

# Strategic Leadership Focus: Talent Management, Mentorship, and Workplace Diversity



**CAPT Delmy M. Robinson, USN, MBA  
Commandant**

**Daniel P. McDonald, PhD<sup>2</sup>  
Director**

**MAJ Roshonda Gilmore, USA, MBA<sup>2,3</sup>  
Department Head**

**Dr. Richard Oliver Hope Human Relations Research Center  
Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute  
366 Tuskegee Airmen Drive, Patrick Space Force Base, FL 32925**

1. JHT Inc.
2. Dr. Richard Oliver Hope Human Relations Research Center, DEOMI
3. Applied Science & Analytics, DEOMI

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and readers should not construe this report to represent the official position of the U.S. military services, the Department of Defense, or DEOMI.

**Tech Report No. 23-12**

**Prepared by**

Courtney Howell, PhD<sup>1</sup>  
Shane Pitts, PhD<sup>1</sup>  
Katie Blair, MS<sup>1</sup>  
Rebecca Free, MA<sup>1</sup>  
Dylan Caldwell, PhD<sup>1</sup>  
Royce Simpson, PhD<sup>1</sup>  
LT Jayson M. Rhoton, USN, PhD<sup>2,3</sup>

**Contents**

- Overview..... 5
- Alignment ..... 5
- Perceptions..... 6
  - Definition and Theoretical Model..... 6
  - Perceptual Errors..... 8
  - Impacts of Perceptions in the Workplace ..... 10
    - Impact on Individuals ..... 10
    - Organizational Impacts..... 11
  - Prevention and Mitigation..... 11
- General Differences in the Workplace..... 13
  - Race..... 13
  - Gender..... 15
  - Age/Generational Gaps..... 16
  - Faith/Spirituality/Religion ..... 17
  - Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity ..... 18
- Mentorship ..... 21
  - Definitions..... 21
  - Considerations..... 26
- Talent Management ..... 28
  - Definitions..... 28
  - Considerations..... 30
- Inclusive Leadership..... 32

Definition ..... 32

Key Features of Inclusive Leadership..... 33

Inclusive Leadership Behaviors ..... 34

Inclusive Leadership in the Military ..... 34

Impacts of Inclusive Leadership on DEI ..... 35

Conclusions..... 37

References..... 38

## SPECIAL TOPICS

### Overview

The Senior Executive Equal Opportunity Seminar (SEEOS) is aimed at supporting newly appointed flag/general officers and Senior Executive Service members. The seminar is designed to present senior leaders with an orientation on the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and organizational aspects of human relations, diversity and inclusion (D&I), equal opportunity (EO), and equal employment opportunity (EEO) in order to gain an understanding of their impact on inclusion, unit cohesion, mission effectiveness, and total Force readiness. SEEOS participants are encouraged to bring real-world issues and problems to the table, give and receive feedback, and explore the impact of their personal behaviors on others, the group, and on larger organizational systems. This document provides synopses of additional topics that could be considered for inclusion in the SEEOS curriculum. The topics presented in this document consist of salient issues in the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) space: perceptions, general differences in the workplace, mentorship, talent management, and inclusive leadership.

### Alignment

The Department of Defense outlines the following goals in its *Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2022-2023*: increased diversity to enhance global joint warfighter capabilities in order to address complex emerging security challenges and to create a culture of organizational resiliency; expansion of equity and equality across the DoD; improved workplace inclusivity; and commitment to accessibility. Senior leaders as the DoD's strategic decision makers must be well versed in contemporary DEI challenges and opportunities in order to achieve the mission and vision of this strategic plan.

Additionally, the Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1020.05, *DoD Diversity and Inclusion Management Program*, issued on September 9, 2020, mandated a Diversity and Inclusion Management Program to: 1) promote a diverse workforce, 2) promote an inclusive culture, and 3) use data to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. DoDI 1350.02, *DoD Military Equal Opportunity Program*, was reissued on September 24, 2020, and requires that leaders at all levels foster a climate of inclusion that supports diversity and is free from prohibited discrimination. It charges commanders with the responsibility to assess and improve their command climates. In addition, the U.S. Secretary of Defense memorandum titled *Immediate Actions to Address Diversity and Inclusion and Equal Opportunity in the Military Services*, dated July 14, 2020, directed training for commanders to conduct relevant, candid, and effective conversations as a specific initiative against discrimination, prejudice, and bias, and as part of a broader approach to promote morale, cohesion, and readiness of the Force. The SEEOS meets the needs of these DoD directives by specifically providing diversity and inclusion training for senior leaders in the Armed Forces, and this collection on perceptions, general differences in the workplace, mentorship, talent management, and inclusive leadership can help these leaders navigate some of the most impactful challenges of today.

## **Perceptions**

### **Definition and Theoretical Model**

Perception can be defined as the following:

The process or result of becoming aware of objects, relationships, and events by means of the senses, which includes such activities as recognizing, observing, and discriminating.

These activities enable organisms to organize and interpret the stimuli received into

meaningful knowledge and to act in a coordinated manner (American Psychological Association, 2023).

Kahneman's Dual Process theory (2011) can serve as a *metaphorical* model of perceptual processes. His model distinguishes between system 1, also referred to as "fast thinking," and system 2, also referred to as "slow thinking." While both systems are interrelated and adapted to support different types of mental tasks, each system is associated with specific benefits and risks (Kahneman, 2011). Likewise, in virtually any task or thought, both systems are involved to more or less of an extent. However, for optimal performance, people need to understand how both systems work. This is especially true within the military context, where leaders are required to respond quickly as well as strategically based on emergent information.

***System 1 / Fast / Heuristic Thinking:***

- Thinking occurs rapidly and automatically, with no sense of subjective choice or voluntary control.
- This type of cognition allows humans to rapidly assess situations and react quickly based on prior training and expertise.
- This system relies on heuristics (mental "rules of thumb"). For example, if a physician has recently seen a significant increase in strep throat at her clinic, when presented with most, but perhaps not all the same symptoms in a new patient, she may use availability to quickly surmise this new instance may also be strep. Why? This possibly incorrect judgment is due to the use of the "availability heuristic" – that which comes to mind most effortlessly and quickly tends to be judged as more frequent or more likely to recur in the future. However, as with any heuristic, they may often be incorrect.

- Fast thinking relies on prior knowledge, mental associations formed from mere exposure, previous training, and existing expertise.
- While system 1 is fast, efficient, and does not require a lot of cognitive resources or effort, its cognition is particularly vulnerable to bias and emotional influence.
- System 1 is more likely used when cognitive resources are limited, e.g., when tired, under stress, or multi-tasking, etc.
- System 1 use, given its relative automaticity, is often difficult for people to detect in themselves – it goes on in the background, and is often inaccessible to conscious awareness.
- An example of this type of automated thinking would be driving a car on an empty familiar road.

***System 2 / Slow / Deliberative Thinking:***

- This type of thinking allocates attention and cognitive resources to the mental activities that demand it, including complex computations, concentration, and other mental operations that individuals subjectively experience as "thought."
- System 2 tasks require time and mental energy, which can lead to delayed action.
- While system 2 is also vulnerable to unconscious bias, only the mental activities occurring in system 2 can help individuals understand, acknowledge, analyze, and potentially mitigate or prevent their bias from spilling onto their behavior.
- An example of this type of complex thinking would be the process of parallel parking.

**Perceptual Errors**

In situations where individuals are cognitively taxed, meaning their mental resources are depleted, they may rely more heavily on system 1 when processing information, which renders



them more likely to rely on cognitive heuristics. Cognitive heuristics are “methods that use principles of effort-reduction and simplification. By definition, heuristics must allow decision makers to process information in a less effortful manner than one would expect from an optimal decision rule” (Shah & Oppenheimer, 2008, p. 207). In essence, heuristics can be likened to a decision-making rule or algorithm. While the use of heuristics aids in fast decision making and the preservation of mental energy, these shortcuts in thinking are particularly vulnerable to unconscious biases. Some common perceptual errors are:

**Confirmation Bias.** The tendency to seek and interpret information in a way that supports existing beliefs (Wason, 1960).

**Halo Effect.** The halo effect is an autonomous social judgement we make about others based on superficial characteristics (Thorndike, 1920).

**Attribution Error.** Attribution error occurs when an incorrect assumption is made to explain a person’s behavior or action. Because individuals are unable to directly observe others’ intentions or motivations, they are prone to make inferences about others based on observable behavior (Gilbert & Malone, 1995).

**Affinity Bias.** Affinity bias (also known as similarity bias) is the tendency to evaluate a person more positively or act more favorability towards those who are perceived to share our backgrounds and beliefs (Byrne, 1972). Affinity bias can lead to in-group favoritism (Fiske & Taylor, 1991).

**Representativeness Heuristic.** Representativeness heuristic refers to an approach used to make judgments, classifications, or estimates of probabilities based on how similar a person is to the typical or average member within the category, often while failing to consider the base-rate (Kahneman & Tversky, 1973).

**Intergroup Bias.** Intergroup bias refers to “the tendency to evaluate one’s own membership group (the in-group) or its members more favorably than a non-membership group (the outgroup) or its members” (Hewstone et al., 2002, p. 576). Members of privileged groups show bias on dimensions that favor their own group and not on dimensions that are irrelevant to the privileged status of their social identity (Bettencourt & Bartholomew, 1998).

**Unconscious Bias.** Unconscious or implicit bias can be defined as:

Beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions that individuals form automatically, informed by the individual’s personal life experiences and natural human cognitive limitations, which may be inaccurate or incomplete, and thus can result in a pattern of unintended marginalization of people from certain groups (Definition developed internally by DEOMI ASA, not in print).

Research shows that perceptual errors are not mutually exclusive and may even reinforce one another in an escalatory way that compounds judgement errors, especially in highly cohesive groups (Jones & Roelofsma, 2000). A risk factor for perceptual error is cognitive load.

Cognitive load refers to the amount of information that working memory can process at one time with high cognitive load, making the use of heuristics more likely (Sweller, 2011).

### **Impacts of Perceptions in the Workplace**

Perceptual errors in the workplace can be costly to the individual and the organization.

