

Examining the Relationship between Equal Opportunity Climate and
Individual-Level Outcome Variables

Elizabeth Steinhauser

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute & Florida Institute of Technology

Marinus van Driel

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

Mitchell Peterson

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

Daniel McDonald

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

NOTE: The findings in this Study are not to be construed as an official Department of Defense position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

For any inquiries regarding this paper, Liz Steinhauser may be contacted at
Elizabeth.Steinhauser.ctr@patrick.af.mil

Abstract

Equal Opportunity (EO) climate is a topic of great interest in a variety of organizational contexts. This interest stems from the demonstrated empirical relationship between EO climate and a variety of individual level and organizational level outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational performance). The current study examines the relationship between EO climate and individual level outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational trust. Results are supportive of previous findings, indicating significant positive relationships between EO climate and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, as well as organizational trust.

Examining the Relationship between Equal Opportunity Climate and Individual-Level Outcome Variables

Volumes have been written regarding the relationship between the effective management of diversity and workplace outcomes. Within this body of literature it has been noted that diversity within organizations can be both a source of friction as well as a potential strategic asset (e.g. Homan, Van Knippenberg, Van Cleef, & De Dreu, 2007; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999; Moon, 1997).

A contributing factor to the effective management of diversity within organizations is the existence of equal opportunities to all members of an organization irrespective of their personal background or beliefs. The prevalence of equal opportunities is typically assessed in terms of the equal opportunity (EO) climate. Defined in general terms, EO climate is the

“expectation by individuals that opportunities, responsibilities, and rewards will be accorded on the basis of a person’s abilities, efforts and contributions, and not on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin. It is to be emphasized that this definition involves the individual’s perceptions and may or may not be based on the actual witnessing of behaviors.” (Dansby & Landis, 1991, p. 392).

EO climate overlaps considerably with what Cox (1993) and others (e.g. Van Knippenberg, & Schippers, 2007; Kossek, & Zonia, 1993) refer to as diversity climate. Diversity climate, as traditionally defined, is typically assessed in terms of individuals’ evaluations of methods for managing with workplace diversity (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2009; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007), whereas EO climate focuses more specifically on perceptions of the opportunities and potential favoritism afforded to groups of employees which are defined in terms of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin (Dansby & Landis, 1991). In other words, EO climate can be

crudely described as the perceptions of outcomes of diversity management practices within organizations in the tradition of the referent shift/cross-level effects (Chan, 1998) strategy for assessing organization level characteristics.

EO and Diversity Climate Research

Much like diversity climate, (e.g., Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000; Hopkins, Hopkins & Malette, 2001, McKay , Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2007) EO climate has been linked to individual level outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived work group efficacy in active duty military personnel (e.g., Estrada, Stetz, & Harbke, 2007; McIntyre, Bartle, Landis, & Dansby, 2002). Similarly, in a study of military reservists, it was discovered that the prevalence of positive EO behavior (i.e., behavior that facilitates integration of minority and majority members of a group) exhibited by a command as well as perceptions of climate related to racism and sexual discrimination were significant predictors of outcomes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work group effectiveness (Estrada et al., 2007).

Also similar to diversity climate, EO climate has received little empirical investigation as an aggregated organization level construct. Cross-level inquiries in regards to diversity climate are burgeoning; however, studies that have linked diversity climate as an organizational level construct to individual level outcomes are still limited in number. Results of studies that have linked diversity climate to other aggregated organizational level phenomena indicated that diversity climate does have an impact on organizational performance (e.g., Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009; McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2009). Furthermore, it has been found that diversity climate, when examined as an organizational level phenomenon, does have a relationship with individual level work outcomes such as organizational attachment (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009).

Despite the application of diversity climate across levels of analysis, little empirical enquiry has been done in regards to linking EO climate as an aggregated organization level construct to individual level or other aggregated organizational level outcomes. The only study that has assessed the viability of EO climate as an organizational level construct was conducted by Peterson, Van Driel, Crepeau, and McDonald (2008). In this study, it was found that EO climate strength, or the extent to which EO climate perceptions are shared, acts as a moderator of the effect of EO climate on outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Based on these observations, the focus of the current inquiry is to extend existing findings in regards to EO climate and seek to investigate the cross-level application of EO climate by referencing the extant literature and findings in regards to diversity climate.

Applying EO Climate to Individual and Organizational Level Outcomes

The Logic for EO Climate as an Organizational Level Phenomenon

As reflected by studies, such as that performed by McIntyre et al. (2002), EO climate has mainly been approached as a component of psychological climate (i.e., the meaning attached to organizational events and attributes by individual organizational members; James & James, 1989). Organizational climate is derived from the extent to which such valuations are shared by organizational members (McKay et al, 2009; Reichers & Schneider, 1990). Therefore, if perceptions regarding fairness and equity are sufficiently shared among members of organizations, it is possible to assess EO climate as an organizational level construct.

Linking EO Climate to Individual Level Outcomes

Leveraging extant diversity climate theory as well as previous research findings in terms of EO climate (e.g., McIntyre et al., 2002), it is possible to argue that EO climate, when

aggregated to the organizational level, should relate to individual level work outcomes as well as organizational level outcomes.

