999; Woolthuis, Hillebrand, & Nooteboom, 2005). Woolthuis and colleagues considered adulthood theories in explaining certain contours of leadership, such as spirituality, morality, and diversity in leadership among adults. By examining
the relationships among these constructs, the developmental narrations of the participants can be inferred. Thus, meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies are important concepts when it comes to understanding the processes of human development. The interactions of these constructs are significant in our understanding of a purposeful influence of leaders, a moral judgment in leadership decisions, and the management of differences.

Most adult development theories explain how adults grow in human relationships, moral principles, and self-assessment against acceptable social norms. However, the relationships of among the present study variables together are missing in adult development literature. Thus, the interplay of three such variables in adulthood is very significant in human development. Leadership literature helps to explain how social responsibilities build character; character leads to meaningful leaderships; and the combination of such adulthood characteristics leads to the law of respect in leadership (Maxwell, 2007). The present study added to the literature on the roles of meaning, moral reasoning, and multicultural dimensions on human development. More importantly, in the area of social relationship, the otherness dimension of this study added much significance in any adulthood (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004). Most relationships are cultivated purposefully, based on moral relationships, and the value attached to differences (Parker et al., 2008). Perhaps the data on some of these developmental constructs expand our understanding of certain trajectories of the adult life of these participants.

Overall, the findings from this study are significant in the direction of practice, pedagogy, and predictions of professional citizenship and otherness leadership. The debate is still on: What constitute professional or business citizenship? The present study was an explanatory attempt. The study has set the agenda for the development of otherness leadership assessment for further studies. Furthermore, the present study’s investigation of demographic differences as related to
the three constructs was a significant contribution to literature on gender and race issues. The study is altogether about differences. Hypothetically, our understanding of otherness should lead to further appreciation of universal differences and professional expectations.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms were defined as indicated below for clarity and, more specifically, for operational definitions:

**Adulthood (Adults):** The period of life, usually from the legal age of 18, when individuals assume duties and responsibilities associated with developmental maturity in most societies (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004).

**Citizenship (Professional or Business):** Is a term used to describe social responsibility assumed or expected of professionals as part of their social enterprise (Neron & Norman, 2008; Wood & Logsdon, 2008). Some literature refers to it as a corporate citizenship (Hamann, 2007), or a corporate social responsibility (as per United Nation’s CSR) (Idemudia, 2008). However, business or professional citizenship involves a moral context (Hemphill, 2004); professional citizenship involves morality and veracity (Ellin, 1988).

**Connectedness:** The connection between a person and others, a person and authorities higher than themselves, both horizontal and vertical, that creates dependency and interdependency, respectively (Burkhardt & Nagai-Jacobson, 2002; Frick & Frick, 2007).

**Differentiation:** Inherent differences in thinking, feeling, and behavior revealed in diversity contrary to normative or collective expectations (Chavez et al., 2003).

**Diversity:** Natural or apparent differences in demographics (i.e., gender, race, age, sexual orientation, religion), ideas or opinions, and differentiations in multi-contextual identities (Chavez et al.). Diversity is considered a universal part of multiculturalism (Fuertes et al., 2000).
**Diversity (Multicultural) competencies**: The abilities of a person to demonstrate understanding and appreciation of diversity, differences, and multiculturalism (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). Diversity competencies are synonymous to multicultural competencies in the context of universality. These are measured using the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scales (M-GUDS) (Fuertes et al., 2000). Or as in the case of multicultural competencies, the abilities of someone to demonstrate *awareness, knowledge, and skills* in relations with other cultures or subcultures aside from his or her inherent culture in measurable fashions (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004).

**Leadership**: Leadership is defined as the practices that lead to positive influence, growth, and development of both the individual and groups for a collective purpose.

**Graduate Students**: Students enrolled, also considered as adults, and in graduate-level programs in recognized graduate colleges within higher education institutions.

**Individual Diversity Development**: The different dimensions indicated by the level of understanding and appreciation of differences, otherness, based on “differentiation of knowledge construction among diverse cultures.” It is measurable in the affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains to show “unawareness, dual awareness, questioning and self-explorations, risk-taking or other exploration, and integration dimensions” (Chavez, et al., 2003, p. 454-455).

**Meaning**: The interpretation of one’s spiritual experience that renders an understanding, appreciation, and a purpose to otherwise inexplicable environment regulated by internal and external states (Baumeister, 1991; Fry, 2000). Meaning can be measured as a factor of spirituality by multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality instrument (MMRS) (Stewart & Koeske, 2006); in this case, it is measured as a life quest by the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ) (Steger, et al., 2006).
**Moral Reasoning:** A person’s moral judgment characterized by his or her judgment, socio-moral understanding, and interpretation of moral dilemmas. Moral reasoning indicates moral problem-solving abilities; it is measurable psychologically in the three learning domains as affective, behavioral, and cognitive using the Managerial Moral Judgment Test (MMJT) (Loviscky et al., 2007).

**Otherness:** The abilities to reflect affectively, behaviorally, and cognitively toward those considered as “other(s)” and to expresses understanding, appreciation, and value toward others (Chavez et al., 2003).

**Otherness Development:** A person’s developmental ability to express a positive attitude, understanding, and appreciation of others in a reputable fashion. In this case, the researcher’s assumption is that meaning, moral reasoning, and multicultural competencies influence otherness development. It may also be assessed as a significant progression through the levels of individual diversity development.

**Otherness Leadership:** It is aligned with the influence accorded to leaders by their individual diversity development. It is the ability to influence others for a purposeful relationship that shows mutual respect and moral responsibility. And it is otherness competencies that assumes cognitive, affective, and behavioral abilities in leadership and citizenship.

**Religiosity:** The outward observance or expression of customs and beliefs in a particular faith tradition usually associated with rituals (Cartwright, 2001).

**Spirituality:** The acknowledgement of higher authority beyond the human existence. It is an expression of beliefs in an inherent essence of a supreme being through interconnectedness, involvements, and the metaphysical unification of universal life both physical and spiritual (Delgado, 2005).
Delimitations

The delimitations of this study involved the following: first, the sample participants are restricted to graduate education and business students at a Midwestern public university. Samples have been assumed to be adults who have meaning in life (as in spirituality) (Baumeister, 1991; Fry, 2000) and moral reasoning (Rest, 1986). Second, the correlational design used to examine relationships and explanations lends itself to restricted statistical analyses and inferences such as Pearson $r$ and regressions.

Also, the instruments came with the following delimitations: first, the researcher chose these instruments among many options to measure meaning, moral reasoning, and multicultural competencies. Second, the meaning in life questionnaire (MLQ) and M-GUDS-S were both chosen for their fewer items (as per review) and part of larger instruments. Third, the researcher chose to use the measure of managerial moral judgment test (MMJT), instead of the other instruments such as the defining issues test, which is managerial specific and scenario based.

Limitations

Participants’ selection was limited because of its convenience, which could affect generalizability (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Selection of participants was not randomized. The graduate students from two colleges also limit the generalizability. The study was limited by the reliance on self-reports. Participants were trusted to be honest and accurate. However, the use of pure quantitative method in this case may limit the perceptual inferences. Also, the use of scenarios that are predominantly justice bias has implications in measuring moral reasoning. The MMJT instrument for measuring moral reasoning is Kohlbergian bias; the care aspect of moral reasoning is clearly missing (i.e., according to Gilligan’s argument in moral development
theory); and MMJT has an excessive dependency on simple sum scores for statistical analyses, which is yet to be tested by other scale development researchers.

Another limitation was the design itself. Correlational design, which makes use of quantitative data, may not capture participants’ perceptions very well. It is true that inferential analysis carry with it the researcher’s biases. However, one of the strengths of this study was the method of administrating the instruments electronically. Participants were not identified because their responses were anonymous; they were free to volunteer responses without risk. Response rate was expected to be high but turned out to be low. Within educational research, correlation design can be more cost effective than experimental (Gay & Airasian, 2003). But as a limitation, the researcher had very little control of the electronic administration, participation, and hence the response rate.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

The remaining chapters were organized as follows: the review of relevant literature, the methodology, results and analysis of findings, and finally, discussions and conclusion. The review of literature reported previous studies as the framework for this study. The methods chapter examined the design, procedures, and processes for data collection and analyses. The results and findings chapter reported limited descriptive and inferential statistics. And the final chapter discussed the overview, significance, limitations, practical implications, and other recommendations.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

There is a bounty of literature on spirituality, morality, and diversity in general. For the purpose of this study, the review was focused on (a) the construction of meaning in spirituality, (b) the construction of moral reasoning as the psychological cognition of one’s moral actions or behaviors, and (c) the construction of diversity leadership as the awareness, knowledge, and skills culminating in multicultural competencies. However, to further focus the study, this review was concentrated on the developmental aspects the three constructs: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies.

Graduate students are adults. Therefore, from a developmental perspective, the review of adult developmental theories related to social responsibilities, networking, and humanistic values is appropriate. Therefore, in building a cohesive framework, this chapter presented a review of literature in the following areas: (a) adult development theories, (b) development and characteristics of spirituality, (c) development and characteristics of moral reasoning, (d) development of diversity and multicultural competencies, and (e) syntheses for the two central themes: professional citizenship and otherness leadership of graduate business students. Please refer to figure 2 for a diagrammatic representation of the guide through the literature review.
Figure 3: A guide to the review of related literature on Professional Citizenship and Otherness Leadership
Adult Development Theories

Developmental literature defines the different stages in life from childhood to adulthood. Bee and Bjorklund (2004) described this either as a linear path marked by maturity or as a cyclic journey with life trajectories. “Development is often continuous . . . it is slow and gradual in a predictable direction” (Bee and Bjorklund, p. 3). Adulthood is a journey that progresses in stages, such as physical, emotional, and social relationships. However, Bee and Bjorklund agreed that these stages could be influenced by certain established socio-cultural factors (i.e., social traditions, beliefs, and moral norms). These factors are also part of the process or individual’s stories in search of meaning and reasons.

Adult Development: Process and Narration

Adulthood is a process full of experiences. Clark and Caffarella (1999) mentioned that adulthood is best understood as the process of life. They theorized that adult development gives understanding to the “various aspects and dimensions of that unfolding [process of life]” (p. 3). Also, these authors considered the process as marking maturity in respect to “biological, psychological, socio-cultural, and integrative perspectives” (p. 3). However, Clarke and Caffarella cautioned that even though research supports adulthood maturity as characterized by autonomy (i.e., self-direction, self-thinking, etc.), researchers must be careful in characterizing the degree of autonomy as maturity in general. To support their idea, Bee and Bjorklund (2004) considered the process as revisiting the typology of adult development. Whereby the revisit will imply understanding the landmarks of an individual’s journey of adulthood.

Adulthood theories throw more light on the process of growing as an interaction with one’s environment. Reeves (1999) mentioned the process as “a coming-to-be” (p. 19). Reeves urged that “development that occurs within the individual, whether development is primarily an
internal process or results from interactions within [a given] environment” (p. 20), is based on acquired maturity in the process of adulthood. This process is also marked by various physiological and psychological changes. Notably, Erikson’s concept of adulthood shows a stage-by-stage development. According to Reeves, Erikson’s theory of psychosocial development remains the most influential in the process marked by becoming an adult stage by stage. These stages are well documented and accepted by researchers in developmental studies and texts (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004; Vaillant, 2001).

In addition, adult development is also a narration of life experiences. Rossiter (1999) explained adulthood as a narration of experiences, orientations, and interpretations in a continuum of growth. To Rossiter, “the narrative structure of our meaning making [in life] is apparent” (p. 78). Rossiter emphasized that to appreciate the process of adult development one has to “consider its storied nature” (p. 79) in four forms: contextual, interpretive, retrospective, and temporal. To Rossiter (1999), these four forms shape a person’s constructive and incremental understanding of the “process of becoming” an adult.

Hence, adult development as a process and a narration gives trajectories to differences in life. Bee and Bjorklund (2004) mentioned the construction of experiences, mental images, and various encounters, which are best, interpreted by individual trajectories of life. These trajectories shape an individual’s faith, beliefs, social responsibilities, and other social networks. Therefore, in Bee and Bjorklund’s work, The Journey of Adulthood, they categorized the processes of adulthood through stories of social responsibilities, human practices, societal norms and expectations that are consistent in most literature on adult development.
Social Development Theories: Roles and Networks

Adulthood involves socialization and relationship building. Studies by James, Witte, and Galbraith (2006), Ross-Gordon (1999), and Chandler and Kram (2005) agreed that the process of adulthood includes the development of social roles, the development of social relationships, and the development of social networks, which link people to others. These social roles, relations, and networks involve mentoring and the valuing of others in a social context (Chandler & Kram, 2005). To the authors, these are social constructs within the complexities of adulthood. For example, James et al. (2006) stated, “whereas children’s developmental processes are a product of biological maturation, the developmental progress of adults is based primarily on social roles” (pp. 52-53).

Furthermore, these social roles are both positional and societal expectations framed in conventions. Most societies expect adults to exercise certain roles and meet demands and expectations (Chandler & Kram, 2005). Some roles may change according to gender and other demographics (Ross-Gordon, 1999), but these expectations are based largely on socio-cultural conventions. James et al. (2006) even saw the process of social roles as having a spiritual dimension. Thus, irrespective of one’s beliefs and practices, there is an element of connectivity within the spirit of the society. Moreover, social roles have shown a relationship with generativity (i.e., the giving back to community to preserve the spirit of the society for generations) (Dillon, Wink, & Fay, 2003). Generativity is discussed in further details later.

Regarding gender differences, some studies have established differences in social roles, expectations, and the way a person learns to value others in relationships. For example, Ross-Gordon (1999) examined social networks and social responsibilities toward others by expanding the concept of gender beyond just relationship. Ross-Gordon exposed the value for others in
terms of gender identity. Ross-Gordon touched on the mechanics of gender identity to include traditional and contemporary approaches to explain the differences: (a) psychoanalytic theory (the Oedipal complex), (b) social learning theory (socialization), and (c) cognitive development (enculturated). In contrast, Chandler and Kram (2005) considered network systems based on the mutual benefits of mentoring others irrespective of gender. Yet, in both studies the authors acknowledge the existence of difference just as individuality exists. Thus, the more matured a person is on the adulthood spectrum, the more tolerant he/she is in social relationship with others. Still, society expects some level of social skills and roles as a traditional way to interact with and to appreciate others.

**Virtues of Generativity**

Generativity “is primarily the concern with establishing and guiding the next generation” (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004, p. 36). Followers of Erikson maintained that the next important stage after *intimacy* versus *isolation* for both men and women is *generativity* versus *stagnation* (Dillon, Wink, & Fay, 2003; Vaillant, 2001). Generativity is simply a stage “demonstrated [by] a clear capacity for care, productivity, and establishing and guiding the next generation. Generativity means assuming sustained responsibility for the growth and well-being of others” (Vaillant, p. 150). Vaillant believed that generativity has virtues that include taking care of others in a community. In part, generativity involves the process of maturity; requires the performance of social roles, the conformity to social norms, and the preservation of societal values for posterity. Chalofsky and Griffin (2005) mentioned the effect that generativity has on certain virtuous behaviors holistically. For these authors, social responsibilities are central to humanistic values in any community. Even though the study was not conclusive on developmental theories, it presents the virtues in generativity as a holistic responsibility towards development.
Generativity, as part of the adulthood process, is a landmark in the stages of adulthood that is beneficial to others more than self. Generativity becomes meaningful and a moral responsibility (Dillon et al., 2003; Vaillant, 2001). Dillon et al. studied the relationship between generativity and spirituality in a longitudinal study. They found a correlation between religiousness, spirituality, generativity, and other variables in the late stages of adulthood. The authors also mentioned the likelihood of a moral association as a “long-established link between religion and doing good for others” (Dillon et al., p. 427). They even saw a link between generativity and racial relationship - diversity.

Generativity and its virtue and care, contributes to civility and diversity appreciation. According to the study by Dillon et al. (2003), people who are ready to give to society, posterity, do not conflict with diversity: they are ready to give irrespective of gender, race, age, sexual orientation, or any other social biases. People who exercise generativity and show maturity in adulthood that demonstrates care and civic aptitudes. Thus, the understanding of diversity (otherness) becomes a mark of adulthood responsibility and generativity. Fortunately, many studies support the importance of these concepts of social roles, social networking, social responsibilities, and generativity in diversity (Chandler & Kram, 2005; Chavez et al., 2003; Dillon et al., 2003; Ross-Gordon, 1999). These researchers described the virtues of generativity in association with spirituality, sensitivity, self-awareness, interdependency, and adaptability when dealing with others.

Development and Characteristics of Meaning/Spirituality

First of all, spirituality is an experiential phenomenon in human life. Blanchard (1999) stated profoundly, “We are not human beings having a spiritual experience. We are spiritual beings having a human experience” (p. 92). Second, spirituality is an important part of adult
development (Sinnott, 2001; Tisdell, 1999). Sinnott stated, “People consider their spiritual lives to be important” (p. 199). Third, humanistic and existential psychological approaches see spirituality as welcoming.

However, the question is: What constitutes spirituality in human life? Sinnott (2001) and Tisdell (1999) agreed that the definition of spirituality could be problematic. Spirituality is experiential; it is experienced differently according to people, culture, traditions, and belief systems. Sinnott explained spirituality as “one’s personal relation to the sacred or transcendent, a relation that then informs other relationships and meaning of one’s own life” (p. 199). In this respect, spirituality is developmental and characteristically phenomenal.

**Definition of Spirituality**

The definition of spirituality is far beyond religiosity. When defining spirituality, Delgado (2005) mentioned the broad nature of the “concept that goes beyond religious and cultural boundaries” (p. 157). This is consistent with other studies on the definition of spirituality – because spirituality can be defined in many ways (Bash, 2005; Daly, 2005; Dillon et al., 2003; Speck, 2005; Tisdell, 1999, 2003). Tisdell (1999) defined spirituality through existential examples. Hense (2006) defined spirituality in context of various traditions and belief systems. Hense cited the 25-volume reference work, *World Spirituality*, and insisted that any definition of spirituality should postpone intellectual debates based on specific traditions such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and others.

Therefore, spirituality can be defined in context of (a) a tradition or (b) a field of study, but not solely by religious practices. For example, Delgado (2005) defined spirituality in health related studies as the external influences related to well-being. Armstrong and Crowther (2002) defined spirituality according to socio-cultural and experiential beliefs. Cognitive development
theories define spirituality along the lines of psychometric construction of faith and existential authority or powers (Cartwright, 2001). Most of these studies examined spirituality within the following common themes: (a) harmonious interconnectedness, (b) beingness, (c) involvement in life, and (d) transcendent relationship.

From a developmental point of view, spirituality becomes meaning gained that exerts influence on life in general. Spirituality becomes a central aspect of human life that promotes meaningful existence (Tisdell, 1999). Tisdell defined spirituality through three vignettes that serve as a “possible manifestation of spirituality in people’s lives” (p. 88): Spirituality of Dwelling, Spirituality of Seeking, and Spirituality of Moral Responsibility. For example, Tisdell referred to “sense of moral responsibility” that leads individuals to “carry on the work of justice of ancestors and others who forged ahead to create a better world in the place of adversity . . . embedded in a particular sociocultural history” (p. 89).

For Tisdell, spirituality is constructed by cultural knowledge, symbolic interpretations (meanings), and moral orientations. In support of this socio-cultural facet of spirituality, Delgado (2005) defined spirituality to include the degrees of manifestation “influenced in part by the social and cultural environment” (p. 157).

Furthermore, spirituality defines the parameters in a person’s search for meaning. Delgado (2005) wrote: “Spirituality for many involves faith or willingness to believe, a search for meaning and purpose in life, a sense of connection with others, and a transcendence of the self, resulting in a sense of inner peace and well-being” (p. 157). It involves the connection with others beyond one’s self. Particularly in the areas of (a) transcendence of self (Burkhardt & Nagai-Jacobson, 2002), (b) the concept of inner peace (Armstrong & Crowther, 2002), and the
(c) holistic well-being (Capeheart-Meningall, 2005), spirituality is meaning making (Drath & Palus, 1994).

**Characteristics of Spirituality**

Some characteristics are associated with spirituality, one of which is the establishment of meaning in life. Drath and Palus (1994) characterized this spirituality as meaning making or establishing common sense. Delgado (2003) proposed four main characteristics of spirituality: (a) faith and acceptance of a belief system, (b) a personal search for meaning and purpose, (c) an awareness of a connection or interrelatedness to others, and (d) a sense of self-transcendence. These characteristics help make sense of life. Spirituality is characterized by a belief system that is not “formalized, but derived from direct moment-to-moment experience” (Delgado, p. 159). Citing Canda’s existential spirituality, Delgado further explained how individuals courageously “create meaning” by choosing to believe. People choose to make sense of life experiences, meaningfully.

Spirituality is also characterized by the quest for meaning. According to Fry (2000), people search for personal meaning or purpose. This search becomes part of our spiritual experience. The quest for meaning, or a purpose in life, is the “quintessential existential question” (Delgado, 2005, p. 159) that defines spirituality. To Delgado (2005), meaning may be associated with vocation, mission, and destiny. For Delgado, spirituality is characterized by a search for meaning that accommodates a shift from “material values to more altruistic or idealistic values” (p. 159).

The third characteristic of spirituality is an awareness of connection or relatedness to others. According to Burkhardt and Nagai-Jacobson (2002), spirituality establishes a sense of connection and harmony with the universe. This connection includes people and Higher Powers,
usually consolidated by spiritual activities such as prayers. Burkhardt and Nagai-Jacobson (2002) made the connection within meaning and an internal sacredness. Burkhardt and Nagai-Jacobson defined spirituality in terms of both horizontal and vertical connections. Meaning as in spirituality is established by a “horizontal connection between self and others and a connection or relationship on a vertical axis between self and God [a Higher Being]” (Delgado, p. 160).

The fourth characteristic of spirituality towards developing meaning is self-transcendence. According to Delgado (2005), based on Frankl’s self-transcendence, spirituality helps develop self. Also, Delgado drew on Maslow’s theory of hierarchy of needs, Erikson’s theory of the identity and ego development, and Marcoen’s theory of the last refuge. Delgado explained spirituality to include “a constitutive characteristic of being human . . . directed, to something other than the self” (p. 160). According to Delgado, self-transcendence is a sense of positive attitude to life, a greater value for relationship with others, a sense of connections with humans and the universe.

In effect, spirituality is characterized by looking at life meaningfully, realizing values and goals, and experiencing positive attitudes in times of adversity through the willingness to believe in internal and external powers (Delgado, 2005). Spirituality is, therefore, living beyond the organized life processes by extending personal stories to include external influences (Speck, 2005). Hence, according to Delgado and Speck, spirituality involves beliefs, meanings, connections, and self-transcendence.

*Spirituality and Religiosity*

Spirituality is beyond religiosity. Many studies have examined the development of spirituality in comparison with religiosity (Love & Talbot, 1999; Marty, 2003; Mitroff, 2003; Sheldrake, 2007; Speck, 2005; Tisdell, 2003). However, Tisdell cited James Fowler’s theory of
faith development as “not always religious in its content or context” (p. 89). Tisdell agreed with Fowler that spirituality is part of faith development and it is “related to meaning making and [is, however,] beyond religious tradition” (p. 89).

The Judeo-Christian perspective has influenced many people’s understanding of spirituality. According to Milacci (2006), defining spirituality along the lines of religion or theology can be hazardous when it comes to understanding spirituality and learning. Milacci’s primary research question was “how do selected adult educators describe spirituality?” (p. 212). Although he tried to be inclusive in defining spirituality, Milacci conceded the definition of spirituality as “being grounded in a religious/ theological context, being grounded in faith” (p. 212). Milacci accepted that his definition was influenced by his worldview and Judeo-Christian lens. Therefore, it is difficult to define such an “elusive term and an elusive concept” as spirituality (Tisdell, 2000, p. 333) without a bias toward a person’s religious inclination or worldview.

Spirituality is related to the soul, whereas religiosity is related to rituals. Hyman and Handal (2006), in an effort to clarify the two concepts, religion and spirituality, examined them from a psychological angle. Hyman and Handal addressed the discrepancies by referring to the root of the word psychology to mean “the study of the soul [the word ‘psyche’ means ‘the soul’ in Greek]” (p. 264). Thus, any study related to the psychology of spirituality, religion, or faith in the context of human development must be validated in context of “the soul” before extending to traditional faiths and practices. Contrary, Hense (2006) contested this psychological concentration on the soul and insisted on the sense – a spiritual sensitivity, and a more “permissive description” based on spiritual traditions. However, Hyman and Handal maintained
that for content validation purposes, empirical research on religiosity or spirituality should concentrate on the “soul searching” of people in the psychology field.

There are many similarities between religion and spirituality. For some studies the terms are interchangeable (Cunningham, 2003; Hodge & McGrew, 2006; Hyman & Handal, 2006; Marty, 2003). For others there is a clear distinction between the terms (Daly, 2005; Walker, 2003). Thus, the two concepts have been considered directly related or distinctly separated depending on researcher biases. For Milacci (2006) and Tisdell (2003), when it comes to spirituality and religiosity, researchers bring their own worldview, beliefs, and conceptual biases. According to Daly (2005) sameness but differences exit between the two terms. Daly (2005) attempted to differentiate both concepts. For Daly, religiosity involves ritual practices, while spirituality involves more of the existential being and self-connection.

When contrasted closely, religiosity is considered the practice of institutionalized rituals, and spirituality is an experience of a human being, such as in transcendentalism. Religion is an extrinsic and intrinsic devotion to faith and practices (Daly, 2005; Marty, 2003). Thus, religion becomes a sacred external demonstration of one’s worldview, beliefs, and faith in an organized fashion (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004; Tirri et al., 2006; Tirri et al., 2005; Ubani & Tirri, 2006). In contrast, spirituality is a “humane behavior in daily life, including integrating one’s values and beliefs . . . transcendental quality of reality and belief in a higher power of some kind” (Ubani & Tirri, 2006, p. 359). The paradigm that Ubani and Tirri used was that spirituality is part of humanity, and there is always a humanistic dimension to spirituality. This dimension connects spirituality to humanity, people to people, and human beings to spiritual beings. That is interconnectivity.
Spirituality as Interconnectedness

There is a link between specific components of spirituality and the value of others. Many studies have shown that spirituality accounts for the development of self-concept (Magolda, 2001) and interconnectedness (Burkhardt & Nagai-Jacobson, 2002). For example, according to Magolda, self-authorship is an important concept in self-development, and self-development connects well with spirituality. Particularly, Magolda wrote on self-authorship among students, and said it helps to cultivate interconnections, a meaningful journey through college life. This author maintained that an effective self-transformation and interrelationship with others served as indicators of a person’s self-identity, self-concept, self-esteem, and a connection with others.

