

INNOVATION RESEARCH CENTRE

IMPROVING THE RELIABILITY OF THREE NEW SCALES WHICH MEASURE THREE NEW DIVERGENT THINKING ATTITUDES RELATED TO ORGANIZATIONAL CREATIVITY

by

Min Basadur, Pam Pringle and Simon Taggar
Michael G. DeGroot School of Business
McMaster University

Innovation Research Centre
WORKING PAPER NO. 45

November, 1995

Innis

~~HD~~

HD

45

.W657

no.45



MCMMASTER

• UNIVERSITY •

MICHAEL G. DEGROOTE
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

INNIS LIBRARY

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

**IMPROVING THE RELIABILITY OF
THREE NEW SCALES WHICH MEASURE
THREE NEW DIVERGENT THINKING ATTITUDES
RELATED TO ORGANIZATIONAL CREATIVITY**

by

Min Basadur, Pam Pringle and Simon Taggar
Michael G. DeGroot School of Business
McMaster University

Innovation Research Centre
WORKING PAPER NO. 45

November, 1995

The Working Paper series is intended as a means whereby a researcher may communicate his or her thoughts and findings to interested readers for their comments. The paper should be considered preliminary in nature and may require substantial revision. Accordingly, this Working Paper should not be quoted nor the data referred to without the written consent of the author. Your comments and suggestions are welcome and should be directed to the author.

ABSTRACT

In an increasingly complex and changing business environment, creativity is becoming recognized as a critical success factor for organizations. The identification of attitudes towards creativity and the subsequent development of creative thinking are important mechanisms for organizations to encourage creativity across all employees. Employee attitudes towards creativity can indicate their potential for behaving in a creative manner and organizations that can incorporate creativity into their organizational culture can further encourage creative thinking. This research extended previous research by Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) which identified three new divergent thinking attitudes related to organizational creativity: Valuing New Ideas, Creative Individual Stereotypes, and Too Busy for New Ideas.

Three expanded and improved scales emerged. Reliabilities (internal consistency) were increased significantly for each scale. The scales remained independent of each other. Confirmatory factor analysis provided further evidence that the new set of items in each scale cluster together and relate to the underlying construct significantly. Future steps toward reliability validity and test-retest reliability are identified.

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly complex and changing business environment, creativity is becoming recognized as a critical success factor for organizations. The identification of attitudes towards creativity and the subsequent development of creative thinking are important mechanisms for organizations to encourage creativity across all employees. Employee attitudes towards creativity can indicate their potential for behaving in a creative manner and organizations that can incorporate creativity into their organizational culture can further encourage creative thinking. This research extended previous research by Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) which identified three new divergent thinking attitudes related to organizational creativity: Valuing New Ideas, Creative Individual Stereotypes, and Too Busy for New Ideas. The purpose of the present study was to improve the reliability of Basadur and Hausdorf's three Likert type scales which measure these three new divergent thinking attitudes.

Background

To go back to the beginning, Basadur and Hausdorf's (1995) research extended the previous work of Basadur and Finkbeiner (1983, 1985) as follows. Basadur and Finkbeiner (1983) identified four divergent thinking attitudes - Preference for Ideation, Tendency to (not) Make Premature Critical Evaluation of Ideas, Valuing of New Ideas and Belief that Creative Thinking is (not) Bizarre. Subsequent studies first focussed on the first two attitudes and the Basadur 14 Item Preference Scale which measures both of them was established by Basadur and Finkbeiner (1985). This questionnaire has been used frequently in subsequent research (Basadur,

Graen & Scandura, 1986; Basadur, Wakabayashi & Graen, 1990; Basadur, Wakabayashi & Takai, 1992; Runco & Basadur, 1993).

More recent work has focussed on the other two attitudes. It is believed that the ability to accurately measure and differentiate among these two attitudes would further help organizations and individuals better understand specific divergent thinking attitudes and cognitive processes that affect innovation. This information would in turn increase our understanding of how training in creative thinking and problem solving works, thereby increasing its effectiveness. Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) combined the 12 highest loading items from the scales measuring these two attitudes (Basadur & Finkbeiner, 1983) into a single 24 item questionnaire (Table 1) with a 5-point Likert format. Their subsequent analysis of this questionnaire revealed that the 24 items actually comprised three concepts rather than two. These were labelled Valuing New Ideas, Creative Individual Stereotypes, and Too Busy for New Ideas. Eighteen of the 24 items in Table 1 across the three concepts were carried forward on three scales. All three scales so emerging were shown to have theoretical relevance for creative problem solving in Basadur & Hausdorf (1995) but it was strongly felt that all three needed improvement to increase reliability.

Cronbach Alphas for the three emergent scales respectively ranged from .70 to .76, .58 to .76, and .53 to .64 depending on the sample (Basadur & Hausdorf, 1995). The low number of items, especially for Creative Individual Stereotypes (3) and Too Busy for New Ideas (4) suggested that additional items should be added using the existing items on each scale as a base. For the Valuing New Ideas scale, it was suggested that new items needed to be created and added to or substituted for the existing 11 items to reduce the apparent transparency of the scale and to increase its ability to discriminate among responses.