Arguably one of the most comprehensive models linking diversity climate within organizations to organizational processes and outcomes was provided by Cox (1993; see Figure 1). Cox proposed that diversity climate within an organization has a direct impact on the career outcomes of individuals (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational identification, job involvement, job performance, promotion, and compensation). Similarly, EO climate may also have an impact on individual level work outcomes.

In support of this contention, it has been observed that minority groups often perceive themselves as marginalized, excluded and discriminated against (Blank & Slipp, 1994; Goldman, Gutek, Stein, & Lewis, 2006). Evidence also suggests that EO climate is more relevant to members of minority as compared to majority groups (Truhon, 2008), which indicates that fairness and equity within organizations are more salient concerns to minority group members. Furthermore, perceptions of marginalization and discrimination have been linked to reduced motivation and ability to contribute to organizational functioning (Robertson & Block, 2001).

Based on these observations, EO climate has relevance to individuals within organizations. In other words, an organizational climate in which individuals do not perceive themselves to be treated fairly and equitably may well have an influence on individuals' work related outcomes as proposed by Cox (1993). We therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: EO climate, measured as an organization level construct, is positively related to individual level work related outcomes.

Hypothesis 2: Each EO climate variable will be positively and uniquely related to individual level work related outcomes.

Method

Assessing EO Climate

EO climate is assessed via the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (DEOCS). The DEOCS is a product of the long term interest of the military interest in diversity related issues. This interest was spurred initially by both the civil rights movement and the realization that diversity was an operational reality in the Armed Services (Estrada et al., 2007). The equal opportunity and diversity initiatives enacted within the Department of Defense eventually led to stable research programs aimed at assessing EO climate in military organizations (e.g., Dansby & Landis, 1998; Knouse & Dansby, 1999; Rosenfeld, Thomas, Edwards, Thomas, & Thomas, 1991). As a consequence of these research programs, the Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (MEOCS) was created and subsequently revised and renamed as the DEOCS.

The DEOCS is a management tool that allows for the proactive measurement of critical organizational climate dimensions that can affect organizational effectiveness in both military and civilian contexts. All data collected via the DEOCS is aggregated to the “unit” level or organizational level. Organizations and units are operationally defined as a group of individuals serving under the same organizational leader or commander for which a single report detailing climate survey results was requested (Peterson et al. 2008). All organizations (i.e. units) therefore have a single leader as well as clearly defined membership.

The DEOCS contains 63 items. These items are used to create 14 subscales, 8 of which address EO, and 6 of which address organizational effectiveness (OE) outcomes. Further

questions are dedicated to respondent demographics and special interest topics. All scales within the DEOCS are described in Table 1. A sample copy of the DEOCS is provided in Appendix.

Components of the DEOCS that are of particular interest to the current inquiry regarding EO climate are scales that assess perceptions of Sexual Harassment and Sex Discrimination, Differential Command Behavior, Positive Equal Opportunity Behaviors, Racist Behaviors, and Religious Discrimination. Further, scales within the DEOCS that are of interest as individual level outcome variables are organizational commitment, organizational trust, and job satisfaction.

Procedure

The DEOCS is managed by the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI). DEOMI deploys the DEOCS as both an online and pen and paper based instrument at the request of a military commander or at the request of leaders of civilian federal organizations. In most cases, the online version of the DEOCS is used by organizations that are located in non-combat areas whereas the pen and paper version of the DEOCS is used in instances where access to the internet is limited, such as those found in combat areas. Only the on-line version of the survey was employed in this enquiry.

When requested, all members of organizations are asked to complete the DEOCS. Through the online administration procedure, an invitation to complete the DEOCS containing a web link (URL) to the online instrument is distributed to all organizational members. In this invitation organizational members receive instruction regarding the purpose of the DEOCS and are assured that all of the data they provide will be treated as strictly confidential. To ensure that

all data is collected in a timely manner, all organizational members are asked to complete the DEOCS by a deadline agreed upon by DEOMI and the organization requesting the DEOCS.

Sample

The DEOCS was deployed during 2008 to 2010 to service members (N= 461,666) representing all of the military service branches within the United States Department of Defense. Table 2 provides an overview of the composition of the sample. The sample included 7,844 groups with an average size of 59 group members.

Analytic Strategy

Assessing Method Bias

Following steps implemented by McIntyre et al. (2002), principal components analysis (PCA) was performed on the DEOCS data at the individual level of analysis to determine whether subsequent findings in this inquiry would be attributable to method bias. According to Podsakoff and Organ (1986) if multiple components are found via a PCA, common method bias is not a concern. In this inquiry we found that 5 components emerged, as indicated in Table 3, thereby eliminating concerns about method bias.

Furthermore, a prior confirmatory factor analysis using all DEOCS items, further evidence was found for the structure of the DEOCS. The data fit the theoretical structure of the DEOCS using established guidelines (CFI = .93, TLI = .92, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .04; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2006).

Appropriateness of Aggregating EO Climate

According to Van de Vijver & Fischer (2009), all aggregated scales should have a sufficient amount of variance that can be attributed to grouping variables (i.e., ICC(1) > .05), reliable group means (ICC(2) > .70), and sufficient agreement within groups (a_{wg} > .70).

Aggregation indices were computed for EO climate. To calculate a_{wg} , only groups with roughly twice the number of people than anchors in a given scale can be utilized. Groups with fewer respondents can yield uninterpretable a_{wg} values (Brown & Hauenstein, 2005). Therefore, only groups with 10 or more members were considered for the calculation of a_{wg} indices.