Self-concepts also promote meaning making in life. Self-beliefs, according to Bong and Skaalvik (2003), are parts of several socio-cultural factors, which are embedded with a spiritual connotation. Choi (2005) studied the relationship between self-concept and self-efficacy among college students, and found a spiritual connotation in their self-belief systems. For the 230 students studied by Choi, the two concepts (self-concept and self-efficacy) correlated because of the commonality of self-belief (faith). Both Bonk and Skaalvik and Choi made a potent discovery about the capacity of individual’s self-belief system to influence the ability to thrive and succeed in life. Independently, these researchers established the nexus between spirituality, as in meaning, and self-concepts. Many other researchers have established the connection between meaning in spirituality and self concepts that help one’s value of life (Bandura, 1982; Magolda, 2001; W. M. Reynolds, 1988; Vancouver & Kendall, 2006).

Finally, spiritual connectedness leads to understanding of human relations. Burkhardt and Nagai-Jacobson’s (2002) book, Spirituality: Living our Connectedness, is entirely devoted to explaining the relationship among people, their beliefs, and their wellbeing. They exposed the
interconnectedness as a paramount phenomenon that is both intuitive and exponential in human relations. For the authors, human beings are intuitively connected to one another; and as spirit beings, they are also universally connected to powers outside themselves.

Moreover, interconnectedness has been considered a moral responsibility. Frick and Frick (2007) also explained the concept of connectedness from an ethical perspective. For the authors, “The ethic of connectedness refers to community building and welfare as central to moral thought and practice” (Frick & Frick, 2007, p. 1). Frick and Frick associated connectedness with self-beliefs, social engagements, relationships with others, and professional ethics (or morals). Specifically, the ethics of connectedness is related to “the context of . . . relatedness to others” (Frick & Frick, p. 10). By implication, they referred to interconnectedness as a construct that brings meanings to life in societies. Thus, the concepts of interrelationship (Hodge & McGrew, 2006), interconnectedness (Burkhardt & Nagai-Jacobson, 2002), and ethics of connectedness (Frick & Frick, 2007) can be considered in a paradigm of “meaning creation” in social life.

**Meaning as a Component of Spirituality**

As discussed in an earlier section of this review, one characteristic of spirituality is meaning. First, meaning making is personal in life (Fry, 2000). Fry examined personal meaning in the wellbeing of the elderly. Fry concluded that personal meaning fosters resilience, hope, and relationship with others. According to Fry, personal meaning is sought within one’s self and in conjunction with relationships. Therefore, meaning can be evident in relationships both with others and with the supernatural. It is based on a purposeful relationship.

The first characteristic of meaning is purpose. Fry (2000) considered meaning as (a) a composite index of the purpose of life, (b) the sense of order, reason for existence, clear sense of identity, and (c) a future reason for life. Bee and Bjorklund (2004) further explained meaning as
The Construction of Purpose. Meaning is the interpretation of a purpose in life based on worldviews, internal mental models, and personal motives (Bee & Bjorklund). Fry (2000) and Bee and Bjorklund (2004) agree that meaning is synonymous with purpose, except that Bee and Bjorklund expanded further on the idea that meaning is the “central human motive” (p. 131). Meaning is “one characteristic all human beings have in common . . . [having] some sense that life is meaningful” (Bee & Bjorklund, p. 311). This purposefulness characteristic of meaning is consistent in many research studies and resonates the need for spirituality (Cadge & Catlin, 2006; Chalofsky & Griffin, 2005; Plattner & Meiring, 2006; Stewart & Koeske, 2006).

A second characteristic of meaning is the construction of reality. Meaning is characterized by the social construct of reality (Cadge & Catlin, 2006). Meaning gives the understanding of realities that are otherwise psychologically inexplicable. Meaning is the making of sense (Drath & Palus, 1994); it is the explanation of realities of “existential challenges” (Cadge & Catlin, p. 249). In other words, it is the part of the Wisdom of the Ego (Vaillant, 2001) that creates resilience, gives explanations during hardships or adversities, and makes life worth living. Cadge and Catlin recommended that the study of personal meaning systems include the “construct of an anchor” in the midst of challenges, sufferings, and the inexplicable in life, both professionally and socially.

A third characteristic of meaning in the context of spirituality is the construction of values, visions, and missions. Meaning can help in values creation (Chalofsky & Griffin, 2005; Walker, 2003). It can help envisioning (Huffman, 2003). And meaning can create an inner voice toward a mission (Palmer, 2000). Chalofsky and Griffin described meaning systems as the creations of values in life, particularly in a competitive community. Furthermore, based on the
works of Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, and Douglas McGregor, Chalofsky and Griffin (2005) found the nexus between meaning and motivation. Meaning exerts strength in adversity.

In a sense, meaning helps the creation of a vision. Huffman (2003) encouraged thoughtfulness, purposefulness (meaningfulness) through the power of envisioning. For Huffman, professional learning communities, for example, can be given a new meaning by “establishing a clear vision” (p. 21). Huffman explained envisioning as meaningful reflections of “systems of beliefs, values, and knowledge” (p. 22). Again, envisioning creates commitment, communality, and collaborative gains in any organization (Chalofsky & Griffin, 2005).

*Measuring Meaning in Life*

There are many ways to measure meaning in spirituality. Fry (2000) reviewed three instruments for such measurement: (i) the Spiritual Well-Being Scale, (ii) the Religious Orientation Scale, and (iii) the Religious Involvement Questions. According to Fry, these instruments are all valid and reliable. However, depending on the research interest, meaning can be measured as a factor within the context of spirituality using the multidimensional measurement of religiousness/spirituality instrument (MMRS) instrument (Stewart & Koeske, 2006).

In 1999, the Fetzer Institute (2008) produced the MMRS to reflect the complexity surrounding the definition of spirituality and part of this instrument measured meaning in life. Fetzer Institute organized a consortium consisting of religious, spirituality, and health specialists (Stewart & Koeske, 2006) to produce the MMRS instrument. The Fetzer Institute reported that many studies have used the MMRS instrument successfully. Stewart and Koeske also reported “a priori” and an exploratory factor analysis with 515 students. The authors found the “a priori” characteristics and structural validity of the MMRS as a great resource in measuring meaning.
However, due to the religious bias of MMRS, another measurement of meaning becomes more appropriate for the present study. This instrument is the *Meaning in Life Questionnaire* (MLQ) (see Appendix D) (Steger et al., 2006). For Steger and colleagues, “Because there is no universal meaning that can fit everyone’s life . . . each person must create meaning in his or her own life” (p. 80). The researchers developed the MLQ instrument containing 10-items equally divided into the two subscales: *Presence* and *Search*. Theoretically, Steger and colleagues based their work on Frankl’s works: i.e., *Search for Meaning* and *Will to Meaning*, the 10 items of MLQ define meaning as “the sense made of, and significance felt regarding, the nature of one’s being and existence” (p. 81). The framework for MLQ is about the individual’s perception assessed by the presence of and the search for meaning. So the questions are simple and direct; the respondents are to agree on a statement as to how true or otherwise it applies to them (Appendix D).

The MLQ is validated and tested and retested for reliability. Steger and colleagues did three different studies to support their claims. First, they did a study to minimize the Christian biases in the initial 44 items developed. Using a principal-axis factor analysis (PFA) with oblique (deltas = 0), the researchers were able to undertake a data reduction strategy. The result was the use of a scree-plot analysis that showed the presence of six factors (Eigenvalues of 11.63, 8.07, 2.03, 1.82, 1.54, and 1.27), but showing two main dominant factors. These two dominant factors were “the presence of meaning in people’s lives and the emphasis on the search for meaning” (Steger et al., 2006, p. 83). According to Steger et al., these findings were consistent with the researchers’ theoretical review.

In the second study, the Steger and colleagues used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to modify and test for fitness using 154 participants. The result, 17 items did not achieve an
acceptable fitness: “(goodness-of-fit index = .77; adjusted goodness-of-fit index = .71; normed fit index = .79; Tucker-Lewis index = .83; comparative fit index = .85; RMSEA = .11)” (Steger et al., p. 83). Following the second study, a third study was purposed “to further establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the MLQ subscales” (p. 85). In the third study, the researchers recruited population (N = 401) from a large university and a large community college in a metropolitan area to test for CFA and reliability with other meaning measures. For the third study, bivariate correlation coefficients were computed; analyses were done to establish convergent and discriminant validity for the two subscales; and thus, resulted in the Meaning in Life Questionnaire for Presence [MLQ-P] and Meaning in Life Questionnaire for Search [MLQ-S]). Finally, all the three sequential study yielded the convergent and discriminant validity of the entire MLQ subscales (e.g., a high correlations range of 0.61 – 0.74 between MLQ-P and other meaning measures).

Development and Characteristics of Moral Reasoning

The moral development debate has been ongoing since Kohlberg’s justice and Gilligan’s care concepts were first published (Rest, 1980). Within academia these two views have been the center of debate, with moral psychologists describing ways to characterize and measure moral reasoning (Bricker, 1993). Here, moral reasoning is reviewed to investigate what makes moral reasoning possible and measurable. As Bricker mentioned, moral reasoning is evident in character, but it is more evident in actions in the context of situations. For this part of the review, the moral reasoning debate is considered in context: Kohlberg and Gilligan, the definition of moral reasoning, the characteristics of moral reasoning, and the measurement of moral reasoning in literature.
Kohlberg’s Theory of Justice

Kohlberg started his approach to ethics and moral development as a professor at the Center of Moral Education at Harvard University. Kohlberg (1984) pioneered a theoretical description of six stages. His stages emphasize the development of moral judgment in the contexts of socialization and personality. According to Kohlberg, “After a child learns to speak, there are three major developmental stages of reasoning: the intuitive, the concrete operational, and the formal operational” (p. 170). By adolescence and young adulthood, many children may have grown to “partially attain the stage of formal operations; they consider all the actual relations of one thing to another at the same time, but do not consider all possibilities and do not form abstract hypotheses” (p. 171). Thus, Kohlberg suggested that many adolescents and adults would be at the “highest stage of formal operations” (p. 171).

According to Kohlbergian theory, most adults move to attain the logical stage that is to see and relate to “systems” put in place by the society. This individual is able to take up social roles, see and relate with others, and judge fairly or rightly. Kohlberg suggested a final step in the stages as the moral reasoning capacity. This is where the individual “requires a high stage of moral reasoning” (p. 172). At this stage, the individual is capable of following moral principles, living up to his or her moral reasoning, and attaining a moral stage predictable by “action in various experimental and naturalistic settings” (p. 172).

Theoretically, Kohlberg put the six stages of moral development into three major levels: pre-conventional level (stages 1 and 2), conventional level (stages 3 and 4), and postconventional level (stages 5 and 6). “The term ‘conventional’ means conforming to and upholding the rules and expectations and conventions of society or authority just because they are society’s rules, expectations, or conventions” (Kohlberg, 1984, p. 172). Hence, at the conventional level, the
individual comes to understand and uphold societal rules and expectations. Kohlberg mentioned, “one way to understand the three levels [or the six stages] is to think of them as three different types of relationships between the self and society’s rules and expectations” (p. 173). Moral reasoning takes place at all the stages but peaks at the postconventional level where individual principles are predominant. By then a person is able to differentiate “his or her self from rules and expectations of the others and defines his or her values in terms of self-chosen principles” (p. 173).

According to Kohlberg’s theory of moralization, the first stage is to do with punishment and obedience. At this stage, the individual is concerned about avoiding punishment to him or herself. The moral reasoning is egocentric, not so much in consideration of the interest of others. The second stage, instrumental exchange, is where the moral reasoning is guided by fairness and equal exchange. Both first and second stages form the preconventional level (Kohlberg, 1984).

The conventional level constitutes the third and fourth stages. The third stage is where the individual is preoccupied by mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and conformities. Here there is a shared value and conformity to social expectations. The fourth stage is the harmonious existence of social system and individual’s conscience maintenance. It is the stage where institutional systems are maintained alongside personal motives.

Finally, the postconventional level constitutes the last two stages: (a) prior rights and social contract, and (b) universal ethical principles. At this level the individual has developed the moral judgment that attaches a sense of obligation, awareness, and social contract to moral decisions. The stage of universal ethical principles brings moral perspectives where social arrangements are derived from morality. According to Kohlberg (1984), moral orientations also
follow basic (a) normative order, (a) utility consequences, (c) justice or fairness, and (d) ideal-self. For further details, see Table 1.

Among many developmental theorists, Kohlberg is known for his stand on justice as the “balance” or “equilibrium” in human development. In the developmental circles, according to Kegan (1986), Kohlberg’s contribution reaches far more than moral psychology. Kegan credited Kohlberg for his contribution at the explicit level to ego development theories. Loevinger (1986) wrote: “Kohlberg’s conception of the moralization of judgment has been hedged about almost from the beginning by the larger issue of maturation of personality generally” (p. 183). Loevinger saw the balance of personality or ego development and moral cognition in Kohlberg’s works. However, Loevinger criticized Kohlberg for his lack of empirical data, or published work, for some of his claims on issues closer to ego development such as personal reasoning. Still, most researchers support the notion that Kohlberg’s theory is an assertion of the prominence of justice (Flanagan & Jackson, 1993; Kegan, 1986; Rest et al., 1999; Thoma, 2006; Thoma et al., 1999; Weber, 1991). To these researchers, moral reasoning, or moral justice by Kohlberg, offers more to our understanding of human development in many respects.
### Table 1

**Contents of the Kohlbergian Moral Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and stage</th>
<th>What is right</th>
<th>Reasons for doing right</th>
<th>Social perspective of stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level I:</strong> Preconventional</td>
<td>To avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obedience for its own sake, and avoid physical damage to persons and property</td>
<td>Avoidance of punishment, and the superior power of authorities</td>
<td>Egocentric point of view: Doesn’t consider the interests of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stage 1:</em> Heteronymous morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following rules only when it is to someone’s immediate interest; Fairness, agreement, and equal exchange</td>
<td>To serve one’s own needs or interests in a world where you have to recognize that other people have their interests.</td>
<td>Concrete individualistic perspective: Right is relative, conflicting, and own interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II:</strong> Conventional</td>
<td>Living up to what is expected by people close to you or what people generally expect of people in your circles. Being good, good motives, concern about others, are considered important</td>
<td>The need to be good in your own eyes and those of others. Care for others. Belief in the golden rule. Support for rules and authority which support stereotypical good behavior</td>
<td>Perspective of the individual in relationships with other individuals. Shared feelings, agreements, expectations take primacy over individual interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stage 3:</em> Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and conformity</td>
<td>Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases where they conflict with other fixed social duties</td>
<td>To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the breakdown in the system, and to have an imperative conscience to defined obligations</td>
<td>Differentiates societal point of view from interpersonal agreement or motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level III:</strong> Postconventional</td>
<td>Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, that most values and opinions</td>
<td>A sense of obligation to law because of one’s social contract to make and abide by laws for the welfare of all and for the protection of all people’s right. “The greatest good for the greatest number”</td>
<td>Prior-to-society perspective. A rational individual awareness of values, rights, and social attachments and contracts. Considers moral and legal points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stage 5:</em> Social contract or utility and individual rights</td>
<td>Following self-chosen ethical principles. Particular laws or social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles. Principles are universal; principles of justice; equality, respect, and dignity of human beings as individual persons.</td>
<td>The belief as a rational person in the validity of universal moral principles, and a sense of personal commitment to them.</td>
<td>Perspective of a moral point of view from which social arrangements derive. Perspective is that of any rational individual recognizing the nature of morality or the fact that persons are ends in themselves and must be treated as such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 6:</strong> Universal ethical principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kohlberg accepted that moral development involves more than either justice or reasoning and the constructive criticisms. According to Kohlberg (1975, 1980), moral development has a basic cognitive-developmental characteristic that reinforces our theoretical understanding of some inexplicable human development elements. Some of these elements are perceptually discerned. So for Kohlberg, the measure of moral justice can best be captured qualitatively; that through interviews individuals’ perception of moral justice can be measured. Notably, the influence of Kohlberg’s justice in moral education, cognitive moral development, and socio-cultural moral sanctity in the American society is colossal and cannot be dismissed. Even though, according to Thoma (2006), the measurement of moral reasoning by Kohlberg’s justice using interviews is overly weighted on perceptions of fairness or justice.

_Gilligan’s Theory of Care_

Gilligan is also known for her work with women, feminists, and gender issues on moralization, which followed her publication, *In a Different Voice*, after her dissertation at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Gilligan (1987) opposed moral development based on justice that is biased against care. Gilligan presented a perceptive different from Kohlberg’s justice perspective. Based on Gestalt’s psychology of perceptual organization, Gilligan argued that there are always different ways of looking at a seemingly obvious image. “The justice perspective, often equated with moral reasoning, is recast as one way of seeing moral problems and a care perspective is brought forward as an alternate vision or frame” (p. 20).

For Gilligan (1987), “the distinction between justice and care cuts across the familiar divisions between thinking and feeling, egoism and altruism, theoretical and practical reasoning” (p. 20). Thus, because there are always two sides to every argument, Gilligan believed that the “two moral visions – one of justice and one of care – recur in human experience” (p. 20).
Fundamentally, the concept of two orientations has perpetuated the call of Gilligan and others to defend the differences in gender perspective when it comes to moralization.

In context of her work among women, Gilligan (1987) observed that when women talked about moral issues, their responses were divergent to “the assumptions that shape psychological thinking about morality and about self” (p. 21). Gilligan’s persistent criticism of Kohlberg’s ethics of justice (a male-dominated moral reasoning based on justice) caused Kohlberg to revisit his measurement of moral development and to acknowledge the care perspective (Kohlberg, 1884). Gilligan’s care perspective encourages a defining of self and others; “the self as a moral agent perceives and responds to the perception of need” (Gilligan, 1987, p. 23). She wrote, “Within a justice construction, care becomes the mercy that tempers justice; . . . or signifies altruism freely chosen . . . interpretations of care leave the basic assumptions of a justice framework intact: the division between the self and others, the logic of reciprocity or equal respect” (Gilligan, 1987, p. 24). For the natural dichotomy between males and females supported the interplay of justice and care in moral decisions.

In Gilligan’s theory of care, suffering in any circumstances is morally wrong in the light of care and compassion. Gilligan (1987) believed that a moral responsibility, a moral reasoning, must be driven by care and compassion for others. And the care perspective in the moral debate “may facilitate women’s ability to speak about their experiences and perceptions and may foster the ability of others to listen and to understand” (p. 32). Walker (2006) stated that gender and morality have ignited a contemporary debate in moral psychology between Kohlberg and Gilligan followers. And that Gilligan’s theory entails a methodological consideration (Walker, 2006). Yet, Walker continued, there are strengths in both Kohlberg-Gilligan perspectives.
Contextual Moralization: Gilligan vs. Kohlberg

Developmental studies suggest that an individual’s ability to relate with others depends on social development and the stages of life as a contextual progression (Jorgensen, 2006; Latif, 2001; Rest, 1989). Jorgensen (2006) examined both Kohlberg’s and Gilligan’s theories and believed that developmental processes include moral formation or moral development based on where individuals are on the adulthood spectrum. Jorgensen supported Erikson’s developmental stages, that an individual’s stage of development affects his/her relationship abilities, meaning of life, and more moral principles. And even though “there are two types of moral reasoning, namely Kohlberg’s justice and Gilligan’s care, there still seems [to be] unresolved issues” (Jorgensen, p. 179). Both sides primarily differ on differences in approach but not on relational differences. Moral reasoning is based on relationships.

Contextually, moralization can include both Gilligan’s and Kohlberg’s reviews. Jorgensen (2006) found commonalities between the two views. Thus, adult development theories allow the process of moralization from both Gilligan’s and Kohlberg’s perspectives, universally. Moralization theories accept both concepts: Kohlberg’s justice dominated by masculinity, and Gilligan’s care, predominantly in women as a contextual progression.

Interestingly, this dualistic progression is acceptable and fits according to individual gender, experiences, and developmental pathways. Rest, Thoma, Moon, and Getz (1986b) stated that Gilligan accepted her bias position on the gender differences; and contrasted Gilligan’s position with Kohlberg’s eventual acceptance of the care aspect. Rest and colleagues continued the idea that many still remember Gilligan’s stand on moral development against “the tradition of Piaget, Kohlberg, and other cognitive developmentalists” (p. 111). Yet, behind this contention is the bias that “Gilligan starts with the premise that male social development highlights a growing
sense of individuality, while female development stresses connectedness between individuals”
(Rest et al., 1986b, p. 111). For many researchers, the debate still continues (Nunner-Wininkler,
1993; Walker, 1993). Kohlberg, a male, used male subjects, and his masculinity may have
influenced his analyses and biases (Rest et al., 1986b).

However, it is also clear that moral development theorists demonstrate moral reasoning in
relations with one another. Kohlberg believed that individuals’ responses to dilemmas were
based on their perception of social relationships with others and conventions (Nunner-Wininkler,
1993). Nunner-Winkler explained that Gilligan is more about ethics of care and responsibility,
which women have been known to excel in when it comes to others. Gilligan believed there is a
fundamental difference between men and women in moral reasoning. And that this difference is
between justice and care: “two different types of moral reasoning that take different
developmental pathways” (Jorgensen, 2006, p. 181). Both justice and care are still important in
defining moral reasoning.

Definition of Moral Reasoning

The definition of moral reasoning can be difficult depending on the theory one adheres to in
research. Kohlberg (1980) wrote, “Morality is a troublesome word to many Americans who
equate morality with sexual norms and ethics or with professional fee setting and collusion
therein” (p. 19). According to Rest (1980), moral reasoning is a person’s moral judgment that
can be characterized by his or her socio-moral understanding and interpretation of moral
dilemmas. Moral reasoning is evident in problem-solving abilities, and it can be measured
psychologically in affective, behavior, and cognitive domains. In other words, moral reasoning
has cognitive abilities to it; but it is also garnished with affective (social values) and behavioral
(choice of actions) abilities (Rest, 1980). Clearly, according to Rest et al. (1986), behaviors, as much as cognitive and affective processes, demonstrate moral judgment.

In some psychology literature the words reasoning and judgment are interchangeable (Ellis, 2002; Pasupathi & Staudinger, 2001). High-level reasoning may be “the pinnacle of moral reasoning development” (Pasupathi & Staudinger, 2001, p. 403). Other researchers use the word judgment to mean the moral reasoning for judging moral issues (Kaplan et al., 2007; Rest, 1980; Thoma et al., 1999; Thoma et al., 1986). However, Pasupathi and Staudinger acknowledged the complexity of defining moral reasoning because of “competing moral claims” and “multiple perspectives” in arriving at decisions and actions.

Other researchers have considered moral reasoning in the light of social issues and human rights. Ellis (2002) attempted to define moral reasoning in a study of 545 students at UK universities regarding moral reasoning and homosexuality. Ellis equated reasoning to human rights. In all, the respondents (Ellis, 2002) favored a moral reasoning that is oriented more toward human rights than individual self-concerns, legal concerns, and even relationship concerns. Ellis suggested that “moral reasoning appears to be context-dependent” (p. 464) to support the socio-cultural element of defining moral reasoning. This author urged for a contextual definition because most moral arguments are in context with social issues and social change. Ellis also acknowledged that “The reliance on arguments based on existing social and legal frameworks is, however, problematic . . . [as] such frameworks often reinforce or even legitimate prejudice and discrimination” (p. 465).

Psychologically, based on reviews, moral reasoning can be operationally defined as individual’s reasoning or judgment manifested when he/she is confronted with societal moral issues (or traditional norms), professional dilemmas, and/or personal choices. Moral reasoning
must be measurable psychologically to reflect affective, behavioral, and cognitive abilities (Dellaportas et al., 2006; Lopez et al., 2001; Mason & Mudrack, 1997; Raaijmakers & Hoof, 2006; Rest, 1980; Rest et al., 1986a). For example, Raaijmakers and Hoof, who studied moral reasoning and socio-political attitudes among Dutch young adults wrote, “Moral reasoning is understood as the manifestation of an inner-psychological and cognitive-developmental structure that governs actions in situations in which moral claims conflict” (p. 618). From this definition, moral reasoning must be manifested by a psychological behavior or cognition, which is measurable against moral structures. And by moral structure, they meant “general organizing principles or patterns of thought rather than specific moral beliefs or opinions” (Raaijmakers & Hoof, p. 618).

Conceptually, therefore, the definition of moral reasoning as a variable, or moral judgment, should include the socio-cultural, social-moral context (Ellis, 2002; Raaijmakers & Hoof, 2006); it should include the concept of care (Gilligan, 1987; Walker, 2006) measurable in the three psychological domains (Rest, 1980); and the developmental context of Kohlberg’s postconventional stages (Rest et al., 1999). Contextually, moral reasoning should be framed within socio-moral norms. It should be measurable to allow psychological assessment. Finally, the assessment primarily should be categorized according to the six stages proposed by Kohlberg and possibly, analyzed to reflect the care and responsibility elements of moral reasoning proposed by Gilligan.

*Characteristics of Moral Reasoning*

Some other characteristics of moral reasoning are worth consideration. Moral development has certain traits (Rest 1986): (a) value for others, (b) conscience toward others, and (c) respect for others. In line with these traits, Pasupathi and Staudinger (2001) considered
that moral reasoning demonstrated characteristics such as “social intelligence,” particularly in understanding different perspectives. Also, moral reasoning correlates with age. Moral reasoning performance increases in adolescence; it is “largely stable in adulthood, with some studies showing small declines in later life” (Pasupathi & Staudinger, 2001, p. 403). Moral reasoning characteristically can be based on Kohlberg’s stage-based orientations, describing an order of development (Ellis, 2002).

Inclusive characteristic of moral reasoning should consider the concept of care. The mention of care as a concept in moral development brings the picture of sex-specific moral preferences associated with the work of Gilligan (Nunner-Winkler, 1993). Any characteristics of moral reasoning must include the ethics of care and responsibility. Nunner-Winker wrote, “The characteristics [of moral reasoning] . . . show the ethics of care and responsibility to be primarily an orientation to imperfect duties, the ethic of rights and justice to be primarily an orientation to perfect duties” (p. 144). Nunner-Winker pointed out that data from other studies have shown sex differences in moral judgment. “Females feel more bound by imperfect duties than do males; . . . [Secondly,] In moral decisions females will take more situational details into account” (Nunner-Walker, p. 153).