#### ***Impact on Individuals***

Perceptual errors can lead to individuals being the targets of bias. Implicit biases (often called “unconscious”) can be a type of logical fallacy when they are based on pre-existing beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions about individuals and groups that people (bias holders) apply to pre-judge others (bias targets) in the absence of direct personal experience or individual

information about the targets (e.g., using stereotypes). Understood in this way, social biases like stereotypes can compromise mental accuracy, lead to erroneous decisions, and inadvertently enable and reinforce prejudice and discrimination, especially when people rely on biases as habitual mental shortcuts to assess individuals, groups, and social situations, regardless of whether they are consciously aware of doing so (e.g., Devine, 2015). Individuals who perceive that they are the targets of bias within their organizations are more likely to be disengaged at work, withhold ideas and creative solutions, and are significantly more likely to leave their employer (Turnbull, 2019; Chamorro-Premuzic, 2017; Perez, 2019; Pugh, 2022). Unaddressed, the impact of unconscious bias can lead to disengagement and burnout (Shore et al., 2011).

### ***Organizational Impacts***

Perceptual errors can impact the organization by impacting mentoring, evaluation and promotions, and policy implementation and enforcement, which have profound costs for the DoD. For example, unconscious biases may impact whom we mentor and the mentoring relationship (Hinton et. al, 2020). Leaders' biases can lead to inaccurate interpretation of performance and appraisals of behaviors and result in discriminatory workplace behavior (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005), which impairs equitable selection, merit-based promotion, and judicial punishment. When people in positions of power and authority rely on biased decision making, it can have far-reaching consequences, from discriminatory hiring practices to poorer healthcare treatment and prejudice in the legal system (Agrawal, 2020).

### **Prevention and Mitigation**

Research suggests that automatic stereotypes and prejudice are controllable, and the perceiver's goals and intentions can matter quite a bit (Blair, 2002). Activating people's motivation to be moral can reduce their unconscious biases (Van Nunspeet et al., 2015).

Training should aim to increase trainee commitment to conscious objectivity, such as by establishing the incompatibility of prejudice and discrimination with military values and by introducing bias-mitigation strategies as skills to increase personal performance. Across branches, the incompatibility of service values with prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory practices as they relate to error in perception and bias has been emphasized:

**Army (USA).** The Army focuses on the ideology that “training should center on building trust, developing leaders who value differences, treating diverse individuals equitably, helping Soldiers and Civilians understand their potential biases, and creating shared understanding through open, two-way communication” (U.S. Army, 2020, p.12).

**Air Force (USAF).** The Air Force notes that individuals should be able to recognize and work through their own biases (The Inspector General Department of the Air Force, 2020, p. 106).

**Navy (USN).** The Navy created a task force in order to combat bias, which focused on enhanced understanding of bias as a big picture outcome (U.S. Navy, n.d.; U.S. Navy, 2020).

**Marine Corps (USMC).** The Marine Corps holds the belief that people do not “automatically set aside prejudices, bias, and perceptions upon joining our ranks;” instead, individuals “must be pro-active; [they] must establish a command climate that allows every Marine to reach his or her potential without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, or national origin” (U.S. Marine Corps, n.d., p. 4).

**Coast Guard (USCG).** The Coast Guard aims for the work environment to be free from discrimination and harassment of any kind (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2020). An initial step toward mitigating any bias is to become aware of and knowledgeable about biases. Thus, military personnel need education on the origin, existence, persistence, and negative

effects of such biases (Burgess et al., 2007; Devine, 2015). This includes an exploration of one's biases as well as psychoeducational materials on the science of bias and related cognitive processes. More specifically, Patricia Devine and colleagues have developed a program for "breaking the prejudice habit," which aligns well with conscious objectivity training. Part of the model includes education and awareness components wherein participants learn what biases are (including specifically unconscious bias), how such biases are measured, and some of the detrimental consequences of unconscious biases for marginalized persons (Devine et al., 2012; Forscher et al., 2019).

### **General Differences in the Workplace**

Individuals bring many different identities to the workplace. Identity can be understood through intersectionality. "The term intersectionality references the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age act not as unitary, mutually exclusive entities, but as reciprocally constructing phenomena that in turn shape complex social inequalities" (Hill Collins, 2015, p. 2). Intersectionality means that individuals experience multiple identities as simultaneously interacting together (Gopaldas, 2013). People also experience others as the sum total of all their identities and not just as one or the other. Some salient aspects of identity that constitute general differences in the workplace are race, gender, generational gaps, and religion. Cross-cultural competence is an essential aspect of diversity and inclusion work (Kaufmann et al., 2014).

### **Race**

Despite the racial diversity of the Military and the Nation, interracial interactions remain fraught with difficulties. Interracial interactions are often besieged by stress and anxiety (Trawalter et al., 2009) and by divergent goals and assumptions (Bergsieker, et al., 2010), which

can result in individuals feeling drained cognitively and emotionally (Richeson & Shelton, 2007). Research shows that different people may experience the same situation with a different set of emotions and perceptions of the interaction (e.g., Shelton et al., 2005a; Shelton et al., 2005b). For instance, interracial interactions may cause White folks to be concerned about appearing prejudiced, while racial minorities in that same interaction may fear or anticipate experiencing prejudice or confirming stereotypes (Richeson & Shelton, 2007). Many White individuals seek to be liked during interracial interactions, whereas African-American individuals seek to be respected and deemed competent (Bergsieker et al., 2010). The fact both members of the conversation have different goals and outcomes can lead to symptoms such as being less attentive, having less ability to process information, and having a less positive attitude or engagement in the conversation (Shelton et al., 2005a; Shelton et al., 2005b; Trawalter & Richeson, 2006). Such anxiety-ridden interactions may also lead to responses that are counterproductive, including freezing up, avoiding conversation, and overcompensating (Trawalter et al., 2009). Thus, it is no surprise that sometimes individuals are more comfortable talking about certain subjects in a homogenous setting. However, this can result in certain topics not being addressed equally in all circles, which is natural given that people within a group often have similar experiences, different than those of other groups. For example, a recent study showed that a homogenous group of individuals identifying as Black talked about police brutality at a higher rate (80%) than a homogenous group of White individuals (55%) (Eveland & Appiah, 2021).

These types of studies are important to note because it means that different topics may come up depending on the individuals present at any given point. This means that lack of diversity will result in lack of perspective, because topics that may be common in other in-groups

are not likely to come to the front, which can have an impact in group tasks involving problem solving, strategizing, and more. Indeed, there is an argument to be made that it is appropriate to give people both homogenous and diverse spaces in which to interact, because the types of conversations that emerge will look different (Harrison & Williams-Cumberbatch, 2022), and thus, conversations between people who have differences in ideology or beliefs should be encouraged, while providing safe spaces in which to develop ideas and thoughts with less risk of judgement. The idea of employee resource groups or affinity groups is to provide a homogeneous space for employees to have real conversations (promoting uniqueness and belonging) while typically requiring such groups to share suggestions and ideas with the rest of the organization as well as other groups.

### **Gender**

There are many cultural and societal factors that play a role in how men and women are perceived. Because of those factors, some differences in outcomes between them exist, including communication styles. Historically, leadership has been held by men, and as a result is often associated with so-called “male” characteristics, though recent studies show little differences in actual behaviors by gender (Ladegaard, 2011; Sdeeq et al., 2021). A recent study showed that men and women in the 21st century tend to communicate using a style that is “facilitative, indirect, collaborative, person- and process-oriented” (Ladegaard, 2011, p. 16). The difference, however, is how men and women are perceived; men in the study had no issues leading meetings or spaces, whereas the women were sometimes challenged in their abilities to do so (Ladegaard, 2011).

Given the challenges that women face in the private sector, such challenges may be exacerbated in the hyper-masculine environment of the Armed Forces. Women still face

difficulties in integration into the military forces, with many experiencing harassment, assault, and exclusion during their time in the service (Hajjar, 2010). Examples of ways to address inequality include having conversations with military personnel in more private, but still professional, capacities, in addition to mandatory trainings or educational seminars (Hajjar 2010). Concerns of harassment and assault must be taken seriously, and trainings should work to help members recognize the power of women as leaders and the fact that there is really not much difference in leadership style between men and women. In addition, leaders can support women by encouraging other leaders and subordinates to normalize and participate in the use of policies and benefits such as paternity leave regardless of gender, across units, to help reduce the stigma associated with this type of family accommodation, as well as others that tend to impact women more broadly.

### **Age/Generational Gaps**

Currently, there are at least four generations in the workplace: Traditionalists (1909-1945), Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1978), and Millennials (1979-2000) (Bennett et al., 2021). Additionally, Generation Z (2000-2012) is beginning to enter the workforce (Mahmoud et al., 2021), giving the possibility of up to five generations in the workforce simultaneously. Generational differences result from the differences in the world during the time of growth and development and impact attitudes and characteristics of people within that time period (Mahmoud et al., 2021).

However, communication across generations does not have to be complicated. A study comparing Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials found that the three generations “largely share similar patterns of regular use of business communication media” (Woodward & Vongswasdi, 2017, p. 372). Further, face-to-face communication when possible is preferred by



all generations (Woodward & Vongswasdi, 2017). In fact, the biggest factor to keep in mind, especially when it comes to Millennials and Gen Z, is to “create an inclusive and understanding multigenerational working environment” (Mahmoud et al., 2021, p. 205), which can be achieved through many of the best practices in inclusive leadership.

### **Faith/Spirituality/Religion**

Faith and spirituality are equally important aspects of diversity that impact the lives of individuals. A recent study explored the differences in perception between spirituality and religion in the global population and found that participants perceived spirituality to be “a core part of themselves” and religion to be “a framework for spirituality” (Gall et al., 2011). Religion is not necessary for spirituality but can facilitate spiritual practices (Gall et al., 2011); religion tends to focus on specific behaviors and tenets connected to a formal institution, like a church, whereas spirituality does not (Héliot et al., 2020). There is some connection between religious/spirituality identity and generations, with older generations reporting more formal religious activity than Millennials (McMurray & Simmers, 2020). Religious, spiritual, or faith-based identities can be difficult to see from the outside, but they are an aspect of identity that is generally considered important to the individual (Héliot et al., 2020). Indeed, there is some evidence to show that people seek out workplaces that align with their values or faith (Park & Martinez, 2022).