Subsequently, only groups with sufficient agreement, as specified by Fischer and Van de Fijver (2008) were retained for further analysis. ICCs and final analyses were conducted on 7,844 groups composed of 461,666 members. ICC(1) had a sufficient amount of variance attributed to grouping variables $ICC(1) = .08$. ICC(2) indicated that there was sufficient within group agreement ($ICC(1) = .94$).

Analytic Strategy for Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1, which predicts that better EO climate leads to better individual work outcomes, was tested using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). This analysis is appropriate for analyzing relationships that contain individual level and organizational levels of analysis. Because there is dependence among individual responses within organizations, standard errors would be miscalculated if traditional regression analysis was utilized (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). The source of dependence among individuals within the same organization arises from shared experiences. HLM is able to handle this dependence among individuals by taking into account the unique random effects of each organization when estimating the standard errors (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

The individual level (level-1) variables included organizational commitment, organizational trust, and job satisfaction. Overall EO climate, racist behavior climate, positive EO behavior climate, differential command behavior climate, sexual harassment climate, and religious discrimination climate constitute organization level (level-2) variables. All EO climate

variables were centered around the grand mean so that the intercept term (β_{0j}) could be interpretable (see Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997, p. 784). HLM allows for the investigation the cross-level main effect of EO climate on individual level work outcomes. The cross-level main effect of EO climate on individual work outcomes was tested with the following level-1 equation:

$$\text{Level-1: Individual work outcomes} = \beta_{0j} + r_{ij} \quad (1)$$

where β_{0j} is the level-1 intercept and r_{ij} is the level-1 error term. HLM will estimate a level-1 equation for each organization. Then, it will estimate the average intercepts (across organizations) while also examining EO climate variables as a predictor of these intercepts. The level-2 equation is as follows:

$$\text{Level-2: } \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} (\text{EO climate}) + \mu_{0j} \quad (2)$$

where γ_{00} is the level-2 intercept, γ_{01} is the level-2 slope and μ_{0j} reflects the level-2 error term. A significant γ_{01} indicates that the average main effect across organizations is significant. (Hypothesis 2 will be tested with all EO climate variables in the level-2 equation, but for the purpose of clarity this equation is not being displayed.)

Results

Table 4 displays the individual-level descriptive statistics for all study variables. All of the above measures exhibited adequate internal consistency reliabilities, ranging from .75 to .87, and can be seen in Table 5 along with the individual level correlations between variables.

The null models for our individual work outcomes were run to determine the amount of between-group variance in these measures. The results for organizational commitment ($\tau_{00} = .18$, $df = 7843$, $\chi^2 = 107418.23$, $p < .01$), organizational trust ($\tau_{00} = .17$, $df = 7843$, $\chi^2 = 90532.24$, $p < .01$) and job satisfaction ($\tau_{00} = .06$, $df = 7843$, $\chi^2 = 49332.24$, $p < .01$) indicate that

19% of the variance in organizational commitment lies between organizations, 16% of the variance in organizational trust lies between organizations, and 9% of the variance in job satisfaction lies between organizations. This means that our level-2 predictor (EO climate) could potentially explain some of this between-group variance.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 tested the relationship between EO climate and individual work outcomes. Hypothesis 1 was supported. All EO climate variables were significantly related to better individual work outcomes. The specific results within hypothesis 1 are reported in Table 6. Please take note that these R^2 estimates cannot be interpreted as traditional R^2 estimates as “this percentage only talks about the fraction of explainable variance that is explained” (see Singer, 1998 p. 332). For example, overall EO climate is able to predict 6% of the between-group variance (reported above- 19%) in organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 2 tested the unique relationship between EO climate and individual work outcomes. This analysis will allow us to analyze the total contribution of all EO climate variables on individual work outcomes and will allow us to see which EO climate variables account for the most unique variance in individual work outcomes. Overall, all EO climate variables accounted for 7.6% of the variance in organizational commitment, 7.1% of the variance in organizational trust, and 7.2% of the variance in job satisfaction. The results for each individual predictor are displayed in Table 7.

Hypothesis 2 was partially supported, all EO climate variables significantly predicted individual work outcomes with the exception of religious discrimination climate predicting job satisfaction ($\gamma = .00$, n.s.). Further, religious discrimination was negatively related to organizational commitment ($\gamma = -.03$, $p < .01$) and trust in the organization ($\gamma = -.03$, $p < .05$).

The unexpected results concerning religious discrimination climate and individual work outcomes will be addressed in the discussion.

Discussion

We were able to demonstrate that EO climate, as measured at the organizational level, is related to individual level work outcomes and that these results are not due to method bias. Overall, EO climate, racist climate, and sexual harassment climate were the strongest predictors for individual work outcomes. Each of these predictors predicted between five and six percent of the between-group variance in the individual work outcomes. Further, we were able to demonstrate that all EO climate variables accounted for 7.6% of the between-group variance in organizational commitment, 7.1% of the between group variance in organizational trust, and 7.2% of the between-group variance in job satisfaction.

This demonstrates that EO climate is important as it can affect individuals' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust in their organizations. These individual level outcomes have been linked to turnover, organizational effectiveness, etc (e.g., McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2007). Therefore, it is critical to manage EO climate to ensure organizations function well, and people within organizations remain, and are effective while at work.