It was suggested that such improvements would have to be made to each of the three new scales before subsequent research could be undertaken to confirm internal, external and criterion validity. It was further suggested that the 5-point Likert scales be expanded to 7-point or even 9-point scales to improve their ability to discriminate among respondents' attitudes.

Method

The 18 highest loading items thus identified across the three scales by Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) were used as a base for this present study. These items and their factor loadings, error variance and their respective scales, are shown in Table 2. Then 118 new items were added through consultation with a wide cross section of industry managers, adding items to each of the three scales in turn. Each scale was thus expanded. There were 49, 51 and 36 items in the expanded Valuing New Ideas, Creative Individual Stereotypes, and Too Busy For New Ideas scales respectively. The resulting 136 items were then randomly arranged in rotating order by scale to form a new questionnaire, the "Basadur Preference Scale #2" (Table 3) which was administered to a new sample. The items were all on a 9-point scale. Refinement of these three expanded scales through analysis of the responses is the focus of this paper.

A new sample (n=223) completed the 136 item questionnaire. The managers in the sample were not the same managers who had helped develop the items. The scale refinement process followed a strategy of optimizing the internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). First, for each expanded scale, items that correlated with the rest of the scale items with a correlation coefficient below 0.25 were dropped. Then other items with relatively low correlations with the rest of the scale items were removed if their removal improved the

Cronbach Alpha score. This was done in an iterative fashion until each scale's reliability was maximized as measured by the Cronbach Alpha method. This resulted in a new 44 item scale labelled Basadur Preference Scale #3.

Next, using Lisrel 8 (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1992), with generalized least squares estimates, reliability of the scales in Basadur Preference Scale #3 were further assessed in a confirmatory factor analysis. That is, the items which were expected to load on each of the three factors were checked to see if they did indeed load accordingly without sizable measurement error.

The Lisrel 8 analysis produces several statistics that show the degree to which the input data fit the expected three constructs. Although chi-square is sometimes used as a fit statistic it is sensitive to sample size, departures from the multivariate normality assumption, and the model's complexity (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980; Bearden, Sharma and Teel, 1982; Oliver and Bearden, 1985). In recognition of these problems, the present study employed: (a) a goodness-of-fit index developed by Joreskog and Sorbom (1984), (b) a comparative fit index, a fit measure that prevents the underestimation of fit likely to occur in small samples (Bentler, 1990) and (c) Bentler's normed fit index (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980) which compares a theoretical model's chi-square value with that obtained from the null model that constrains all parameters except the error coefficient to zero. T-values were also used to check if the factor loading (the Lambdas in table 5) of each item onto its construct was statistically significant.

Finally, the 44 item Basadur Preference Scale #3 was administered to a new, final sample of managers (n=68) and reliabilities were calculated (Cronbach alpha) for each of the three new scales.

Results

Of the original 49 additional items generated for measuring the Valuing New Ideas construct, 31 items were removed and 18 items were retained after the reliability analysis. A Cronbach alpha of .83 was finally obtained in this manner (Table 4). Of the 51 original additional items generated for measuring Creative Individual Stereotypes, 37 items were removed and 14 items were retained with a Cronbach alpha of .75 (Table 4). Of the original 36 items measuring Too Busy for New Ideas, 24 were removed, leaving the remaining 12-item scale with a Cronbach alpha of .80 (Table 4). Table 5 shows how the resulting three scales were combined to form the 44 item Basadur Preference Scale #3. The seven items that were retained from the original scales of the Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) study are indicated (they are the first seven). Of the three items in the original Creative Individual Stereotypes scale emerging from the Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) study all three were retained in the Basadur Preference Scale #3. Of the four items in the original Too Busy for New Ideas scale emerging from the Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) study two were retained in the Basadur Preference Scale #3. Of the eleven items in the original Valuing New Ideas scale emerging from the Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) study two were retained in the Basadur Preference Scale #3.

Table 6 presents confirmatory factor analysis results. The measurement model for "valuing new ideas" fit the data adequately after allowing items to intercorrelate¹ (*Goodness of Fit Index .93, Comparative Fit Index .96, Normed Fit Index .87*). The scale mean was 43.43 (SD=12.91). After allowing items within factors to intercorrelate, the measurement model for "creative individual stereotypes" fit the data well (*Goodness of Fit Index .95, Comparative Fit Index .96, Normed Fit Index .86*). For this scale the mean was 74.62 (SD=13.27). The initial

measurement model for "too busy for new ideas" fit the data well (*Goodness of Fit Index* .95, *Comparative Fit Index* .97, *Normed Fit Index* .89). The scale mean was 75.11 (SD=13.22). All measures showed acceptable convergent validity, with each being significantly related to its latent construct ($t > 1.96$) (Table 7).