Millennials generally find religious displays, such as prayer and religious paintings, in the workplace to make the workplace less attractive and welcoming (Beane et al., 2017). However, there were exceptions for displays that related to the employer’s personal experience, such as photos of baptisms or diplomas from religious institutions (Beane et al., 2017). Trainings on spiritual diversity should be considered, as they can give people a chance to understand others

better and express their own identities (Loo, 2017; McMurray & Simmers, 2020). Similar to other identities, giving members space to feel accepted and acknowledged can lead to more positive feelings about the workplace (Park & Martinez, 2022). Employee resource groups can be utilized for faith-based communities to increase feelings of inclusion as well (Terry, 2021).

### **Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity**

Sexual minority is an umbrella term that includes individuals who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. A gender minority is someone whose gender identity is different from their sex assigned at birth. LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, and related identities) is a term often used to describe both sexual and gender minorities. Sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) is an umbrella term used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Although gender identity is distinct from sexual orientation, people who are transgender often have been grouped with people who are lesbian, gay or bisexual members of SOGI groups. Importantly, gender-related terminology is in a fluid state, sometimes changing rapidly. It is important to be responsive to changing gender-related terminology to properly recognize and respect individuals. The table below encompasses gender-related terminology that is up-to-date at the time of this writing.

#### **Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Terms**

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Sex	Binary biological status assigned at birth	male, female
Gender	Social, cultural, psychological, and behavioral attributes typically associated with sex.	masculine, feminine
Gender Identity	Internal sense of being male, female, somewhere in between, or not part of any gender category.	boy, girl, man, woman, transgender man, transgender woman, agender, genderqueer, gender nonbinary, gender nonconforming

Cisgender	A person whose gender identity matches the sex they were assigned at birth.	cisgender man, cisgender woman
Transgender	A person whose assigned sex at birth incorrectly or incompletely describes their gender identity	transgender man, transgender woman, genderqueer, gender nonbinary, agender
Sexual Orientation	The gender to whom one is attracted	heterosexual/straight, lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, pansexual
Asexual	A person who does not experience sexual attraction	ace
Sexism	A system of oppression that includes interpersonal, institutional, and cultural discrimination against women	
Anti-trans prejudice	Prejudice against people who are transgender	cisgenderism, transphobia
Heterosexism	Ideological system that prescribes a norm of heterosexuality and denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes sexual minority groups	homophobia, sexual prejudice
SOGI	Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (Umbrella term used by the EEOC)	

Definitions from APA (2015); Herek (2007), Bosson et al. (2021), and EEOC.gov

Population information about the LGBT community is typically made available as an aggregate of all its components; that is, numbers include all those who report identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. In the case of the U.S. Department of Defense, the numbers are divided into sexuality (LGB) and gender identity (T). In the U.S., a recent poll shows that 7.1% of the U.S. population identifies as LGBT (Jones, 2022). According to the 2018 DoD Health Related Behaviors Survey (HRBS), 6.3% of active Service members identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (Meadows, et al., 2018). More women (17.6%) than men (4.1%) in

active service identify as LGB (Meadows et al., 2018). The Department of Defense estimates that there are 8,980 transgender Service members, of which the majority are transgender women who joined as men (Office of People Analytics, 2017). This estimate represents 0.7% of all active-duty service troops.

Results from the *2021 Workplace and Gender Relations of Active-Duty Members* (WGR) indicate that Service members identifying as LGBT were more likely than members who do not identify as LGBT to report sexual assault, harassment, and discrimination (Breslin et al., 2022). Rates of unwanted sexual contact for LGB Service members (8.5%) and gender minorities (6.3%) were higher than for their non-LGB (1.7%) and cisgender (2.1%) counterparts (Breslin et al., 2022). Sexual harassment was reported by 31.3% of members identifying as LGB and 26.7% gender minorities. Harassment for Service members not identifying as LGB was 8.0% (Breslin et al., 2022). Gender discrimination rates were also higher for members identifying as LGB (11.7% vs. 3.0%) or a gender minority (9.9% vs. 3.7%) (Breslin et al., 2022). Results from the 2018 WGR are consistent with these findings, with LGBT Service members at a higher risk for sexual assault and harassment (Breslin, 2019).

Further, SOGI populations are at an increased risk for a variety of mental and physical health issues. In a review of 30 studies examining the physical health of Service members and veterans, Mark et al. (2019) concluded that LGBT members experienced worse outcomes on a variety of measures including hypertension, obesity, and levels of smoking. Results from the most recent Health Related Behaviors Survey (HRBS) reveal that LGB Service members are significantly more likely to report feelings of psychological distress (30.5% compared to 15.5% for non-LGB Service members), more symptoms of PTSD, and increased likelihood of experiencing suicidal thoughts (Meadows et al., 2018). A systematic review by O'Leary and

Marcelli (2022) reported significantly worse mental health outcomes among transgender veterans and higher rates of suicide for both transgender veterans and active-duty Service members.

Several researchers have suggested that the differences in health outcomes may be related to an increase in stressors and stigma experienced by LGBT Service members (e.g., Holloway et al., 2021; Oblea & Siaki, 2022). The role of stigma and stressors in the mental health of LGB individuals is central to the minority stress theory presented by Meyer (2003); indeed, studies document increased exposure to distal stressors (e.g., stigmatizing external events and conditions) in both civilian (e.g., Huebner et al., 2004) and military SOGI populations (e.g., Burks, 2011; Schuyler et al., 2020). Moody et al. (2020) found that stressors associated with sexual-orientation-based discrimination in LGB military Service members was associated with poorer mental health and a greater risk of alcohol abuse.

Service members who identify as LGBT report feeling less support compared to members who do not identify as LGBT (Carey et al., 2022). LGBT Service members are more likely than non-LGBT members to separate from service for unplanned administrative reasons and are less likely to continue their military career after completing their service (Carey et al., 2022; McNamara et al., 2021).

## **Mentorship**

### **Definitions**

Mentorship can be defined by Army Regulation 600-100 as “the voluntary developmental relationship that exists between a person of greater experience and a person of lesser experience that is characterized by mutual trust and respect” (Department of the Army, 2017). Across service branches, mentorship has been a focal point with the overarching goal of fostering the unique talents of each Service member in a way that promotes the development of a diverse

Force across all levels of leadership. On June 25, 2021, President Biden signed Executive Order (EO) 14035, *Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce*, which mandates the identification of ways to expand mentorship and leadership as it relates to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility in the Federal workforce. This section provides a brief overview of each service branches' stance on mentorship. Mentorship can involve a "voluntary and developmental relationship that exists between a person with greater experience and a person with less experience, characterized by mutual trust and respect" (Department of the Army, 2017). It can also serve as a way to identify talent and coach mentees into the leaders of the future, especially in situations where the mentee does not see themselves represented in leadership.

**Army (USA).** The Army endorses the ideology that "training should center on building trust, developing leaders who value differences, treating diverse individuals equitably, helping Soldiers and civilians understand their potential biases, and creating shared understanding through open, two-way communication" (U.S. Army, 2020, p. 12). The Army provides an inclusive leader development program that "ensures all Soldiers and civilians trust their leaders and have the access and opportunities to fulfill their professional aspirations and defined ideals of success" (United States Army, 2020, p. 5). The Army emphasizes that all leaders are responsible for developing and facilitating junior development through counseling, coaching, and mentoring (Department of the Army, 2017). The Army selects individuals based upon their documented talents and potential (Department of the Army, 2017).

**Air Force (USAF).** Among the Air Force's core principles of mission command are team building through mutual trust and the creation of a shared understanding of the operational environment (U.S. Air Force, 2021). A diversity-supportive climate of inclusion supports team building through trust and enhances mutual understanding. The Air Force notes that individuals

should be “able to recognize and work through their own biases” (The Inspector General Department of the Air Force, 2020, p. 106). The Air Force wants “inclusive leaders [to] build Air Force organizations, which are more capable of incorporating different ways of thinking and performing, integrating functional cultures, and combining work methodologies for more innovative, effective results” (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2019, p. 21). Moreover, inclusive Air Force leaders can “function more effectively in cross-cultural settings to produce better operational outcomes” (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2019, p. 21).

The Air Force Mentoring Program highlights that “mentoring is an essential ingredient in developing well-rounded, professional, and competent future leaders. The overall goal of mentoring is to help airmen (civilian, enlisted, and officer) maximize their full potential” (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2019, p. 3). Additionally, AFI 1-2 notes that mentoring is an inherent responsibility of leadership (Department of the Air Force, 2014). The Air Force’s *Enlisted Force Development Action Plan 2022-2023* focuses on modernizing talent management systems to include feedback methods that center around coaching, mentoring, and developing airmen from the beginning of their careers (U.S. Air Force, 2022). For example, leaders are to understand the programs and policies that support their organizations’ personnel in addition to improving the work environment to aid in the growth of airmen (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2019).

**Navy (USN).** The Navy “values diversity, equality, and inclusivity – striving to build a community of Service members who accurately reflect the rich makeup of [the United States]” (Department of the Navy, n.d.). The Navy offers training and education that focuses on objective skills and performance across all levels, from entry level to executive levels (United States Navy, n.d.). The Navy believes that inclusive leadership is the secret weapon of the

Navy's best leaders (My Navy HR, 2019). The Navy recognizes that mentoring can be both formal or informal and that anyone can serve informally as a mentor in their command or community (e.g., MyNavy HR, n.d.a). Moreover, the Navy views mentoring as most effective when there is a voluntary relationship between a sailor and an experienced superior. The Navy talent management system focuses on "increased confidence and transparency in the talent management process" (U.S. Navy, n.d., p. 23). For example, the Navy has implemented objective-based performance evaluations as a means to eliminate bias and reduce subjectivity (U.S. Navy, n.d.).