The results regarding religious discrimination climate were somewhat surprising. We venture that we may have found the negative relationship between religious discrimination climate and individual work outcomes because religious climate is simply not salient to most military members. According to an issue paper released by the Military Leadership Diversity Commission, the US military religious affiliation is largely Catholic, Baptist or has no religious

preference. Future research should conduct subgroup analyses by religious affiliation on religious discrimination climate individual level work outcomes. This will allow for a more accurate depiction of the effects of religious discrimination climate in organizations.

References

- Barak, M., Cherin, D., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34*, 82-104.
- Blank R, & Slipp S. (1994). *Voices of diversity*. New York: AMACOM.
- Brown, R. D., & Hauenstein, N. A. 2005. Interrater agreement reconsidered: An alternative to the r_{wg} indices. *Organizational Research Methods, 8*, 165-184.
- Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of compositional models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 234-246.
- Cox, Jr., T. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research and Practice*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc: San Francisco, CA.
- Dansby, M. R., & Landis, D. (1991). Measuring equal opportunity climate in the military environment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 389–403.
- Estrada, A. X., Stetz, M. C., & Harbke, C. R. (2007). Further examination and refinement of the psychometric properties of the MEOCS with data from reserve component personnel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*, 137-161.
- Gilbert J. A., & Ivancevich J. M. (2000). Valuing diversity: A tale of two organizations. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*, 93–105.
- Goldman B. M., Gutek B. A., Stein J. H., & Lewis K. (2006). Employment discrimination in organizations: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management, 32*, 786–830.

- Gonzalez, J., & Denisi, A. (2009). Cross-level effects of demography and diversity climate on organizational attachment and firm effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*, 21-40.
- Hicks-Clarke, D., & Iles, P. (2000). Climate for diversity and its effects on career and organisational attitudes and perceptions. *Personnel Review, 29*, 324-345.
- Homan, A. C., Van Knippenberg, D. Van Cleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2007) Bridging faultlines by valuing diversity: Diversity beliefs, information elaboration, and performance in diverse work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1189–1199.
- James L. A., & James L. R. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 739–751.
- Jehn, K.A., Northcraft, G.B., & Neale, M.A. (1999). Why Differences Make a Difference: A Field Study of Diversity, Conflict, and Performance in Workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*, 741-764.
- Kidwell, R. E., Mossholder, K. W., & Bennett, N. (1997). Cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis using work groups and individuals. *Journal of Management, 23*, 775-793.
- Knouse, S. B., & Dansby, M. R. (1999). Percentage of work-group diversity and work-group effectiveness. *The Journal of Psychology, 133*, 486-494.
- Kossek, E. E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 61–81.
- McIntyre, R. M., Bartle, S. A., Landis, D., & Dansby, M. R. (2002). The effects of equal opportunity fairness attitudes on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived work group efficacy. *Military Psychology, 14*, 299-319.

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, 35–62.

McKay, P., Avery, D., & Morris, M. (2009). A tale of two climates: Diversity climate from subordinates and managers perspectives and their role in store unit sales performance.

Personnel Psychology, 62, 767-791.

Moon, M. K. (1997). *Understanding the impact of cultural diversity on organizations*. The Research Department, Air Command and Staff College.

Peterson, M., Van Driel, M., McDonald, D. P., & Crepeau, L. J. (2008). *Examining Climate Strength as a Moderator of Unit-Level Relationships Between Equal Opportunity Climate and Outcome Variables*. Paper presented at the 23rd annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists, 10 - 12 April, 2008, San Francisco, CA.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 531–544.

Raudenbush, S. W. & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reichers A. E., & Schneider B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In Schneider B (Ed.), *Organizational Climate and Culture* (pp. 5–39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roberson L., & Block C. J. (2001). Racioethnicity and job performance: A review and critique of theoretical perspectives on the causes of group differences. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 247–325.

- Rosenfeld, P., Thomas, M. D., Edwards, J. E., Thomas, P. J., & Thomas, E. D. (1991). Navy research into race, ethnicity, and gender issues: A historical review. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 407-426.
- Singer, J. D. (1998). Using SAS PROC MIXED to fit multilevel models, hierarchical models, and individual growth models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 24*, 323-355.
- Truhon, S. (2005). Equal Opportunity in the United States military: Are differences in the eye of the beholder? *European Journal of work and Organizational Psychology, 17*, 153-169.
- Van de Vijver, F.J.R. & Fischer, R. (2009). Improving methodological robustness in cross-cultural research. In Rabi S. Bhagat and Richard M. Steers (Eds.), *Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work* (Chapter 17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Knippenberg, D. V., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 515-541.

Appendix

Defense
 Equal
 Opportunity
 Management



ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SURVEY (DEOCS)

VERSION 3.3

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

In accordance with DoD Directive 5400.11, the following information about this survey is provided:

- a. Authority: 10 USC, 131.
- b. Principal Purpose: The survey is being conducted to assess your organization from an equal opportunity and motivational perspective.
- c. Routine Uses: Information provided by respondents will be treated confidentially. The averaged data will be used for identifying strengths and weaknesses in the unit, research, and development purposes. Averaged results will be provided to the commander requesting the survey and will be accumulated to a database of results from all organizations surveyed in your Service.
- d. Participation: Response to this survey is voluntary. Failure to participate will lessen the ability of your commander to identify concerns and will hamper efforts by DoD to track trends in equal opportunity and organizational issues. Your response is needed to ensure the validity of the survey. We appreciate your participation.