The oblique nature of the constructs is illustrated by the correlational analysis² in Table 8. All three constructs correlate only at low levels. The correlation between "creative individual stereotypes" and "too busy for new ideas" were .21 ($p < 0.01$). The other two correlations were .17 and .18 ($p < 0.05$). Although the correlations are statistically significant, they are not strong correlations and indicate that the constructs are largely independent of each other.

The reliabilities calculated for the three scales comprising the Basadur Preference Scale #3, on the final new sample ($n=68$) were again high and are shown in Table 9. This supported the reliability of the three scales comprising Basadur Preference Scale #3. The results indicate the reliabilities of the three scales are not sample specific. A Cronbach alpha for "Valuing New Ideas" of .70 was obtained on the final sample which, while somewhat lower, still compares favourably to the Cronbach alpha .83 obtained initially (Table 4). For the "Creative Individual Stereotypes" scale a Cronbach alpha of .77 was obtained which is slightly higher than the .75 value obtained initially (Table 4). The "Too Busy for New Ideas" scale had a Cronbach alpha of .81 on the final sample which is slightly higher than the .80 obtained initially (Table 4).

Conclusions and Future Directions

Three improved scales measuring the divergent thinking attitudes called Valuing New Ideas, Creative Individual Stereotypes, and Too Busy for New Ideas have emerged from this

research. The improvement lies in higher reliability in terms of the internal consistency as measured by the Cronbach Alpha method. The reliabilities so calculated range from .70 to .83, .75 to .77, and .80 to .81 respectively versus reliabilities ranging from .70 to .76, .58 to .76, and .53 to .64 calculated for the previous versions of the scales reported in the Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) study.

The three scales also appear to be largely independent of each other, with correlation coefficients among them varying from .17 to .21. These correlations are significant, but are quite low.

The improvement in the reliability of the three scales resulted from new and additional items being added to each scale. The improved scales contain 18, 14, and 12 items respectively versus 11, 3 and 4 items respectively for the three scales which emerged from the Basadur and Hausdorf (1995) study. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that all of the items on each of the three new scales do indeed cluster together and relate significantly to the concept underlying each scale.

In short, it appears that we have three reliable, internally consistent scales for the three new divergent thinking attitudes. What is left to do now is to test whether or not these scales can discriminate between respondents accurately, such as before and after training that is designed to impact these three attitudes. Also, test-retest reliability needs to be established for each scale.

Endnotes

1. Several correlations among unique constructs were considerable, with off-diagonal elements in the phi-matrix exceeding .60.
2. Correction for measurement errors not made.

References

- Basadur, M.S., and Hausdorf, P., (1995). Measuring divergent thinking attitudes related to creative problem solving. Creativity Research Journal, 8(4).
- Basadur, M.S., and Finkbeiner, C.T., (1983). Identifying attitudinal factors related to ideation in creative problem solving. McMaster University Research and Working Group, Working Paper Series #207.
- Basadur, M.S., and Finkbeiner, C.T., (1985). Measuring preference for ideation in creative problem solving training. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20(1), pp. 23-34.
- Basadur, M.S., Graen, G.B., and Scandura, T.A., (1986). Training effects on attitudes toward divergent thinking among manufacturing engineers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(4), pp. 612-617.
- Basadur, M.S., Wakabayashi, M., and Graen, G.B., (1990). Attitudes towards divergent thinking before and after training: Focusing upon the effect of individual problem solving styles. Creativity Research Journal, 3(1), pp. 22-32.
- Basadur, M.S., Wakabayashi, M., and Graen, G.B., (1990). Identifying individual differences in creative problem solving style. Journal of Creative Behavior, 24(2), 111-131.
- Basadur, M.S., Wakabayashi, M., and Takai, J., (1992). Training effects on the divergent thinking attitudes of Japanese managers. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, pp. 329-345.
- Bearden, W.O., Subash, S., and Teel, J.E., (1982). Sample size effects on chi square and other statistics used in evaluating causal models. Journal of Marketing Research, 19 (November), pp. 425-430.
- Bentler, P.M., (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. Psychological Bulletin, 107, pp. 238-246.

- Bentler, P.M., and Bonett, D.G., (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. Psychological Bulletin, 88(3), pp. 588-60.
- Joreskog, K.G., and Sorbom, D., (1984). Lisrel VI: User's Guide. Mooresville, IN.: Scientific Software, Inc.
- Joreskog, K.G., and Sorbom, D., (1993). Lisrel 8: Structural Equation Modelling with the Simplis Command language. Mooresville, IN.: Scientific Software, Inc.
- Kerlinger, F.N., (1973). Foundations of Behavioural Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Oliver, R.L., and Bearden, W.O., (1985). Crossover effects in the theory of reasoned action: A moderating influence attempt. Journal of Consumer Research, 12(3), pp. 324-340.
- Runco, M.A., and Basadur, M.S., (1993). Assessing ideational and evaluative skills and creative styles and attitudes. Creativity and Innovation Management, 2(3), pp. 166-173.