A debate is still going on about the characteristics of moral reasoning without sex-differences. According to Walker (1993), there are unjustifiable critical review of literature on Kohlberg’s moral reasoning as a neglect of issues regarding sex bias. Walker accepts that a study is exclusive if it is bias towards one sex, if analysis does not report on sex differences, and so forth. However, Walker explained that the reason why “DIT studies were fairly consistent in failing to reveal significance sex differences . . . [because] it yields continuous indexes, the “P” or “D” scores; it relies on stage definitions that differ somewhat from Kohlberg’s” (p. 162). In
his conclusion, Walker wrote in defense after review and meta-analyses “contrary to the prevailing stereotype, very few sex differences in moral development have been found [against Kohlberg’s theory]” (p. 176). But Baumrind (1993) counteracted and supported the characteristics of care and responsibility in moral reasoning by refuting the conclusion drawn by Walker’s work. “Gilligan [in most of her work] . . . has suggested that, characteristically, women are concerned with welfare, caring, and responsibility more than they are with abstract, universalistic justice” (Baumrind, p. 184). There may be a natural sex difference in moral reasoning; however, characteristically, what the differences are can be debatable.

In sum, inclusive characteristics of moral reasoning are (a) a sense of social contract, rights-based, and the best interest of the majority, (b) a universal ethical principle of justice, equality (human rights), (c) a respect for persons beyond the laws, respectively (Ellis, 2002, pp. 456-459), and (d) a sense of care and responsibilities. Mason and Mudrack (1997) also pointed out the concept of cooperation as another characteristics of moral reasoning. Their concept of cooperation stems from (a) the morality of obedience, (b) the morality of instrumental egoism and simple exchange, (c) the morality of interpersonal concordance, (d) the morality of law and duty to social order, (e) the morality of consensus-building procedures, and (f) the morality of nonarbitrary social cooperation (Mason & Mudrack, p. 1314).

Finally, Riaz (2007) described two forms or characteristics of moral reasoning: teleological and deontological reasoning. According to Riaz, teleological reasoning is based on “gauging [the] consequences” (p. 9). “In contrast, deontological reasoning assesses the morality of an act by applying a certain rule, ethic, or principle” (Riaz, p. 9). With the characteristic comes the orientation toward utilitarian or Kantian ethics, an essential component of professional ethics or moral reasoning. Moral reasoning also can be characterized by the choice of actions
based on consequences (teleological), the choice of cooperation with social norms, and the choice of reasoning based on personal principles.

**Cognitive Moral Development Measurements**

The measurement of cognitive moral development (CMD) has been a serious research area in the field of psychology raising the question about affective and behavioral domains. Cognitive-developmental moral education has been the focus of Professor James Rest’s career at the Center for the Study of Ethical Development at the University of Minnesota (CSED). Rest (1980) believed that psychological research can provide roadmaps for measuring and evaluating educational programs, particularly with regard to moral development. Rest’s DIT fortunately measures in the three domains: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Drawing on the work of Kohlberg, Rest (1980) devised a method of assessing an individual’s moral thinking. The result created a “process involves matching what people say with [the] description of stage characteristics in the scoring guide, and thereby arriving as a stage score” (Rest, 1980, p. 602).

Many CMD measurements have been developed along the work of Kohlberg, who started with moral judgment interviews (MJI). According to Rest (1980), unlike Kohlberg’s test by interviewing, he and his other researchers developed the DIT, which “uses a multiple-choice format and therefore can be objectively and easily scored” (p. 602). The DIT instrument was created based on “the assumption that people at different developmental stages will choose different statements as representing the most important issue” (p. 602). According to Rest (1980), unlike Kohlberg’s MJI, DIT is not suitable for younger participants. Rest and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota (CSED-UM, 2008) are responsible for improving the test of judgment by moving from interviews to multiple-choice answers (Thoma, 2006).
To compare DIT to other CMD instruments, Weber (1996) examined several cognitive moral development (CMD) instruments used to measure morality. Weber (1996) identified three instruments for measuring morality: The multidimensional ethics scale (MES), the moral judgment interview (MJI), and the defining issue test (DIT). MES was developed by Robin, Gordon, Jordon, and Reidenbach who “genuinely” sought to contribute to the field of CMD (Weber, 1996). Robin and colleagues sought “the ability to measure CMD and behavioral intent” (Weber, p. 517). Weber commended the researchers of MES for “the statistical analysis and rigor used in assessing their instrument” (p. 517). However, Weber dismissed the claim to have replaced existing CMD instruments with MES, particularly DIT and MJI.

In addition, Weber (1996) was concerned that the researchers, Robin and colleagues, who developed MES had made Kohlberg’s MJI and Rest’s DIT the same and interchangeable. Nevertheless, Kohlberg’s assessment of moral judgment paved way for Rest and others to develop the DIT at their center at the University of Minnesota. The difference between MMJ or MJI and DIT lies in the methods of gathering data. For DIT participants use multiple-choices to demonstrate their moral stands; Kohlberg’s (1984) MMJ used interviews. Unlike Robin and others’ MES, which promoted relativism, “the MJI and DIT, based on Kohlberg’s and Rest’s theories of CMD, establish a normative foundation relying on the two generally accepted ethics theories: deontology and utilitarianism” (Weber, p. 519).

**Managerial Moral Judgment Test**

The measure of managerial moral judgment (MMJT) was developed along the lines of previous CMD measurements. Loviscky, Trevino, and Jacobs (2007) published an assessment test that could be applied to the business or professional environment. According to Loviscky et al., other instruments measure moral reasoning in general, but the MMJT is specific to
managerial moral judgment. Dellaportas, Cooper, and Leung (2006) supported by stating, “DIT does not contain dilemmas of a business or professional nature” (p. 57).

The measure of managerial moral judgment was based on Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development and Rest’s defining issue test (DIT). Loviscky et al. found that these two measurements are “two different tests of cognitive moral development that tap the same general domains” (p. 265). The researchers found high correlations between scores from DIT and MJI ($r = 0.7$) to support their claim. Therefore, for Loviscky and colleagues there is the need to create a more appropriate measurement for managerial moral assessment. Hence, the need for MMJT, but still based on the assumption that most American adults reason at the conventional level. However, some American adults reach the “post-conventional or principled level, [where] the individual makes decisions more autonomous” (Loviscky et al., p. 265).

In addition, Loviscky et al. (2007) justified the need for a more appropriate measure for managerial assessment. Reviewing literature on other CMD measurements, these authors mentioned that Rest and his colleagues at CSED believed that moral measurement must be contextualized; and that the context dependency may affect results of the test. Loviscky et al. found that “managers invoke lower stages of moral judgment when making decisions in the managerial domain than when making decision in a more general life domain” (p. 266). Moreover, according to Loviscky and colleagues, managers’ responses to moral issues with employers, employees, and job candidates may be different from their responses in other circumstances. The MMJT offers “job-related ethical situations” to gauge managerial moral judgment in context; unlike MJI and DIT, Loviscky et al. (2007) claimed the MMJT to be more sensitive to job-related dilemmas.
MMJT is scenario based, professional or business oriented, and itemized just like the DIT. According to Loviscky et al. (2007), the managerial moral judgment test includes scenarios based on ethical dilemmas in the workplace. Even though the researchers acknowledged the limitations and challenges of using scenarios, they opted for this style believing that the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. First, Loviscky and colleagues believed that the content of decision-making of managers could best be captured through scenarios. Moreover, the scenario-based style serves as stimulus materials to garner the moral context. Second, the MMJT instrument was developed in context of realism with contributions from 11 experts who had corporate ethics and human resource backgrounds in various industries. The 11 content experts, Loviscky et al. claimed, gave the MMJI realism. Third, the 72 items (within six scenarios) of the MMJT are structured to effectively assess the post-conventional reasoning (according to the Kohlberg’s six stages). Post-conventional level of moral reasoning is important in businesses; “Since post-conventional reasoners have a well-developed, self-defined value system . . . managers who are post-conventional reasoners would be likely to earn high ratings on a performance appraisal dimensions that emphasize ethics or values” (Loviscky et al., p. 275).

With validation, the measure of managerial moral judgment (MMJT) has been vigorously tested. The researchers checked for evidence of construct validity. According to Loviscky et al., MMJT was studied in relationship with DIT, education, and age. Scores on the MMJT and DIT were consistent in correlation due to context-specificity. The study among doctoral students, MBA students, undergraduate seniors, and under classmen undergraduate students reported construct validity. Also in the MMJT was correlated with cognitive abilities, the Wonderlic Personnel Test and other tests to show construct validity.
In all, the measure of managerial moral judgment (MMJT) developed by Greg Loviscky, Linda Trevino, all of Pennsylvania State University, has shown credibility. The theoretical framework has been proven to align with established moral cognitive development theories. The comparison with Kohlberg’s MJI and Rest’s DIT is logical. MMJT is context-specific to managerial ethics and moral reasoning among business-related supervisory positions. Finally, the validity and reliability studies on MMJT have been vigorous. Therefore, for the present study, the challenges of using a scenario-based instrument may be overlooked because of the importance of its content-specificity. Again, the scoring system is cumbersome in each case whether DIT or MMJT. However, the authors of MMJT provided guidelines for the researcher (see Appendix H for details). There are two scoring of interest in the present study: (i) simple sum scores and (ii) \( P \)-scores.

Development and Characteristics of Diversity/Multiculturalism

*Introduction to Diversity: Altruism*

Altruism is an unselfish positive attitude or behavior toward others. It is marked by the belief that an action or decision that affects others must be mutually beneficial. According to Jarymowicz (1992), the altruistic movement in psychology is based on “we-ness” as “the degree of perceived similarity between a person and other people with regard to such qualities as age, social status, and personality” (p. 194). Altruism involves a sense of self and other(s). For social comparison, Jarymowicz exposed “Me-We-They” differentiation to expand on the respect a person ought to have for other; the respect for diverse opinions; and the social responsibility people should have for others and themselves.

In addition, respect in any relationship is important in altruistic movement. Jarymowicz’s (1992) altruism research recognized “self-we-others” as important in altruistic involvement. This
means, to avoid “egocentricizing tension” first, one has to show responsiveness in diversity. Second, according to Jarymowicz, altruism leads to interdependency shown by the tripartite “self-we-others”. Third, in an altruistic sense, we need positive attitudes to evoke more similarities than differences. Four, in altruism, self-respect leads to respect for others. Finally, Jarymowicz concluded that the lack of self, self-we, self-others, and self-we-they distinctiveness could be problematic in diversity.

Thus, the lack of any of this distinctiveness leads to defensiveness, identity crises, and prejudices and hostility in any diversity or multicultural environment. In altruistic movement, the self is made less in order to avoid the ego. Egocentric can be positive at times, but it can be destructive in an environment that promotes diversity. Lack of self-we-they identity can lead to lack of cooperation in a multicultural organization. Therefore, the lack of awareness has to be assessed. People must be exposed to diversity before assessment on learning (in the affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains) can take place.

Diversity and Multicultural Initiatives

Diversity is prevalent in any natural environment unless one scientifically creates a homogeneous sameness. Diversity is universal. Connerley and Pedersen (2005) and many others advocated for diversity and multicultural initiatives in awareness, knowledge and skills. Connerley and Pedersen defined diversity as a focus on differences, and “multiculturalism focuses on aspects of multiple cultures” (p. 3). Universally, people have differences and similarities; there are differences in culture, worldviews, and practices; and there are difference in opinions, abilities, and orientations (Fuertes et al., 2000).

Diversity initiatives may be more related to legal requirements that organizations abide and promote. Organizations promote tolerance, value of others, cultural fitness, and acculturation
as a social responsibility (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). Moreover, in a multicultural society, the
most positive way to incorporate diversity is to encourage, acknowledge, and advance
differences. According to Connerley and Pedersen, “Differentiation and integration are
complimentary processes” (p. 5); any attempt to create a “culture-free” environment is as elusive
as the concept of “melting pot” heralded in the old American tradition. According to Fuertes et
al. (2000), awareness of diversity, alike and different, promotes effective interactions among
people. Whether legal or moral, diversity initiatives are imposed universally in organizations.

Diversity and multiculturalism add value to an organizational environment. Connerley
and Pedersen (2005) explained the added value of promoting diversity and multicultural
competency in any organizational environment, and they cited companies that have benefited
from such action: General Motors, Citicorp, Colgate-Palmolive, Exxon Mobile Corporation,
United Parcel Services. More importantly, these authors have been proactive in research,
training, and development of diversity and multiculturalism. Again, according to the National
Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC, 2008), organizations benefit by setting goals toward
cultural leadership. In 2004, Schein offered models for conflict management style, intrapersonal
cultural grid, and constructive ways of dealing with different people in a diverse or multicultural
environment.

Moreover, currently, diversity and multiculturalism are studied in many fields.
Diversity/multiculturalism has been introduced in schools (K-12) and teacher education classes
(Alexander, Kruczek, and Ponterotto, 2005; Asher, 2007; Kitsantas & Talleyrand, 2005). It is
taken seriously in psychology and counseling (Glockshuber, 2005; A. L. Reynolds & Pope,
1991; Sue et al., 1992), and in higher education (Krishnamurthi, 2003), in the student affairs
profession (Castellanos, Gloria, Mayorga, & Salas, 2007), and the area of college student
personnel (Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996). In K-12 teacher education, Asher (2007) pointed out the demographic changes in the United States calling for multicultural engagement. Asher challenged teachers to stop denying the idea and become proactive regarding due to multiculturalism with respect to race, culture, gender, and sexuality.

Diversity/Multicultural competencies have been promoted among preservice teachers. Particularly in K-12 teacher preparation, and students are encouraged to be multiculturally competent (Kitsantas & Talleyrand, 2005). Kitsantas and Talleyrand said that even though diversity may be a sensitive subject, it is better to prepare for it than not to do so. They even suggested the use of technology as a resource to promote multicultural competencies, especially after increased conflict and tension that “resulted in the wake of [September 11th, 2001], there has been cry for help to increase the awareness of, understanding of, and tolerance among diverse racial and ethnic groups” (Kitsantas & Talleyrand, 2005, p. 633). Therefore, these researchers recommended the engagement of experts to equip teachers, counselors, and school leaders using online technology as a tool for diversity understanding.

In higher education circles, diversity promotion and multicultural competencies development are interchangeable when it comes to initiatives. Krishnamurthi (2003) explained that diversity and multiculturalism in higher education means “representation of people that exemplifies all cultural and congenital differences. Diversity is an essential component of multiculturalism, but multiculturalism encompasses more than diversity” (p. 263). Krishnamurthi has asked that higher education institutions proactively promote multicultural competencies, and considered higher education (HE) institutions as diverse as the universe. HE has diversity in gender, race, social economic status (SES), sexual orientation, abilities and disabilities; these communities are filled with different cultures and subcultures. As a case study, Krishnamurthi
assessed the comprehensive initiative of Northern Illinois University and recommended that such “diversity and multicultural initiatives are increasingly becoming important in higher education due to the changing demographics” (2003, p. 275).

Again, in higher education, diversity and multiculturalism initiatives have been taken seriously in the field of student affairs. According to Pascarella et al. (1996), a major problem exists when institutions fail to acknowledge the shortcomings in college students’ cultural experiences, and these authors found a direct impact of “students’ appreciation and acceptance of cultural, racial, and value diversity” (p. 175). Pascarella et al. asked for more research on the impact of diversity and multiculturalism initiatives; based on the value added to both academic and nonacademic competencies, these researchers suggested openness to diversity and multicultural education in all college fields. Pascarella et al. observed that receptivity to diversity and multiculturalism can be assessed at both institutional and individual levels, and that students who are exposed to diversity/multicultural openness are challenged, self-accentuated, and more likely to change.

With regard to gender differences, diversity acceptance and cultural competencies (awareness, knowledge, and skills) are important for both integration and acceptance. Many gender-related studies point to differences, and include a tone of feminist advocacy. Yet, the research concentration on women may be overly biased (Liu, 2005). Liu studied men, masculinity, and multiculturalism. Liu highlighted the need for studying these topics in the gender literature. Liu also stressed gender socialization differences as an important issue regarding the concepts of diversity and multiculturalism. Particularly, Liu considered the issues of the construction of gender and race in such multicultural competencies focusing on men of color, men in the workplace, and men in worldviews. Liu’s (2005) argument contains many
reasons that point to differences between male-female acquisition of knowledge, awareness, and skills. Hence, any diversity/or multicultural initiative or assessment of such initiatives must be universal: adaptable to gender, race, and other natural dichotomies (Fuertes et al., 2000).

Measuring Diversity/Multicultural Competencies

Most researchers assess multicultural competencies according to awareness, knowledge, and skills (Alexander et al., 2005; Beasley, 1988; Castellanos et al., 2007; Connerley & Pedersen, 2005; Fuertes et al., 2000; Glockshuber, 2005; Hage et al., 2006; Liu, 2005). Kocarek et al. (2001) reviewed the reliability and validity of three scales mainly used in the counseling profession: the multicultural counseling awareness scale (MCAS), the multicultural awareness-knowledge-and-skills survey (MAKSS), and the survey of graduate students’ experiences with diversity (GSEDS) and found similar correlations among awareness, knowledge, and skills. According to these authors, other areas such as relationship and comfort are measured.

The works of Raechele L. Pope and Amy L. Reynolds, and many other researchers in the field of student affairs have informed the theory behind multicultural competence measurement. In most literature related to multicultural competencies in student affairs in particular, these researchers have pioneered the understanding of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills (Castellanos et al., 2007; A. L. Reynolds & Pope, 1991). Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller (2004) referred to multicultural organization development (MCOD) in the 1980s to exemplify a systematic effort by business leaders to create multicultural sensitivity at the organization level. Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller recommended that both individuals and organizations test their multicultural readiness in the areas of awareness, knowledge, and skills.

Awareness is the understanding (sensing) of multicultural environment in any social context. Thorough it, individuals become aware of differences in culture or the re-socialization
that may occur in any setting (Liu, 2005). Awareness is paramount, and it is the beginning of
cultural competence, whether multi-cultural or sub-cultural. Connerley and Pedersen (2005)
explained that awareness is like the Socrates’ “know thyself” quotation. Most diversity
researchers will measure awareness as a subscale (Castellanos et al., 2007).

*Knowledge* refers to the declarative, procedural, and strategic abilities of individuals to
understand and apply facts about different cultures. Knowledge is obtained through systematic
learning (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). For Connerley and Pedersen there were three distinct
areas of knowledge: declarative, procedural, and strategic. Declarative knowledge included an
individual’s store of facts, that is, “verifiable blocks of information” (p. 93), for appropriate
interpretations to situations. Procedural knowledge is understanding when and how to apply the
facts with procedures to the context of situations. And “strategic knowledge is the highest level
of knowledge and it is used for planning, monitoring, and modifying goal-directed activity”
(Connerley & Pedersen, 2005, p. 93) in multicultural setting. For Liu (2005), multicultural
knowledge is the contextual understanding of the psychology of men, for example, in terms of
their needs, expectations, and roles. It is the strategic understanding of men’s behaviors,
worldviews, and attitudes. Hence, knowledge reinforces facts and information that build
multicultural competencies.

*Skills* are “the capacities needed to perform a set of tasks that are developed as a result of
training and experience” (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005, p. 94). Quoting Confucius, saying, “I
hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do and I understand,” Connerley and Pedersen
explained that skills equal demonstrable actions such as communicating a new language, eating
new foods, and becoming acculturated. It adds to the ability to adapt to multicultural situations.
Skills competencies can be demonstrated in four ways: conceptual, humanistic, technical, and political.

Skills in multicultural competencies allow leaders to demonstrate correct actions, in a correct cultural context. Connerley and Pedersen wrote, “in developing multicultural competencies in leaders, skill is the most important stage of all and therefore requires a great deal of preparation before teaching about awareness and knowledge” (p. 94). Also, for a practical explanation of skill in multicultural competencies, Liu (2005) described a psychologist who skillfully examines specific behavior, such as rage, alienation, and respect, in the context of a specific culture, such as the African-American adolescents. A culturally competent person will show skillful understanding of a person’s worldview. In other words, according to Liu, skill is where awareness and knowledge are turned into actionable competency for desirable results.

*Miville-Guzman’s Universal-Diverse Scale*

In addition to multicultural competencies in awareness, knowledge, and skills, there is also a more universal diversity measurement that measures “an awareness and potential acceptance of both similarities and differences in others that is characterized by interrelated cognitive, behavioral, and affective components” (Fuertes et al., 2000, p. 153). Fuertes et al. (2000) agreed that the measurement of multicultural competencies can take different forms, and one of the forms is the universal diversity orientation. Universality in diversity is an important concept. Fuertes et al. cited the work of Miville and colleagues in the 1990s that resulted in the universal diversity orientation. Subsequent work resulted in the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS).

The concept behind M-GUDS is a universal diversity “based on universal and common aspects of human experiences” (Fuertes et al., 2000, p. 157). M-GUDS includes 45 items
measuring three areas: diversity of contact (DC), relativistic appreciation (RA), and a sense of connection (SC). By accounts of three studies, Fuertes and colleagues created a shorted version (i.e., Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale-Short [M-GUDS-S]). This shorter version consisted of 15 items that were carefully and statistically studied “by selecting the five highest structure coefficients in each of the three factors identified” (Fuertes et al., 2000, p. 163).

The short form of the M-GUDS is broken into five items for each subscale: DC, RA, and SC. However, the sense of connection (SC) was renamed the comfort with differences (CD). According to Fuertes et al., all the 15 items selected for measuring the DC, RA, and CD factors were factor analyzed, structurally and constructively tested for validity and reliability. According to their study, the internal consistency reliability correlates significantly among the three factors in both the long and short versions ($\alpha = .77, p < .001$). The researchers undertook three different studies using several statistical analyses to confirm their confidence in the shorter scale.

The statistical evaluation of Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale – Short (M-GUDS-S) has been very vigorous. Some of the statistical analyses the researchers did included confirmatory factor analysis and multiple indicators of fit: Bentler-Bonnet nonnormed fit index, goodness of fit index, and comparative fit index (Fuertes et al., 2000, p. 164). For Fuertes et al. (2000), the M-GUDS-S is suitable for varied settings and recommended for future investigation in the measurement of multicultural competencies, or more specifically, universal diverse orientation. However, one issue with M-GUDS and M-GUDS-S is that the central focus is assessing individual’s competency in the larger and broader diversity (universal) environment. Also, the instruments are meant to measure the cognitive, behavioral, and affective domains.

The M-GUDS-S does not specifically follow the conventional awareness, knowledge, and skills model. Unlike other instruments for measuring multicultural competencies, the M-
GUDS-S measures diversity in sync with the three learning domains: cognitive, behavioral, and affective. This is consistent with Chavez, et al.’s (2003) work on the individual diversity development model. However, Castellanos, et al. (2007) suggested taking etic (culture-general) and emic (culture-specific) approaches to multicultural competencies. Thus, Castellanos and colleagues (2007) proposal etic and emic accounts for differences that exist in general and at the individual levels. In other words, whether the awareness-knowledge-and-skills model is used or the UDO model is used, the universal diversity context is measured psychologically in the three domains.

For the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS) both long or short versions, the most important factor is that all the three domains considered. Thus, (a) the relativistic appreciation (RA) of oneself and others equates cognition; (b) the seeking a diversity of contact (DC) with others equates behavior (action), and (c) the sense of connection or comfort with diversity (CD) within a larger society or humanity or organization as a whole shows affection. The M-GUD-S is, therefore, appropriate for assessing diversity or multicultural diverse fields other than the counseling or student’s affairs professionals (Fuertes et al., 2000). Hence, M-GUDS-S is adapted for the present study because it is valid and reliable; it is also short and quick to administer.

Individual Diversity Development and Otherness Leadership Development

Individual diversity development (IDD) can be assessed to reflect an individual’s ability to learn and function in social transformation. Chavez, Guido-DiBrito, and Mallory (2003), using a constructivist approach, established a framework for learning to value the “other.” This learning framework led to the understanding of multiple developmental pathways focusing on individual cognition differences. In addition, their study established five levels in IDD. All these
levels, according to Chavez et al., construct diversity competency, that is, the “differentiation of knowledge construction among diverse cultures” (pp. 454-455) for individuals to demonstrate affective, behavioral, and cognitive skills in social transformation.

According to Chavez and colleagues (2003), the concept of individual diversity development springs from four main theoretical concepts. First, IDD follows Kegan’s Five Orders of Consciousness. The construction of learning to value “others” comes through “mental organization affecting thinking, feeling and relating to others” (p. 455). Second, IDD draws from Gilligan and other similar moral theorists to explore diversity and development of the value of both identity and connection, naturally. Third, that diversity is “inherent in oneself” in the midst of what society considers as normal. Finally, IDD is based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Chavez et al. (2003) mentioned that diversity has been influenced by needs on behavioral choices and the value of others. Thus, individual diversity development corresponds to how individuals respond to others, in similarities and in differences, based on their changes in thinking, needs, motivations, and choices.

Individuals progress in learning to value “others” or otherness. Chavez et al. (2003) discussed the assessment of an individual’s progression through the IDD model. IDD is a model for growing in diversity and multicultural competencies at five levels. “For any one kind of otherness, individuals move – although not necessarily in a linear progression – through periods of unawareness/lack of exposure, dual awareness, questioning and self-exploration, risk-taking or other exploration, and integration dimensions” (Chavez et al., p. 458).

The first level is Unawareness/Lack of Exposure. The IDD starts with a state of unawareness/lack of exposure to others. Individuals should accept their lack of awareness, a conscious sense of not-knowing the “other” behaviorally and culturally. Individuals must
recognize their lack of awareness, knowledge, and skills regarding differences in others (Chavez et al., 2003; Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). Connerley and Pedersen also supported this notion of unawareness and encouraged an awareness to counter ignorance as a first step to facilitate multicultural appreciation. Otherwise, Chavez et al. noticed, as prevalent in most adults, the individual remains ignorant because “individuals often surround themselves with family, friends, and even coworkers who are, at least visually, similar to them” (p. 459).

The first stage of diversity development is rudimentary for avoiding stereotypes. Without awareness a person can have “generalized conceptions of others based on incorrect, stereotypical, out of context, or exaggerated information” (Chavez et al., 2003, p. 459). According to Chavez et al., at this stage, in developing diversity awareness a conscious effort should be implemented to expose individuals to “facilitate reflection on types of differences such as religion, body type, personality, and personal habits” (p. 459). Such awareness can lead to an exposure of any flaws in thoughts, deeds, emotions, and behaviors. The effort has to be a planned to confront the lack of awareness.