The Navy also emphasizes coaching as a leadership development skill consisting of active listening, empathy, and asking powerful questions. Coaching facilitates open, honest, and respectful communication among all levels of the organizational hierarchy. Coaching hereby provides bi-directional feedback and collaborative communication in order to foster individual growth and performance, ultimately enhancing warfighting capability and Navy lethality. In contrast to mentoring, which centers around a senior subject matter expert guiding a less experienced sailor, coaching is a joint learning approach geared at developing self-awareness with the strategic goal of attracting and retaining the best talent across the Navy through a culture of feedback (U.S. Navy, n.d.).

**Marine Corps (USMC).** The Marine Corps holds the belief that "an individual does not automatically set aside prejudices, bias, and perceptions upon joining our ranks. In order to address such bias [they] must be pro-active; [they] must establish a command climate that allows every marine to reach his or her potential without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, or national origin" (U.S. Marine Corps, n.d., p. 4). The talent management system of the Marine Corps focuses on creating an equal opportunity for success and talent (Department of



the Navy, 2021). Moreover, the talent management system requires leadership to build inclusive teams (Department of the Navy, 2021). The Marine Corps requires all marines to be mentored by a senior marine in their chain of command.

In order to be an effective mentor, *NAVMC Directive 1500.58* notes that there must be a course of action for developing a mentor partnership, and evaluations must be made on the effectiveness of said mentorship (Department of the Navy, 2013). Marine Corps commanders have the ability to:

Highlight and prioritize the specific professional and educational backgrounds they seek in their key leaders, detail billet descriptions and expectations, and articulate their command philosophies, family readiness priorities, and other information that might be useful to potential applicants, facilitating a much better match between Marine and commander. (Department of the Navy, 2021, p. 10)

*Marine Corps Order 1500.61, Marine Leader Development*, stresses coaching as an ongoing process of observation and encouragement that aims to enhance a marine's personal and professional growth via informal feedback. Coaching is viewed as a leadership skill that both encourages and demands output in order to draw greater performance from individuals and teams, thereby exceeding what they thought they were capable of (MyNavy, n.d.b).

**Space Force (USSF).** The U.S. Space Force was founded on December 20, 2019 and is actively developing its doctrine and policies. Nevertheless, the Space Force has committed to focus its recruitment efforts on those groups who have historically not been inclined to join the Service (Maucione, 2021). According to the Space Capstone Publication, *Spacepower* (SCP), it falls on leaders to establish the purpose and identity of the U.S. Space Force by instilling a unique vision, ethos, and values; leaders must balance mission execution and warfighter

readiness which requires leaders to be “intimately familiar with the strengths, weaknesses, and organizational climate of the forces under their care” (Maucione, 2021, p. 55). SCP further emphasizes that leadership is instrumental in influencing organizational culture, while adding that a stable culture can only flourish once the Space Force’s organizational purpose and identify are fully understood and accepted (U.S. Space Force, 2020).

**Coast Guard (USCG).** The Coast Guard provides a Leadership Inclusion and Diversity Advisory Council (LIDAC), which promotes key ambassadors in the achievement towards inclusivity, as described below:

The LIDACs are responsible for assisting their command cadre in cultivating a culture of inclusion by monitoring the command climate and promoting leadership development and diversity initiatives that create and help sustain an environment of equal opportunity for all members and a workplace free of discrimination. (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2020, pp. 3-4)

The Coast Guard provides professional and mentorship support through the use of mentoring programs (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2020). Through mentorship, Coast Guard members can have successful long-term relationships that promote employee development (U.S. Coast Guard, n.d.). In fact, the Coast Guard finds mentorship to be one of the 28 leadership competencies. The Coast Guard’s talent management system aims to “increase member opportunity while also improving recruitment and retention of those members with vital experience needed for mission success” (U.S. Coast Guard, 2022, p. 21).

### **Considerations**

There are many different ways that mentorship can take place, and a one-size-fits-all mentality for mentoring is unlikely to be successful (Gleiman & Gleiman, 2020). Successful

mentorship should take into account the individual background, identities, and preferences of both the mentor and mentee (Cho, 2013; Hinck, 2022; House et al., 2018). The social identities of both the mentor and the mentee should be vital components to consider for successful mentoring matches (Cho, 2013). There is evidence from West Point Academy to show that when female cadets are paired with female mentors, they are more likely to state that they want to follow the same career path as the mentor (Kofoed & McGovney, 2019). The same finding is true for Black cadets paired with Black mentors (Kofoed & McGovney, 2019). These findings do not necessarily mean that mentorships should be based solely on social identity, but rather that such pairings can and do have an impact on the mentee that should not be taken lightly.

The attitude of the mentor can greatly shape the experience of the mentee; for instance, when instructors in the U.S. Air Force brought hostile sexist attitudes to the training space, trainees reported ineffective mentoring, maltreatment, and possible detriments to psychological health (Barron & Ogle, 2014). A recent study of an Air Force coaching program found that “the key to the coaching experience for all instructors was building a relationship with students with trust, authenticity, and active listening” (Hinck, 2022, p. 27). Both mentors and mentees need to be prepared to go out of their comfort zone and have an open mind (Cho, 2013; Johnson & Andersen, 2015). Successful mentor relationships include mentors imparting wisdom, offering support during adversity, and opening or introducing new career opportunities (Johnson & Anderson, 2015).

When a mentorship or coaching program is done well, participants express positive outcomes; for example, 80% of Air Force members who participated in a coaching program identified it as a great learning experience (Hinck, 2022). In a study on mentoring in the U.S. Navy, the majority of participants indicated “Agreeing” or “Strongly Agreeing” that their mentor

helped them in the following ways: advocated on their behalf, helped them develop military skills, enhanced military career development, offered acceptance, support and encouragement, and increased self-esteem (Johnson & Andersen, 2015). Individuals who had mentors also indicated retention in the Service as an important outcome from the mentoring program (Johnson & Anderson, 2015).

Further, a study of officers in the Army found that “serving under a high-performing mentor significantly increases the likelihood that a junior officer protege will be promoted early to the rank of major” (Lyle & Smith, 2014, p. 250); in that study, a commander was considered high-performing if they were promoted early to the rank of major. Importantly, however, a second study in the U.S. Army found that female mentees experienced mentoring differently than male mentees: for women, advice and support was for survival in the Army, whereas for men, it was about career advancement (Portillo et al., 2022). Although both sets of groups benefitted from the mentor relationship, the fundamental difference in experience should be taken into account when considering diversity and inclusion goals.

## **Talent Management**

### **Definitions**

Talent management is the deliberate process to manage the career lifecycle by:

- building the capability to achieve the mission and organizational goals with the right talent, in the right place, and at the right time;
- closing talent gaps through a systematic process that integrates each element of the career lifecycle;

- assessing executives' 18 DoD core leadership competencies (derived from the five U.S. Office of Personnel Management Executive Core Qualifications (ECQs) and one DoD ECQ; Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service, n.d.)

Talent Management focuses on efforts to “deliberately track and develop high potential diverse talent” as well as remove “barriers to overcome to retain talent and initiatives to promote engagement” (U.S. Navy, n.d., p. 76). Senior leaders need to understand how to recruit and retain members within their units, as “teams with diverse perspectives and modes of thinking solve problems faster and more creatively” (Department of the Navy, 2021, p. 5). A strong talent management orientation can “strengthen a workforce that is adaptable, resilient, and Always Ready” (United States Coast Guard, 2022, p. 20). Each service branch has published their own interpretation of talent management. These varying interpretations are important.

**Army (USA).** The Army selects individuals based upon their documented talents and potential (Department of the Army, 2017). Moreover, individuals can continue to develop and achieve professional certification through the Army’s career management, training programs, and talent management initiatives (Department of the Army, 2017).

**Air Force (USAF).** The Air Force initiative focuses on modernizing talent management systems in order to allow for greater experience (U.S. Air Force, 2022). For example, leaders are to understand the programs and policies that support their organization’s personnel in addition to improving the work environment to aid in the growth of airmen (Department of the Air Force, 2019).

**Navy (USN).** The Navy talent management system focuses on “increased confidence and transparency in the talent management process” (U.S. Navy, n.d., p. 23). For example, the

Navy has implemented objective-based performance evaluation as a means to eliminate bias and reduce subjectivity (U.S. Navy, n.d.).

**Marine Corps (USMC).** The talent management system of the Marine Corps focuses on creating an equal opportunity for success and talent (Department of the Navy, 2021). Moreover, the talent management system reinforces leadership to build inclusive teams (Department of the Navy, 2021).

**Space Force (USSF).** Although the Space Force is in its early days, it has promised to focus on the recruitment of individuals who are not inclined to join (Maucione, 2021).

**Coast Guard (USCG).** The Coast Guard's talent management system aims to "increase member opportunity while also improving recruitment and retention of those members with vital experience needed for mission success" (United States Coast Guard, 2022, p. 21).

### **Considerations**

Recent publications have called into question some of the practices of the U.S. Military that inhibit talent management (Duffy, 2018). For instance, promotion processes can be rigid, both in how long it takes to promote and fulfill the requirements towards promotions; forced geographic moves are tough on individuals and families; and physical requirements are enforced for positions that do not need them for work performance (such as cyber security) (Duffy, 2018).

One commander suggested the following considerations for change in the U.S. Military:

Allow strong performers to stay in their positions without forcing them to promote; expand opportunities to stay in a geographic area; allow flexibility to leave the organization to pursue novel opportunities, and come back in at the same rank; remove restrictions on service for the physically disabled. (Duffy, 2018, p. 23)

There has already been some movement within the Army to provide greater transparency about job opportunities and placements for soldiers (Whitfield & Crozier, 2022).