Table 1

Top 24 Items from Basadur & Finkbeiner's (1983) Two Divergent Thinking Attitudes

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	
1)	I have often been able to come up with a new idea myself based on an idea from someone else.
2)	Creative people generally seem to have scrambled minds (R).
3)	Ideas are fundamental to decision making, and as such should not be taken for granted.
4)	New ideas seldom work out (R).
5)	Most people never really "open their minds" to all the possible options or alternatives when considering solutions to a problem.
6)	Truly creative people also have unusual lifestyles.
7)	In organizations, senior management should encourage ideas by demonstrating they are willing to act on them.
8)	I'm often too embarrassed to suggest my wild ideas. People laugh and suspect I can't think straight.
9)	I really enjoy the challenge of finding a different way to solve a problem.
10)	Really creative people are never very organized.
11)	Some people really surprise me with their new ideas.
12)	I don't have much time for thinking up wild ideas, I'm too busy just getting my job done.
13)	Most innovations occur because of needs or problems.
14)	Why is everybody always talking about ideas? I've got more work now than I know what to do with.
15)	When I get a new idea, I really get excited.
16)	Ideas are only important if they impact on major projects.
17)	All people have creative ideas from time to time.
18)	The boss' idea is usually always the best since it comes from a much broader perspective (R).
19)	Crazy sounding ideas can lead to something.
20)	Listening to other people's ideas is a waste of time (R).
21)	Productive change is important to a business. New ideas foster change. Therefore, new ideas are important to business.
22)	If everyone is providing ideas, then no one gets any work done.
23)	The more problems I have, the more opportunities I have.
24)	Only smart, knowledgeable people have good ideas (R).

Table 2

**Factor Loadings and Error Variances for the Eighteen Items
Emerging from the 24 Items in Table 1**

#	VALUING NEW IDEAS	CREATIVE INDIVIDUAL STEREOTYPES	TOO BUSY FOR NEW IDEAS	ERROR VARIANCES
2		.599 (.509)		.642 (.741)
3	.431 (.367)			.814 (.866)
4	-.397 (-.347)			.843 (.880)
6		.616 (.514)		.620 (.736)
7	.496 (.496)			.754 (.754)
9	.318 (.362)			.899 (.869)
10		.741 (.630)		.451 (.604)
12			.419 (.503)	.747 (.824)
14			.593 (.622)	.613 (.649)
15	.436 (.431)			.810 (.814)
16			.527 (.546)	.702 (.722)
17	.342 (.328)			.883 (.892)
18	-.396 (-.350)			.843 (.878)
19	.479 (.462)			.770 (.786)
20	-.608 (-.655)			.630 (.572)
21	.542 (.635)			.706 (.596)
22			.506 (.499)	.751 (.744)
24	-.452 (-.641)			.796 (.589)

Notes: 1. This table is reproduced from Basadur & Hausdorf (1995). That study had two samples, employees and students. The employee sample is in parentheses and the student sample is not.

2. Negative loadings indicate items that are reverse scored.

Table 3
136 Item Preference Scale With Corresponding Factors
(Basadur Preference Scale #2)

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	FACTOR
1. Ideas are fundamental to decision making, and as such should not be taken for granted.	1
2. I don't have much time for thinking up wild ideas, I'm too busy just getting my job done.	3
3. Creative people generally seem to have scrambled minds.	2
4. New ideas seldom work out. (R)	1
5. Why is everybody always talking about ideas? I've got more work than I know what to do with.	3
6. Really creative people are never very organized.	2
7. In organizations, senior management should encourage ideas by demonstrating they are willing to act on them.	1
8. Ideas are only important if they impact on major projects.	3
9. Truly creative people also have unusual lifestyles.	3
10. I really enjoy the challenge of finding a different way to solve a problem.	2
11. If everyone is providing ideas, then no one gets any work done.	1
12. Creative people don't fit in our department.	3
13. When I get a new idea I really get excited.	1
14. Ideas take too much time to generate.	3
15. Doers, not creative thinkers are the kind of people we need.	2
16. All people have creative ideas from time to time.	1
17. The time spent on generating good ideas saves time in solving problems.	3
18. Creative people are better suited for the arts.	2

Factor Key:

- 1 - Valuing New Ideas**
- 2 - Creative Individual Positive Stereotypes**
- 3 - Not Too Busy for New Ideas**

Table 3 (continued)
136 Item Preference Scale
With Corresponding Factors Continued