The second level of the IDD is Dualistic Awareness. The individual progresses from the lack of awareness to a dualistic reality pertaining to the obvious opposite differences such as morality (good and bad), gender (male and female), race (the “same” and “different” from you), age (young and old), and so forth. Chavez et al. (2003) termed it “difference dichotomously.” In this context, these authors cited an example of how obvious cultural differences can be polarizing. Dualistic awareness is a simplistic awareness of the “other(s)” in the learning domains. In this dimension the individual benefits from expanding his or her knowledge base by accepting and analyzing multiple perspectives rather than a bi-polarity dichotomy. Here, diversity competency is developed through discussions on diverse opinions, “processing
affective and cognitive hooks,” and examining misconceptions to transform behaviors (Chavez et al., p. 461).

The third dimension of IDD is **Questioning/Self-Exploration.** Individual diversity competency development involves individuals questioning “their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in relation to others” (Chavez et al., 2003, p. 461). The individual progresses from dualistic thinking to realistic thinking (relativism), which involves reflection. The advantage is that “once [the] individual accepts the possibility of relativism, it is difficult – if not impossible – to retreat to dualism” (Chavez et al., p. 461). Cognitively, the individual questions original traditions, beliefs, values, and cultural teachings; affectively, the individual feels the mixture of both anger and excitement; and behaviorally, the individual is motivated to explore more new information on the other’s culture. According to Chavez and colleagues, questioning creates room for self-reflection, and it generates a meaningful relationship with the others.

The fourth dimension of IDD is **Risk Taking/Exploration.** This is a natural progression from the questioning to adventure. According to Chavez et al. (2003), this dimension is proactive, challenging, and risk-taking. The risk involves facing “the real possibility of rejection” by close and distant others. These authors suggested inclusion and mentoring with others. It can be done through well-programmed activities such as studies abroad, service learning, collaborative staff and faculty training series. In such cases, participants are encouraged to look for the ideal balance of challenges and substantive development. Individuals develop diversity or multicultural competencies at this level by taking risk to explore more of the otherness.

Finally, the fifth dimension of IDD is **Integration/Validation.** This dimension of IDD is progressive and responsible learning. It involves an individual’s centering on both his or her own self-concept and respect for others. “In this dimension, individuals begin to see themselves, as
well as others, both as members of a variety of different populations and as complex individuals with many identities and characteristics” (Chavez et al., 2003, p. 463). Cognitively, individuals acknowledge the rights, responsibilities, and contributions of others. Individuals accept similarities and differences in a group. Affectively, there is a good sense of self-esteem, comfort, and appreciation. Behaviorally, individual actions are in sync with integrity, thoughtfulness, and confidence. At this dimension, individuals are able to validate “the need for connection with communities of identity and the need for appreciating the diversity within these communities” (Chavez et al., 2003, p. 463).

In effect, individual diversity development can be a great way to look at diversity, even cross-culturally. According to the National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC, 2008) at Georgetown University, cultural or multicultural competence can be developed by both individuals and organizations. The NCCC conceptualized that developmental levels can be enhanced and evaluated to highlight cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. Chavez et al. (2003) tested their IDD model cross-culturally and recommended diversity development wherever differences exist. First, individuals need to acknowledge differences. Second, individuals must acknowledge flaws in bi-polarity. Third, individuals should question their own perceptions. Fourth, in a diverse or multicultural environment, individuals must be prepared to take risks in exploring ways to value others. Finally, individuals have to validate their own information concerning others. All these levels are assessable in the three learning domains: affective, behavioral, and cognitive, making otherness evaluation possible.
Graduate Students’ Citizenship and Leadership

Background

There have been many studies on the leadership of graduate students. For many years the field of leadership development has been the focus of study among business graduates in particular (Siegel, 1973). Siegel researched what has influenced leadership among his study participants, 73 MBA students, 36 managers, and 13 faculty colleagues in two Ontario business schools, in organizational settings. Siegel looked at popular themes in leadership, such as authoritative and democratic leadership. As far back as in 1973 Siegel was more concerned about socialization themes, attitudes involved in relationships, and organizational reality or cultural in perspective.

Siegel’s findings have a historical importance regarding the development of graduate business students’ leadership. Siegel’s study shows that historically, leadership has been about relationships. According to Siegel (1973), previously, most studies had been about leadership abilities and behaviors, but his study is about trust and skills in these relationships (socialization context). Thus, Siegel was concerned about “our educational institutions, in emphasizing knowledge, skills, techniques, may in the process be de-emphasizing the future manager’s faith and trust in others” (p. 409). More important, Siegel mentioned, “in studying the socializing effects of a graduate school of business . . . attitude changes were related to attitudes of the school’s faculty [towards socialization]” (p. 409). In other words, business educators’ or faculty’s values, morals, and actions in social context have a direct influence on graduate students (their constituents).

Although, one may argue that the generalizability may be limited because of the Canadian sample, studies in America are consistent with Siegel’s (1973) findings (e.g., Brown,
Sturges et al. looked at the influence of business programs on MBA careers and concluded that today’s society demands soft skills more than the traditional technical skills. Leavitt also pointed out some aspect of managerial education on which business colleges are failing to concentrate. Leavitt, like many researchers, are encouraging people soft skills, empathy, and emotional relationships to management or leadership in business circles.

In more recent years, future professional leaders, whether in business or education, are admonished to look at relationship for effectiveness. Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) drew attention to *The Leadership Challenge* that focuses on effective practices to promote leader-followers relationship. The authors emphasized credibility as the foundation of leadership; credibility is a hallmark of trust (a show of good citizenship) in relationship. Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy, and Wirt (2004) also advised educational administrators to advance values, equity, and moral responsibility as signs of good governance. The authors cautioned the simplification of educational leadership as the “mundane work of making a bureaucratic work” (p. 225). They urged educational leaders to take the social interrelationship that appears in today’s society seriously if they have to impact their school community.

In the twenty-first century, the challenge of management and leadership coincide with professional citizenship. Kotter and Cohen (2002) mentioned that many organizations were over-managed and under-led in the C20th century; for “management is about coping with complexity while leadership is about coping with change” (Hill, 2000, p. 63). But with change prevalent around us, future leaders either business or education, are admonished to demonstrate competencies in people skills, believability, and moral citizenship that allow effective influence on their respective constituents.
Demographic Characteristics

Traditionally, one or two programs may dominate graduate teacher and business education. For example, Masters in Business Administration (MBA) degrees traditionally dominate graduate business education. Most business colleges place great emphasis on MBA programs. But, the business college traditions are being challenged; “they [MBA programs] are reluctant to change, even after traveling the same track for over thirty years” (Leavitt, 1989, p. 39). According to Leavitt (1989), since the 1960s the programs have MBA has dominated business graduate programs partly because of salaries of grantees, career prospects, and recruitment and support systems from most business graduate colleges. However, other business programs include finance and banking, accounting, economics, management, and organizational development.

A program such as teaching and learning, or the early child education may also dominate the teacher education. However, the situation may differ in various colleges. According to Leavitt, there is the need to improve the design of programs such as “the whole MBA experience” to include psychological development, leadership skills, a focus of globalization, and management actions. Leavitt mentioned the need to focus “leadership, imagination, and determination, sense of duty?” (p. 40). Banks and Nguyen (2008) stated: “The increasing racial, ethnic, cultural, language, and religious diversity in nation-states throughout the world raises new and complex questions about educating students for effective citizenship” (p. 137). Characteristically, the demographic trends have given rise to many other programs such as educational leadership, special educations, cross-cultural or diversity education. Colleges have increased traditional programs particularly to main relevant and effective in teacher education in respond to the social changes.
Another demographic characteristic of graduate students is the intellectual capacity demonstrated in test scores. There has been a greater emphasis on test scores than on other abilities in many of such programs, which affects certain demographics. Many education programs will take graduate students with high GRE scores. Leavitt (1989) questioned the concentration of high-scored GMAT students in business college admissions: “They treat managerial potential as largely a matter of narrowly defined, IQ-type intelligence” (p. 43). Leavitt raised many questions, including what contributes to team building? What constitutes vision, values, and determination? What should be taught at graduate business colleges? Eventually, Leavitt wrote, “[we need] more emphasis on individual vision, values and determination” (pp. 47-48). Thus, assessment of potential candidates for MBA degrees may be more than just IQs and GMAT test scores. Candidacy may require EI scores: Goleman and his team of emotional intelligence theorists advocated for EI more than IQ in a graduate business curriculum (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). Goleman et al. advocate for relationship-based intelligence that consistently emphasizes emotional abilities more than technical-based abilities in management as well as leadership.

Demographically, there are different genders, characteristics, and accessibility conditions in most graduate programs. Laczniaiak and Inderrieden (1987) studied 113 MBA students in an urban Midwestern university and described the subjects as “primarily a part-time, night-time operations, 85% of the students currently hold full-time managerial positions in an organization” (p. 300). These characteristics of graduate business students may still be apply. Other studies have shown student diversity to include men and women (Kaplan, 1994; Simpson, 2000; Sturges, Simpson, & Altman, 2003; Waclawski, Church, & Burke, 1995); differences in disciplines such as Business Administration (MBA), Organizational Development (MOD) (Waclawski et al.,
1995), Human Resources Management (HRM) (Warren, 1999); and Accounting (Allen & Ng, 2001). Currently, students from all types of backgrounds enter higher education institutions: Whites, Blacks, Hispanics/Latinos, Asians, and others. Even though, statistically, demographic minorities are still remain under-represented in most graduate business colleges, institutional policies are becoming more proactive in both recruitment and commitment (Smallwood, 2005).

In graduate teacher education, institutions seek to represent the demographic needs of the society. Many colleges seek demographic representation of the community they serve. Within the concept of No Child Left Behind, many graduate teacher students are learning to be all inclusive; teacher students are coming from different backgrounds, pursuing different specializations, and taking into consideration the needs of their community (Abedi & Dietel, 2004; May, 2005; Sergiovanni et al., 2004). Educationally, they are responding to the No Child Left Behind Act by offering diverse programs, diverse strategies to tackle needs, and to facilitate inclusiveness (Abedi & Dietel, 2004).

However, May (2005) believes that demographically, educational leaders still have a long way to reach the object of the No Child Left Behind. Particular concern is raised on demographic balance of representing minorities (including race, disability, and gender) in educational programs and in school building leadership. Banks and Nguyen (2008) support the balance in teacher education that encourages citizenship and diversity leadership. Cultural pluralism is historically challenging to most teacher education systems; but its becoming more challenging philosophically for many higher education institutions to embrace the changing culture and demographics of the United States (Banks & Nguyen). According to Banks and Nguyen, educational institutions should promote citizenship education as a way to “enable students from diverse groups to experience cultural freedom and empowerment” (p. 148).
Gender Differences in Graduate Education

Gender differences among graduate students have been the focus of many studies (Liu, 2005; Simpson, 2000, 2006; Waclawski et al., 1995). Waclawski et al. (1995) examined the differences between women and men as organizational development (OD) practitioners of 416 study participants (150 women and 266 men). These authors noted that the OD field, once dominated by men, has experienced an influx of women. Both genders bring their values and differences to OD practice causing “change in their consulting efforts with regard to this diversity issue . . . and how they [women] are similar and different from their male counterparts is of particular importance to the field” (Waclawski et al., 1995, p. 91). Women, theoretically, are seen as more caring than men. But both can equally be tenacious and deliver results. Also, these researchers mentioned the gender differences in OD strikes a “balance between humanistic values and increase efficiency of functioning” in a time where “productivity and efficiency are being stressed” in most organizations (Waclawski et al., 1995, p. 91).

In another study, Simpson (2006) considered masculinity and femininity in management education. Simpson’s study objective was to examine gender issues in critical management education, and to expose the problem of “masculine underpinnings of management values and practice” (p. 182). In addition, Simpson’s study was done with the intent of calling for a need to “feminize” the MBA. Many demographic debates follow the conceptual framework of Gilligan and other feminists. The reason Simpson (2006) gave for her study was simply, citing the work of Gilligan, that there is “a broader meaning beyond intrinsic characterizations of men and women to include attributes and qualities culturally associated with the categories male and female” (p. 183). Thus, while most non-MBA programs may recognize these differences and incorporate that understanding, Simpson (2006) noted, business education is slow in promoting
this difference. There are soft, personal, and interpersonal managerial skills that are “being recognized as critical to the successful manager, it has been argued that they remain a neglected component of management education” (p. 183). This was not to deny all traditional masculine approaches, however, as Simpson believed, “criticality does not necessitate a wholesale rejection of a creed, merely a point of departure from it in terms of interpretation, belief, and expression” (p. 190). Therefore, according to much research, gender in business education brings differences in values, beliefs, and expressions. It also promotes the quality of diversity.

**Professional Citizenship and Career Diversifications**

Current research phenomena in graduate business and teacher education are professional citizenship and career diversification. Many research studies have discussed on diverse areas of interests, including spirituality, moral formation, career orientation/competencies, and internationalization (Bigel, 2002; Guy, 2001; Kaplan et al., 2007; Marques, 2006; Phau & Kea, 2007; Primeaux, 2005; Simpson, 2000; Sturges et al., 2003; Watson & Sheikh, 2007). These studies may not have concentrated on the relationships among these concepts; however, their findings are important in graduate professional development in general. For example, spirituality among business graduate education was examined by Marques (2006), who advocated for the inclusion of spiritual perspective to business education.

In addition, there is a new trend advocating for moral reasoning among business students in social responsibilities and corporate citizenship. There are ongoing debates on whether ethics or morals can be taught in classrooms, need to be taught, or will even transform students (Koehn, 2005). Yet, some researchers question the moral decision in choosing which area of morality is appropriate for business education (Bigel, 2002; Phau & Kea, 2007). In most cases when morality is mentioned, it is referred to the Judeo-Christian centric morality that talks about “sin
and saints” (Walker, 2003)? Or, as in some cases, morality is taken in context to the conformity to social expectations and norms. Whatever the definition assigned to morality in literature, there is a dichotomy in question of the “reality” and the “metaphorical assumption” of morality in professionalism as par “business citizenship” (Neron & Norman, 2008; Wood & Logsdon, 2008). To these authors, business prudence is a moral responsibility and a sign of good citizenship, in relation to professionalism.

When it comes to graduate education, whether as in teacher education or for the business arena, the operative meaning of morality can be controversial too. However, the term citizenship sounds appropriate in education too (Banks & Nguyen, 2008). Banks and Nguyen looked at citizenship with respect to cultural identity and responsibility to society. They created a cultural typology to examine the citizenship education needed for teachers to be apt with otherness. Neron and Norman (2008) asked, “Do we really want businesses to be good corporate citizens?” (p. 1). Same can be asked of education students. According to the authors, business citizenship is more than corporate philanthropy. Among the cluster of definitions given to business “citizenship,” Neron and Norman (2008) mentioned that business citizenship requires (a) minimalist concept – “an internalized sense of public good” (p. 3); and the (b) expansionist concept – “synonymous with ‘corporate social responsibility’ (CSR)” (Neron & Norman, p. 3) advocated by the United Nations (Idemudia, 2008). Furthermore, Neron and Norman expanded on the issue of morality in future business leadership beyond the conventional moral development directions. Thus, professional/business citizenship constitutes (a) political identity, (b) locus of control, (c) virtuous activity, and (d) legal status.

The discussions on professional or business citizenship have gained momentum in current literature, which might affect graduate programs in the future. Some studies have already
suggested the integration of professional ethics, moral citizenship, and technical skills to be applied to business and teacher education programs (De George, 2008; Wood & Logsdon, 2008). De George reflected on the concept of citizenship and suggested that championing this course is expedient for all students and it is great for globalization. Banks and Nguyen supported this same reason of international or global citizenship for education.

Moreover, professional citizenship can have a mixed connotation. De George (2008) noted more profoundly that the use of business citizenship could have both positive and negative connotations. Positive in the sense that citizenship promotes commitment to social existence; negative because it can be contentious in context. How do you define “citizenship”? “In any event, hard data would be informative, since the debate about the usefulness of the concept of corporate [business] citizenship is more a political than a philosophical one” (De George, p. 49).

Applying a moral context to professional or business citizenship can be problematic. According to Wood and Logsdon (2008), the concept of citizenship expands the concept of morality, and this will challenge business organizations, business leadership, and possibly, business education. “Applying the concept of ‘citizenship’ to business organizations offers challenges and opportunities to scholars and managers as well as stakeholder and political units” (Wood & Logsdon, p. 51). Applying citizenship to teacher education also poses an issue too (Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Martin, 2008). Yet, these authors agree that it is an important concept to be address in education and business. Particularly, citizenship is important for the global education or international business (Banks & Nguyen); there is still a lack of common moral codes in the corporate world, globally (Brammer et al., 2007; Jaffe & Pasternak, 2006).

In terms of career diversification, graduate education is supposed to lead to a career in middle level management and leadership. Many graduate business students will proceed to
business leadership (Sturges, Simpson, & Altman, 2003). So are the career ambitions of the graduate students from teacher education programs; they are going to be elementary and secondary teachers (Martin, 2008). Sturges et al. believed that career opportunities for MBA graduates, for example, are expanding, and so are their responsibilities in a diverse and global world. And the new career trends are demanding certain skills and traits.

In their book, *Primal Leadership*, Goleman et al. (2002) insisted that organizations are looking for career leaders with emotional intelligence as well as technical skills. Graduate studies, both teacher education and business education must encourage “career competencies in context of the boundaryless career environment” (Sturges et al., p. 54). Teachers, for example, are charged to reflect on their changing roles and respond to their ‘calling’ as vocational rather than a job (Demon, 2008). Sturges et al. also advised business graduates to seek more career competencies such as *knowing-how, knowing-why, and knowing-whom*. Appropriately, it is the know-whom competency that relates closer to the value of others (otherness): i.e., classmates, faculty, workmates, employees, employers, etc. It is the philosophical understanding of otherness, within the sameness, that enriches organizational leadership (Durand & Calori, 2006).

*Graduates’ Otherness Leadership Development*

While the concept of otherness leadership in education and organizations may be developing, some studies may be appropriated. Durand and Calori (2006) talked about the richness that resonates from otherness in sameness. Durand and Calori highlighted the idea that within a corporate vision and purpose, sameness in goals and missions, there exists otherness that forms the basis for organizational efficiencies. Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) studied the impact of training and leadership/follower development on leadership performance in military colleges with a sample of 54 military leaders, 90 direct followers, and 724 indirect
followers. Dvir et al. considered the development of transformational leadership in their study, direct and indirect leadership interaction between leaders/followers, and concluded that researchers discuss motivational leadership, morality, and empowerment in diversity relationships. Dvir et al. believed that transformational leaders are motivational leaders whose “primary motive is to satisfy [or raise] self-actualization needs rather than the lower needs in Maslow’s need hierarchy” of their followers and that is significant in considering others (p. 736).

In practice, otherness leadership includes moral relations that affect teamwork and organizational development. Moral respect for sameness within otherness is what builds corporation (Durand & Calori, 2006). Moral reasoning is seen as a crucial element in managerial effectiveness (Loviscky et al., 2007). According to the prior review of literature, moral reasoning affects managerial decisions, relationships, understanding, and appreciation of others in situations. This is also consistent with Hemphill’s (2004) study on managerial moral principles. Interestingly, otherness leadership exposes more than self-interest; it is an individual’s awareness in a moral context of accepting others in diversity (Chavez et al., 2003). Applying this idea of moral reasoning in otherness to graduate students can mean a transformation in socialization. It can lead to a collective orientation in transformational leadership (Dvir et al., 2002).

As per diversity promotion, otherness leadership must be part of every career training and development programs. Banks and Nguyen, 2008 support this interplay of diversity and responsibility in education; they looked at it as citizenship education. Primeaux (2005) synthesized spirituality among leaders in terms of value creation, social responsibility, and self-interest versus “otherness-interest” in decision-making rational. Central to Primeaux’s study is godliness; he resonated value creation (meaning), a sound decision-making ability (moral reasoning), and quite distinctly, the avoidance of any rationalization of self-interest against
“otherness-interest” (p. 70). Otherness-interest adds diversity or a multicultural dimension to Primeaux’s study. In addition to otherness, Primeaux lamented about several businesses whose values were not centered on clean competition, sustainability, and accountability for the good of the whole (a universal moral judgment).

Though Primeaux (2005) synthesized the value-added business, he also equated spirituality in business to include “human interaction, especially with a capacity for deep relational sensibilities” (p. 71). For Primeaux, professionals including business leaders should be clear, concise, and recognizable in any social environment. By implication, future graduate students (future leaders) should recognize and accept the “expectations of others-interest and otherness-interest” (p. 71).

Concerning graduate students, many studies have suggested, directly or indirectly, the need for diversity/multicultural leadership. Otherness leadership means diversity and multicultural competencies, and ‘global’ professional ethics, particularly, since most current events dictate global relationships and other businesses operations (Al-Farsy, 1989; Gesteland, 2002; Gregory & Hoffmeyer, 2006; Guy, 2001). For example, Al-Farsy (1989) extrapolated the hazards of misunderstanding people from the Middle East. He complained about extremism misconceptions, stereotypical images, and the Westernization of cultures. Al-Farsy recommended awareness and knowledge-based education across America.

Gesteland (2002) also talked about the essence of cultural competencies in enhancing global marketing, retailing, and other customer-oriented businesses. While emphasizing globalization, Guy (2001) also reiterated the need for business cultural competencies in different societies. Guy studied large-format retailers such as Wal-Mart (both in the United States and breaking new grounds in Western Europe). He emphasized the need for intensive academic
studies regarding cultural differences, different market strategies, and corporate cultural characteristics. According to Guy, such multicultural competence is helpful; and the success or failure in global business is partly dependant on the leadership’s level of understanding, awareness, and management of internationalistic differences.

Summary

Beginning with adult development theories, reviews have shown a process and narration of life experiences that highlights social roles, responsibilities, and generativity virtues. Further, adulthood followed with the development of meaning in life, moral reasoning, and the valuing of others in a diversity/multicultural context. While spirituality may account for the meaning in life pursuits, moral reasoning becomes the moral judgment for constructive decisions that affect others. Moral reasoning is the construct for accountability in actions, decisions, and relationships (Rest & Thoma, 1986; Thoma, 2006). All these constructs add up to augment the need for professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

The intertwining of meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity/multicultural competencies is an agenda for investigation into management-leadership development in the both business and teacher education of the 21st century. A review of the book: Management 21C, edited by Subir Chowdhury (2000) and colleagues showed a significant paradigm shift in style for the 21st century business management and organizational leadership. For example, Hill (2000) mentioned “management is about coping with complexities while leadership is about coping with change” (p. 63). Hill attributed this management-leadership distinction to global complexities, competitiveness, and challenges propelled by stakeholders (others), who demand meaningful responsibilities. Hence, the measures of meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies
of an individual leader are presumably good indicators of that person’s ability to excel in professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

Importantly, otherness can be equated to diversity awareness. Otherness can also be evaluated by the individual diversity development concept (Chavez et al., 2003). Per IDD, the individual’s diversity awareness can be assessed at five different levels. According to Chavez et al., IDD is measured in the affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains. These learning domains are psychologically affected by the intertwining of meaningfulness, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. All these variables are measurable. And their intercorrelations are yet to be fully explored in otherness development literature.

Moreover in practice, current leadership literature advocates for the promotion of purpose, moralization, and citizenship. It takes a personal meaning in life to create purposefulness – i.e., value, vision, and mission. It takes meaning to create avenue for creative leadership (Drath & Palus, 1994). And it takes meaningfulness and moral reasoning to effect professional citizenship (Wood & Logsdon, 2008). Metaphorically, professional citizenship exemplifies high standard of moral obligations, value realizations, and socio-cultural responsiveness. Thus, for graduate students heading toward some level of organizational or institutional leadership, they have to excel in otherness leadership and to demonstrate professional citizenship.

According to the review of literature, future leaders are facing a proliferation of multicultural society, a diversity environment in the workplace, and the challenges of professional acumen. Hence, graduate students must show a personal meaning, demonstrate a conventional level of moral reasoning, and develop individual diversity aptitudes. In addition, reviews have shown that meaning is an attribute to the pursuit of excellence in leadership; moral
reasoning is essential to professional citizenship; and the valuing of others in diversity is 
treasured. The present study has extended the research on all these three study variables to 
iluminate their relationships and to embrace their importance in the discussions of professional 
citizenship and otherness leadership.
CHAPTER III: METHODS

This chapter presents the research design, participants, instrumentation, and procedures for collecting data. The proposed data analysis and inferential statistics are also described. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies to explain the development of professional citizenship and otherness leadership among graduate students in a Midwestern public institution. This chapter relates primarily to what was done to achieve this purpose.

Research Design

The design is correlational to gain an insight into the relationships among the three study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies.

- Meaning is measured as a factor of spirituality using the meaning in life questionnaire instrument (MLQ) developed by Steger et al. (2006).
- Moral reasoning is measured by the managerial moral judgment test (MMJT) (Loviscky et al., 2007).
- Diversity competencies are measured by the shorter version of the universal diversity orientation (M-GUDS-S) (Fuertes et al., 2000).

Finally, the explanation of professional citizenship was in line with what is prudent and responsible in professional practices; the explanation of otherness leadership was investigated along the framework of awareness, knowledge, and skills in dealing with differences and the appreciation of ‘others’ (Chavez et al., 2003).

The correlational study was intended to be an explanatory study. It was to explore the relationships and possible interactions among the three study variables – meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies – to explain the phenomena of professional citizenship.
and otherness development among the study participants. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2006), explanatory studies are not interested in manipulation, causation, or observation. In other words, the study was not designed to determine a cause and effect, and therefore there is no intervention or manipulation. Also, Gay and Airasian (2003) mentioned that in explanatory studies there is no experimentation or random sampling, whereby variables are controlled.

Correlational design is simple and cost effective for the purpose of this study. Participants came with their own self-reported levels of these three variables. Thus, the primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationships that may exist among these variables (i.e., meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies) with graduate students enrolled in one Midwestern research institution – Bowling Green State University, Ohio. Because all these variables are measured quantitatively, their relationships were analyzed effectively and inexpensively.