One long-held belief in the Military is that a good leader can work with anyone, and therefore leaders are often unable to have any say in who reports to them (Shivashankar, 2018). There may be merit in reconsidering that policy for certain positions and allowing operational leaders to have a voice in selecting personnel (Shivashankar, 2018). This change would allow leaders to gain skills in hiring and decision making (Shivashankar, 2018). However, such changes should be carefully debated and implemented, due to concerns of hiring bias based on gender, race, or other social identities (Moore, Livingston, & Susskind, 2022; Nandigama et al., 2021; Parasurama, 2022). Consideration should also be given to the compensation system at large; one set of authors suggests re-evaluating the total benefits (including non-cash benefits) and promotion tables, as well as the needs of those serving in order to compete with talent in the private sector (Wallace et al., 2015).

Other considerations for talent management include ensuring that leadership develops strong relationships with those under their command and communicates with each individual member about their talents and how they can best be utilized (Eger, 2018). Further, individuals need to have the right experience for a particular position before being asked to carry out the associated tasks (Piggee, 2018). In order to gain the necessary skills, mentorship will help soldiers develop strong values that will give them the integrity needed to lead teams (Piggee, 2018). One very specific policy related to talent management is that of the U.S. Marine Corps' Body Composition and Military Appearance Program (BCMAP) standards (Gaudry Hanie et al., 2022). A recent study by the RAND Corporation found that the BCMAP standards were not designed for the diversity of the current USMC (particularly for people of color and women) and

are leading to unhealthy eating habits and behaviors, including disordered eating (Gaudry Hanie et al., 2022). Such a practice has a strong possibility of impacting talent management because of retention concerns (Gaudry Hanie et al., 2022).

## **Inclusive Leadership**

### **Definition**

A framework that can inform leadership accountability as it relates to D&I is inclusive leadership. Inclusive leadership means fully adopting the lens and practice of inclusion (Ferdman & Deane, 2014) in a manner that transforms mindsets, behaviors, and collective practices to fully benefit from our many differences (Ferdman et al., 2020). In the human resource literature, the term inclusive leadership is defined by Shore et al. (2011) as “the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness” (p. 1265).

Inclusive military leadership develops and implements a strategic accountability framework that is based on the needs of the DoD (DoD, n.d.). Senior leaders who embody inclusive leadership can identify the needed conditions for systemic change, along with associated challenges and opportunities, and put those changes into practice. Inclusive leadership transcends cultural competence and management of diversity. Senior leaders are to create and foster conditions that make everyone feel psychologically safe, fairly treated, and appreciated so each unique team member can be and do their best (Ferdman et al., 2020).

Inclusive leadership in a diverse work environment is associated with a variety of positive outcomes such as empowerment (Hollander, 2009), psychologically safe work environments (Edmondson, 1999), and improved learning and performance (Hirak et al., 2012).



Catalyst's (2022) report on inclusive leadership across 352 large corporations in the United States found that, while inclusive experiences are beneficial for both employees and employers, fewer than half of employees reported experiences of inclusion. Among those who had positive experiences of inclusion at work, 52% attributed these experiences to their managers' inclusive leadership behavior. Leaders have the opportunity to provide inclusion experiences by engaging in inclusive leadership behavior.

Traditional leadership approaches often reinforce systemic, institutionalized beliefs that can be a barrier to truly inclusive environments. When working toward creating accountability around inclusion and diversity efforts, the associated accountability frameworks must be inclusive in nature and remain responsive to the needs of all stakeholders in the organization. Accountability systems should aim at creating a climate of psychological safety and trust that fosters a sense of diversity across the organization (Corley, 2020).

### **Key Features of Inclusive Leadership**

Person et al. (2015) define inclusion as having the following eight dimensions: purpose, trust, appreciation of individual attributes, sense of belonging, access to opportunity, equitable reward and recognition, cultural competence, and respect. Inclusive leadership addresses these dimensions as follows:

- Inclusive leadership is relationship-based with the leaders focusing on meeting the needs of employees and being available to employees (Hollander, 2009).
- Inclusive leaders are open, available, and accessible in their interactions with followers (Carmeli et al., 2010).
- Inclusive leadership promotes experiences of inclusion (Nishii & Leroy, 2022).

- Inclusive leadership ensures individuals can bring their full self to work and feel like they belong and are valued for their contributions (Ferdman, 2014).

### **Inclusive Leadership Behaviors**

Ferdman (2020, pp. 19-20) recommends the following leadership behaviors while emphasizing that the overarching goals of inclusive leadership are to foster fairness and equity across multiple identities:

1. Hold yourself and others accountable for creating an inclusive culture.
2. Invite engagement and dialogue.
3. Model bringing one's whole self to work and give permission for and encouragement to others to do so.
4. Foster transparent decision making.
5. Understand and engage with resistance.
6. Understand and talk about how inclusion connects to the mission and vision.

### **Inclusive Leadership in the Military**

Although each branch of service has their own definition of leadership, which involves influencing others to accomplish a mission (Malik, 2016), in order to be considered effective, individuals must be able to adapt their leadership style to meet mission, personnel, and environmental demands. Inclusion in military leadership might include such things as being sensitive to U.S. citizenship status, finding blind spots, listening and engaging in dialogue, building the team, encouraging team collaboration, and providing recognition to team members when deserved (Gosby Smith, 2020). Inclusive leadership also involves a cross-cultural component, especially in missions overseas (Hajjar, 2010; Masakowski, 2017). Cross-cultural competency as a component of inclusive leadership is required for an effective military force to

1) ensure a cohesive force made up of diverse individuals from the United States and 2) develop military plans with an understanding of other cultures (Hajjar, 2010). Several branches provided additional insights on their commitment to inclusive leadership and are discussed in the below paragraph.

The United States Army (2020) states that commanders and leaders should be “inclusive in their decisions, actions, and missions which enable access, opportunity, and choice for the total force” (p. 4). Additionally, the Army (2020) provides a Leadership Development Program to cultivate trust in leadership, as well as professional development opportunities. The United States Air Force (2019) discusses inclusive leaders as those who incorporate “different ways of thinking and performing...combining work methodologies for more innovative, effective results” (p. 21). The Navy proclaims that “inclusive leadership is the secret weapon of the Navy’s best leaders” (MyNavy HR, 2019). Finally, the Coast Guard’s Leadership Inclusion and Diversity Council plays a role in creating a positive work environment through initiatives to ensure inclusion, anti-discrimination, and harassment (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2020).

### **Impacts of Inclusive Leadership on DEI**

Strong leaders with inclusive practices are paramount to the success of an organization. In order for employees to feel included, they need a supervisor who dedicates time and resources to cultivating a strong, positive relationship with them (Brimhall et al., 2017) and an organization that is sensitive to the needs of its employees (Jin et al., 2017). When employees do feel included, their job satisfaction rises, which in turn lowers their desire to leave the organization (Brimhall et al., 2014; Liggans et al., 2019; Chung et al., 2021). One model suggests that a focus on inclusive leadership can lower the risk of sexual harassment (Perry et al., 2021). When leaders practice uniqueness and belonging, it increases perceptions of work group performance,

especially among minorities (Jin et al., 2017). Further, such practices support employees in feeling that employment decisions and assessments are fair processes because they believe in the good intentions of the leadership (Hoang et al., 2022). An inclusive climate can also lead to an increase in innovative practices and job satisfaction (Brimhall, 2019).

A ripple effect in leadership practices has been documented, where inclusive leaders encourage those under them to be inclusive in their practices as well (Rice & Young, 2021). Middle managers tend to follow the lead of those in upper-management, so if upper-management demonstrates inclusive leadership, those under will do so as well, and “they [will] work to make other organizational members feel valued and welcome” (Rice & Young, 2021, p. 11). The opposite is also true: “if managers engage in abusive management, supervisors are less likely to lead inclusively” (Rice & Young, 2021, p. 11). Unsurprisingly, “supervisory display of hostility toward subordinates is likely to be experienced as an unwelcoming and marginalizing experience” (Rice et al., 2020, p. 610).

Failure to incorporate inclusive practices can lead to negative outcomes, such as discrimination and unhappy employees. Discrimination in the workplace is associated with poor outcomes: “results show that perceived racial discrimination at work is negatively related to job attitudes, physical health, psychological health...and diversity climate” (Triana et al., 2015, p. 502). If leaders of organizations do not fully buy into inclusion and inclusive leadership practices, it can lead to leaders seeming ingenuine and alienating employees (Buengeler et al., 2018). Ineffective leadership may also result in employees of color being asked to shoulder the burden of educating others in the workplace about their own oppression (McShannon, 2021). Failures to build and actively promote a culture of inclusion may also result in feelings of rejection and ostracism, which in turn lowers workforce self-esteem, sense of belonging, positive

affect, and even their health via stress (e.g., Williams, 2007). When leaders do not choose to practice inclusive leadership, the climate of inclusion takes a hit.

### **Conclusions**

The topics covered in this brief are only a small sample of subjects that may be of further interest to senior leaders within the United States Military. Topics such as these can be introduced to provide a starting point for discussion and change management. The climate related to diversity and inclusion is constantly shifting and evolving, requiring leadership to stay informed about current trends. Knowledge of current trends and the ability for senior leaders to be proactive will allow for a bright outlook for Service members now and in the future.