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	FACTOR
37. Everyone can generate new ideas.	2
38. New ideas can save us time.	3
39. Creative people are more effective in defining problems.	2
40. Creative people think outside the normal boundaries.	2
41. We should never be too busy to think of ideas to save us time.	3
42. You cannot teach an old dog new tricks.	3
43. Everyone has some creativity for creating new ideas.	2
44. We are always coming up with new ideas we just need to pay attention to them.	1
45. You are born with creativity.	2
46. Generating new ideas can be learned.	2
47. We ought to take more time to create new ideas.	3
48. Creativity can be learned.	2
49. New ideas challenge our stability. (R)	1
50. New ideas take time to implement.	3
51. There's nothing really strange about creative people.	2
52. In order to change to something new, new ideas need to be generated.	1
53. People don't like new ideas.	2
54. The business environment doesn't encourage the use of creativity.	3
55. New ideas "bug" me. (R)	1
56. To adjust to new ideas takes time.	3

Factor Key:

- 1 - Valuing New Ideas**
- 2 - Creative Individual Positive Stereotypes**
- 3 - Not Too Busy for New Ideas**

Table 3 (continued)
136 Item Preference Scale
With Corresponding Factors Continued

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	FACTOR
57. Creative people are really no different from anyone else.	2
58. New ideas result in new solutions.	1
59. Not enough new ideas is the reason we are behind.	1
60. Creative people need a supportive environment.	2
61. New ideas are fun to generate.	1
62. New ideas don't really take much time.	3
63. Under the right conditions, all people are creative.	2
64. Generating new ideas expands the mind.	1
65. New ideas are a twenty four hour deal.	1
66. Taking the time to solve problems creatively can save you time.	3
67. New ideas result in new problems.	1
68. New ideas pop up all the time.	1
69. Creative people are always looking for another rule to break.	2
70. Old problems can be solved with new ideas.	2
71. Ideas excite teams.	1
72. Creative people are ahead of their time.	2
73. New ideas are limited by our own experiences.	1
74. One good idea is worth the time it takes to generate a hundred bad ones.	1
75. Creative people wear unique glasses.	2
76. New ideas are not limited by I.Q.	2
77. New ideas don't happen 9-5.	3

Factor Key:

- 1 - Valuing New Ideas**
- 2 - Creative Individual Positive Stereotypes**
- 3 - Not Too Busy for New Ideas**

Table 3 (continued)
136 Item Preference Scale
With Corresponding Factors Continued

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	FACTOR
78. Creative people are usually very humorous.	2
79. Outsiders have the best ideas.	2
80. Teams can amplify the number of ideas.	3
81. Creative people become standup comedians.	2
82. People who do the work have good ideas about their work.	1
83. Because I spend time thinking of ideas, I often miss my bus.	3
84. Creative people have their own set of boundaries.	2
85. You shouldn't pre-judge your new ideas.	1
86. An old idea must be a new idea first.	1
87. Creative people really get results.	2
88. New ideas are usually a new twist on an old idea.	1
89. New ideas can be generated anywhere.	3
90. Creative people bring new perspectives to problem solving.	2
91. A germ of an idea can lead to a big idea.	1
92. New ideas can be generated fast.	3
93. Creative people are flaky.	2
94. New ideas are old ideas reborn.	1
95. New ideas cost money.	1
96. Creative people are not responsible.	2
97. Most ideas we try are not really new.	1
98. New ideas almost always cost more money.	1

Factor Key:

- 1 - Valuing New Ideas**
- 2 - Creative Individual Positive Stereotypes**
- 3 - Not Too Busy for New Ideas**

Table 3 (continued)
136 Item Preference Scale
With Corresponding Factors Continued

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	FACTOR
99. Creative people generate a lot of ideas.	2
100. New ideas are easily killed.	1
101. New ideas always take more time.	3
102. There are enough creative people in business.	2
103. If everyone is thinking, then no one is doing.	3
104. If we had more creative people in business we would be able to solve more problems.	2
105. New ideas take more time, but they are worth it.	3
106. We need more people who are creative in business.	1
107. New ideas never work.	1
108. Creativity cannot be taught.	2
109. Not many new ideas ever work.	1
110. Creative people can energize an organization.	2
111. New ideas come from creative people.	2
112. Creative people can make work fun.	2
113. We should all slow down and think of more new ideas.	3
114. Creative people can prevent us solving the wrong problem.	1
115. New ideas create more new ideas.	1
116. Creative people never get results.	2
117. New ideas are often forgotten.	1
118. You never know what a creative person will say next.	2

Factor Key:

- 1 - Valuing New Ideas**
- 2 - Creative Individual Positive Stereotypes**
- 3 - Not Too Busy for New Ideas**

Table 3 (continued)
136 Item Preference Scale
With Corresponding Factors Continued

ITEM (R denotes reverse scoring)	FACTOR
119. Ideas that are inventive come from experience.	1
120. Creative people are stupid.	2
121. One new idea can save a life.	1
122. Creative people are more effective in solving problems.	2
123. New ideas almost always take too much time.	3
124. Creative people don't know what to say.	2
125. We'll get left behind unless we spend some time on new ideas.	1
126. Only some people are creative.	2
127. New ideas save time in the long run.	3
128. We really need creative people.	1
129. New ideas are spontaneous.	1
130. Manufacturing people should be creative.	1
131. Trying new ideas slows us down.	3
132. Management should be more creative.	1
133. Not many new ideas get implemented.	3
134. New ideas always take too much time.	3
135. Most people don't really have to work at creating new ideas.	3
136. New ideas can happen spontaneously.	3