In addition, the correlational design was intended to examine the covariant relations within all the three variables and the demographic differences. The covariant relations were to evaluate the valences in professional citizenship and otherness leadership readiness of these participants. Differences, covariant relationships, were examined in correlational research design to “seek out traits, abilities, or conditions that covary, or correlate” in multiple scores (Mertler & Charles, 2005, p. 298). The demographic data was simplified and categorized into various variables for appropriate analyses. The categorical data from demographics were then analyzed alongside the scores from the three study variables.

Participants

Participants for the present study were recruited from among graduate students enrolled in various graduate programs at two BGSU colleges during the summer and fall 2008 semesters. The two colleges were the College of Business Administration (CBA) and the College of
Education and Human Development (EDHD). The CBA (CBA, 2008) has varieties of graduate programs: Accounting, Business Administration, Economics, Operations Research, and Organization Development. The EDHD also has programs such as College Student Personnel, Higher Education Administration, Educational Administration and Leadership Studies, Teaching and Learning, Special Education, Family and Consumer Sciences, and the Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural and International Education (MACIE). Subsequent paragraphs explain the characteristics and sampling of participants.

**Characteristics**

According to the both colleges website (CBA, 2008; EDHD, 2008), these graduate students are adults (mostly above the age of 20 years), a mixture of traditional and non-traditional, and are often engaged in extra curricular activities. Participants are mostly responsible citizens and either part-time or full time students. Thus, some are in full-time employment outside the colleges and others are graduate assistants pursuing their degrees as full-time students. Again, most of the participants are considered active members of the BGSU community.

Demographically, there is diversity in gender, race and ethnicity, religion, and fields of specialization (or career orientation). However, the population is predominantly white, middle-class, and career-oriented. The only criterion, in terms of characteristics, for participation is to be a registered graduate student of the two colleges.

**Sampling**

Sampling was by convenience with particular consideration of the above criterion. The sampling process involved the following steps:
1. A letter of intent was sent to program administrators at both colleges stating the intended purpose of the study (Appendix A) and to solicit their help in recruiting study participants via email addresses of all the accessible population.

2. Program administrators were asked to send email messages with an attached letter of consent to participants on behalf of the researcher that introduced the electronic survey – Otherness Leadership Development.

3. Participants were then asked to volunteer their participation with an informed consent referencing the HSRB’s approval through an email message. The email message had a hyperlink to the survey utilizing the functionalities of www.surveymonkey.com (Appendix B).

Instrumentation

The study involved the use of three instruments (with permissions sought from the respective researchers via email letter [Appendix C]), and a demographic questionnaire. The first part of the survey was the subscale for meaning from the meaning in life questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Steger and colleagues (Appendix D). The second part of the survey was the measure of managerial moral judgment test (MMJT) (Loviscky et al., 2007). MMJT (Appendix E) yielded scores for the moral reasoning (i.e., simple sum scores and P-scores). The third part was the short version of the Miville-Guzman universality-diversity scale (M-GUDS-S) (Fuertes et al., 2000). M-GUDS-S (Appendix G) yielded scores for the diversity competencies.

The MLQ had two subscales: presence (MLQ-P) and search (MLQ-S). The M-GUDS-S had three subscales: diversity contact (DCQ-DC), relativistic appreciation (DCQ-RA), and a sense of connection or comfort (DCQ-SC). The fourth part of the Otherness Leadership Development survey was the demographic information (Appendix G). All the instruments were
constructed together as one survey instrument, to be termed, *Otherness Development Survey*.

The *Otherness Development Survey* was constructed with these four sections and had 104 items in total. These sections are: (a) *Meaning in Life (MLQ)*, (b) *Moral Reasoning (MRQ)*, (c) *Diversity Competencies (DCQ)*, and (d) *Demographics Information*. Thus, the meaning section had 10 items. The morality section had six scenarios and each scenario has 12 items. The diversity section had 15 items. The demographic section consisted of seven (7) items for gender, race, age, religious affiliation, career orientation, degree program, and any previous exposure in terms of coursework in the area of ethics/moral, spirituality, or diversity. The final demographic item was included to check for any inherent biases. Table 2 shows the form study the *Otherness Development Survey* took.

Table 2

*Survey Design Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Part</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>Subsections</th>
<th>Description of Items</th>
<th>Scale Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: Meaning in Life (MLQ)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None obvious, but 2 subscales built in (Presence [MLQ-P = 5 items] and Search [MLQ-S = 5 items])</td>
<td>Participants’ self-reported experiences</td>
<td>Likert-type (1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Moral Reasoning (MRQ)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6 (scenarios) with 12 items each and items on importance for ranking the 12</td>
<td>Responses to moral dilemma scenarios</td>
<td>Likert-type (1-5) Ranking of importance (Likert-type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: Diversity Competencies (DCQ)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>None obvious, but 3 subscales built in (DC = items 1 to 5, RA = items 6 to 10, SC = items 11 to 15)</td>
<td>Participants’ self-report on awareness</td>
<td>Likert-Type (1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4: Demographic Information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes, branching: with optional text box for specifics</td>
<td>Simplified by Dichotomy of scores</td>
<td>Optional choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity and Reliability

The first instrument, the meaning in life (MLQ) has been validated and shown reliability. Steger and colleagues (2006) studied in detail the construct validation of the 10-items in three different studies with different participants (i.e., combined sample $N = 401$). According to Steger et al., the convergent factor analysis (CFA), validity, and reliability have been psychometrically analyzed and reported consistently in literature. Steger et al.’s study showed exploratory analyses, convergent and discriminant, and theoretical construct validations: “Factor loadings were robust (between 0.65 and 0.83 on intended factors), and fit indices a good fit” (p. 85). The MLQ showed convergent validity among the subscales (MLQ-P and MLQ-S) with other meaning measurements. The authors reported high convergent correlations (between 0.61 and 0.74) and a test and retest ranging between 0.58 and 0.74.

The second instrument, the measurement of managerial moral judgment (MMJT) also reported consistent validity and reliability. According to Loviscky et al. (2007), data from the MMJT are psychometrically analyzed. The instrument is scenario-based. Its items are correlated with the other measures of cognitive moral development such as Kohlberg’s MJI and Rest’s DIT to show validity and reliability (between $r = 0.71$ and $0.95$; test and retest correlation = 0.70) (Loviscky et al., p. 271).

The third instrument, for measuring diversity competencies, M-GUDS-S, is also validated and reliability tested. According to Fuertes et al. (2000), all the 15 items selected for measuring the DC, RA, and CD factors were factor analyzed. The M-GUDS-S items are structurally and constructively tested for validity and reliability. According to their study, the internal consistency reliability correlates significantly among the three factors in both the long and short versions ($\alpha = 0.77$, $p < 0.001$).
Data Collection Procedures

The data collection procedures began with Human Subject Review Board’s (HSRB) approval. This approval was important for referencing on all relevant cover letters. Part of the application included the submission of the *Otherness Development Survey* for the study and the draft of all the study correspondences including letters for permission to use instruments from designated authors. The survey was designed and published using www.surveymonkey.com. The survey design was a construction of all the study instruments together in four sections. The e-survey was printed and the hyperlink included for the HSRB approval.

Once the HSRB’s approval was granted, a letter was sent to the program administrators in the two colleges to explain the study referencing HSRB approval (Appendix A). First, an email sent to administrators to solicit their assistance in recruitment of all potential participants. Next, the researcher sent an email message with an attached letter of consent to be forwarded to all prospective participants. The letter of consent (Appendix B) was to inform participants what they required to do, the volunteering nature, and explained the no-risk factor. The email message contained a hyperlink to the e-Survey. Thus, participants who decided to continue after reading the informed consent instructions had to submit their consent electronically by clicking a submit button. Participants were not identified except for their individual scores.

In all, participants spent about 30 to 35 minutes on the e-Survey. The e-Survey was published for four months (June to October 2008); follow-up emails were sent to program administrators/ coordinators who acted as gatekeepers. Responses from participants were sent automatically into a folder after completion as part of the functionality of the SurveyMonkey. All the raw data (or scores for each sections) from the participants were password protected and only accessible by the researcher. The survey was closed after three months and activities stopped.
Data Analysis

The data analysis procedure was in two main steps: data input and statistical analyses. First, the raw data was input into Microsoft Excel™. The raw data was processed into groups of scores for each of the study variables and for each of the participants. Second, the processed data sets were then entered and encoded in the SPSS 16.0™ for statistical analyses.

The seven demographic items used in this study were also dichotomized or simplified for statistical soundness (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Thus, gender was categorized as male/female; race collapsed into majority and minority; and likewise, career orientations simplified as business and education majors. For further analysis, all the study variables were simplified by using their descriptive statistics (i.e., means) and correlated with the demographic categories for group differences and independent sample mean t-tests.

Upon encoding all the data sets into SPSS, limited statistical analyses were conducted for significance. First, the descriptive statistics of central tendencies (Means, percentiles, and standard deviations) were computed. Second, the bivariate correlation technique was used to calculate the Pearson coefficients ($r$) for measuring the association between each pair of quantitative variables within the study variables and their subscales. P-scores were calculated from the ranked scores of the MMJT. The P-scores came from the importance participants attributed to the scenario items, and they were calculated based on a procedure recommended by the MMJT instrument author (see Appendices H and I for details).

Independent t-tests were conducted. T-tests checked for significant differences across the demographic categories with the means of all the three study variables. The mean scores from the demographic clusters of all the study variables were analyzed to explain the differences in demographics. Refer to Table 3 for a summary of research questions and the data analyses.
### Table 3

**Data Analyses Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Data Analysis/ Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the relationship between meaning and moral reasoning?</td>
<td>Quantitative variables Categorical differences in subscales (i.e., MLQ-P and MLQ-S)</td>
<td>Pearson r, Report: descriptive statistics and possible correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the relationship between moral reasoning and diversity competencies?</td>
<td>Quantitative variables Categorical differences in subscales (i.e., DC, RA, and SC)</td>
<td>Pearson r, Report: descriptive statistics and possible correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the relationship between meaning and diversity competencies?</td>
<td>Quantitative variables Categorical differences in subscales (i.e., DC, RA, &amp; SC and MLQ-P &amp; MLQ-S)</td>
<td>Pearson r, Report: descriptive statistics and possible correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there demographic differences (i.e., gender, race, and career) in the relationships among the three variables?</td>
<td>Demographics (i.e., gender, race, program) vs. meaning (MLQ-P &amp; MLQ-S), moral reasoning, and diversity competencies (i.e., DC, RA, &amp; SC)</td>
<td>Independent t-tests, Report: Tables showing central tendencies and t-test significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Methods**

Primarily, the entire study was a correlational design to examine relationships among three variables in an attempt to explain the multi-faceted professional citizenship and otherness leadership development among business graduate students. Participants were from the College of Business Administration and College of Education and Human Development, BGSU, a Midwestern public research institution. These graduate students were mostly homogeneous in nature, but the researcher assumed some group differences.

There were three main instruments involved in this study administered electronically. All the instruments were content validated and reliability tested. The administration of these instruments primarily involved electronic survey – *Otherness Development Survey*. The e-Survey had four sections to take care of all the three variables plus demographic information. Raw scores were collected using the functionality of the SurveyMonkey.
Finally, data analyses were conducted using MS Excel and SPSS. The analyses focused on Pearson correlation coefficients, independent t-tests, and central tendencies. There was no hypothesis; only research questions were applicable. However, for significance, the Pearson $r$ and other valuable statistics were appropriately analyzed. The subsequent two chapters reported these results and recommendations respectively.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among the three study variables – meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies – in an attempt to explain the overarching themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership among graduate students in a medium-sized Midwestern public university. To reach this purpose, the researcher used three instruments to measure meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies and analyzed the data for relationships among the study variables. This chapter presents the results on the descriptive statistics and a limited inferential analysis from usable data from the Otherness Development Survey - as an attempt to answer the respective research questions.

Results from Participation

The target sample was 200 students from the two colleges: Business Administration and Education and Human Development of Bowling Green State University. Forty students participated representing a response rate of 20%. The Otherness Development Survey contained 104 items constructed to gather data for demographics and the three study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. After publishing the survey for four months (June to October 2008), participation still remained low (N = 40). Ultimately, on average only 32 respondents submitted usable data and even fewer (n = 26) for the correlational analyses towards answering the respective research questions. Several efforts were made to increase the response rate. For example, the researcher reached out to various program coordinators and administrators, through email and by telephone as a follow up. Still the response rate did not improve.
Demographic Statistics

Tables 4 to 10 represent the demographic information on the participants and their responses. In brief, the respondents who chose to identify themselves were nearly equally divided between male ($n = 16, 53.3\%$) and female ($n = 14, 46.7\%$). Half of the participants were aged between 26 and 35 ($n = 16, 50.0\%$). The majority were Caucasians ($n = 17, 63.0\%$), followed by Black/Non-Latino ($n = 7, 25.9\%$), and Asian/Pacific Islander ($n = 3, 11.1\%$). None of the respondents reported being of Latino decent, and others chose not to identify by skipping the item ($n = 13$). But Table 8 shows two respondents reported having Latino acquaintances. Table 6 shows that a majority of the respondents were from the College of Education and Human Development ($n = 19, 57.5\%$). Seventeen respondents also came from the College of Business Administration ($n = 17, 42.5\%$).

Two items were specifically included in the demographic part of the survey to ask for any previous exposure or future interests in the present study’s subject areas. Respondents were asked whether they have received any kind of formal training in any of the study’s subject areas. Over half of the respondents have received some kind of exposure or formal training in morality and ethics ($n = 17, 53.1\%$) and diversity or multiculturalism ($n = 18, 56.3\%$). Another item asked respondents if they would be interested in any formal training or coursework in the subject areas. Table 10 showed that in each of the content areas the response was positive. For example, with the subject of morality and ethics ($n = 20, 62.5\%$) showed an interest in formal training. On the contrary too, other respondents reported no exposure ($n = 11, 34.4\%$) and others reported no interest at all ($n = 6, 18.8\%$) (See details in Tables 9 and 10).
Table 4

**Gender of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other respondents ($n = 10$) skipped the item

Table 5

**Age of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other respondents ($n = 8$) skipped the item

Table 6

**Specializations of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges and Programs</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration (MBA) ($n = 9$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Organizational Development (MOD) ($n = 2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Research ($n = 1$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified programs ($n = 4$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration &amp; Supervision ($n = 6$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Cross-cultural and International Education ($n = 5$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning ($n = 2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Science ($n = 1$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified programs ($n = 3$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other respondents ($n = 4$) did not identify their college nor programs
Table 7

Racial/Ethnic Group of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Latino</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Non-Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specified minority)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other respondents (n = 9) skipped the item or responded other unspecified

Table 8

Racial/Ethnic Acquaintances of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Latino</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Non-Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specified minority)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other respondents (n = 8) skipped the item

Table 9

Exposure of Respondents in Formal Training or Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Training or Coursework</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality or Religious Studies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and Ethics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity or Multiculturalism</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were able to select more than one option and therefore f and percentages add up to more than 100.0.
Table 10

Interest of Respondents to Formal Training or Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest or Considering Coursework</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality or Religious Studies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and Ethics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity or Multiculturalism</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were able to select more than one option and therefore f and percentages add up to more than 100.0.

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

The Otherness Development Survey consisted of 104 items asking respondents to respond to questions on the three main study variables and demographics. The study variables were meaning (MLQ), moral reasoning (MRQ), and diversity competencies (DCQ); the demographics used for analyses are gender, race, and career orientation. The subsequent paragraphs present the descriptive analyses for the study variables and demographics.

Meaning

The MLQ consisted of 10 items and it has two subscales (i.e., presence [MLQ-P] and search [MLQ-S]). The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (Absolutely True [7] to Absolutely Untrue [1]). Table 11 shows the means of MLQ and subscales used for inferential analyses to answer the research questions. In total, MLQ reported a mean of 46.62 out of a potential score of 70.00. Table 12 reported the means and SD for the items.
Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics for Meaning and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P (Presence of Meaning)</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-S (Search for Meaning)</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLQ (Meaning in Life)</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.62</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>7.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out of possible maximum score of 70

Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics for Meaning Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understand my life’s meaning.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am looking for something that makes my life feel meaningful.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am always looking to find my life’s purpose.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My life has a clear sense of purpose.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am always searching for something that makes my life feel significant.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My life has no clear purpose.**</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am searching for meaning in my life.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number do not match because some respondents skipped the item
MLQ syntax to create Presence and Search subscales:

Presence: 1, 4, 5, 6, & 9 (**) = reverse coding
Search: 2, 3, 7, 8, & 10
Moral Reasoning

The second part of the Otherness Development Survey was moral reasoning (MRQ), measured by the managerial moral judgment test (MMJT) with six business-oriented scenarios. The MMJT is very involving. Each scenario starts with an item on a basic decision-making question on a managerial case (based on a 3-point scale). It is followed by 12 items (based on a 5-point Likert scale), which are the basis for calculating Simple Sum Scores used for inferential analyses to answer the research questions. Next, the respondents ranked 4 out of the 12 items they consider important. The items they ranked in importance are used to calculate their \( P \)-scores (see Appendices H, I, and J for scoring details). If any of the items ranked is considered to align with postconventional moral development, according to the procedure supplied by the authors (Loviscky et al., 2007), a value is assigned to it. Tables 13-16 show the descriptive statistics for all the various components of MRQ, which are (i) initial decisions, (ii) simple sum scores, and (iii) \( P \)-scores.

First, Table 13 shows the initial decisions in detail; the following is the summary:

(i) Scenario 1: the largest group of respondents (\( n = 15, 42.9\% \)) said Alex *should not* be reprimanded.

(ii) Scenario 2: majority (\( n = 22, 68.8\% \)) reported that Kris *should* schedule the training.

(iii) Scenario 3: majority (\( n = 22, 68.8\% \)) reported that Ray *should not* instruct his subordinates to focus on meeting deadlines at the expense of doing quality work.

(iv) Scenario 4: majority (\( n = 27, 93.10\% \)) reported that Leigh *should* have the interaction with the subordinate.

(v) Scenario 5: majority (\( n = 25, 86.2\% \)) reported that Pat *should* report the mistake.

(vi) Scenario 6: majority (\( n = 15, 53.6\% \)) reported that Fran *should* promote the superstar.
Table 13

*Numbers do not match because other respondents skipped items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n*</th>
<th>Should</th>
<th></th>
<th>Can’t Decide</th>
<th></th>
<th>Should not</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should Alex reprimand the employee according to the company policy?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Kris schedule the training?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Ray instruct his subordinates to focus on meeting the deadlines at the expense of doing quality work?</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.80</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Leigh have the interaction with the subordinate?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Pat report the mistake?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86.20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Fran promote the potential superstar?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, Table 14 shows the means for the various simple sum scores of the six scenarios with a potential total score of 60.00 (i.e., 12 items with a maximum score of 5 on each item). The means of the simple sum scores were used for further analyses to answer the research questions. For the research question analyses, computations were done with only usable data (n = 26). The lowest mean for the simple sum score was recorded for Scenario 1 (M = 36.6, SD = 5.58), and highest was for Scenario 4 (M = 42.40, SD = 5.15). A high mean score presents a picture of high moral reasoning with respect to the particular scenario instance in managerial judgment.
Table 14

*Descriptive Statistics for MRQ Scenarios from the Simple Sum Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1 – Alex</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2 – Kris</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3 – Ray</td>
<td>40.81</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4 – Leigh</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5 – Pat</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6 – Fran</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average for MRQ Simple Sum Scores</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.20</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>4.93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out of possible maximum score of 60

Third, the $P$-scores from respondents (see Appendix J) demonstrated their perceived moral judgment of what is considered important regarding the decisions (i.e., the 12 items) in the various scenarios. For $P$-scores, the individual respondents’ scores were calculated as follows (e.g., for Scenario 1):

A. Each of the 12 items is pre-tagged with a specific stage of moral development, according to Kohlberg’s (1984) theory (see Appendix H for details) without pre-knowledge of the respondents:

*Item 1. Every time an employee escapes punishment for a policy violation, doesn’t that just encourage more violations?*  
  *(Stage 4)*

*Item 2. Was Alex a good friend of the employee?*  
  *(Stage 3)*

*Item 3. What is the value of health prior to society’s perspective on personal values?*  
  *(M)*

*Item 4. What values are going to be the basis for how companies treat their employees?*  
  *(Stage 6)*

*Item 5. Whether there is a law that requires employers to allow employees to take sick days for mental health problems.*  
  *(Stage 4)*

*Item 6. Whether reprimanding the employee or overlooking the transgression would be best for the company.*  
  *(Stage 2)*
Item 7. Can society afford to let everybody take off work when they aren’t physically sick?

(Stage 4)*

Item 8. Does the organization have the right to force their definition of health on their employees?

(Stage 5)

Item 9. Whether the policy in this case is interfering with an employee maintaining his/her health.

(Stage 5)

Item 10. How could anyone be so cruel as to reprimand an employee who needed a day off?

(Stage 3)*

Item 11. Whether the employee’s co-workers are in favor of reprimanding the employee or not.

(Stage 3)*

Item 12. What values Alex has set in his/her own personal code of behavior.

(Stage 5)

N/B: * items and “M” are non-scoring in P-scores calculations

Only items 4, 8, 9, and 12 (postconventional stages) are scored for P-scores, depending on the level of importance, those receive 40, 30, 20, and 10, for a possible maximum score of 100.

B. Assuming that a respondent ranked items in importance according to the following:

Most important _______ item 9 _______ (40 score)

2nd most important _______ item 8 _______ (30 score)

3rd most important _______ item 6 _______ (non-score for a Stage 2 choice)

4th most important _______ item 12 _______ (10 score)

C. Then the P-score is calculated as 80 (i.e., 40 + 30 + 10) out of a potential 100 total score.

Items 9, 8, and 12 are post-conventional items, but item 6 is not.

D. Each respondent’s total P-scores, which show stages 5 and 6 of Kohlberg’s moral development, for all the six scenarios were recorded (see Appendix J for details).

E. Then further descriptive analyses were recorded in Table 15 and 16.
The result of the $P$-scoring data process yielded interesting descriptive data (see Tables 15 and 16). In all, respondents showed different levels of Kohlberg’s moral development (see Table 1 in chapter 2) for the various scenarios. Table 16 shows the means for all the $P$-scores of all the scenarios. This is based on the mean $P$-scores calculation (see Appendix J for details); the majority of the respondents expressed a post-conventional level of reasoning (i.e., stages 5 and 6 on Kohlberg’s moral development model).

Table 15

**Descriptive Statistics for MRQ Scenarios Ranking of Importance Showing Kohlberg’s Moral Development Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1st Important</th>
<th>2nd Important</th>
<th>3rd Important</th>
<th>4th Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>25.80</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>17.9</strong></td>
<td>4, 7</td>
<td>6, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>4, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number do not match because some respondents skipped items*

*Bold texts indicate items at post-conventional stage (used in $P$-scoring)*

Table 15 shows the percentage of respondents, items ranked, and the stage of moral development according to individual respondents’ reports of the ranking of importance for the moral scenario items. For example, scenario 1 has twenty-four respondents ($n = 24, 54.9\%$) ranking item 4 as first and second in importance, and item 9 at third importance. These items represent postconventional stages (i.e., items 4 & 9). These are included in $P$-scoring. Again, for the same scenario 1, few respondents ranked item 6 as 4$^{th}$ importance (i.e., stage 2, non–
scoring). Scenario 2 showed respondents \((n = 23, 67.3\%)\) reached at the conventional stage (i.e., items 5, 2, 1) and fewer reached the postconventional stage \((n = 8, 21.9\%, \text{item 12})\). Scenarios 3 and 5 follow similar results (majority at postconventional), and scenario 4 and 6 show few at postconventional stage. Meanwhile as mentioned already, for \(P\)-score calculations only postconventional items are used.

Table 16 shows the average total \(P\)-scores for all the scenarios according to all those who responded. Individually, the \(P\)-scores total average for respondents ranged from 11.67 to 60.00 out of potential total of 100 (see page 3 of Appendix J for details). Also, Table 16 shows the lowest and the highest \(P\)-scores for each scenario, ranging between 0 and 100. And the final average total \(P\)-score for all the scenarios came to 38.60, ranging from a minimum of zero to a maximum of 83.33.

### Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for \(P\)-scores (Kohlberg’s Postconventional Stage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Lowest (P)-score</th>
<th>Highest (P)-score</th>
<th>(P)-score Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1 (Alex)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2 (Kris)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3 (Ray)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4 (Leigh)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5 (Pat)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6 (Fran)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.60</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diversity Competencies

The third part of the Other Development Survey dealt with the diversity competencies (DCQ). This section has 15 items in total with three subscales. DCQ has five items for each of the three subscales (i.e., Diversity of Contact (DC), Relativistic Appreciation (RA), and Sense of
Connection (SC)). DCQ items have a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., from lowest (1) to highest (5)) and a potential total score of 75. Item by item, many respondents showed significantly good responses to diversity competencies (M = 59.10, SD = 8.96). Respondents showed variations in the means for the various DCQ items ranging from the lowest for item 3 (M = 3.13, SD = 1.28) to the highest for item 15 (M = 4.61, SD = .80) (Table 17). Again, respondents showed good score for competency in diversity contact (DCQ-DC) scoring 18 out of 25. Table 18 shows the means for the subscales. Respondents also showed good results in relativistic appreciation (RA) scoring 19.35 out of 25, and a very good sense of connection (SC) scoring 21.74 out of 25.
Table 17

*Descriptive Statistics for Diversity Competencies Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know people from other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would like to go to dances that feature music from other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often listen to music of other cultures.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.13*</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existed in this world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I attend events where I might get to know people from different</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racial backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can best understand someone after I get to know he/she is both</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar and different from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In getting to know someone, I like knowing both how he/she</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differs from me and is similar to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me understand my own problems better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Getting to know someone of another race is generally an</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncomfortable experience for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am only at ease with people of my own race.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 It’s really hard for me to feel close to a person from another</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I often feel irritated by persons of a different race.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.61**</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minimum and ** Maximum

Table 18

*Descriptive Statistics for Diversity Competencies and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-DC (Diversity of Contact)</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-RA (Relativistic Appreciation)</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-SC (Sense of Connection)**</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ (Diversity Competencies)</td>
<td>59.10</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Out of possible maximum score of 75 ** Reverse coded
Group Descriptive

Tables 19 to 21 show the descriptive statistics for gender, race, and career orientation with respect to the three main variables. Gender groups show no significant differences in means for the three study variables. With regard to race, minorities reported slightly higher means in meaning and diversity study variables (i.e., MLQ \([n = 13, M = 49.23]\), DCQ \([n = 14, M = 62.71]\)); whilst majority (Caucasians) reported slightly higher mean in moral reasoning \((n = 18, M = 39.51)\). And with career orientations, college of business administration students reported slightly higher means (MLQ \([n = 14, M = 48.43]\), MRQ \([n = 15, M = 40.33]\), and DCQ \([n = 15, M = 60.40]\)) compared to their counterparts in the college of education and human development (MLQ \([n = 17, M = 44.41]\), MRQ \([n = 17, M = 38.88]\), and DCQ \([n = 16, M = 57.88]\)).