The original MEOCS survey was constructed by the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) and the Center for Applied Research and Evaluation, University of Mississippi under Contract F08606-89-C-007 from DEOMI, Patrick Air Force Base, FL, 32925-6685. For further information, see the following report: Landis, D., Dansby, M., & Foley, R. (1993). *The Military Equal Opportunity Climate Survey: An example of surveying in organizations*. In P. Rosenfeld, J. Edwards, & M. Thomas (Eds.), *Improving organizational surveys: New directions, methods, and applications* (pp210-239). Newbury Park: Sage.

DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SURVEY
(DEOCS)

General Description

The DEOCS questionnaire is intended for organizations of any size, and is suitable for military and/or civilian personnel. The questionnaire measures climate factors associated with the military equal opportunity (EO) program, civilian equal employment opportunity (EEO) program, and organizational effectiveness (OE) issues. The race-ethnic classification system used on DEOCS is consistent with recent Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines for classification of racial groups and multi-racial designations. Approximately half of the questionnaire items address EO/EEO issues, the remainder address organizational and demographic areas. The DEOCS is a climate assessment instrument designed to assess the “shared perceptions” of respondents about formal or informal policies, practices, and procedures likely to occur in the organization.

For the purposes of this survey, the following ethnicity and race definitions are provided (using standard Federal definitions).

Per OMB guidance, 1 January 2003, Spanish/Hispanic/Latino is an ethnic category, not a race category. All race and ethnicity responses are rolled up into minority or majority categories for the final report.

Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race. The term, “Spanish origin,” can be used in addition to “Hispanic or Latino.”

American Indian or Alaska Native. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

Asian. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Black or African American. A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa. Terms such as “Haitian” or “Negro” can be used in addition to “Black or African American.”

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

White. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

MORE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE

IMPORTANT! Before beginning the survey:

IN THE AREA MARKED "ADMIN NO." AT THE TOP OF YOUR ANSWER SHEET, WRITE IN THE FOLLOWING NUMBER: **Sample**

PART I

The information provided below **WILL NOT** be used to identify you. *It* is used by a computer to identify groups of people (e.g., Male, Female, Officer, Enlisted, Civilian, etc.). If fewer than five responses are given for a particular group, those responses are not reported for that group.

YOUR ACCURACY IS IMPORTANT IN GETTING AN HONEST ASSESSMENT OF YOUR ORGANIZATION.

1. I am

1 = Male 2 = Female

2. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

1 = No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

2 = Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

3. What is your race? *Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.*

1 = American Indian or Alaska Native

2 = Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese)

3 = Black or African American

4 = Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (e.g., Samoan, Guamanian, or Chamorro)

5 = White

6 = N/A

4. My age is

1 = 18 - 21

2 = 22 - 30

3 = 31 - 40

4 = 41 - 50

5 = 51 or over

5. Are you currently deployed?

1 = No, it has been more than 6 months since my last deployment, or I have never deployed

2 = No, but I returned from combat zone deployment within the past 6 months

3 = No, but I returned from non-combat zone deployment within the past 6 months

4 = Yes (CONUS)

5 = Yes (OCONUS, in a combat zone)

6 = Yes (OCONUS, in a non-combat zone)

6. I am a(n):

1 = Military officer

2 = Warrant officer

3 = Enlisted member

4 = Federal DoD civilian employee

5 = Federal non-DoD civilian employee

6 = Other (e.g., contractor, private civilian, State employee) --> GO TO QUESTION 14

Please Continue

3

7. If you are a federal civilian employee, in which category are you a member?
- 1 = GS
 - 2 = GM
 - 3 = WG/WL/WS/WB
 - 4 = SES
 - 5 = NSPS --> GO TO QUESTION 9
 - 6 = N/A
8. What is your pay grade (for example; E4-E5, O4-O5, GS4-GS5)? FOR NSPS CIVILIANS ONLY: Leave #8 BLANK on the bubble sheet.
- 1 = 1 - 3
 - 2 = 4 - 6
 - 3 = 7 - 8
 - 4 = 9 - 10
 - 5 = 11 - 13
 - 6 = 14 - 15
9. If you are a Federal civilian employee under NSPS, what is your Career Group?
- 1 = Medical
 - 2 = Investigative/Protective
 - 3 = Scientific/Engineering
 - 4 = Standard
 - 5 = N/A
10. If you are a Federal civilian employee under NSPS, what is your Pay Schedule? FOR MILITARY AND NON-NSPS EMPLOYEE: Leave #10 BLANK on the bubble sheet.
- 1 = Professional or Investigative
 - 2 = Technician/Support
 - 3 = Supervisor/Manager
 - 4 = Fire Protection or Police/Security Guard
 - 5 = Physician/Dentist
 - 6 = Student
11. If you are a Federal civilian employee under NSPS, what is your Pay Band? FOR MILITARY AND NON-NSPS EMPLOYEE: Leave #11 BLANK on the bubble sheet.
- 1 = 1
 - 2 = 2
 - 3 = 3
 - 4 = 4
12. MILITARY ONLY: My branch of service is: FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES: Leave #12 BLANK on the bubble sheet.
- 1 = Air Force
 - 2 = Army
 - 3 = Coast Guard
 - 4 = Marine Corps
 - 5 = Navy
 - 6 = Other Military Service
13. MILITARY ONLY: I am a (n): FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES: Leave #13 BLANK on the bubble sheet.
- 1 = Active component member (including Coast Guard)
 - 2 = Traditional guardsman
 - 3 = Guardsman on active duty
 - 4 = Traditional reservist
 - 5 = Reservist on active duty
 - 6 = N/A

Part II

YOU NEED NOT HAVE PERSONALLY SEEN OR EXPERIENCED THE ACTIONS BELOW.