Factor Key:

- 1 - Valuing new ideas**
- 2 - Creative individual positive stereotypes**
- 3 - Not too busy for new ideas**

Table 4
Reliability Analysis of the Basadur Preference Scale #3 Showing the Items Grouped into
the Three New Scales which Measure Three Divergent Thinking Attitudes

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Valuing New Ideas			
Items			
1. Ideas are fundamental to decision making, and as such should not be taken for granted.	41.3317	.2918	.8303
2. In organizations, senior management should encourage ideas by demonstrating they are willing to act on them.	41.3055	.4781	.8231
14. New ideas result in new solutions.	40.7387	.3917	.8255
15. Not enough new ideas is the reason we are behind.	39.4322	.3218	.8342
16. Generating new ideas expands the mind.	41.1407	.4991	.8214
18. Old problems can be solved with new ideas.	41.1960	.4101	.8250
20. One good idea is worth the time it takes to generate a hundred bad ones.	40.3869	.3249	.8307
25. You shouldn't pre-judge your new ideas.	41.1055	.4203	.8245
26. A germ of an idea can lead to a big idea.	41.3819	.4412	.8249
29. Most ideas we try are not really new.	40.5691	.3966	.8275
31. New ideas are easily killed.	40.3518	.3548	.8307
34. We need more people who are creative in business.	40.2864	.6392	.8095
36. New ideas create more new ideas.	40.6683	.5410	.8169
37. One new idea can save a life.	40.4171	.4771	.8214
40. We'll get left behind unless we spend some time on new ideas.	40.6633	.5832	.8139
41. We really need creative people.	40.9849	.4801	.8216
42. Manufacturing people should be creative.	40.5477	.5067	.8190
43. Management should be more creative.	40.7739	.6237	.8122
Reliability Coefficient alpha = .8320			
Creative Individual Stereotypes			
Items			
4. Really creative people are never very organized.	68.6482	.3334	.7420
6. Truly creative people also have unusual lifestyles.	68.8593	.3551	.7402
12. Creative people think outside the normal boundaries.	72.4422	.3534	.7406
17. Creative people are always looking for another rule to break.	69.8040	.4013	.7351
19. Creative people are ahead of their time.	70.5025	.3634	.7389
21. Creative people wear unique glasses.	68.5779	.4611	.7278
22. Creative people are usually very humorous.	69.9296	.3512	.7403
23. Outsiders have the best ideas.	69.1709	.3662	.7386
24. Creative people become standup comedians.	69.0804	.5543	.7183
27. Creative people are flaky.	68.3166	.3949	.7359
28. Creative people are not responsible.	67.8241	.2960	.7451
30. Creative people generate a lot of ideas.	71.7789	.2942	.7452
35. Creative people can prevent us solving the wrong problem.	70.4573	.3127	.7447
38. Creative people are more effective in solving problems.	71.0452	.2741	.7485
Reliability Coefficient alpha = .7529			
Too Busy for New Ideas			
Item			
2. I don't have much time for thinking up wild ideas, I'm too busy just getting my job done.	69.1357	.5342	.7795
3. Why is everybody always talking about ideas? I've got more work than to know what to do with.	67.8392	.4444	.7886
7. If everyone is providing ideas, then no one gets any work done.	67.8442	.3781	.7950
8. Ideas take too much time to generate.	67.4070	.5399	.7819
9. Thinking of ideas takes time that I don't have.	67.8643	.5147	.7822
10. I wish I had the time to think up some new ideas.	69.9146	.4470	.7892
11. It takes a hundred new ideas to come up with one that works, so who has the time?	67.3618	.4026	.7926
13. The business environment doesn't encourage the use of creativity.	70.4623	.3695	.7973
32. New ideas always take more time.	69.1256	.4009	.7927
33. If everyone is thinking, then no one is doing.	67.9849	.4282	.7902
39. New ideas almost always take too much time.	67.9196	.5512	.7808
44. New ideas always take too much time.	67.9397	.4299	.7901
Reliability Coefficient alpha = .8026			

Table 6
Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Statistics for the Three Scales making
up the Basadur Preference Scale #3

	Creative Individual Stereotypes	Too Busy for New Ideas	Valuing New Ideas
Chi-square Statistic	75.89 ^{d.f.=59}	64.22 ^{d.f.=50}	116.02 ^{d.f.=88}
Goodness of Fit Index	.95	.95	.93
Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index	.81	.92	.90
Normed Fit Index	.86	.89	.87
Comparative Fit Index	.96	.97	.96
Incremental Fit Index	.97	.97	.96