### References

- Agrawal, R., Williams, K., & Miller, B. J. (2020). An assessment of student moral development at the National Defense University: Implications for ethics education and moral development for senior government and military leaders. *Journal of Military Ethics, 19*(4), 312–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2021.1881217>
- American Psychological Association. (2015). Guidelines for psychological practice with transgender and gender nonconforming people. *American Psychologist, 70*, 832–864.
- American Psychological Association. (2023). *APA dictionary of psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/perception>
- Barron, L. G., & Ogle, A. (2014). Individual differences in instructor attitudes underlying maltreatment and effective mentoring in basic military training. *Military Psychology, 26*(5–6), 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mil0000053>
- Beane, D., Ponnappalli, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2017). Workplace Religious Displays and Perceptions of Organization Attractiveness. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 29*(2), 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-016-9286-9>
- Bennett, J., Pitt, M., & Price, S. (2021). Understanding the impact of generational issues in the workplace. *Facilities, 30*(7/8), 278–288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02632771211220086>
- Bergsieker, H., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(2), 248–264.
- Bettencourt, B., & Bartholomew, B. D. (1998). The importance of status legitimacy for intergroup attitudes among numerical minorities. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 759–775. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01247.x>

- Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(3), 242–261.
- Bosson, J. K., Buckner, C. E., & Vandello, J. A. (2021). *The Psychology of Sex and Gender*. SAGE.
- Brimhall, K. C. (2019). Inclusion Is Important . . . But How Do I Include? Examining the Effects of Leader Engagement on Inclusion, Innovation, Job Satisfaction, and Perceived Quality of Care in a Diverse Nonprofit Health Care Organization. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 48(4), 716–737. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019829834>
- Brimhall, K. C., Lizano, E. L., & Mor Barak, M. E. (2014). The mediating role of inclusion: a longitudinal study of the effects of leader-member exchange and diversity climate on job satisfaction and intention to leave among child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 40, 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.003>
- Brimhall, K. C., Mor Barak, M. E., Hurlburt, M., McArdle, J. J., Plankas, L., & Henwood, B. (2017). Increasing Workplace Inclusion: The Promise of Leader- Member Exchange. *Administration in Social Work*, 41(3), 222–239.
- Breslin, R. A., Davis, L., Hylton, K., Hill, A., Klauberg, W., Petusky, M., & Klahr, A. (2019). *2018 Workplace and Gender Relations of Active Duty Members: Overview Report* (OPA Report No. 2019-027). Office of People Analytics, U.S. Department of Defense. Retrieved from <https://www.opa.mil/research-analysis/health-well-being/gender-relations/2018-workplace-and-gender-relations-survey-of-active-duty-members/2018-workplace-and-gender-relations-survey-of-active-duty-members-overview-report/>
- Breslin, R. A., Klahr, A., Hylton, K., White, A., Petusky, M., & Sampath, S. (2022). *2021 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Military Members: Overview Report* (OPA

- Report No. 2022-182). Office of People Analytics, U.S. Department of Defense.  
Retrieved from <https://www.opa.mil/research-analysis/health-well-being/gender-relations/2021-workplace-and-gender-relations-survey-of-military-members-reports/2021-workplace-and-gender-relations-survey-of-military-members-overview-report/>
- Buengeler, C., Leroy, H., & De Stobbeleir, K. (2018). How Leaders Shape the Impact of HR's Diversity Practices on Employee Inclusion. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(3), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.02.005>
- Burgess, D., van Ryn, M., Dovidio, J., & Saha, S. (2007). Reducing racial bias among health care providers: Lessons from social-cognitive psychology. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(6), 882–887.
- Burks D. J. (2011). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual victimization in the military: An unintended consequence of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell?” *American Psychologist*, 66(7), 604–613. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024609>
- Byrne, D. E. (1972). The attraction paradigm. *Behavior Therapy*, 3(2), 337–338.
- Carey, F. R., Jacobson, I. G., Lehavot, K., LeardMann, C. A., Kolaja, C. A., Stander, V. A., & Rull, R. P. (2022). Military service experiences and reasons for service separation among lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals in a large military cohort. *BMC public health*, 22(1), 1–13.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22, 250–260.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2010.504654>



Catalyst. (2022, September 19). *Getting real about inclusive leadership – United States report.*

<https://www.catalyst.org/research/united-states-inclusive-leadership-workplace-experience/>

Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2017). *The talent delusion: Why data, not intuition, is the key to unlocking human potential.* Piatkus.

Cho, H. J. (2013). Mentoring & diversity. *The Armed Forces Comptroller*, 58(4), 17–19.

Chung, B. C., Dean, M. A., & Holcombe, K. (2021). Inclusion values, practices and intellectual capital predicting organizational outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 50(2), 709–730.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2019-0352>

Corley, T. (2020). Creating accountability for inclusive, responsive leadership: to make inclusion a cultural reality, organizations must examine how diversity and leadership can and should work together. *People & Strategy*, 43(1), 28–34.

Darr, C. R. (2016). Debating Diversity: Ethics and Controversial Public Issues. *Communication Teacher*, 30(3), 147–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2016.1192660>

Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service. (n.d.). *Talent management – talent management and succession planning – executive resources.*

<https://www.dcpas.osd.mil/executiveresources/talentmanagementsuccession/talentmanagement>

Department of Defense. (n.d.). *Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Strategic Plan*

*Fiscal Years 2022-2023.* Retrieved February 6, 2023, from

[https://diversity.defense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/DoD%20DEIA%20Strategic%20Plan%20-%20FINAL.pdf?ver=3nYAnV3qlqR2y4wDPK1sUw%3d%3dDepartment of the](https://diversity.defense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/DoD%20DEIA%20Strategic%20Plan%20-%20FINAL.pdf?ver=3nYAnV3qlqR2y4wDPK1sUw%3d%3dDepartment%20of%20the)

- Air Force. (2014). Air Force Instruction (AFI) 1-2: Commander's Responsibilities. [https://www.af.mil/Portals/1/documents/csaf/afi1\\_2.pdf](https://www.af.mil/Portals/1/documents/csaf/afi1_2.pdf)
- Department of the Army. (2017, April 5). Army Profession and Leadership Policy (Army Regulation 600-100). [https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR\\_pubs/DR\\_a/pdf/web/ARN3758\\_AR\\_600-100\\_FINAL\\_WEB\\_.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN3758_AR_600-100_FINAL_WEB_.pdf)
- Department of the Navy. (n.d.). Navy Diversity & Equity. Retrieved February 6, 2023, from <https://www.navy.com/who-we-are/diversity#:~:text=America's%20Navy%20values%20diversity%2C%20equality,be%20successful%20in%20the%20Navy.>
- Department of the Navy. (2013). NAVMC Directive 1500.58. Marine Corps Mentoring Program (MCMP) Guidebook. <https://www.marines.mil/Portals/1/Publications/NAVMC%20DIR%201500.58.pdf>
- Department of the Navy. (2021). Talent Management 2030. [https://www.hqmc.marines.mil/Portals/142/Users/183/35/4535/Talent%20Management%202030\\_November%202021.pdf](https://www.hqmc.marines.mil/Portals/142/Users/183/35/4535/Talent%20Management%202030_November%202021.pdf)
- Devine, P. (2015, November 13). *Patricia Devine on Kicking the Prejudice Habit* [Video]. YouTube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OqRl3\\_m5WM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OqRl3_m5WM)
- Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1267–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003>
- Duffy, K. (2018). Improving military talent management: How to recruit and retain the best talent. *Diplomatic Courier, 12*, 22–23.

- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Eger, D. (2018). Leader development and talent management: A perfect combination. *Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin*, 44(2), 18–25.
- Esper, M. T. (2020). *Immediate actions to address diversity, inclusion and equal opportunity in the military services* [Memorandum]. [https://media.defense.gov/2020/Jul/15/2002457268/-1/1/1/Immediate\\_Actions\\_to\\_Address\\_Diversity\\_Inclusion\\_Equal\\_Opportunity\\_in\\_Military\\_Services.pdf](https://media.defense.gov/2020/Jul/15/2002457268/-1/1/1/Immediate_Actions_to_Address_Diversity_Inclusion_Equal_Opportunity_in_Military_Services.pdf)
- Eveland, W. P., & Appiah, O. (2021). A National Conversation About Race? Political Discussion Across Lines of Racial and Partisan Difference. *Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics*, 6(1), 187–213. <https://doi.org/10.1017/rep.2019.36>
- Ferdman, B. M. (2014). The practice of inclusion in diverse organizations: Toward a systemic and inclusive framework. In B. M. Ferdman & B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 3–54). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118764282.ch1>
- Ferdman, B. M. (2020). Inclusive leadership – the fulcrum of inclusion. In B.M. Ferdman, J. Prime & R.E. Riggio (Eds.), *Inclusive leadership: transforming diverse lives, workplaces, and societies* (pp. xxvii- xxxii). Taylor & Francis.
- Ferdman, B. M., & Deane, B. R. (2014). Preface—Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion. In B. M. Ferdman & B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: the practice of inclusion* (pp. xxi–xxxii). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ferdman, B. M., Prime, J., & Riggio R. E. (2020). Preface and overview inclusive leadership.

In B.M. Ferdman, J. Prime & R.E. Riggio (Eds.), *Inclusive leadership: transforming diverse lives, workplaces, and societies* (pp. xxvii- xxxii). Taylor & Francis.

Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social Cognition*. International Edition. McGraw-Hill Series in Social Psychology.

Forscher, P. S., Lai, C. K., Axt, J. R., Ebersole, C. R., Herman, M., Devine, P. G., & Nosek, B.

A. (2019). A Meta-analysis of procedures to change implicit measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117*(3), 522–559.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000160>

Gall, T. L., Malette, J., & Guirguis-Younger, M. (2011). Spirituality and Religiousness: A Diversity of Definitions. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health, 13*(3), 158–181.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19349637.2011.593404>

Gaudry Hanie, J., Fleming, J., Revitsky Locker, A., & Shih, A. (2022). Impacts of Marine Corps body composition and military appearance program (BCMAP) standards on individual outcomes and talent management. *Rand Health Quarterly, 9*(4), 1–90.

Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.1.21>

Gleiman, A., & Gleiman, J. K. (2020). Mentoring in the military. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 167–168*, 59–69.