Use the following scale to rate the *LIKELIHOOD* that the actions listed below *COULD* have happened, even if you have not personally observed or experienced it. *If you are a member of a Reserve or National Guard unit or are a part time employee, "your last 30 work days" refers to the last 30 days you spent at your unit (not necessarily the past consecutive 30 workdays).*

- | |
|--|
| <p>1 = There is a <i>very high chance</i> that the action occurred.
 2 = There is a <i>reasonably high chance</i> that the action occurred.
 3 = There is a <i>moderate chance</i> that the action occurred.
 4 = There is a <i>small chance</i> that the action occurred.
 5 = There is <i>almost no chance</i> that the action occurred.</p> |
|--|

CHECKPOINT: ENSURE YOU ARE AT #14 ON YOUR BUBBLE SHEET BEFORE PROCEEDING.

During your last 30 workdays at your duty location:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>14. A person told several jokes about a particular race/ethnicity.</p> <p>15. Supervisors of different racial or ethnic backgrounds were seen having lunch together.</p> <p>16. Personnel of different racial or ethnic backgrounds were seen having lunch together.</p> <p>17. A supervisor did not select a qualified subordinate for promotion because of their race/ethnicity.</p> <p>18. A member was assigned less desirable office space because of their race/ethnicity.</p> <p>19. The person in charge of the organization changed the duty assignments when it was discovered that two people of the same race/ethnicity were assigned to the same sensitive area on the same shift.</p> <p>20. While speaking to a group, the person in charge of the organization took more time to answer questions from one race/ethnic group than from another group.</p> <p>21. Members from different racial or ethnic groups were seen socializing together.</p> <p>22. Members joined friends of a different racial or ethnic group at the same table in the cafeteria or designated eating area.</p> <p>23. When a person complained of sexual harassment, the supervisor said, "You're being too sensitive."</p> <p>24. Offensive racial/ethnic names were frequently heard.</p> <p>25. Racial/ethnic jokes were frequently heard.</p> | <p>26. A supervisor referred to subordinates of one gender by their first names in public while using titles for subordinates of the other gender.</p> <p>27. Sexist jokes were frequently heard.</p> <p>28. Someone made sexually suggestive remarks about another person.</p> <p>29. A well-qualified person was denied a job because the supervisor did not like the religious beliefs of the person.</p> <p>30. A demeaning comment was made about a certain religious group.</p> <p>31. A supervisor favored a worker who had the same religious beliefs as the supervisor.</p> <p>32. A younger person was selected for a prestigious assignment over an older person who was equally, if not slightly better qualified.</p> <p>33. An older individual did not get the same career opportunities as did a younger individual.</p> <p>34. A worker with a disability was not given the same opportunities as other workers.</p> <p>35. A young supervisor did not recommend promotion for a qualified older worker.</p> <p>36. A career opportunity speech to a worker with a disability focused on the lack of opportunity elsewhere; to others, it emphasized promotion.</p> <p>37. A supervisor did not appoint a qualified worker with a disability to a new position, but instead appointed another, less qualified worker.</p> |
|---|--|

Please Continue

5

Part III

In this part of the survey, answer the following questions regarding *how you feel about your organization*.

- 1 = *Totally agree* with the statement
 2 = *Moderately agree* with the statement
 3 = *Neither agree nor disagree* with the statement
 4 = *Moderately disagree* with the statement
 5 = *Totally disagree* with the statement

38. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
39. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
40. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization until retirement (assuming I could do so if I wanted to).
41. Often, I find it difficult to agree with the policies of this organization on important matters relating to its people.
42. Becoming a part of this organization was definitely not in my best interests.
43. The values of this organization reflect the values of its members.
44. This organization is loyal to its members.
45. This organization is proud of its people.

Part IV

Please respond to the following items regarding the *effectiveness of your work group* (all persons who report to the same supervisor that you do) using the scale below:

- 1 = *Totally agree* with the statement
 2 = *Moderately agree* with the statement
 3 = *Neither agree nor disagree* with the statement
 4 = *Moderately disagree* with the statement
 5 = *Totally disagree* with the statement

46. The amount of output of my work group is very high.
47. The quality of output of my work group is very high.
48. When high priority work arises, such as short deadlines, crash programs, and schedule changes, the people in my work group do an outstanding job in handling these situations.
49. My work group's performance in comparison to similar work groups is very high.
50. My work group works well together as a team.
51. Members of my work group pull together to get the job done.
52. Members of my work group really care about each other.
53. Members of my work group trust each other.
54. Top leaders in my organization work well together as a team.
55. Top leaders in my organization pull together to get the job done.
56. Top leaders in my organization really care about each other.
57. Top leaders in my organization trust each other.