Table 7

**Factor Loadings (Lambdas) and T-Values Obtained in the Confirmatory Factor Analysis
of the Basadur Preference Scale #3**

Scale Items	Lambdas ^a	T-values ^b
Valuing New Ideas		
1. Ideas are fundamental to decision making, and as such should not be taken for granted.	.27	3.58
2. In organizations, senior management should encourage ideas by demonstrating they are willing to act on them.	.37	5.91
14. New ideas result in new solutions.	1.00	-- ^c
15. Not enough new ideas is the reason we are behind.	.21	3.69
16. Generating new ideas expands the mind.	.40	7.19
18. Old problems can be solved with new ideas.	.34	6.04
20. One good idea is worth the time it takes to generate a hundred bad ones.	.26	4.47
25. You shouldn't pre-judge your new ideas.	.39	5.38
26. A germ of an idea can lead to a big idea	.41	5.62
29. Most ideas we try are not really new.	.54	8.01
31. New ideas are easily killed.	.33	4.40
34. We need more people who are creative in business.	.69	9.84
36. New ideas create more new ideas.	.63	8.54
37. One new idea can save a life.	.59	8.09
40. We'll get left behind unless we spend some time on new ideas.	.69	9.65
41. We really need creative people.	.53	7.09
42. Manufacturing people should be creative.	.61	8.36
43. Management should be more creative.	.77	10.87
Creative Individual Stereotypes		
4. Really creative people are never very organized.	1.00	-- ^c
6. Truly creative people also have unusual lifestyles.	.43	7.81
12. Creative people think outside the normal boundaries.	.26	3.47
17. Creative people are always looking for another rule to break.	.42	5.48
19. Creative people are ahead of their time.	.31	3.96
21. Creative people wear unique glasses.	.56	7.33
22. Creative people are usually very humorous	.36	4.60
23. Outsiders have the best ideas.	.44	5.73
24. Creative people become standup comedians.	.74	9.52
27. Creative people are flaky.	.49	6.90
28. Creative people are not responsible.	.27	4.89
30. Creative people generate a lot of ideas.	.16	2.84
35. Creative people can prevent us solving the wrong problem.	.15	2.64
38. Creative people are more effective in solving problems.	.14	2.47
Too Busy for New Ideas		
2. I don't have much time for thinking up wild ideas, I'm too busy just getting my job done.	1.00	-- ^c
3. Why is everybody always talking about ideas? I've got more work than to know what to do with.	.85	6.31
7. If everyone is providing ideas, then no one gets any work done.	.61	4.75
8. Ideas take too much time to generate.	.97	7.00
9. Thinking of ideas takes time that I don't have.	.98	7.08
10. I wish I had the time to think up some new ideas.	.81	6.10
11. It takes a hundred new ideas to come up with one that works, so who has the time?	.71	5.42
13. The business environment doesn't encourage the use of creativity.	.59	4.58
32. New ideas always take more time.	.49	3.85
33. If everyone is thinking, then no one is doing.	.74	5.61
39. New ideas almost always take too much time.	.80	6.01
44. New ideas always take too much time.	.58	4.53

a The Lamdas are reported from the completely standardized solution

b $t > 1.96$

c Fixed coefficient of 1 assigned in the relationship between the first unique construct and latent construct for scaling purposes.

Table 8
Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for the Three Scales Making
Up the Basadur Preference Scale #3

	Means	s.d.	Valuing New Ideas	Creative Individual Stereotypes	Too Busy For New Ideas
Valuing New Ideas	43.43	12.91			
Creative Individual Stereotypes	74.62	13.27	.18*		
Too Busy for New Ideas	75.11	13.22	-.17*	.21**	

* P<.05

** P<.01

Table 9
Reliability Coefficients for the Three Scales
Making Up the Basadur Preference Scale #3 on the Final Sample

Construct	Cronbach alpha
Valuing New Ideas	.70
Creative Individual Stereotypes	.77
Too Busy for New Ideas	.81

