



Factor Rating Interpretation Guide Inclusion

What is Inclusion?

Inclusion indicates whether individuals are treated fairly and respectfully, have equal access to opportunities and resources, and can contribute fully to the organization's success. Inclusive work environments ensure that it is safe for an individual to voice their different opinions, perspectives, and/or suggestions.⁶

The following items are used to assess *Inclusion* on the DEOCS using a five-point response scale from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*:

- The people I work with believe that everyone has worth and value, regardless of how they identify (for example, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other identities).
- The people I work with believe that everyone has worth and value, regardless of their occupation and rank/grade.
- The people I work with build on each other's ideas and thoughts during the decision-making process.
- The people I work would speak up if someone is being excluded.
- Communication goes both up and down the chain of command.
- Among the people I work with, the quality of ideas matters more than who expresses them.

Note: Survey questions may differ depending on whether the organization is a military unit, Military Service Academy, or civilian organization. Please see the sample survey for each population on the Assessment to Solutions web site (<https://www.defenseculture.mil/Assessment-to-Solutions/A2S-Home/>) for exact wording.

Why is it important?

Prior research finds that inclusive work environments are linked to reduced risk of racial/ethnic harassment/discrimination and turnover intentions as well as increased readiness.^{1,2,3} For example, when employees perceive that their organizations are committed to *Inclusion* and diversity, they are likely to be more satisfied, have strong attachments to their organizations, perform better overall, and have reduced turnover intentions.^{4,5} Similarly, when members of an organization feel safe to voice suggestions and feel listened to, they are more adaptable to changes in the organization⁶, a fundamental aspect of military readiness. For example, a 2014 study of U.S. military personnel found that workgroups that have a positive perception of diversity climate within their organizations also had increased job satisfaction, reduced turnover intentions, and were less at risk of experiencing incidences of racial/ethnic harassment/discrimination.⁷


For more information on how to review your DEOCS results with these key outcomes in mind, please see the "Strategic Target Outcome Guide" in the Quick Links menu of the DEOCS dashboard.

How do I read my factor ratings?

The DEOCS dashboard displays results for *Inclusion* in a stacked bar graph showing ratings for **Non-inclusive Organization**, **Neutral**, and **Inclusive Organization**. Because *Inclusion* is a factor that is measured by multiple questions, you should interpret the results as “X% of responses” (not participants). An example is shown below:



For the graph showing results by demographic categories, the percentages represent the percentage of responses from each demographic category that were favorable, neutral, or unfavorable.



The first bar will always show the overall results and will be the same percentages that are shown in the stacked bar graph. The next bars will represent various demographic categories for your organization. These results can help determine whether some groups of people in your organization have particularly high or low perceptions of climate factors. In addition, you may have different categories than in the example above. If your organization did not have any participants from a particular demographic category or had fewer than five participants

from a particular category, you would not see those categories in your graph. For more information on how the demographic groups are created, please see the “Data Overview” in the Quick Links menu of the DEOCS dashboard.

In this example, the favorable ratings (marked in green) can be interpreted as:

- 69% of responses from non-Hispanic White participants indicated the organization is inclusive, while 61% of responses from minority participants indicated the organization is inclusive;
- 47% of responses from enlisted participants indicated the organization is inclusive, while 66% of responses from officers indicated the organization is inclusive;
- 47% of responses from junior enlisted participants indicated the organization is inclusive, while 64% of responses from senior enlisted participants indicated the organization is inclusive.

The neutral ratings (marked in yellow) can be interpreted as:

- 21% of responses from non-Hispanic White participants indicated the organization is neither inclusive nor non-inclusive, while 17% of responses from minority participants indicated the organization is neither inclusive nor non-inclusive;
- 34% of responses from enlisted participants indicated the organization is neither inclusive nor non-inclusive, while 24% of responses from officers indicated the organization is neither inclusive nor non-inclusive;
- 27% of responses from junior enlisted participants indicated the organization is neither inclusive nor non-inclusive, while 21% of responses from senior enlisted participants indicated the organization is neither inclusive nor non-inclusive.

The unfavorable ratings (marked in red) can be interpreted as:

- 10% of responses from non-Hispanic White participants indicated the organization is not inclusive, while 22% of responses from minority participants indicated the organization is not inclusive;
- 19% of responses from enlisted participants indicated the organization is not inclusive, while 10% of responses from officers indicated the organization is not inclusive;
- 26% of responses from junior enlisted participants indicated the organization is not inclusive, while 15% of responses from senior enlisted participants indicated the organization is not inclusive.