Table 22 shows the group difference between respondents who were exposed and those who desired training with respect to all the three variables. These differences show the slightly higher percentages of respondents expressing interest in all the content areas. Notably, half of the respondents wished to have training in moral reasoning; but only 42.50% of respondents have been exposed to any content in moral reasoning.
Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Gender Groups and All Three Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>DCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>39.99</td>
<td>60.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>DCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>39.99</td>
<td>60.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for Racial Groups and All Three Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>DCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority (Caucasian decent)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>39.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Minority (other ethnic groups) | Mean | 49.23| 39.63| 62.71|
| n                              | 13   | 14   | 14   |
| Std. Dev.                      | 7.40 | 6.37 | 7.36 |
| % of Total                     | 44.4%| 45.7%| 41.9%|
Table 21

Descriptive Statistics for Career Orientation Groups and All Three Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>DCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>60.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>57.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for Exposure and Training Desire in Subject Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>DCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%*</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%*</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Exposure nor Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%*</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested in either</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%*</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Final Total does exceed 100% due to ability to select more responses and also missing data

Inferential Statistics for Research Questions

To answer the research questions, various inferential analyses were conducted. As a correlational study, the research questions were to probe the plausible relationships among the three study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. The following sections address each of the questions in turn. Tables 24 to 30 show the results of the inferential
analyses.

Research Question One

What is the relationship between meaning and moral reasoning among graduate students?

The first 10 items of the Otherness Development Survey addressed meaning (MLQ) as a factor of spirituality with two sub-sections, presence and search. Meaning followed by moral reasoning (MRQ) and its six scenarios. MRQ was calculated with the simple sum scores to summarize the self-reported moral reasoning of respondents. The mean scores from MLQ were correlated with the mean of simple sum scores of the moral reasoning (MRQ). The results are shown in Table 23. In part, due to the limited response (i.e., usable data \( n=26 \) with missing data eliminated; see Table 15 for details), the relationship between the two variables shows very limited significance.

Specifically, the correlation between MLQ and MRQ was weak \( (r = .23) \). However, the correlations between meaning and its subscales and among the individual moral reasoning scenarios show some significance; the strongest relationship existed between MLQ and its subscale MLQ-S \( (r = .90) \); and the weakest relationship was between MLQ-P and MRQ scenario 5 \( (r = -.01) \). In few cases, as expected, there were high correlations; there were strong correlations between MRQ scenarios 5 and 4 \( (r = .63) \), between scenarios 5 and 6 \( (r = .66) \), and between MRQ and scenario 6 \( (r = .87) \).
Table 23

**Correlation between Meaning and Moral Reasoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MLQ-P</th>
<th>MLQ-S</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>Sc.1</th>
<th>Sc.2</th>
<th>Sc.3</th>
<th>Sc.4</th>
<th>Sc.5</th>
<th>Sc.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-S</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRQ</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario4</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario5</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario6</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Bold and italicized represent correlations across variables; non-italicized are correlations within variables.

Research Question Two

*What is the relationship between meaning and diversity competencies among graduate students?*

With respect to the relationship between meaning (MLQ) and diversity competencies (DCQ), the results were similar to the outcome for Research Question 1. For example, Table 24 shows that the correlation between MLQ and DCQ was weak and negative, $r = -.09$. But the relationships among the subscales reported some significance (e.g., MLQ and MLQ-S [$r = .89$] and DCQ and DCQ-DC [$r = .87$]). There were other negative but less significant correlations among subscales.
Table 24

Correlation between Meaning in Life and Diversity Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>MLQ-P</th>
<th>MLQ-S</th>
<th>DCQ</th>
<th>DCQ-DC</th>
<th>DCQ-RA</th>
<th>DCQ-SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-S</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-DC</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-RA</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-SC</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Bold and italicized represent correlations across variables; non-italicized are correlations are within variables.

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between moral reasoning and diversity competencies among graduate students?

The relationship between MRQ and DCQ was also similar to the outcomes for Research Questions 1 and 2. The relationship between MRQ and DCQ was weak ($r = .08$). Strongest relationships were among the main variables and their subscales, which reported some significance. For example, the relationship between DCQ and DCQDC ($r = .87$) was strong; and the relationship between MRQ and its subscale Scenario 6 ($r = .87$). But to answer the research question, Table 25 shows that the relationship between the MRQ and DCQ was not statistically significant ($r = .08$).
Table 25

*Correlation between Moral Reasoning and Diversity Competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DCQ</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>MRQ</th>
<th>Sc.1</th>
<th>Sc.2</th>
<th>Sc.3</th>
<th>Sc.4</th>
<th>Sc.5</th>
<th>Sc.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

*Bold and italicized represent correlations across variables; non-italicized are correlations are within variables*

**Research Question Four**

*Do the relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies differ among different demographics (i.e., gender, race, and career orientation)?*

The fourth research question was addressed by comparing the central tendencies and independent t-test analyses of the various groups: gender, race, and career orientation. Initially, ANOVAs were planned for comparisons of three or more group differences. However, due to the low response rate, the race categories were collapsed into two groups to simplify the analyses. As previously reported, gender reported male (*n* = 16, 53.3%) and female (*n* = 14, 46.7%); race reported majority (*n* = 18, 58.06%) and minority (*n* = 13, 41.94%); and career orientation reported business (*n* = 14, 45.16%) and education (*n* = 17, 54.84%) (See Tables 26-28 for details). The
following analyses were reported to answer the research question.

*Gender differences*

An inferential analysis examined differences between means of gender groups for all the study variables and their subscales. Table 26 shows the responses for the meaning variable: i.e., respondents reported differences between males (M = 46.81, SD = 6.90) and females (M = 44.79, SD = 7.05). With moral reasoning, groups reported males (M = 39.99, SD = 4.24) and females (M = 38.98, SD = 5.54). And with diversity competencies, groups reported males (M = 44.87, SD = 7.74) and females (M = 46.07, SD = 6.51). In all, the male group showed higher means for meaning and moral reasoning, while the female group reported higher mean in diversity competencies.

Aside from the descriptive differences, there is no statistical significant difference between gender groups as shown by the independent t-test analyses with regard to the three study variables. Independent t-tests for gender differences show meaning (t = .79, df = 28, p = .43), gender differences in moral reasoning (t = .57, df = 28, p = .58), and gender differences in diversity competencies (t = .31, df = 27, p = .76).
Table 26

Gender Group Statistics for the Three Study Variables and Sub-Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-Presence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.79</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.99</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.81</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.87</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-RA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/B: Male is represented by 1, and Female is represented by 2
Main study variables are highlighted in bold text
Racial differences

An inferential analysis examined differences between means of racial groups for all the study variables and their subscales. The racial groups were collapsed from five levels to two, majority and minority. Table 27 shows results from meaning, respondents reported majority (M = 44.06, SD = 6.20) and minority (M =49.23, SD = 7.40). With moral reasoning, respondents reported majority (M = 39.51, SD = 2.96) and minority (M = 39.63, SD = 6.37). And with diversity competencies, respondents reported majority (M = 43.28, SD = 5.78) and minority (M = 48.62, SD = 7.25).

Further, the racial groups showed significant differences in meaning (t = -3.39, df = 33, p = .04) and diversity competencies (t = -2.28, df = 29, p = .04), with minority students scoring higher than the majority students. But there was no significant difference in moral reasoning.
Table 27

Racial Groups Statistics for the Three Study Variables and Sub-Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ (Meaning in Life)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>-3.39</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-Presence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRQ (Moral Reasoning)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.89</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.93</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.43</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.65</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ (Diversity Competencies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.62</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-RA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level
N/B: Majority is represented by 1, and Minority is represented by 2
Main study variables are highlighted in bold text
**Career orientation differences**

Table 28 shows the differences in responses from career orientation groups (colleges). Broadly, the business group reported slightly higher means than the education group: i.e., (i) business students reported meaning (M = 48.43, SD = 7.91) and education students (M = 45.94, SD = 5.99); (ii) business students reported moral reasoning (M = 40.97, SD = 4.72) and education students (M = 38.25, SD = 4.20). Similar differences existed for diversity competencies, i.e., business (M = 46.64, SD = 8.31) and education (M = 44.59, SD = 5.50).

Finally, Table 28 also shows the t-test for the two career orientation groups. There were no statistical differences in all the study variables: i.e., meaning (t = 1.61, df = 29, p = .12), moral reasoning (t = .87, df = 30, p = .39), and diversity competencies (t = .78, df = 29, p = .44). Thus, in general, differences in career orientation showed no statistical significance.
Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLQ</strong> (Meaning in Life)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRQ</strong> (Moral Reasoning)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.22</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCQ</strong> (Diversity Competencies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.59</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-RA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ-SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/B: Business group is represented by 1, Education group is represented by 2
Main study variables are highlighted in bold text
Summary of Findings

This chapter on results presented the findings from the *Otherness Development Survey*. The response rate was low ($n = 40, 20\%$) after publishing the survey online for four months. The researcher had to settle with descriptive statistics and limited inferential analyses with missing data eliminated, as previously discussed. The limitations encountered by the researcher further affected the statistical significances. Hence, the limitation also affected the correlational results needed for answering all the research questions.

Compared to the correlational analyses, which showed very limited significance, the independent t-tests for group differences revealed interesting results. However, the statistical significance of these inferential tests still limited any validation or generalization. In other words, there were considerable limitations to the present study, which will be discussed later, affecting the findings and discussions on all the research questions.

Chapter V discusses the results, the limitations, and the recommendations and implications for future research in the area of professional citizenship and otherness leadership.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter begins with a review of the study, a discussion of the study’s limitations, a discussion of the results, and finally recommendations for practice and future research.

Review of the Study

The present study examined four research questions to explore the relationships among three main variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. These examinations directed the purpose of the study and the conceptual frameworks, which are discussed in the subsequent paragraphs. Conceptually, meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies were reviewed from literature to establish their association with the two central themes: professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among three study variables as an exploration to explain two themes among graduate students in a medium-sized Midwestern public university: professional citizenship and otherness leadership. Review of literature explained first, professional citizenship within the framework of social responsibility (De George, 2008; Wood & Logsdon, 2008), social enterprise (Neron & Norman, 2008; Wood & Logsdon, 2008), and corporate citizenship (Hamann, 2007). In effect, professional citizenship involves a moral context (Hemphill, 2004) and a relational context (Banks & Nguyen, 2008).

Secondly, the theme of otherness leadership was explained within the framework of the individual’s ability to appreciate diversity. Otherness involves multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). Otherness leadership involves some level of individual diversity development; it involves the values of others who are socially, culturally, and naturally different in leadership context (Chavez et al., 2003).
Conceptual Frameworks

Conceptually, meaning is expressed in spirituality, value-creation, and purposefulness in life (Baumeister, 1991; Drath & Palus, 1994; Huffman, 2003; Steger et al., 2006). Meaning in life was measured with an instrument authored by Steger and colleagues to examine, not a religious experience, but the presence of and the search for a purpose in life. The concept of meaning in a professional environment determines individuals’ commitment to a shared value, shared vision, and mission (Huffman, 2003). The researcher started with a framework that meaning is a vital ingredient in any discussion of citizenship and otherness.

Next, the study was guided by the concept of moral reasoning as part of moral development. Moral reasoning is revealed in character, in decisions, and in actions morally and contextually (Bricker, 1993; Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005; Rest, 1989; Stables, 2005; Starratt, 1991). The characteristics of moral reasoning were examined with particular reference to the different perspectives of Kohlberg and Gilligan (Jorgensen, 2006). Moral reasoning was measured by the managerial moral judgment test (MMJT) (Loviscky et al., 2007). MMJT focuses on the influence of moral decisions in six scenarios common to business managerial or leadership situations. The researcher assumed that moral reasoning contributes to professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

Again, the study was guided by the concept of universal diversity competencies. Universally, inherent differences exist in diversity: opinions, perspectives, and orientations, and so forth as in multiculturalism. This concept of universal diversity or multiculturalism calls for awareness, knowledge, and skills among leadership (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). The notion of diversity competencies was consistent with the value of otherness measured by individual diversity development (IDD) and valuing and appreciating ‘others’ (Chavez et al., 2003).
Diversity competencies were measured with a short version of Miville-Guzman’s universal diverse scale (M-GUDS-S) (Fuertes et al., 2000). Diversity competencies are necessary for the two themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

Finally, while research existed that established relationships between each of the study variables (Ashley, 2000; Bunch, 2005; Drath & Palus, 1994; Haan, Langer, & Kohlberg, 1976; Kohlberg, 1977; Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982; Payne, 1988; Weber, 1991), little or no research exists that has examined all these relationships among the study variables in line with professional citizenship and otherness leadership. However, meaning is vital in collective values, envisioning, and missions (Hesselbein, 1997; Huffman, 2003). Moral reasoning is considered an important factor in organizational citizenship (Ryan, 2001). And diversity harmonizes multicultural existence in any professional environment. Therefore, conceptually, the researcher proposed plausible intertwining relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies, which is consistent to literature reviewed, to further contribute to professional citizenship and otherness leadership development among graduate students.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the present study was based on the central themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership. Both themes were explored within the frameworks of the possible relationships among the study variables. The fundamental assumption was that both themes require meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. And the present study significantly explored these relationships for further explanation of the central themes.

In addition, the study was significant in the ongoing discussions of professional citizenship and otherness leadership within the contexts of business and instructional/educational leadership. Students need instruction in professionalism and otherness because both constructs
require a sense of belongingness, rules of conduct, moral responsiveness, and a well structured appreciation of memberships and/or diversity (Bigel, 2002; Guy, 2001; Kaplan et al., 2007; Marques, 2006; Phau & Kea, 2007; Primeaux, 2005; Simpson, 2000; Sturges et al., 2003; Watson & Sheikh, 2007). The researcher proposed a significant look at professional citizenship and otherness leadership within the trajectories of students’ graduate education and human development.

Discussions on the Research Limitations

The following paragraphs present discussions on the limitations for this study. These limitations are focused on four areas: (i) the target population characteristics, (ii) the instrumentation, (iii) the survey administration, and (iv) the low response rate.

First, the target population was limited to graduate students from the College of Business Administration and College of Education and Human Development of one public higher education institution. The estimated target population was 200 based on a review of another study conducted by the BGSU’s Office of Institutional Research (BGSU-IRO, 2009). Characteristically, the graduate students are assumed to be familiar with electronic surveys. According to Prensky (2005; 2006) today’s generation of students are mostly technologically savvy and accustomed to technology-based requests. The electronic survey can also be impersonal and less motivating. Without some kind of tangible incentive, or a personal connection to the researcher, the electronic survey turned out to be a limitation in this case.

Second, the study was limited by the instrumentation. The researcher compiled the *Otherness Development Survey* from three different instruments. These instruments were individually validated and reliable. However, combining them to form the 104-item *Otherness Development Survey* posed an extra challenge. The survey was long, more involving, and diverse
in content areas. This probably caused problems for some potential respondents. However, as part of the human subject requirements, the participants reserve the right to exit the survey at any time. Potential respondents may have given up without completion, causing missing data; others might have quit entirely.

Third, the study was limited by the administration of the survey itself. The design was based on self-reporting of respondents. The program administrators or coordinators helped in administration of the survey. Certain factors may have presumably affected the study responses:

(i) For participants to be fully engaged in the 35-40 minute long, 104-item electronic survey, the timing was very crucial. During the summer semester, most graduate students were pressed with time; they were busy with short but intense coursework; and they tend to be involved in other family or professional activities during the summer season.

(ii) The administration of the electronic survey involved the cooperation from the various program administrators and program coordinators. The administrators or coordinators may not necessarily be enthused about the study or its contents. Speculatively, this may have affected the execution of the directives from the researcher, plus the necessary reminders via email for maximum participation. First of all, the administrators and coordinators were asked by the researcher via an email (Appendix A) to send an email message on behalf of the researcher to all potential participants with a consent letter (Appendix B). All that the administrators were asked to do was to forward the letter of consent to solicit participation from the graduate students in their individual programs. Secondly, the administrators were asked to send reminders to the target population a couple of times. There is a limit to what administrators can do to motivate participation.
The researcher was limited by the study sampling itself, as the purpose was to study graduate students from business and education background in two colleges (as discussed earlier). The sampling was very specific and restrictive. At one point, the researcher considered expanding the study sampling to include other colleges, departments, and undergraduate students. But that meant compromising the research purpose. Moreover, in this case, there were no guarantees of maximizing participation by expanding the sample population.

Finally, and more importantly, the study was limited by the response rate ($n = 40, 20\%$). The response rate was considerably low. For a correlational study with three variables, the low response rate was a huge limitation. The low response rate limited the data analyses. Forty students responded; 32 respondents submitted usable data; and only 26 respondents had all the 104 items completed. For correlational analyses among the variables, missing data were eliminated. The researcher has to settle with descriptive statistics and limited inferential analyses. Subsequently, these limitations affected further discussions and propositions too.

Discussion of the Research Findings - Demographics

The following paragraphs present further discussions of the findings beginning with the demographics to elaborate on the group variations. These discussions are on two demographic categories - gender and race - and the three study variables. The results showed very limited differences in career orientations to be of interest. So the discussions proceed to the responses on training and exposure to the three content areas. The demographic results bring an interesting discussion on group differences and diversity. Research question four asked: Do the relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies differ among the different demographics – gender, race, and career orientation?
**Gender Discussion**

First, the gender groups reported close results between male \( n = 16, 53.3\% \) and female \( n = 14, 46.7\% \) within the study variables. The mean scores for the three variables from the gender groups were very close. For example, with regard to meaning, the results were the male group \( n = 16, M = 47.06, SD = 7.02 \) and the female group \( n = 14, M = 44.79, SD = 7.05 \); similar close results were reported for moral reasoning using the simple sum scores: male group \( n = 16, M = 39.99, SD = 4.24 \) and female group \( n = 14, M = 38.98 SD = 5.54 \). This brings to mind a reflection on the gender debates among many moral development theorists (Jorgensen, 2006). Notably, Kohlberg (1984) and Gilligan (1987) have always insisted on gender differences in moral development.

In the present study, the differences between the gender groups were marginal (no statistical significance). The male group reported descriptively higher means than the female group. The closeness of these results may support equal levels of meaning and moral reasoning in this study, but does not negate the debate surrounding gender differences. Loviscky and colleagues (2007) based the MMJT instrument on Kohlberg’s theory of post-conventional reasoning as important in management that “emphasize ethics or values” (p. 275) without any gender bias. Second, in the light of differences from such a small sample size, the gender differences propounded by Gilligan (Jorgensen, 2006) may be hard to validate. Particularly, since the MMJT overlooked gender differences and concentrated post-conventional stages (see Appendix H for details). According to Jorgensen, the gender differences in moral reasoning lie with the levels of justice and care. Yet it is important to note the equal levels of value of meaning in life and moral reasoning among the gender groups. Both male and female groups may exercise similar values, purpose, and moral decisions in respect to justice and care. On the other hand,
Gilligan’s concept of care is important in moral reasoning and hence its assessment. So as a recommendation, a scenario or two can be added to test for managerial care and sensitivity.

Specific discussions on gender and meaning in life may be limited in this study. But some studies showed women are more inclined to religiosity and spirituality as a whole (Armstrong & Crowther, 2002; Fry, 2000). Armstrong and Crowther showed more African American women are involved in religious or spiritual related activities than their male counterparts. Armstrong and Crowther noted a socio-racial and sociocultural element in their findings. For moral reasoning, Gilligan’s (1993) argument was that women’s rationalize morality and are highly sensitive compared to men (Kegan, 1986; Kohlberg, 1984). In the present study, both gender groups showed a balance in both concepts, meaning and moral reasoning, and nonsignificant differences in their results.

Diversity competencies presented a different picture. The female group reported descriptively higher means compared to their male counterparts (see Table 26 for details). Does this translate to women being more inclined to diversity and multiculturalism than men? According to DiversityInc (2004) factoids, most discussions on diversity involve more women than men. Historically, women are more likely to be involved in diversity discussions because of their inclusiveness (Chavez et al., 2003; DiversityInc, 2004). According to Chavez et al., “women tend to be more likely than men to be involved, perhaps both because of marginalization and relational orientation … [and are] often frustrated with the lack of understanding and multicultural skills on our campuses” (p. 467). And the results of the present study indicated otherwise: i.e., no statistical differences. The present study remains inconclusive as to whether women group were overall more aware, knowledgeable, and skilled in diversity competencies.
Also, relationships matter to both men and women (Parker et al., 2008); but men may be more inclined to negotiate relationships for their benefits. Women tend to rationalized the need for relational balance. Albeit, most diversity discussions have focused more on race/ethnicity and gender issues; hence women and “marginalized populations of students” (Chavez et al., p. 467) tend to be proactive and more engaged in such discussions (DiversityInc, 2004).

Garcia (2002) categorized female teachers as more understanding in cultural diversity because of the proxy of historical perspective in most general discrimination discussions. According to Garcia, discussions on differences in U.S. education have always been concerning the inherently superior or inferior, which historically have included gender and race. Guy (1999) agreed by saying “Historically, dominant cultures have systematically limited the power of women and people of color in their social, political, and religious institutions” (p. 8). These biases, “isms” (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005), and discriminations have forced many women and people of color (or racial minorities) to prominently engage in diversity talks.

**Race Discussion**

The findings from the race groups also presented interesting discussions on diversity in public higher education institutions. In the present study, race groups were dichotomized into majority (Caucasians) \( n = 18, 58.06\% \) and minority groups \( n = 13, 41.96\% \). The minority group consisted of Black/Non-Latino and Asian/Pacific Islanders. There were no respondents of Hispanic or Latino descent. However, judging data from BGSU Institutional Research Office (2008), there are many Hispanics/Latinos at BGSU as a whole. The race results from the present study are not a true representation of the racial demographics of BGSU. But the race results indicated that BGSU is attracting minorities into business and education programs. Undeniably, many higher education institutions in the Midwest, including Bowling Green State University,
are making great efforts in recruiting minorities. Even though most business and education programs are still dominated by students of Caucasian descent (BGSU-IRO, 2008), the racial groups results from the present study are encouraging.

According to the statistical results, minority group showed higher mean scores in meaning \( (n = 13, M = 49.23) \) and diversity competencies \( (n = 13, M = 48.62) \). This shows that the minorities tend to be interested and engaged in spirituality and also diversity matters. More importantly, this may reflect the historical perspective that Banks and Nguyen (2008) discussed in their argument for cultural diversity and pluralism. According to Armstrong and Crowther (2002), a study of African Americans showed high level of spirituality and an engagement in religious activities. DiversityInc (2004) also reported a significant involvement of people of color in diversity matters in most U.S organizations.

Furthermore, the results from respondents on their racial acquaintances are also encouraging. Most respondents have acquaintances similar to themselves \( (n = 19, 59.4\%) \), which is natural for comfort and safety (Durand & Calori, 2006; Guy, 1999). According to Table 27, there was no significant difference between majority and minority when it comes to a sense of connection or comfort (DCQ-SC) \( (t = -.35, df = 29, p = .73) \), even though there was a significant difference in diversity competencies as a whole. The feeling of comfort in the presence of others of different race or culture is significant in building skills in diversity or multicultural competencies (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005).

Durand and Calori reported that sameness is as enriching as otherness in an organization. What are worth noting are the acquaintances with other races among the respondents. Notably, even though there was no Latino among the respondents, others reported having acquaintances different from themselves, including Latinos. From a racial discussion point, this is a positive
indication of today’s generation, which is gradually becoming color or racially blind and more multicultural (Banks & Nguyen, 2008; DiversityInc, 2004; Djelic & Vranceanu, 2006). Djelic and Vranceanu (2006) proposed open and frank discussions, meaningfully and morally on the fundamentals of every knowledge for managerial and leadership purposes.

Both results from the racial groups and their acquaintances presented a positive picture of diversity in the two colleges at BGSU. The results also presented the challenges ahead of both colleges to increase diversity. Judging from the demographic information on overall students, BGSU is inclusive (BGSU-OIR, 2008), and the institution is actively promoting inclusion and diversity in all of its programs. The Global Village initiative (Global Village-BGSU, 2009) is an example of an institutional effort to recruit, at the undergraduate level, students from all over the world. As a recommendation, the same effort may be necessary to encourage minorities in graduate business and education programs. Secondly, both colleges have to encourage frantic discussions in ‘safe’ classrooms through the “stories” of individuals particularly those from different cultures, backgrounds, in an effort to counteract any stereotypical images.

**Exposure & Training**

Another important discussion on the demographic data centers on the results from the respondents’ exposure to or/and interests in the present study’s subject matters. From the results, some respondents ($n=13, 40.6\%$) have been exposed to formal training or coursework in the area of meaning (as in spirituality or religiosity). Table 9 shows over half of the respondents reported an exposure to morality or ethics ($n=17, 53.1\%$) and diversity or multiculturalism ($n=18, 56.3\%$). From the results, respondents reported less exposure to spirituality than other contents. Discussions on spirituality provoke tensions in public education institutions because of the idea of separation of church and state (Green, 2004). But according to Green, the search for
spirituality still eludes many educational researchers, and many students are searching for spirituality in secular environments. Spirituality is not religiosity; the search for spirituality is deeper than ritualized religion.

Some of the respondents from both business and education programs have yet to be exposed to any formal coursework in the areas of spirituality, morality, and diversity. Proportionately, the fact that eleven out of forty graduate students (n = 11, 34.4%) are coming out of their educational experiences with no formal exposure or training in any of these concepts can be a little alarming. William (2003) mentioned the changing demographics (diversity) in the workplace and reiterated the changes in needs to accommodate both spirituality and morality in businesses. In the modern US, the need for meaning, morality, and diversity is paramount in teacher education (Damon, 2008; O’Hara & Pritchard, 2008). More importantly, some of these graduate business and education students are going through their graduate education without any exposure to these vital concepts necessary for professional citizenship and otherness leadership.