INNOVATION RESEARCH WORKING GROUP
WORKING PAPER SERIES

1. R.G. Cooper and E.J. Kleinschmidt, "How the New Product Impacts on Success and Failure in the Chemical Industry", February, 1992.
2. R.G. Cooper and E.J. Kleinschmidt, "Major New Products: What Distinguishes the Winners in the Chemical Industry", February, 1992.
3. J. Miltenburg, "On the Equivalence of JIT and MRP as Technologies for Reducing Wastes in Manufacturing, March, 1992.
4. J.B. Kim, I. Krinsky and J. Lee, "Valuation of Initial Public Offerings: Evidence from Korea", February, 1992.
5. M. Basadur and S. Robinson, "The New Creative Thinking Skills Needed for Total Quality Management to Become Fact, Not Just Philosophy", April, 1992.
6. S. Edgett and S. Parkinson, "The Development of New Services Distinguishing Between Success and Failure", April, 1992.
7. A.R. Montazemi and K.M. Gupta, "Planning and Development of Information Systems Towards Strategic Advantage of a Firm", April, 1992.
8. A.R. Montazemi, "Reducing the Complexity of MIS Innovation Through Hypermedia and Expert Systems", May, 1992.
9. M. Basadur and Bruce Paton, "Creativity Boosts Profits in Recessionary Times - Broadening the Playing Field", June, 1992.
10. Robert G. Cooper and Elko Kleinschmidt, "Stage-Gate Systems for Product Innovation: Rationale and Results", June, 1992.
11. S.A.W. Drew, "The Strategic Management of Innovation in the Financial Services Industry: An Empirical Study", July, 1992.
12. M. Shehata and M.E. Ibrahim, "The Impact of Tax Policies on Firms' R & D Spending Behavior: The Case of R & D Tax Credit", July, 1992.
13. Willi H. Wiesner, "Development Interview Technology: Implications for Innovative Organizations", July, 1992.

14. Isik U. Zeytinoglu, "Technological Innovation and the Creation of a New Type of Employment: Telework", August, 1992.
15. John W. Medcof, "An Integrated Model for Teaching the Management of Innovation in the Introduction to Organizational Behaviour Course", October, 1992.
16. Min Basadur, "The Why-What's Stopping Analysis: A New Methodology for Formulating Ill-Structured Problems", October, 1992.
17. Stephen A.W. Drew, "Strategy, Innovation and Organizational Learning an Integrative Framework, Case Histories and Directions for Research", November, 1992.
18. Stephen A.W. Drew, "Innovation and Strategy in Financial Services", November, 1992.
19. Scott Edgett, "New Product Development Practices for Retail Financial Services", November, 1992.
20. Robert G. Cooper and Elko J. Kleinschmidt, "New Product Winners and Losers: The Relative Importance of Success Factors - Perception vs. Reality", November, 1992.
21. Robert G. Cooper and Elko J. Kleinschmidt, "A New Product Success Factors Model: An Empirical Validation", November, 1992.
22. Robert G. Cooper & Elko J. Kleinschmidt, "Stage Gate Systems: A Game Plan for New Product Success", November, 1992.
23. Min Basadur, "Optimal Ideation-Evaluation Ratios", March, 1993.
24. Christopher K. Bart, "Gagging on Chaos", March, 1993.
25. Yufei Yuan, "The Role of Information Technology in Business Innovation", July, 1993.
26. Isik Urla Zeytinoglu, "Innovation in Employment: A Telework Experiment in Ontario", July, 1993.
27. John Miltenburg and David Sparling, "Managing and Reducing Total Cycle Time: Moles and Analysis", August, 1993.
28. R.G. Cooper, C.J. Easingwood, S. Edgett, E.J. Kleinschmidt and C. Storey, "What Distinguishes the Top Performers in Financial Services", September, 1993.
29. B.E. Lynn, "Innovation and Accounting Research", September, 1993.

30. Min Basadur and Peter Hausdorf, "Measuring Additional Divergent Thinking Attitudes Related to Creative Problem Solving and Innovation Management", November, 1993.
31. R.G. Cooper and E.J. Kleinschmidt, "Determinants of Time Efficiency in Product Development", December, 1993
32. Christopher K. Bart, "Back to the Future: Timeless Lessons for Organizational Success", February, 1994.
33. Ken R. Deal and Scott J. Edgett, "Determining Success Criteria for New Financial Products; A Comparative Analysis of CART, Logit and Discriminant Analysis", February, 1995.
34. Christopher K. Bart and Mark C. Baetz, "Does Mission Matter?", February, 1995.
35. Christopher K. Bart, "Controlling New Products: A Contingency Approach", February, 1995.
36. Christopher K. Bart, "Is Fortune Magazine Right? An Investigation into the Application of Deutschman's 16 High-Tech Management Practices", February, 1995.
37. Christopher K. Bart, "The Impact of Mission on Firm Innovativeness", February, 1995.
38. John W. Medcof, "Transnational Technology Networks", April, 1995.
39. R.G. Cooper and E.J. Kleinschmidt, "Benchmarking the Critical Success Factors of Firms' New Product Development Programs", April, 1995.
40. John W. Medcof, "Trends in Selected High Technology Industries", July, 1995.
41. Robert C. Cooper & E.J. Kleinschmidt, "Benchmarking Firms' New Product Performance & Practices", September, 1995.
42. Min Basadur and Darryl Kirkland, "Training Effects on the Divergent Thinking Attitudes of South American Managers", November, 1995.
43. Min Basadur, "Organizational Development Interventions for Enhancing Creativity in the Workplace", November, 1995.
44. Min Basadur, "Training Managerial Evaluative and Ideational Skills in Creative Problem Solving: A Causal Model", December, 1995.

MCMaster UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

3 9005 0241 9775 2

Jnnis
REF
HD
45
W657
no. 45