Part V

The questions in this section are used to determine *how satisfied you are with job-related issues*. Indicate your degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction by choosing the most appropriate phrase:

- 1 = *Very* satisfied
- 2 = *Moderately* satisfied
- 3 = *Neither* satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 = *Moderately* dissatisfied
- 5 = *Very* dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with:

- 58. The chance to help people and improve their welfare through the performance of my job.
- 59. My amount of effort compared to the efforts of my co-workers.
- 60. The recognition and pride my family has in the work I do.
- 61. The chance to acquire valuable skills in my job that prepare me for future opportunities.
- 62. My job as a whole.

65. Did you report any of the above incidents of discrimination or sexual harassment to someone in your organization?

- 1 = I filed a formal complaint through my organization's EO/EEO representative.
- 2 = I reported the incident through my organization's EO/EEO representative without filing a formal complaint.
- 3 = I reported the incident to my supervisor/superior without filing a formal complaint.
- 4 = I confronted the individual who committed the act without filing a formal complaint.
- 5 = I did not report the incident to anyone.
- 6 = N/A. I did not experience an incident of discrimination or sexual harassment in the past 12 months.

If you did not report the incident to anyone, please explain why.

Part VI

63. Within the past 12 months, I have personally experienced an incident of discrimination within my current organization. (Mark all that apply.)

- 1 = YES, racial/national origin/color
- 2 = YES, gender (sex)
- 3 = YES, age
- 4 = YES, disability
- 5 = YES, religion
- 6 = No

64. Within the past 12 months, I have personally experienced an incident of sexual harassment within my current organization.

- 1 = YES 2 = NO

66. How satisfied are you with how your issue was (or is being) resolved?

- 1 = *Very* satisfied
- 2 = *Moderately* satisfied
- 3 = *Moderately* dissatisfied
- 4 = *Very* dissatisfied
- 5 = N/A

If you were moderately or very dissatisfied with how the issue was (or is being) resolved, please explain why.

Please provide any written comments in the space below. Use additional paper if needed.

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE PROVIDED TO YOUR COMMAND EXACTLY AS THEY ARE WRITTEN.

S
A
M
P
L

Thank you for your responses. Please provide your answer sheet and this survey to your survey administrator.

You may send comments regarding this survey directly to:

Directorate of Research
Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute
366 Tuskegee Airman Drive Building 352
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida 32925-3399
Email: support@deocs.net

Table 1.

Scales Contained within the DEOCS

Scale	Description	Response format
<i>EO/EEO Related Scales</i> Sexual Harassment and Sex Discrimination	Assesses perceptions of how extensively sexual harassment and discrimination (such as gender insensitive language, sexist jokes, or sexually suggestive language) are thought to occur within the respondent's unit. A typical item is, "Sexist jokes were frequently heard."	Within the last 30 days: 1) There is a <i>very high</i> chance that the action occurred. 2) There is a <i>reasonably high</i> chance that the action occurred. 3) There is a <i>moderate</i> chance that the action occurred. 4) There is a <i>small</i> chance that the action occurred. 5) There is <i>almost no</i> chance that the action occurred.
Differential Command Behavior	Assesses perceptions of differential treatment on the basis of race/ethnicity.	Same as above
Positive Equal Opportunity Behaviors	Estimates how well majority and minority members get along in the unit and are integrated in the unit's functioning. This scale addresses how frequently positive actions occur.	Same as above
Racist Behaviors	Assesses perceptions of traditional overt racist behaviors, such as name calling and telling racist jokes.	Same as above
Age Discrimination	Assesses the perceptions of whether people are discriminated against because of their age. (Only administered to civilians)	Same as above
Religious Discrimination	Addresses perceptions of discrimination based upon religion.	Same as above
Disability Discrimination	Addresses perceptions of instances of discrimination due to disabilities or handicaps. (Only administered to civilians)	Same as above

Table 1 (Continued)

Scale	Description	Response format
<u>OE Related Scales</u>		
Organizational Commitment	Measures “bonding” to the organization	1) Totally agree with the statement. 2) Moderately agree with the statement. 3) Neither agree nor disagree with the statement. 4) Moderately disagree with the statement. 5) Totally disagree with the statement.
Trust in the Organization	Indicator of how people perceive the organization as a place where people trust and care for each other.	Same as above
Perceived Work Group Effectiveness	Reflects the degree to which the respondent's unit is perceived to be productive and effective in accomplishing its mission.	Same as above
Work Group Cohesion	Measure of how well work groups work together, cooperate on projects, and care for and trust each other.	Same as above
Leadership Cohesion	Measure is similar to Work Group Cohesion, but focused on how members perceive leaders above them working well together.	Same as above
Job Satisfaction	Indicates the degree of satisfaction the respondent has with his or her current job.	1) Very satisfied. 2) Moderately satisfied. 3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. 4) Moderately dissatisfied. 5) Very dissatisfied

Table 2.