However, Table 10 shows that respondents are interested in formal training in spirituality, morality, and diversity. In all more than 50 percent of respondents indicated interests. A significant number of the respondents (n = 20, 62.5%) welcomed morality and ethics training. Perhaps on a small scale (based on the limitation of response rate), this is an important needs assessment for institutional discussions. The need for morality and ethics training is not confined to a specific college or program, it cuts across all programs, and both business and education.

Discussion of the Research Findings - Variables

The following paragraphs also present further discussions of the findings with the study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. The discussions are focused on the descriptive statistics on these variables, and continued on the limited correlational results.
Meaning Discussion

The results of the present study showed that respondents have a relatively high existence of meaning in life (i.e., $M = 46.72$ out of 70). The subscales of meaning – presence and search – also show moderately high results (see Table 11). All items on presence of meaning were rated high between a mean of 5.31 and 5.72 (except for the reverse coding, i.e., item 9). On the search of meaning, respondents indicated moderate results too. Overall, Table 11 shows respondents reported on the presence of meaning, a mean of 23.40 out of 35.00, and a search for meaning, a mean of 22.15 out of 35.00. The total MLQ reported was 46.72 out of 70.00.

These results are encouraging since meaning, as in spirituality, is very important in human development, particularly for organizational relationships and leadership (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Chalofsky & Griffin, 2005; Durand & Calori, 2006; Fry, 2000; Walker, 2003). Meaning is also important in graduate students’ development (Payne, 1988) and teacher education programs (Parker, et al., 2008). Blanchard (1999) stated, “We are not human beings having a spiritual experience. We are spiritual beings having a human experience” (p. 92). The respondents demonstrated an understanding of a meaningful life, the presence of meaningfulness: values, visions, and missions in their pursuits of professional excellence. This is commendable since Huffman (2003) mentioned these elements as great for teacher education and for the creation of organizational purpose. Hesselbein (1999) also supported the role of vision and purpose in transformational leadership in business. Kouzes and Posner (2002) included the element of envisioning as one of the exemplary leadership practices. These graduate students and graduates of the respective programs are likely to go into leadership positions. They are likely to envision, give direction, and communicate their hearts with deep conviction, sensitivity, and authenticity as part of their meaning creation (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Drath & Palus, 1994).
In addition, business people and educators with meaning in life excel in their vocations and performances. Palmer (2000) in his book: *Let Your Life Speak*, mentioned that vision, values, and mission establish an individual’s life vocations. According to Damon’s (2008) study of teachers’ performance, the understanding of purpose creates academic excellence among teachers and/or educators. Meaning creates commitment to successful vocation in both business and education. Teachers who are purposeful transfer their meaning in life to academic success in their students. Purposefulness comes from meaning in life (Baumeister, 1991). Business leaders need to be mindful of meaning for transformational impact (Hesselbein, 1999). Groen and Jacob (2006) questioned whether higher education could be transformed without spirituality. Green (2004) advocated the support for students in their search for meaning; otherwise they will seek spirituality in a secularized environment.

On the concept of meaning, as in spirituality, only 40.6% of respondents reported an exposure to spirituality in their graduate programs. It means a number of graduates are leaving college programs with little of such a valuable exposure. And if recommendations from previous studies such as Hesselbein (1999), Drath and Palus (1994), Huffman (2003), and several other authors are to be considered, these students are going through graduate programs in business and education without the wholeness or holistic exposure needed for life or professional success (Burkhardt & Nagai-Jacobson, 2002; Capeheart-Meningall, 2005; Delgado, 2006). That is not to say that these students lack meaning in life; yet, it is to say that they ought to be exposed to instruction on meaning and all its benefits in graduate education (Delgado, 2006).

More importantly, the results from the present study showed that respondents are interested in spirituality \((n = 17, 53.1\%)\). Over fifty percent of students want to know more. Already the majority of the respondents reported being young adults between the ages of 18 and
This is a cohort of adults noted for intense needs for socio-cultural identity, purposefulness, and recognition in terms of relationships and social roles (Bee & Bjorklund, 2004). This is a cohort of students who yearn for meaning and moral identity as they consolidate their career choices. Parker et al. (2008) emphasized the need for purposefulness in relationships for teacher education programs. The same can be said of business education for organizational leadership. The results from the present study are consistent with literature on the inherent yearning for exposure to the concept of meaning, as a natural developmental need in adulthood: i.e., purpose and values.

Moral Reasoning Discussion

A look at the descriptive statistics from the moral reasoning items shows different reactions to each scenario. The initial responses to the scenario decisions are situational and sensitive in nature. Take for instance the initial decisions in each scenario. Respondents indicated different reactions and sensitivities to the decision that affects employees. In Scenario 1, almost half of the respondents \( n = 15, 42.5\% \) believed that Alex should not reprimand the employee according to company policy. One question is: how many of the graduate students are interested in full compliance in company policies? With Scenario 4, respondents reported unanimous support for Leigh’s interaction with the subordinate. While ethically, it is advisable to interact and show presence as a leader (Starratt, 2004), Leigh’s interaction in this case may be inconsistent with previous employees. Leigh had previously been critical of other employees and given formal letters of discipline. In order to remain consistent, Leigh should consider the time to interact with the employee as worthwhile and morally expedient. On this note, the majority of the respondents’ \( n = 27, 93.1\% \) initial reaction was right to reason with Leigh to interact with the employee.
Also, the majority of the respondents’ decision to support Leigh’s interaction with the employee shows creativity and situational awareness. By looking at their P-scores (See Appendix J for details), the majority of respondents demonstrated moral reasoning and good judgment in managerial situations, which reflect post-conventional levels of moral reasoning (Loviscky et al., 2007). A good judgment in any managerial situation demonstrates a characteristic of a high level moral reasoning or “the ability of situational appreciation exercised in the making of a second premise” (Bricker, 1993, p. 15). Throughout the six scenarios, the initial decisions from respondents showed variations in moral reasoning according to managerial situations (see details from Table 14). Interestingly, when it came to Scenario 6 on Fran’s decision, the respondents were divided, a little over half of the respondents said Fran should promote the potential superstar ($n=15$, 53.6%), the rest said Fran should not or they couldn’t decide.

The discussion on moral reasoning takes a different tangent when we look at the variances in scores. These respondents, being graduate students, are either developing independently or they are showing variances in their abilities to analyze and reason circumstantially. It is interesting to see variations in perceptions, opinions, and thoughts. In fact, moralization theorists agree that there is always an element of bias in judgment according to social influences and other personal factors (Flanagan & Jackson, 1993; Kegan, 1986; Rest et al., 1999; Thoma, 2006; Thoma et al., 1999; Weber, 1991). To these researchers, moral reasoning has many personal factors and human biases, as noted in most human development areas. Variations in perceptions, opinions, and thoughts are all part of our differences in moral reasoning as adults with different stories, experiences, and narrations in life.
Based on the simple sum scores, respondents also showed different reactions to the different moral scenarios. The descriptive statistics showed variance in decisions on various scenarios. Table 14 shows the highest mean (M = 42.4, SD = 5.15) for Scenario 4 (Leigh’s case), and the lowest mean (M = 36.6, SD = 5.58) for Scenario 1 (Alex’s case). The higher mean for a scenario means the respondents may have better moral judgment with respect to a similar case in the future (Loviscky et al., 2007). The aggregate for MRQ simple sum scores is 39.20 out of a potential maximum simple sum score (in each scenario) of 70, which can be considered as moderate.

Most ethical decisions that affect others must take into consideration emotional effect and individual intuition (Marnburg, 2003; Riaz, 2007). The majority of the respondents’ initial decisions, scenario by scenario, were thoughtful and reasonable. When it came to the rating of the 12 items in each scenario, again the respondents showed a pragmatic approach to moral dilemmas; the respondents showed reasonable accommodation, consideration, and moderation in response to the various items. The beyond midpoint (39.20 out of 70.00) means of the simple sum scores (see Table 14) for all the scenarios may indicate a reflective and intuitive thinking about each dilemma before answering. For instance, in Scenario 5 where Pat realized a mistake in a projected budget respondents scored a mean of 40.53 out of 60 on the simple sum scores. The moderate scores show that the respondents were reflective and intuitive in their ratings; they considered the impact of the budget mistake on the company as a whole; and they considered it morally prudent for Pat to report the mistake. An item asked: “Given Pat’s job responsibility, doesn’t Pat owe it to the company to be honest” the majority rated 4 out of 5 (n = 12, 40.0%) to agree that Pat owed it to the company to be honest.
In addition, the $P$-scores also showed the cumulative results from the ranking of importance in each moral reasoning scenario. Table 15 shows the descriptive statistics for the ranking of importance that led to $P$-scores. For example, in Scenario 1, the second most important rating went to item 4 ($n = 9$, 28.1%). In Scenario 1 (Alex) item 4 asked: “What values are going to be the basis for how companies treat their employees?” In other words, for this particular item, respondents ranked values in company as important in their moral judgment in the treatment of employees. This level of judgment resonates the consideration of others and collective responsibilities associated with high level of moral reasoning. This level of moral reasoning is tagged postconventional and earns points for a participant who ranks this item in the top four (Loviscky et al., 2007). In Scenario 2 (Kris), respondents ranked item 5 ($n = 10$, 33.3%) as most important. In Kris’ case, item 5 asked: “Would providing the training in the long run benefit more people to the greater extent?” Respondents’ decision took into consideration the greater benefit of the majority. This aspect of moral reasoning is highly commendable (Allen & Ng, 2001; Riaz, 2007).

Most of the ranking of importance showed a high level of moral reasoning among respondents. From Tables 15 and 16, the rankings of importance showed a definitive understanding of the impact of moral decisions on collectiveness. Vine (1996) believed the measure of moral reasoning should be within the context of collective impact on the good of the whole. Collectiveness is a sign of the postconventional stage where “the moralization of judgment … the maturation of personality generally” have an impact on the whole (Loevinger, 1998, p. 183). Pasupathi and Staudinger (2001) termed this characteristic of moral reasoning as “social intelligence” that yields to understanding different perspectives. At this point, many of the respondents have developed their personal reasoning and assertions of the prominence of
justice (Flanagan & Jackson, 1993; Kegan, 1986; Rest et al., 1999; Thoma, 2006; Thoma et al., 1999; Weber, 1991). These graduate students are showing positive signs of moral reasoning that are consistent with their supposed level of adult development (according to their age as adults).

However, Table 16 shows a concern that should be addressed. The respondents only get points if they rank postconventional items high, in their top four. On the average certain scenarios had very low $P$-scores. For example, Scenarios 2 and 4 with $P$-scores of 25.48 and 28.52, respectively, can be considered low. One explanation may be that the MMJT scenarios may be biased towards business situations (and, therefore, directly relevant to only a portion of the respondents); however, low $P$-scores in some of these cases may raise questions in the postconventional level of moral development for all graduate students as adults. Kohlberg (1984) talked about role-taking opportunities for increasing moral development. A new method of facilitating moral development may be commendable. Lower $P$-scores, such as those found in Scenarios 2 and 6, should raise a flag that suggests a need for further training and exposure in moral development in graduate education, particularly training and exposure program that will include role-taking opportunities. Role-playing activities will give students the experience of grappling with moral dilemmas and engaging in postconventional moral reasoning.

Training in moral reasoning should be encouraged in graduate education. The potential is evident among the respondents. Most of the respondents ($n = 20, 62.5\%$) are interested in formal training or some kind of coursework in moral reasoning. This is a good indication that respondents understand the importance of moral reasoning as professionals and as potential leaders. The various programs have to engage students in meaningful discussions on moral reasoning. And that calls for systematic instructional consideration to include role-taking, real life simulations in graduate programs.
Diversity Competencies Discussion

Many of the respondents reported an interest in organizations that promotes diversity and multicultural interaction. For example, the DCQ item 1 asked if respondents: “would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from other countries”, and the mean score was 3.81 out of 5 for that item. Item by item, Table 17 showed respondents were moderately interested in diversity in general. Each subscale of the diversity competencies: i.e., diversity of contact (DCQ-DC), relativistic appreciation (DCQ-RA), and a sense of connection (DCQ-SC) also showed moderate scores. This translates to moderate awareness, knowledge, and skills of diversity or multiculturalism (Connerley & Pedersen, 2004). Diversity of contact demonstrates awareness of diversity universally. Relativistic appreciation supports the knowledge and skills in relating to different cultures. And a sense of connection establishes the potential to relate and grow in differences; it is in line with the sense of comfort that respondents feel in exposing themselves to new cultures (Fuertes et al., 2000).

In addition, moderate scores from the DCQ items reflect moderate levels of individual diversity development (IDD). Moderate means reported in all the subscales of DCQ (as shown in Table 18) are acceptable for the purpose of evaluating respondents’ IDD. Particularly, at a moderate level of IDD, individuals are likely to be at the level of questioning or self-exploratory. At this level respondents are more likely to express moderation including possibly going beyond the dualistic awareness of diversity. Also, the moderate level shows respondents’ cognitive ability to learn to value otherness, perceptually and sensitively (Chavez et al., 2003). For example, these graduate students responded positively to DCQ item 4: “I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.” They reported a mean of 4.03, SD of .98 for the item 4. The mean of 4.03 out of 5 indicates a high level of awareness beyond
dualistic level of IDD (Chavez et al.). Which means respondents may be heading beyond the bi-
polarity, and are at the level of self-exploration or even at risk taking levels of IDD.

Chavez and colleagues (2003) talked about the learning processes that involve cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains when it comes to assessing IDD. Most respondents showed more than just awareness and knowledge; they also show willingness to explore friendship and relationships with others from different cultures. For example, over 70 percent \((n = 25)\) reported positively on item 9 of the DCQ that asked a question on getting to know others (see Appendix F for details). This item probes into the level of risk-taking/exploration of respondents. In all, both business and education students reported high propensity to diversity competencies and the readiness to take risk for individual diversity development. Again, this is a good report for professional relationships since both future business managers and teachers are more likely to face diversity in their respective organizations and classrooms.

Concerning relationships in teacher education and business leadership, the level of risk-taking is a natural progression from self-exploration, self-questioning, and personal growth in learning. Chavez et al. considered this level of IDD as important in developing inclusion and mentoring. Graduate business and education students should be astute in such otherness that requires risks and involves potential rejections. Notwithstanding, the respondents showed positive aptitudes towards diversity competencies in relationships that matter in teacher education programs (Parker et al., 2008). The same can be said of business students who showed a willingness to risk knowing other cultures. In discussing sameness and otherness in organizations, Durand and Calori (2006) mentioned that it takes adjustment and a resolve to move from the “paradoxical consciousness of remaining oneself” to a venerable position of inclusiveness.
On the other hand, some respondents are missing the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary for diversity competencies. According to the results of the present study, some respondents (n = 11, 27.50%) have not been exposed to formal training in diversity, and others show no interest at all (n = 6, 15.00%). Most literature reviewed lamented about individuals without knowledge who still show unwillingness to learn (Asher, 2007; Connerley & Pedersen, 2004; Chavez et al., 2003; Reynolds & Pope, 1991). In fact, Chavez and colleagues expressed this level of IDD as unfortunate and ignorant. This stage of diversity development is rudimentary for avoiding stereotypes. Without awareness a person can have “generalized conceptions of others based on incorrect, stereotypical, out of context, or exaggerated information” (Chavez et al., 2003, p. 459).

However, other respondents have shown preparedness to learn; they are prepared to risk and validate their own awareness, knowledge, and skills in diversity competencies. Respondents who acknowledged low scores in diversity competencies also expressed interest in learning, and that is a challenge for educational leaders. Indeed, diversity competencies among the respondents are encouraging. Because such competencies can lead to an exposure of one’s flaws in thoughts, deeds, emotions, and behaviors. The growth in diversity competencies would only challenge the graduate students to think globally. The effort has to be concerted and planned to confront the lack of awareness, knowledge, and skills for diversity competencies in business and education programs. Program leaders should take advantage of the interest of students to learn.

Correlational Results Discussion

The correlational results from the present study were disappointing. The relationships among the study variables were weak and statistically not significant. For example, the correlation between meaning and moral reasoning was weak ($r = .23$); the correlation between
meaning and diversity competencies was also weak and negative ($r = -.09$); and the correlation between moral reasoning and diversity competencies was weak as well ($r = .08$). The few significant relationships found were among individual variables and their subscales. The low response rate may have contributed to this major limitation on many inferential analyses.

However, the present study is significant in expanding our knowledge in professional citizenship and otherness leadership. The relationships among the three variables were conceptually plausible according to literature reviewed - meaning related with moral reasoning (Bunch, 2005; Drath & Palus, 1994); moral reasoning related with diversity competencies (Bricker, 1993; Rachels & Rachels, 2007; Tirri, Tallent-Runnels & Nokelainen, 2005); and meaning related with diversity competencies (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Bolman & Deal, 2001; Williams, 2003). So, the prognosis from the present study is that these relationships may exist conceptually; it may not be evident empirically from the limited data. But these relationships cannot be dismissed entirely in any scholarly debate. Because, as Houston (2008) pointed out, professionalism goes beyond conceptual definitions; “that sensitivity to cultural and ethnic difference *ipsa facto* promotes social justice and/or harmony between people(s) and thus is morally educative” (Stables, 2005, p. 185); and professionalism and otherness are societal needs.

Unfortunately, these relationships among the meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies were not conclusive in this present study. The limited data affected discussions in response to most of the research questions. Nevertheless, what were evident in this present study are the important variations in the demographics – gender, race, and career orientations – with respect to these study variables, and therefore, the significance of the entire results from this study goes beyond the limitations.
Implications for Practice

The main objective of the study was to explore the relationships among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies with a graduate student population. The study showed information that may be helpful in our understanding of these plausible correlations. Therefore, certain recommendations should be considered for practical reasons:

First, the various concepts discussed in the study are valuable for practical purposes in higher education. Meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies are all practical for business and education leadership. Any flaws in education that resonate the lack of exposure to spirituality, morality, and diversity are tantamount to the lack of holistic education that should be encouraged in higher education (Bolman & Deal, 2001; Brammer, Williams, & Zinkin, 2007; Capeheart-Meningall, 2005; Delgado, 2006). Practically, higher education should help elevate purposefulness in life among graduate students (Delgado, 2006; Demon, 2008). Delgado recommended exposure of spirituality to health-related education; this recommendation should be extended to other programs in higher education. Knowledge of what is moral and acceptable in society should be fortified in our educational practices (Allen & Ng, 2001; Bigel, 2002; Bunch, 2005). Finally, competencies in awareness, knowledge, and skills in differentiation are just part of our humanity, and these are important considerations for the transformation of our higher education (Magolda, 2001).

Secondly, conceptually, the themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership should be part of our curriculum and instruction within the education system. Knowledge of these themes will enable students to develop in diverse relationships (Lim, 2007), professional acumen, and empowerment for the intercultural freedom in the era of globalization (Guy, 2001). Many current studies are calling for honest and open discussions on the importance of these
themes (Banks & Nguyen, 2008; De George, 2008; Durand & Calori, 2006; O’Hara & Pritchard, 2008; Lim, 2007; Neron and Norman, 2008, Wood & Logsdon, 2008). Lim (2007) discussed the importance of professional behaviors toward others and “a possible appropriation of it for management practice” (p. 251). As further recommendation, our education systems should engage students on such discussions related to diversity and citizenship. In other words, our business and education programs should empower future managers and leadership in corporate citizenship that will lead to social responsibilities. Authors such as Neron and Norman (2008), De George (2008), and Wood and Logsdon (2008) have started the debate on business citizenship. It is incumbent on our higher education system to expand on the significance of citizenship and otherness.

Thirdly, higher education institutions are likely to benefit from initiatives that expand on otherness leadership. Institutional policies regarding inclusiveness have to expand to embrace otherness education (Durand & Calori, 2006; Lim, 2007). Previous studies pointed out that relationship matters (Parker et al., 2008); otherness exists even in sameness (Durand & Calori, 2006); and that otherness needs to be taught systematically and constructively (Lim, 2007). It is not enough to have initiatives for recruitment and retention of minorities if the environment is not conducive for differences. Otherness involves learning to value others in a meaningful way (Chavez et al., 2003); higher education institutions are supposed to be safe places for learning and individuality. As Lim and Durand and Calori pointed out, otherness involves an expression of values, purposefulness, and moral relationships. Practically, higher education will create a meaningful society if otherness becomes a higher core value – an educational opportunity for selflessness and an altruism movement (Jarymowicz, 1992).
Fourthly, our future business and educational leaders have the obligation to be fair, understanding, and accommodating. These are helpful in relational leadership (Goleman et al., 2002), conflict management (Schein, 2004), and creative transformations (Hesselbein, 1999). For conflict management, Schein insisted that fairness and accommodation are paramount in successful “role relationships” (p. 183). During such role relationships, the reality of differences, human characteristics, and the need for professional aptitudes and otherness leadership cannot be over emphasized. It is imperative for higher education institutions to show leadership and to examine their roles in curriculum and instructions towards professional citizenship and otherness leadership development. Systematic instruction in spirituality, morality, and diversity should be considered in higher education institutions.

In effect, higher education environments are changing. They are multicultural, multi-talented, and filled with differences. These differences include opinions, demographics, and social economic statuses. Similarly, businesses are multi-facetted and multi-cultured. Graduate business students and teachers/educators are to embrace citizenship and diversity. Practically, higher educational leaders have to embrace their responsibilities to expose graduate students to these major constructs – meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. These constructs are vital in promoting citizenship and otherness in a multicultural environment.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present study was intended to be an exploration on the themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership. The correlations among the study variables were important in this instance. The following are recommendations for future research:

First, the conceptual relationships among meaning and moral reasoning and diversity are to be explored further in the themes of professional citizenship and otherness leadership.
According to literature, these concepts are related with one another conceptually and they are part of human development (Arievitch & Haenen, 2005; Bee & Bjorklund, 2004; Hanrahan, 2002; Sinnott, 2001; Tirri Tisdell, 2003). Empirical data to consolidate these relationships with business and education graduate students in the area of spirituality, moral development, and other social relations in diversity is recommended. For such empirical data may call for a sequential explanatory mixed methodology (Creswell, 1998) where by quantitative and qualitative data can be processed. The process may also involve sequential sampling of both respondents who score high and low in the various variables. Their “stories or narrations” may be significant contributions to adulthood. And in particular, these adulthood stories are to be explored for further discussions on citizenship and otherness leadership.

Next, further research is recommended to investigate the development of curriculum and instruction in the areas of meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies in graduate programs. Many research centers are devoted to promoting these individual concepts. For instance, The Fetzer Institute (2008) is committed to the promotion of religiosity/spirituality and sensitivity. Morality and ethics and moral reasoning are central research focuses to many institutions such as the University of Minnesota. The National Center for Cultural Competencies (NCCC, 2008) at Georgetown University is committed to multicultural studies. Universities have to be proactive in institutional research in the area of spirituality, morality, and diversity. The results from the present study showed graduate students are yearning for more training and exposure in these areas. It is prudent for institutions to focus on the viability of these concepts and to highlight their potency in human relations.

Furthermore, it is recommended that higher education develop and implement pedagogical methods of teaching these concepts at both undergraduate and graduate levels. It is
alarming to see the level of exposure so low at a graduate level. Discussion on spirituality, morality, and diversity can be subjective (Delgado, 2006; Pascarella, Edison, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996; Raaijmakers & Hoof, 2006). Yet, pedagogically, these concepts need be addressed in higher education (Lim, 2007; Martin, 2008; Rintoul, 2007; Spiridakis & Normore, 2007). Many of these areas are left for individual discretion and interpretation. It is important for institutions to develop pedagogical consistencies for topical discussions on such areas as faith, meaning, spirituality, morality, diversity, multiculturalism, and so forth. As a start, the researcher recommends an active research that will involve a larger sampling to establish empirical data and an expansion of discussions for informed decisions. And from that, institutional policy makers should investigate how best to educate both undergraduate and graduate students on these concepts across disciplines without controversies.

Conclusion

The various concepts discussed in the present study relate significantly to human development. The concepts of meaning as in spirituality, moral reasoning as in morality, and diversity competencies as in multiculturalism, resonate humanistic values. These humanistic values are integral part of citizenship and otherness. By studying the correlations among these study variables, the tone has been set for further discussions on these themes: professional citizenship and otherness leadership. The plausible nature of these relationships is worth exploring in future research.

The statistical connections among meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies were not established in this case. The low response rate placed limitations on the inferential analyses. However, discussions on the descriptive statistics and differences among the demographics point to some practical significance for the study. In essence, the present study
has set the agenda for further research and teaching on meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies. The prospects of developing professional citizenship and otherness leadership among graduate students in business and education departments need to be examined further in such correlational studies.

In addition, the present study has reinforced the importance of professional obligations of higher education institutions. Colleges and universities are to educate students holistically. Professionalism means sensitivity and civility (Houston, 2008; Ryan, 2001; Wood & Logsdon, 2008); otherness means purposefulness in relationships (Chavez, et al., 2003; Durand & Calori, 2006; Lim, 2007; O’Hara & Pritchard, 2008; Udani, 2008). These are human values to be inculcated and reiterated in our educational systems. It is a prognosis for the advancement of human development. In effect, meaning creation should not be experimental; it should be systematic and believable. Moral responsibilities should not remain encoded; they should be civic deliverables for the good of the whole. Diversity should not just remain an institutional goal; it should be an institutional reality, practical and innovative.
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APPENDIX A: Letter to Program Administrators

September 2008

Dear Program Coordinator/Director:

Re: Request for email addresses of potential study participants

I am writing to solicit your assistance in providing access to email addresses of graduate students enrolled in your program. This request is in respect to my research study on Professional Citizenship and Otherness Leadership Development: Examining the Relationships among Meaning, Moral Reasoning, and Diversity Competencies of Graduate Students. As part of my doctoral dissertation in Bowling Green State University’s Educational Administration and Leadership Studies program, I am conducting a research study of college students’ professional moral citizenship and their appreciation of differences and the value of others as part of their human development. This will mean sending email message to all potential students currently enrolled at BGSU to invite them to participate in this study.

Again, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among the study variables: Meaning, Moral Reasoning, and Diversity Competencies, in an attempt to explain the level of professionalism and otherness leadership among graduate students. BGSU’s Human Subject Review Board has approved the study (Id.: H08D352GX2).

My request is for a list of email addresses of potential participants. Alternatively, if you prefer to send the request for participation directly to your students on my behalf, please let me know so that I can forward to you the informed consent letter, which will include the hyperlink to the electronic survey. If you choose to send the email request on my behalf, I would simply need to know how many students are included in the emails you send so that I can keep a record of the size of the initial sample.