Gopaldas, A. (2013). Intersectionality 101. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 32*(1), 90–94. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.12.044>

- Gosby Smith, J. (2020). Peak moments of inclusion among brothers and sisters in arms. In B.M. Ferdman, J. Prime & R.E. Riggio (Eds.), *Inclusive leadership: Transforming diverse lives, workplaces, and societies* (pp. 248–275). Taylor & Francis.
- Hajjar, R. M. (2010). A New Angle on the U.S. Military's Emphasis on Developing Cross-Cultural Competence: Connecting In-Ranks' Cultural Diversity to Cross-Cultural Competence. *Armed Forces and Society*, 36(2), 247–263.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X09339898>
- Harrison, L. M., & Williams-Cumberbatch, H. (2022). Forum: Challenging Students to Engage Meaningfully Across Ideological Differences. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 20(1), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15413446211062375>
- Héliot, Y., Gleibs, I. H., Coyle, A., Rousseau, D. M., & Rojon, C. (2020). Religious Identity in the Workplace: A Systematic Review, Research Agenda, and Practical Implications. *Human Resource Management*, 59(2), 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21983>
- Henderson, M. M., Simon, K. A., & Henicheck, J. (2018). The Relationship Between Sexuality-Professional Identity Integration and Leadership in the Workplace. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 5(3), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000277>
- Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of social issues*, 63(4), 905–925.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 575–604. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135109>
- Hill Collins, P. (2015). Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>

- Hinck, J. M. (2022). Leadership Coaching as a Transformative Process in the Military. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 20(1), 20–34. <https://doi.org/10.24384/6cf9-v073>
- Hinton, A. O., Jr., Vue, Z., Termini, C. M., Taylor, B. L., Shuler, H. D., & McReynolds, M. R. (2020). Mentoring minority trainees: Minorities in academia face specific challenges that mentors should address to instill confidence. *EMBO reports*, 21(10), e51269. <https://doi.org/10.15252/embr.202051269>
- Hirak, R., Peng, A. C., Carmeli, A., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2012). Linking leader inclusiveness to work unit performance: The importance of psychological safety and learning from failures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(1), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.11.009>
- Hoang, T., Suh, J., & Sabharwal, M. (2022). Beyond a Numbers Game? Impact of Diversity and Inclusion on the Perception of Organizational Justice. *Public Administration Review*, 82(3), 537–555. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13463>
- Hollander, E. (2009). *Inclusive leadership: The essential leader-follower relationship*. Routledge.
- Holloway, I. W., Green, D., Pickering, C., Wu, E., Tzen, M., Goldbach, J. T., & Castro, C. A. (2021). Mental health and health risk behaviors of active duty sexual minority and transgender service members in the United States military. *LGBT Health*, 8(2), 152–61. <https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2020.0031>
- House, S. C., Spencer, K. C., & Pfund, C. (2018). Understanding How Diversity Training Impacts Faculty Mentors' Awareness and Behavior. *International Journal of Mentoring*

- and Coaching in Education*, 7(1), 72–86. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2017-0020>
- Huebner, D. M., Rebchook, G. M., & Kegeles, S. M. (2004). Experiences of harassment, discrimination, and physical violence among young gay and bisexual men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(7), 1200–1203.
- Jin, M., Lee, J., & Lee, M. (2017). Does Leadership Matter in Diversity Management? Assessing the Relative Impact of Diversity Policy and Inclusive Leadership in the Public Sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), 303–319. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2015-0151>
- Johnson, W. B., & Andersen, G. R. (2015). Mentoring in the U.S. Navy: Experiences and attitudes of senior navy personnel. *Naval War College Review*, 68(3), 76–90.
- Jones, P. E., & Roelofsma, P. H. M. P. (2000). The potential for social contextual and group biases in team decision-making: Biases, conditions and psychological mechanisms. *Ergonomics*, 43(8), 1129–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130050084914>
- Jones, J. (2022, February 17). LBGT identification in U.S. ticks up to 7.1%. *Gallup*. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/389792/lgbt-identification-ticks-up.aspx>
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1973). On the psychology of prediction. *Psychological Review*, 80(4), 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034747>
- Kaufmann, H. R., Englezou, M., & García-Gallego, A. (2014). Tailoring Cross-Cultural Competence Training. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 56(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.21594>

- Kim, R., Roberson, L., Russo, M., & Briganti, P. (2019). Language Diversity, Nonnative Accents, and Their Consequences at the Workplace: Recommendations for Individuals, Teams, and Organizations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 55(1), 73–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886318800997>
- Kofoed, M. S., & McGovney, E. (2019). The effect of same-gender or same-race role models on occupation choice: Evidence from randomly assigned mentors at west point. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 54(2), 430–467. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.54.2.0416.7838R1>
- Ladegaard, H. J. (2011). ‘Doing Power’ at Work: Responding to Male and Female Management Styles in a Global Business Corporation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1), 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.006>
- Liggans, G., Attoh, P. A., Gong, T., Chase, T., Russell, M. B., & Clark, P. W. (2019). Military Veterans in Federal Agencies: Organizational Inclusion, Human Resource Practices, and Trust in Leadership as Predictors of Organizational Commitment. *Public Personnel Management*, 48(3), 413–437. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026018819025>
- Loo, M. K. L. (2017). Spirituality in the Workplace: Practices, Challenges, and Recommendations. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 45(3), 182–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164711704500303>
- Lyle, D. S., & Smith, J. Z. (2014). The effect of high-performing mentors on junior officer promotion in the US Army. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 32(2), 229–258. <https://doi.org/10.1086/673372>
- Mahmoud, A. B., Fuxman, L., Mohr, I., Reisel, W. D., & Grigoriou, N. (2021). “We Aren’t Your Reincarnation!” Workplace Motivation Across X, Y and Z Generations.



- International Journal of Manpower*, 42(1), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2019-0448>
- Malik, S. Z., Saleem, M., & Naeem, R. (2016). Effect of leadership styles on organizational citizenship behaviour in employees of telecom sector in Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 54(2), 385–406.
- Marine Corps. (n.d.). Standards of Conduct DG (B130129XQ-DM) Student Handout. <https://www.trngcmd.marines.mil/Portals/207/Docs/TBS/Phase%200/B130129XQ-DM%20Standards%20of%20Conduct%20DG.pdf>
- Mark, K. M., McNamara, K. A., Gribble, R., Rhead, R., Sharp, M. L., Stevelink, S. A., Schwartz, A., Castro, C., & Fear, N. T. (2019). The health and well-being of LGBTQ serving and ex-serving personnel: a narrative review. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 31(1), 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540261.2019.1575190>
- Martinez, E. K., Berkshire Hearit, L., Banerji, D., Gettings, P. E., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2018). Raising Awareness of Campus Diversity and Inclusion: Transformationally Teaching Diversity through Narratives of Campus Experiences and Simulated Problem Solving. *Communication Teacher*, 32(1), 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2017.1372618>
- Masakowski, Y. R. (2017). Inclusive leadership and the dynamics of multinational military operations. In *Global and Culturally Diverse Leaders and Leadership* (pp. 233–249). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Maucione, S. (2021). *Space Force's talent management system focuses on development, work-life balance*. Federal News Network. <https://federalnewsnetwork.com/space-operations/2021/09/space-forces-talent-management-system-focuses-on-development-work-life-balance/>

- McMurray, A. J., & Simmers, C. A. (2020). The Impact of Generational Diversity on Spirituality and Religion in the Workplace. *Vision, 24*(1), 70–80.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262919884841>
- McNamara, K. A., Gribble, R., Sharp, M. L., Alday, E., Corletto, G., Lucas, C. L., Castro, C. A., Fear, N. T., Goldbach, J. T., & Holloway, I. W. (2021). Acceptance matters: Disengagement and attrition among LGBT personnel in the U.S. military. *Journal of Military, Veteran and Family Health, 7*(S1), 76-89. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jmvfh-2021-0017>
- McShannon, S. (2021). *Are you doing enough for diversity, equity, and inclusion?* BenefitsPRO. <https://www.benefitspro.com/2021/06/01/are-you-doing-enough-for-diversity-equity-and-inclusion/?slreturn=20221101091123>
- Meadows, S. O., Engel, C. C. Engel, Collins, R. L., Beckman, R. L., Cefalu, M., Hawes-Dawson, J., Waymouth, M., Kress, A. M., Sontag-Padilla, L., Ramchand, R., & Williams, K. M. (2018). *2015 Department of Defense Health Related Behaviors Survey (HRBS)*. RAND Corporation.  
[https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR1695.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1695.html).
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(5), 674–697. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Moody, R. L., Savarese, E., Gurung, S., Rendina, H. J., & Parsons, J.T. (2020). The mediating role of psychological distress in the association between harassment and alcohol use among lesbian, gay, and bisexual military personnel. *Substance Use & Misuse, 55*(12), 2055–2063. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2020.1790007>

- Moore, O. A., Livingston, B., & Susskind, A. M. (2022). Résumé screening heuristic outcomes: an examination of hiring manager evaluation bias. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion an International Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-04-2021-0115>
- Mora, A. R. (2021). Shades in Gender: Visualizing Gender Diversity through Color Palettes. *Communication Teacher*, 35(1), 43–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2020.1797134>
- Mulki, S., & Stone-Sabali, S. (2020). Using Inclusive Language in the Workplace. *Journal - American Water Works Association*, 112(11), 64–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/awwa.1615>
- MyNavy HR. (2019). *What Senior Leaders are Really Thinking*. U.S. Navy. <https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Support-Services/21st-Century-Sailor/Diversity-Equity-Inclusion/Senior-Leaders/>
- MyNavy HR. (n.d.a). *Mentoring the Total Force*. U.S. Navy. <https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Support-Services/21st-Century-Sailor/Diversity-Equity-Inclusion/Mentoring-a-Total-Force/#:~:text=Anyone%20can%20serve%20informally%20as,Personnel%20Command%20Mentor%20Certification%20Program>
- MyNavy HR. (n.d.b). *MyNavy Coaching*. U.S. Navy. <https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Career-Management/Talent-Management/Coaching/>
- Nandigama, D., Shyamsunder, A., & Mulla, Z. (2021). Eeny, meeny, miny, moe: Hire him and let her go? Using science to reduce hiring bias. *NHRD Network Journal*, 14(2), 259–273. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2631454120987343>
- Nishii, L. H., & Leroy, H. (2022). A Multi-Level Framework of Inclusive Leadership in Organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 47(4), 683–722. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011221111505>