Sample Demographics

		DoD/ Joint Service	Navy	Air Force	Army	Marine Corps	Coast Guard	Other	National Guard
<i>Units Represented in Sample</i>		904	2636	222	2415	749	499	19	400
<i>Gender</i>	Males	41256	134597	7764	98148	55807	17756	1176	16999
	Females	10484	37229	2137	26085	5058	3508	299	3221
<i>Age</i>	18-21	5595	14210	708	13778	16171	2166	503	2895
	22-30	18438	59514	3447	48308	31429	8794	520	7613
	31-40	13581	49805	2878	34720	10062	5759	239	5079
	41-50	9041	30439	2006	18907	2380	3188	142	3485
	51 or over	4975	17667	858	8356	711	1325	71	1036
<i>Race</i>	Spanish/Hispanic/ Latino	5808	19360	781	16067	12474	2281	292	1985
	Not Spanish/Hispanic/ Latino	45786	152355	9116	107997	48312	18964	1183	18155
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	1405	5317	289	3344	2012	833	43	605
	Asian	3289	13948	261	6987	2337	607	47	433
	Black or African American	8421	25044	1055	24499	6467	1382	189	2052
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	770	3801	110	2261	1061	385	31	141
	White	34843	115356	7912	78266	42434	17166	988	16194
<i>Deployment Status</i>	More than 6 months since last deployment	36177	126520	8018	81991	40768	15193	1067	14760
	Returned from combat zone in past 6 months	2855	10620	816	10077	8644	188	61	431
	Returned from non- combat zone in past 6 months	1522	10347	345	2916	3459	2808	35	476
	Deployed - CONUS	2437	6544	218	4932	1233	1984	161	1205
	Deployed - OCONUS, in combat zone	5448	7402	427	17036	3333	25	45	2727
	Deployed - OCONUS, in a non-combat zone	2870	9887	72	6980	3340	1047	106	510
<i>Total Number of Representatives of Each Service</i>		51755	171859	9901	124286	60896	21265	1475	20229

Table 3.

Total Variance Explained in Exploratory Factor Analysis

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percent
1	9.58	30.89	30.89
2	3.71	11.98	42.87
3	2.96	9.55	52.42
4	1.70	5.42	57.84
5	1.24	4.00	61.84

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Study Variables

Construct	Mean	<i>SD</i>
1. Racist Behaviors Climate	3.97	1.03
2. Positive EO Behaviors Climate	4.11	.95
3. Differential Command Behaviors Toward Minorities Climate	4.61	.64
4. Sexual Harassment Climate	4.24	.82
5. Religious Discrimination Climate	4.55	.68
6. Overall EO Climate	4.30	.56
7. Organizational Commitment	3.59	.97
8. Trust in Organization	3.59	1.02
9. Job Satisfaction	3.96	.82

Table 2. Results of the Level-2 Analyses for Individual Work Outcomes

<i>Fixed effects</i>	<i>Gamma coefficient</i>	<i>Standard error</i>	<i>T-ratio</i>	<i>R²</i>
Organizational commitment				
Overall EO climate, γ_{01}	.21	.01	20.97	.06
Racist behavior climate, γ_{01}	.11	.01	21.24	.06
Positive EO behavior climate, γ_{01}	.03	.01	4.62	.003
Differential command behavior climate, γ_{01}	.14	.01	14.33	.03
Sexual harassment climate, γ_{01}	.12	.01	18.00	.05
Religious Discrimination climate, γ_{01}	.10	.01	11.79	.02
Organizational trust				
Overall EO climate, γ_{01}	.20	.01	20.35	.06
Racist behavior climate, γ_{01}	.10	.01	18.04	.05
Positive EO behavior climate, γ_{01}	.02	.01	4.13	.003
Differential command behavior climate, γ_{01}	.14	.01	14.17	.03
Sexual harassment climate, γ_{01}	.13	.01	18.83	.05
Religious Discrimination climate, γ_{01}	.11	.01	12.52	.02
Job satisfaction				
Overall EO climate, γ_{01}	.12	.01	19.40	.06
Racist behavior climate, γ_{01}	.06	.00	18.73	.06
Positive EO behavior climate, γ_{01}	.02	.00	4.39	.003
Differential command behavior climate, γ_{01}	.07	.01	12.26	.02
Sexual harassment climate, γ_{01}	.07	.00	17.32	.05
Religious Discrimination climate, γ_{01}	.07	.01	13.07	.03

Notes. $n = 7844$ organizations. All results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

<i>Fixed effects</i>	<i>Gamma coefficient</i>	<i>Standard error</i>	<i>T-ratio</i>
Organizational commitment			
Racist behavior climate, γ_{01}	.09**	.01	11.49
Positive EO behavior climate, γ_{01}	.02**	.01	3.90
Differential command behavior climate, γ_{01}	.07**	.01	5.94
Sexual harassment climate, γ_{01}	.04**	.01	3.17
Religious Discrimination climate, γ_{01}	-.03**	.01	-2.7
Organizational trust			
Racist behavior climate, γ_{01}	.06**	.01	7.37
Positive EO behavior climate, γ_{01}	.02**	.01	3.23
Differential command behavior climate, γ_{01}	.07**	.01	5.67
Sexual harassment climate, γ_{01}	.07**	.01	5.88
Religious Discrimination climate, γ_{01}	-.03*	.01	-2.35
Job satisfaction			
Racist behavior climate, γ_{01}	.04**	.00	9.26
Positive EO behavior climate, γ_{01}	.01**	.00	4.19
Differential command behavior climate, γ_{01}	.02**	.00	2.61
Sexual harassment climate, γ_{01}	.03**	.01	4.57
Religious Discrimination climate, γ_{01}	.00	.00	-.25

Note. ** indicated $p < .01$; * indicates $p < .05$

Figure 1. Cox's Model of the Impact of Organizational Diversity