I understand that the privacy of students’ records is paramount. I can assure you that the privacy and confidentiality of these records will be protected. Any information you provide will remain confidential, and will only be used by or revealed to those closely related to this study. Only the research team will have access to the records (if necessary) and the related data you provide. Particularly, all records or email addresses related to this study will be destroyed immediately after the completion of the study.

Although it is my intent that no one else will see the records, please be advised that posting email addresses on the Internet is not 100% secure, and it is possible that someone else could intercept such information. Further, some establishments use tracking software to monitor and record keystrokes, mouse clicks, and web sites visited. However, all efforts humanly possible on my part will be taken to prevent a bleach of confidentiality on the part of the research team.

If you have any questions, you may contact the following:
• Alexander Edwards, researcher/student on 419 372 6931 or 419 290 3919 or email: akedwar@bgsu.edu.
• Dr. Patrick Pauken, dissertation chair/advisor: on 419 372 2550 or email: paukenp@bgsu.edu.
• Dr. Steve Cady, committee member, on 419 372 2222 or email: stevec@bgsu.edu
• Chair, BGSU’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419.372.7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Alexander Edwards
APPENDIX B: Email Message of Letter of Consent to Participants

August 2008

Principal Researcher: Alexander Edwards          Phone: (419) 290 3919

Project (Dissertation): Professional Citizenship and Otherness Leadership Development

Dear Graduate Student:

I am a doctoral candidate of the Educational Administration and Leadership Studies division, College of Education and Human Development, here in Bowling Green State University. You are invited to be part of a research study on Professional Citizenship and Otherness Leadership Development: Examining the Relationships among Meaning, Moral Reasoning, and Diversity Competencies of Graduate Students. As part of my doctoral dissertation in Bowling Green State University’s Educational Administration and Leadership Studies program, I am conducting a research study of graduate students’ appreciation of differences and the value of others as part of otherness leadership development. Because you have been identified as a graduate student currently enrolled at BGSU, you are invited to participate in this study.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among the study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies, in an attempt to explain the level of otherness leadership among graduate students. The data gathered in this study may expand the current knowledge base of professionalism and diversity appreciation among graduate students. Additionally, this information is going to give valuable insight for programs development in institutions of higher education and other organizations. Completing the survey for this research—Otherness Development Survey—will take approximately 30-35 minutes of your time to participate.

I understand that your time is extremely valuable; however, I would very much appreciate your participation in this study. Your participation in this project is voluntary, and you are free to withdraw your participation at any time without risk or explanation. Your decision to participate or not will not impact your grades/class standing, nor will it interfere with your future relationship with Bowling Green State University, the College of Education and Human Development, the Educational Administration and Leadership Studies division, or the researcher. Your informed consent to participate in this study is assumed by your completion of the survey and submitting your responses. Information you provide will remain anonymous, and your identity will not be revealed to the researcher or anybody else. Only the research team will have access to the data you provide. Your confidentiality as a respondent and your responses will be protected throughout the study and any publication of the results. Thus, your name and other personal, identifying information will not be revealed in any publication or presentation resulting from this study. The risks of participating in this study are no greater than those encountered in normal daily life. There is no known physical or emotional risk in participation. Should you participate in this study, please print and retain this consent document for your record.
Although it is my intent that no one else will see the original returns, please be advised that posting responses on the Internet is not 100% secure, and it is possible that someone else could intercept your survey. Should you choose to complete the survey electronically, please remember to clear your browser's cache and page history after you submit the survey in order to protect your privacy. Further, some establishment use tracking software to monitor and record keystrokes, mouse clicks, and web sites visited. This could impact the confidentiality of your responses, so you may choose to complete the survey electronically in the comfort of your home computer.

For electronic submission, you can access the entire survey at:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=XJx7JmXfk5dX2WeeKfkUg_3d_3d

This survey will be opened until the Middle of October 2008.

If you have any questions, you may contact me on: 419-372-6931 or 419-290-3919 or email: akedwar@bgsu.edu. You may also contact my dissertation advisor: Dr. Pauken on 419 372 2550 or email: paukenp@bgsu.edu. If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or about your rights as a research participant, you may also contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419.372.7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

Thank you for your assistance and your time.

Sincerely,

Alexander Edwards
APPENDIX C:

Letter to Researchers Requesting Permission to Use Published Instruments

June 10, 2008

Dear Author/Researcher

I am a doctoral candidate at Bowling Green State University (BGSU), Ohio. I am writing formally to request for your written consent or permission to adapt your instrument for my research study on Professional Citizenship and Otherness Leadership Development: Examining the Relationships among Meaning, Moral Reasoning, and Diversity Competencies of Graduate Students. As part of my doctoral dissertation in BGSU’s Educational Administration and Leadership Studies program, I am conducting this research study of among graduate students primarily to explain the two concepts: Professional citizenship and otherness leadership development.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among the study variables: meaning, moral reasoning, and diversity competencies using a correlational design. As part of my study, I am using an online survey for this research—Otherness Development Survey—that will involve three published instruments one of which is yours.

I am writing for your approval to include your instrument: (citation) for my study. I have reviewed your instrument with admiration, and I am grateful for your scholarship.

Please let me hear from you officially regarding this request.

If you have any questions, you may contact me on: (419) 372-6931 or cell: (419) 290-3919 or email: aikedwar@bgsu.edu. Alternatively, you may contact my dissertation advisor: Dr. Pauken on 419 372 2550 or email: paukenp@bgsu.edu. If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or about your rights as a research participant, you may also contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419.372.7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Alexander Edwards
Researcher
APPENDIX D:  
The Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ)

Please take a moment to think about what makes your life feel important to you. Please respond to the following statements as truthfully and accurately as you can, and also please remember that these are very subjective questions and that there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer according to the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolutely Untrue (1)</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat Untrue (3)</th>
<th>Can’t Say True or False (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat True (5)</th>
<th>Mostly True (6)</th>
<th>Absolutely True (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I understand my life’s meaning.

2. I am looking for something that makes my life feel meaningful.

3. I am always looking to find my life’s purpose.

4. My life has a clear sense of purpose.

5. I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful.

6. I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.

7. I am always searching for something that makes my life feel significant.

8. I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life.

9. My life has no clear purpose.

10. I am searching for meaning in my life.

MLQ syntax to create Presence and Search subscales:
   Presence: 1, 4, 5, 6, & 9 reverse-coded
   Search: 2, 3, 7, 8, & 10

The University of Minnesota owns the copyright for this questionnaire. This questionnaire is intended for free use in research and clinical applications. Please contact Michael F. Steger prior to any such noncommercial use. This questionnaire may not be used for commercial purposes.
APPENDIX E:

MANAGERIAL MORAL JUDGMENT TEST

(Loviscky, et al., 2007)

SCENARIO # 1:

Alex is supervising an employee who used a sick day to take the previous day off from work. However, Alex has learned from the employee’s co-workers that the employee was not actually sick, but used the day as a “mental health” day. That is, the employee was not physically sick but felt tired mentally. Alex knows that the company’s sick leave policy does not allow for mental health days.

Should Alex reprimand the employee according to the company policy? (Check one)

_____ Should reprimand _____ Can’t decide _____ Should not reprimand

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

1. Every time an employee escapes punishment for a policy violation, doesn’t that just encourage more violations?
2. Was Alex a good friend of the employee?
3. What is the value of health prior to society’s perspective on personal values?
4. What values are going to be the basis for how companies treat their employees?
5. Whether there is a law that requires employers to allow employees to take sick days for mental health problems.
6. Whether reprimanding the employee or overlooking the transgression would be best for the company.
7. Can society afford to let everybody take off work when they aren’t physically sick?
8. Does the organization have the right to force their definition of health on their employees?
9. Whether the policy in this case is interfering with an employee maintaining his/her health.
10. How could anyone be so cruel as to reprimand an employee who needed a day off?
11. Whether the employee’s co-workers are in favor of reprimanding the employee or not.
12. What values Alex has set in his/her own personal code of behavior.

From the list of issues above, select the four most important:

Most important _____ 2nd most important _____ 3rd most important _____ 4th most important ____
SCENARIO #2

Kris has followed industry trends and decided that his subordinates would benefit greatly from a particular training program. In fact, Kris as much as promised these employees that they would receive the training in the near future. The employees were excited and looked forward to this developmental opportunity. At the time that Kris made that statement he felt that his budget would easily cover the training. However, upper management recently sent Kris and the other managers at his level a memo demanding increased efficiency over the next quarter, and outlining new rules saying funds could only be spent on essential functions. Kris believes that this focus on short-term goals would be detrimental to the long-term functioning of the unit that he manages because his subordinates would not be as knowledgeable as employees in competing companies.

Should Kris schedule the training? (Check one)

_____ Should schedule _____ Can’t decide _____ Should not schedule

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

1. Whether Kris has a desire to develop the employees or cares more about what upper management might think.
2. Isn’t it only natural for a supervisor to want to look out for his/her subordinates’ best interests that the supervisor would do what was possible to help them?
3. What effect would delaying the training have on the employees’ ability to compete on a level-playing field?
4. Whether Kris could make it appear like Kris scheduled the training before the memo with the new spending rules was sent.
5. Would providing the training in the long run benefit more people to a greater extent?
6. Whether Kris has experienced training Pomeranians.
7. Would the employees lose faith in Kris if the training was not scheduled?
8. Would sticking by her word be consistent with principles of fairness?
9. Would Kris be following principles, which Kris believes, are above any form of company policy?
10. Does Kris have any right to spend the company’s money as he/she sees fit?
11. Did Kris promise that the employees would receive the training in this quarter, or did Kris just promise to provide training in the future?
12. Does management have a right to make the rules about how the business should be run or not?

From the list of issues above, select the four most important:

Most important ____ 2nd most important ____ 3rd most important ____ 4th most important ____
SCENARIO #3

Ray manages a unit in a company that calls itself a “total quality” organization. Part of the organization’s mission statement says that employees should strive to continually improve their performance. Lately, Ray’s unit has been extremely busy trying to get its work done on several important projects. Ray asked his boss for advice about how to meet all of the deadlines, and the boss basically told him that his unit would have to cut corners on quality in order to get everything done on time.

The boss also told Ray that meeting deadlines is the best way to keep clients off their backs, and that the clients rarely complain about substandard work because its effects show up much later. However, Ray knows that doing substandard work for clients will only hurt the company’s reputation in the long run.

Should Ray instruct his subordinates to focus on meeting the deadlines at the expense of doing quality work? (Check one)

_____ Should instruct _____ Can’t decide _____ Should not instruct

IMPORTANCE:

Great  Much  Some  Little  No

1. Whether cutting corners would stir up discontent among Ray’s subordinates.
2. Whether other employees are in favor of cutting corners or not.
3. Whether the Tau Epsilon quality indicators are resonant with the organization’s goals.
4. Would allowing the subordinates to cut corners now encourage them to cut corners later after the deadlines are met?
5. Can the company allow quality to be somewhat compromised and still satisfy customers in the long term?
6. Can knowingly producing a substandard product ever be considered to be responsible?
7. How would the public good best be served?
8. Is Ray willing to risk his/her boss’s anger in order to preserve the company’s reputation for doing good work?
9. Will cutting corners anger customers and give the business a bad name?
10. Is Ray more responsible to the customers or to upper management?
11. Would cutting corners to meet deadlines be consistent with Ray’s own ethical beliefs?
12. Whether upper management stayed within the limits of its authority by ignoring the mission statement.

From the list of issues above, select the four most important:

Most important _____ 2nd most important _____ 3rd most important _____ 4th most important _____
**SCENARIO #4**

Leigh has been looking forward to the day that a subordinate is rotated out of the unit. The subordinate usually works up to performance standards, but is very abrasive, mean-spirited, and hardly anyone can stand interacting with him. The subordinate is due to be rotated out of the work unit in two days. But, today Leigh has learned that the subordinate made a serious mistake. When others made the same mistake, Leigh has followed company policy by providing negative feedback and constructive criticism after writing a formal letter of discipline for the employee’s personnel file. In this situation, Leigh has written up the employee, but does not know if it is worth the time and effort to engage in what will probably be a very unpleasant interaction with the subordinate. After all, the subordinate will be rotated out of the unit very soon.

Should Leigh have the interaction with the subordinate? *(Check one)*

_____ Should interact _____ Can’t decide _____ Should not interact

**IMPORTANCE:**

1. Is Leigh willing to risk a very unpleasant interaction for the chance that it might help the subordinate?
2. Would Leigh confront the subordinate to really help him/her, or would it just be used as a chance to criticize the subordinate?
3. Would avoiding the confrontation make the other subordinates angry with Leigh?
4. What benefits would discipline have apart from society especially for a charitable supervisor?
5. Wouldn’t it be a manager’s duty to do what is possible to help develop subordinates regardless of the circumstances?
6. If a subordinate needs guidance, shouldn’t it be provided regardless of what the subordinate’s interpersonal skills are like?
7. Is having the interaction consistent with principles of due process?
8. Is If Leigh does not speak with the subordinate would Leigh be preventing the subordinate from providing an explanation for the mistake?
9. Every time an employee escapes discipline for serious mistakes, doesn’t that just encourage more misconduct?
10. What effect would failure to provide feedback have on the employee’s ability to improve?
11. Would Leigh’s conscience allow Leigh to avoid the interaction?
12. Whether an organization’s policies are going to be upheld.

*From the list of issues above, select the four most important:*

Most important ____ 2nd most important ____ 3rd most important ____ 4th most important ____
**SCENARIO #5**

Pat is responsible for providing expenditure estimates for his unit to the controller in his company who then determines the budget for all units in the company. Upper management has always emphasized the importance of providing timely and accurate financial estimates, and they have backed up this policy by disciplining managers for inaccurate or late estimates. Pat recently realized that the figures that he supplied contained a mistake. The mistake was that an expense was projected to be larger than it should have been. It will not affect the ability of the company to stay within the budget. However, the money could be used to cover other company expenditures. Up to this point, no one else has identified the mistake and it is unlikely that they will.

Should Pat report the mistake? (Check one)

- _____ Should report
- _____ Can’t decide
- _____ Should not report

**IMPORTANCE:**

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

| 1. Whether Pat was really loyal to his company. |
| 2. Can the company afford to have employees who determine themselves which policies to apply? |
| 3. Could Pat receive a more harsh punishment if the company finds the mistake without his/her help? |
| 4. What values Pat has set for him/herself in his/her own personal code of behavior. |
| 5. Whether or not company policy ought to be respected by all employees. |
| 6. Whether Pat has been a good employee for a long time to prove that he/she isn’t a bad person. |
| 7. Does Pat have the freedom of speech to remain silent in this case? |
| 8. Would keeping the mistake to himself be consistent with Pat’s own ethical beliefs? |
| 9. Would reporting the mistake do any good for the Pat or society? |
| 10. Whether Pat’s subordinates and peers would lose faith in Pat if Pat is caught instead of reporting the mistake him/herself. |
| 11. Given Pat’s job responsibility, doesn’t Pat owe it to the company to be honest? |
| 12. What values are going to be the basis for how people behave in employment contexts? |

From the list of issues above, select the four most important:

- Most important
- 2nd most important
- 3rd most important
- 4th most important
SCENARIO #6

A position has recently become available in the work unit that Fran manages. Fran will be primarily responsible for determining who fills the position. The position is a desirable one to Fran’s subordinates because it is quite visible to higher management, and the people who have held it in the past have been promoted to other desirable positions. Since the last time the position was open a relatively inexperienced subordinate has impressed Fran by performing very well and often going beyond the call of duty. Since the company weighs employee development highly, Fran thinks that promoting this potential superstar as soon as possible would contribute to his own goal of getting promoted out of the unit in the next round of promotions. However, this person is so new that the work unit has not yet benefited from its investment in training the person. Furthermore, promoting someone with much less experience than other workers in the unit would likely cause low morale. Fran thinks that both of these factors could probably be detrimental to the unit in the long run.

Should Fran promote the potential superstar? (Check one)

_____ Should promote _____ Can’t decide _____ Should not promote

IMPORTANCE:

Great  Much  Some  Little  No

1. Whether the more experienced employees’ seniority has to be honored.
2. Whether Fran would be making the decision to help him/herself or doing this solely to help someone else.
3. Whether promoting the potential superstar or not would be best for the performance of Fran’s work unit.
4. Whether Fran should be influenced by the feelings of the other employees when it is Fran who knows best what would benefit the company.
5. Whether Fran has a bias against young people or whether he/she would mean nothing personal by promoting someone else.
6. Whether the superstar would receive commercial endorsements for promoting the company.
7. Who would the majority of people in Fran’s society feel is deserving of the promotion, the potential superstar or a high performing veteran subordinate?
8. Would promoting the newer employee in any way violate the rights of the other employees?
9. What principles of fairness are appropriate in such a situation?
10. Could Fran be so hard-hearted as to refuse the job to a veteran subordinate, knowing that it would mean so much to him/her?
11. Is Fran more responsible to the more experienced employees or to the highest performing employees?
12. Would promoting the newer employee bring about more total good for more people or not.

From the list of issues above, select the four most important:

Most important ____ 2nd most important ____ 3rd most important ____ 4th most important ____
APPENDIX F:  
*Miville-Guzman’s Universal-Diverse Scale (Fuertes et al., 2000)*

1. I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from other countries. (DC)
2. I would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries. (DC)
3. I often listen to music of other cultures. (DC)
4. I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world. (DC)
5. I attend events where I might get to know people from different racial backgrounds. (DC)

6. Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere. (RA)
7. I can best understand someone after I get to know he/she is both similar and different from me. (RA)
8. Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship. (RA)
9. In getting to know someone, I like knowing both how he/she differs from me and is similar to me. (RA)
10. Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps me understand my own problems better. (RA)

11. Getting to know someone of another race is generally an uncomfortable experience for me. (SC)
12. I am only at ease with people of my own race. (SC)
13. It’s really hard for me to feel close to a person from another race. (SC)
14. It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues. (SC)
15. I often feel irritated by persons of a different race. (SC)
APPENDIX G: Personal Demographics

Please select your response appropriately that most closely describes your self:

1. Gender:
   a. male
   b. female

2. Age: Select the best range
   a. 18 – 25
   b. 26 – 35
   c. 36 – 40
   d. above 40

3. Race: how do you best describe yourself?
   a. American Indian/Alaskan
   b. Asian/Pacific Islander
   c. Black/Non-Latino
   d. Latino
   e. White/Non-Latino
   f. Others (please specify) ______________

4. Do you consider yourself any of these:
   a. Yes    b. No   c. NA
   Spiritual person
   Religious person (practicing religion)
   Moral person

5. Graduate major
   a. MBA    b. Accounting/Finance
   c. Organizational Development d. Economics/Applied Statistic
   e. Students Affairs Personnel f. High Education Administration
   g. Educ. Admin. & Supervision h. Curriculum and Teaching
   i. Early Child Education j. Special Education
   j. MACIE k. Others (please specify) ______________

6. Have you taken any class related to any of the following:
   a. Yes b. No c. NA
   1. ethics/or moral?
   2. spirituality development?
   3. diversity or multiculturalism?

7. Will you be interested in formal course in any of the following:
   a. Yes b. No c. NA
1. ethics/or moral?
2. spirituality development?
3. diversity or multiculturalism?
APPENDIX H:  
Scoring The Managerial Moral Judgment Test

The chart below shows the “scoring key” for the Managerial Moral Judgment Test (MMJT). Each item was designed to represent one of the stages in Kohlberg’s moral development theory. Each scenario has:

- One Stage 2 item
- Three Stage 3 items
- Three Stage 4 items
- Three Stage 5 items
- One Stage 6 item
- One “M” item (nonsensical item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th>Item 6</th>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th>Item 8</th>
<th>Item 9</th>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th>Item 11</th>
<th>Item 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Simple Sum scoring scheme exclusively uses the rating data gathered by the MMJT. Calculate a Simple Sum score for each scenario by adding the importance ratings of items representing post-conventional reasoning (stages 5 and 6), as well as the reverse-scored ratings for items representing non-principled reasoning (stages 2, 3, and 4). After calculating a Simple Sum score for each scenario, add them to calculate the overall Simple Sum score.

The p-score scoring scheme is based on the ranking data gathered by the MMJT. Calculate a p-score for each scenario by determining which, if any, of the four items that were ranked as most important were stage 5 and/or stage 6 items (i.e., post-conventional reasoning items). Add 40 points to the scenario p-score if the respondent ranked a stage 5 or stage 6 item as most important, 30 points if ranked second most important, 20 points if ranked third most important, and 10 points if ranked fourth most important. An overall p-score is calculated for each respondent by calculating the average of the six scenario p-scores.

The Simple Sum scoring scheme offers the advantage of including information about how respondents discount issues that represent basic stages of moral judgment. In addition, we obtained higher reliability estimates with the Simple Sum scores.

To illustrate how to calculate Simple Sum and p-scores, the following pages provide an example set of responses for a scenario and scores them using both scoring schemes.
APPENDIX I:
SCORING EXAMPLE USING SCENARIO #1:

Alex is supervising an employee who used a sick day to take the previous day off from work. However, Alex has learned from the employee’s co-workers that the employee was not actually sick, but used the day as a “mental health” day. That is, the employee was not physically sick but felt tired mentally. Alex knows that the company’s sick leave policy does not allow for mental health days.

Should Alex reprimand the employee according to the company policy? (Check one)

_____ Should reprimand     _____ Can’t decide  __

_____ Should not reprimand

IMPORTANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Every time an employee escapes punishment for a policy violation, doesn’t that just encourage more violations? (STAGE 4)
2. Was Alex a good friend of the employee? (STAGE 3)
3. What is the value of health prior to society’s perspective on personal values? (M ITEM)
4. What values are going to be the basis for how companies treat their employees? (STAGE 6)
5. Whether there is a law that requires employers to allow employees to take sick days for mental health problems. (STAGE 4)
6. Whether reprimanding the employee or overlooking the transgression would be best for the company. (STAGE 2)
7. Can society afford to let everybody take off work when they aren’t physically sick? (STAGE 4)
8. Does the organization have the right to force their definition of health on their employees? (STAGE 5)
9. Whether the policy in this case is interfering with an employee maintaining his/her health. (STAGE 5)
10. How could anyone be so cruel as to reprimand an employee who needed a day off? (STAGE 3)
11. Whether the employee’s co-workers are in favor of reprimanding the employee or not. (STAGE 3)
12. What values Alex has set in his/her own personal code of behavior. (STAGE 5)

From the list of issues above, select the four most important:

Most important __9__ 2nd most important __8__ 3rd most important __6__ 4th most important
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Simple Sum Score: 38 = 3+4+4+3+2+4+4+5+3+2+4

A five-point rating scale is used with Great = 5 and No = 1. The “M” item was not scored. Ratings for items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 were reverse-scored because they represent non-principled reasoning stages.

p-score: 80 = 40+30+10; Items 9, 8, and 12 are post-conventional items, but Item 6 is not.
APPENDIX J: P-Scores for Respondents for Scenarios 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Scenario1 (Alex)</th>
<th>P-score</th>
<th>Scenario2 (Kris)</th>
<th>P-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd 3rd 4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd 3rd 4th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 5 8 7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 6 5 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 5 8 9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5 8 1 12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 3 9 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5 1 12 8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 8 9 11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5 6 10 12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 4 5 8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 2 3 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 4 6 12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5 7 3 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 4 8 9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3 12 11 5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 12 4 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7 8 9 3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 4 9 5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3 5 2 7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 5 12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4 9 3 6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3 8 12 11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 8 4 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5 2 12 3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4 12 1 5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 6 4 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12 5 8 3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 4 8 7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 4 5 8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8 12 7 6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8 7 4 9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 10 9 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5 3 7 11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9 4 6 10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5 7 8 11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5 4 7 12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5 2 8 12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12 4 5 9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 5 11 12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12 9 3 6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8 2 5 1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4 9 1 6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5 7 1 9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 6 3 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 1 11 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5 6 3 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 7 1 8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 6 3 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 5 1 3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4 8 7 6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 2 5 12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>12 9 8 1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10 1 9 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 6 7 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 5 11 2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4 8 9 12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3 2 4 12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4 12 9 8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 5 1 12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>8 12 9 6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8 9 5 2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3 4 5 9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2 7 1 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages: 5.5 6.88 5.97 7.16 57.19 4.84 4.94 6.16 7.58 25.48

Bold text represents postconventional items used in P-scoring
## P-Scores for Respondents for Scenarios 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Scenario3 (Ray)</th>
<th>P-score</th>
<th>Scenario4 (Leigh)</th>
<th>P-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario3</th>
<th>Scenario4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>38.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold text represents postconventional items used in P-scoring*
### P-Scores for Respondents for Scenarios 5 and 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Scenario 5 (Pat)</th>
<th>Scenario 6 (Fran)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd 3rd 4th</td>
<td>1st 2nd 3rd 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 10 6 3</td>
<td>40 7 4 6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 10 5 1</td>
<td>40 9 2 8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 9 4 12</td>
<td>60 9 12 3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 5 7 11</td>
<td>0 1 3 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 4 5 8</td>
<td>40 1 3 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 8 11 10</td>
<td>30 11 1 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 8 11 10</td>
<td>30 11 1 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9 11 10 2</td>
<td>40 12 11 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 8 12 2</td>
<td>50 2 1 3 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 4 11 12</td>
<td>40 8 12 11 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 2 4 8</td>
<td>30 3 2 4 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 9 11 12</td>
<td>40 12 5 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 5 8 1</td>
<td>20 8 9 7 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 6 4 11</td>
<td>20 2 3 10 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8 3 11 6</td>
<td>40 2 5 1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 10 8 12</td>
<td>30 3 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8 4 12 11</td>
<td>90 8 9 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>10 3 8 12 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8 5 9 4</td>
<td>70 11 12 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3 1 10 8</td>
<td>10 9 11 7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4 8 5 12</td>
<td>80 3 8 9 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2 10 11 7</td>
<td>0 1 8 9 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11 6 7 4</td>
<td>10 9 1 4 8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8 9 4 11</td>
<td>90 3 12 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3 4 1 8</td>
<td>40 3 8 12 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5 1 11 12</td>
<td>10 3 1 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4 8 1 12</td>
<td>80 4 3 9 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4 2 6 12</td>
<td>50 9 12 5 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Averages | 5.85 6.23 7.46 8.15 | 40.38 6.04 6.07 6.37 7.74 | 41.85 |

*Bold text represents postconventional items used in P-scoring*