You may also see trends over time for your *Inclusion* favorable rating if there are previous 5.0 surveys with the same unit identification code (UIC) and the same commander/leader.

When applicable, trends over time are available in the dashboard by clicking on this icon: . They also appear in the PDF reports as a table. Even if your report includes trends over time, the results may not be comparable in certain circumstances. It is important to understand differences in roster size and roster composition at different time points as these items may impact comparability of trend results. Take a close look at the number of participants registered, surveys returned, and the response rate for any surveys for which trends are available to report; use caution when comparing trends over time if there are big differences in these numbers between surveys. Other things, such as deployments or changes in policy, may also make trends less comparable. For more information on factor rating trends, please see the “Data Overview” in the Quick Links menu of the DEOCS dashboard..

Finally, you may see an alert  for your *Inclusion* ratings. This means that your unit's/organization's favorable rating for *Inclusion* is **very low** compared to the other favorable ratings for this factor in your Service component. When applicable, this alert icon appears in the dashboard inside the “Protective Factors – Favorable Ratings” heading; click on the icon to

see if *Inclusion* is listed in the table. The alert icon may also appear in the *Inclusion* section of the PDF reports. To identify whether your *Inclusion* ratings receive an alert, cut-off scores were created by rank-ordering all favorable ratings for this factor within a Service component. If your favorable rating for *Inclusion* is below your Service component’s cut-off score, this icon will appear in your report. There are unique cut-off scores for each factor within each Service component. Because of this, you may notice that some of the factors for which you have an alert have very different ratings. For more information on how these alerts are created, please see the “Data Overview” in the Quick Links menu of the DEOCS dashboard.

How are my unit’s/organization’s ratings created?

Inclusion ratings are created by combining responses to six questions from a five-point *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree* scale, as shown in the example below.

Inclusion Questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Communication goes both up and down the chain of command.	4% (4)	9% (8)	22% (20)	49% (45)	16% (15)	100% (92)
The people I work with believe that everyone has worth and value, regardless of how they identify (for example, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other identities).	4% (4)	8% (7)	11% (10)	35% (31)	42% (37)	100% (89)
The people I work with believe that everyone has worth and value, regardless of their occupation and rank/grade.	5% (5)	7% (6)	15% (14)	39% (36)	34% (31)	100% (92)
The people I work with build on each other’s ideas and thoughts during the decision-making process.	4% (4)	8% (7)	26% (24)	40% (37)	22% (20)	100% (92)
The people I work with would speak up if someone is being excluded.	4% (4)	7% (6)	33% (30)	35% (32)	22% (20)	100% (92)
Among the people I work with, the quality of ideas matters more than who expresses them.	9% (8)	9% (8)	25% (23)	30% (28)	27% (25)	100% (92)
	Non-Inclusive Organization		Neutral	Inclusive Organization		Total responses 549
	$(4+8+4+7+5+6+4+7+4+6+8+8) / 549 =$ 13%		$(20+10+14+24+30+23) / 549 =$ 22%	$(45+15+31+37+36+31+37+20+32+20+28+25) / 549 =$ 65%		

The table above displays the percentage of responses (and number of responses in parentheses) for each question across the five response options (*Strongly Disagree*, *Disagree*, *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, *Agree*, and *Strongly Agree*). For the first question, eight participants selected *Disagree*; this represents 9% of participants that responded to

this question ($8 / 92 = .087$ or 9%).

Note that percentages are calculated out of the total number of participants responding to that question and not the total number of participants taking the survey. Participants can skip questions, so you may notice that total responses to questions vary. In the above example, 92 people responded to the first question so all percentages in this row use 92 as the denominator. Only 89 people responded to the second question, so all percentages in this row use 89 as the denominator. In addition, factor ratings may not always add to 100% due to rounding.

- The **unfavorable** rating, named **Non-inclusive Organization**, is a combination of all responses of *Strongly Disagree* and *Disagree* from the **six** questions in the *Inclusion* scale.
 - For this example, four people strongly disagreed with the first question, while eight disagreed. In addition, four people strongly disagreed with the second question and seven disagreed. This process continues for each of the six questions. In total, 71 responses were either *Strongly Disagree* or *Disagree* to these six questions ($4+8+4+7+5+6+4+7+4+6+8+8 = 71$).
 - To produce an overall score for **Non-inclusive Organization** representing unfavorable reactions to these six questions, the total number of responses (71) is divided by the total number of people who responded to all of the *Inclusion* questions. 92 people responded to the first question, 89 the second, and so on for a total of 549 responses to all questions. **This produces a Non-inclusive Organization rating of 13% ($71 / 549 = .1293$).**
- To create the **Neutral** rating, the same process above is followed, except the score is created from only one response option. The *Neither Agree nor Disagree* responses are added from all questions.
 - For this example, there are 121 *Neither Agree nor Disagree* responses across all six questions ($20+10+14+24+30+23 = 121$). This total is divided by the total number of responses to all of the questions ($121 / 549 = .2204$). **This rounds to a Neutral rating of 22%.**
- To create the **favorable** rating, named **Inclusive Organization**, the *Strongly Agree* and *Agree* responses are combined.
 - For this example, that is $45+15+31+37+36+31+37+20+32+20+28+25 = 357$ total responses of either *Strongly Agree* or *Agree*. This total is divided by the total number of responses to all of the questions ($357 / 549 = .6503$). **This rounds to an Inclusive Organization rating of 65%.**

How do I know if my factor ratings are good or bad?

The DEOCS team is working on a data-driven approach that will help you understand what a rating means for an organization's likelihood of positive or negative outcomes. In the meantime, we recommend using the following strategies to help put your *Inclusion* ratings into context and understand whether actions should be taken to address low favorable ratings:

1. If applicable, review the information in the alert icon  to see if your *Inclusion* ratings are called out. This icon would appear in the dashboard and in the PDF reports if your unit's/organization's favorable rating for *Inclusion* is very low compared to others in your same Service component. You should consider taking action to raise this rating.

2. Look at the Item Summary table on the *Inclusion* details page to understand which questions may be driving your favorable rating. This factor is created from six questions, so compare the percentage of participants who selected *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to each question. If there are questions that have a lower percentage of participants who selected *Strongly Agree* or *Agree*, these questions are driving a lower favorable rating and could help you pinpoint more specific actions to increase your favorable rating for *Inclusion*.
3. Examine the bar graph showing the overall favorable rating for *Inclusion* and the favorable ratings by various demographic groups. Look at each group's rating in relation to the overall unit/organization rating. If any groups have particularly low favorable ratings for *Inclusion*, this could help you plan actions to increase your favorable rating within areas of your organization.
4. If applicable, review your *Inclusion* favorable rating trends over time. You can view these trends by clicking on this icon  in the dashboard; they also appear as a table in the PDF reports. Take note if your ratings are going down over time. You may need to take action to reverse this trend.

Scientific Research References on Inclusion

1. Oberfield, Z. W. (2016). Why are some agencies perceived as more committed to diversity than others? An analysis of public-sector diversity climates. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 763–790. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1045017>
2. Lindsey, A. P., Avery, D. R., Dawson, J. F., & King, E. B. (2017). Investigating why and for whom management ethnic representativeness influences interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(11), 1545–1563. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000238>
3. McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Morris, M. A., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2007). Racial differences in employee retention: Are diversity climate perceptions the key? *Personnel Psychology*, 60(1), 35–62
4. Buttner, E., K. Lowe, and L. Billings-Harris. 2012. "An Empirical Test of Diversity Climate Dimensionality and Relative Effects on Employee of Color Outcomes." *Journal of Business Ethics* 110 (3): 247–258. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1179-0
5. Stewart, R., Volpone, S. D., Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. (2011). You support diversity, but are you ethical? Examining the interactive effects of diversity and ethical climate perceptions on turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(4), 581–593.
6. Lee, C., Wang, M., & Liu, M. (2017). When and how does psychological voice climate influence individual change readiness? The mediating role of normative commitment and the moderating role of work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(1737). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01737>
7. Boehm, S. A., Dwertmansn, D. J. G., Kunze, F., Michaelis, B., Parks, K. M., & McDonald, D. P. (2014). Expanding Insights on the Diversity Climate-Performance Link: The Role of Workgroup Discrimination and Group Size. *Human Resource Management*, 53(3), 379–402. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21589>