- Oblea, P. N., & Siaki, L. A. (2022). Looking back, a view to the future of the health and readiness of gender and sexual diverse US service members. *Military medicine*.
- Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. (n.d.). *Sexual and gender minority – terms and definitions*. National Institutes of Health. Retrieved February 7, 2023, from <https://www.edi.nih.gov/people/sep/lgbti/safezone/terminology#:~:text=Sexual%20%26%20Gender%20Minority%20%20A%20term%20used,is%20considered%20outside%20cultural%2C%20societal%2C%20or%20physiological%20norms.>
- Office of People Analytics. (2017). *2016 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Service Members*. Department of Defense.
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. (2020, September 9). *DoD Diversity and Inclusion Management Program* (DoD Instruction 1020.05). <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/102005p.pdf?ver=2020-09-09-112958-573>
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. (2020, September 4). *DoD Military Equal Opportunity Program* (DoD Instruction 1350.02). <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/135002p.pdf>
- O’Leary, K. B., & Marcelli, M. (2022). Mental health outcomes among transgender veterans and active-duty service members in the United States: A systematic review. *Federal practitioner: for the health care professionals of the VA, DoD, and PHS*, 39(10), 418–425. <https://doi.org/10.12788/fp.0321>
- Park, L. S., & Martinez, L. R. (2022). Fifty Shades of Pray: Faith Diversity Management Approaches Impact Employee Satisfaction, Support Perceptions, and Turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(6), 1103–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2626>

- Parasurama, P. (2022). Gendered information in resumes and hiring bias: A predictive modeling approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4074976>
- Perez, C. C. (2019). *Invisible women: Data bias in a world designed for men*. Abrams.
- Perry, E. L., Block, C. J., & Noumair, D. A. (2021). Leading in: Inclusive Leadership, Inclusive Climates and Sexual Harassment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 40(4), 430–447. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-04-2019-0120>
- Person, S. D., Jordan, C. G., Allison, J. J., Fink Ogawa, L. M., Castillo-Page, L., Conrad, S., & Plummer, D. L. (2015). Measuring diversity and inclusion in academic medicine: The Diversity Engagement Survey. *Academic Medicine*, 90(12), 1675–1683. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000921>
- Piggee, A. F. (2018). Why talent management? It makes units better. *Army Sustainment*, 50(4), 3–5.
- Portillo, S., Smith, A. E., & Doan, A. (2022). Up the chain: Gendered mentoring in the U.S. Army. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 734371, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X221076770>
- Pugh, R. B. (2022). *Implicit Bias and Employee Thriving Within an Organizational Culture: A Quantitative Analysis* [PhD Thesis]. Capella University.
- Rice, D. B., Taylor, R., & Forrester, J. K. (2020). The Unwelcoming Experience of Abusive Supervision and the Impact of Leader Characteristics: Turning Employees into Poor Organizational Citizens and Future Quitters. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(4), 601–618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1737521>

- Rice, D. B., & Young, N. C. J. (2021). Integrating Ethics and Inclusion: How and When Upper-Level Managerial Leadership Impact Supervisory Inclusiveness. *Current Psychology*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02460-6>
- Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 316–320.
- Sandoval, J. (2021). Connection Over Correction: Engaging Students in Conversational Commitments for Effective Communication Across Difference and Difficulty. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, 5, 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.31446/JCP.2021.2.06>
- Schuyler A. C., Klemmer C., Mamey, M. R., Schragger, S. M., Goldbach, J. T., Holloway, I. W., & Castro, C. A. (2020). Experiences of sexual harassment, stalking, and sexual assault during military service among LGBT and Non-LGBT service members. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 33(3), 257–266. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.303693>
- Sdeeq, B. M. M., Sulaiman, E. F., Hamad, C. Z., & Abdullah, Z. D. (2021). Proper Communication Styles in Educational Setting from Lecturers' Perspectives. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 3(1), 17–23.  
<https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v3i1.3855>
- Shah, A. K., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2008). Heuristics made easy: An effort-reduction framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.207>
- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Trawalter, S. (2005a). Ironic effects of racial bias during interracial interactions. *Psychological Science*, 16, 397–402.

- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., & Salvatore, J. (2005b). Expecting to be the target of prejudice. Implications for interethnic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 1189–1202.
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. R., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1262–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943>
- Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. In J. P. Mestre & B. H. Ross (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Cognition in education* (pp. 37–76). Elsevier Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-387691-1.00002-8>
- Terry, P. E. (2021). “A Bowl of Vegetables With Someone You Love”: Faith, Health and Workplace Well-Being. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *35*(7), 893–896. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08901171211030141>
- Terry, P. E. (2022). Do Faith Friendly Workplaces Increase Well-Being? *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *36*(6), 909–912. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08901171221098317>
- The Inspector General Department of the Air Force. (2020). *Report of Inquiry (S8918P): Independent Racial Disparity Review*. <https://www.af.mil/Portals/1/documents/ig/IRDR.pdf>
- The White House. (2021). *Executive Order 14035 (EO 14035): Executive Order on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/06/25/executive-order-on-diversity-equity-inclusion-and-accessibility-in-the-federal-workforce/>
- Thorndike, E.L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *4*(1), 25–29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0071663>

- Trawalter, S., Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2009). Predicting behavior during interracial interactions: A stress and coping approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*(4), 243–268.
- Trawalter, S., & Richeson, J. A. (2006). Regulatory focus and executive function after interracial interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*, 406–412.
- Triana, M. del C., Jayasinghe, M., & Pieper, J. R. (2015). Perceived Workplace Racial Discrimination and Its Correlates: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(4), 491–513. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1988>
- Turnbull, S. (2019). Corporate governance: Its scope, concerns and theories. In *Corporate governance* (pp. 415–440). Gower.
- Turnbull, H., & Greenwood, R. (2011). The Inclusion Skills Measurement Profile: Validating an Assessment for Identification of Skill Deficiencies in Diversity and Inclusion. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict, 15*(1), 11–24.
- U.S. Air Force. (2021). *Air Force Doctrine Publication 1* (AFDP-1). [https://www.doctrine.af.mil/Portals/61/documents/AFDP\\_1/AFDP-1.pdf](https://www.doctrine.af.mil/Portals/61/documents/AFDP_1/AFDP-1.pdf)
- U.S. Air Force. (2022). *Enlisted Force Development Action Plan 2022-2023*. <https://www.airforcemag.com/app/uploads/2022/01/Enlisted-Force-Development-Action-Plan-1.pdf>
- U.S. Army. (2020). *Army People Strategy: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Annex*. [https://www.army.mil/e2/downloads/rv7/the\\_army\\_people\\_strategy\\_diversity\\_equity\\_and\\_inclusion\\_annex\\_2020\\_09\\_01\\_signed\\_final.pdf](https://www.army.mil/e2/downloads/rv7/the_army_people_strategy_diversity_equity_and_inclusion_annex_2020_09_01_signed_final.pdf)
- U.S. Coast Guard. (n.d.). *Coast Guard Mentoring ToolKit*. <https://www.dcms.uscg.mil/Our-Organization/Assistant-Commandant-for-Human-Resources-CG-1/Civilian-Human-Resources->



Diversity-and-Leadership-Directorate-CG-12/Office-of-Leadership-CG-128/Programs/Coast-Guard-Mentoring-Program/

United States Coast Guard. (2022). *Ready Workforce 2030*.

<https://media.defense.gov/2022/May/11/2002994521/-1/-1/0/READY%20WORKFORCE%202030%20OUTLOOK.PDF>

U.S. Department of Defense. (2022). *Department of Defense Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2022-2023*.

<https://media.defense.gov/2022/Sep/30/2003088685/-1/-1/0/DEPARTMENT-OF-DEFENSE-DIVERSITY-EQUITY-INCLUSION-AND-ACCESSIBILITY-STRATEGIC-PLAN.PDF>

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2020). *U.S. Coast Guard Civil Rights Manual*. U.S.

Coast Guard. <https://www.uscg.mil/Portals/0/Headquarters/civilrights/PDFs/USCG-Civil-Rights-Manual-COMDTINST-M5350-4E.pdf?ver=t78ky-ihps4Qfv3il3HTng%3d%3d&timestamp=1606241049129>

U.S. Department of the Air Force. (2019). *Air Force Instruction 36-7001*. Diversity &

Inclusion. [https://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/saf\\_di/publication/afi36-7001/afi36-7001.pdf](https://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/saf_di/publication/afi36-7001/afi36-7001.pdf)

U.S. Marine Corps. (n.d.). *Standards of Conduct DG Student Handout (B130129XQ-DM)*.

<https://www.trngcmd.marines.mil/Portals/207/Docs/TBS/Phase%200/B130129XQ-DM%20Standards%20of%20Conduct%20DG.pdf>

U.S. Navy. (n.d.). *Task force one Navy*. <https://media.defense.gov/2021/Jan/26/2002570959/-1/-1/1/TASK%20FORCE%20ONE%20NAVY%20FINAL%20REPORT.PDF>

U.S. Navy. (2020). *U.S. Navy Inclusion & Diversity Goals & Objectives*.

[https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Support/21stCenturySailor/COE/Updated%20Glossy%20I\\_D.pdf?ver=NfdtsrEL5x6eK1om68R3uw%3D%3DU.S](https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Support/21stCenturySailor/COE/Updated%20Glossy%20I_D.pdf?ver=NfdtsrEL5x6eK1om68R3uw%3D%3DU.S).

U.S. Space Force. (2020). *Space Capstone Publication Spacepower: Doctrine for Space Forces*.

[https://www.spaceforce.mil/Portals/1/Space%20Capstone%20Publication\\_10%20Aug%202020.pdf](https://www.spaceforce.mil/Portals/1/Space%20Capstone%20Publication_10%20Aug%202020.pdf)

Van Nunspeet, F., Ellemers, N., & Derks, B. (2015). Reducing implicit bias: How moral motivation helps people refrain from making “automatic” prejudiced associations. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science, 1*(4), 382–391.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000044>

Wallace, R. A., Colarusso, M. J., Hall, A. O., Lyle, D. S., & Walker, M. (2015). *Paid to perform: Aligning total military compensation with talent management*.

Wason, P. C. (1960). On the failure to eliminate hypotheses in a conceptual task. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 12*, 129–140.

Whitfield, A., & Crozier, M. (2022). Visibility & opportunity: Put soldiers first to modernize talent management for the future force. *Army Sustainment, 54*(1), 12–17.

Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 425–452.

Woods, F. A., & Ruscher, J. B. (2021). ‘Calling-out’ vs. ‘calling-in’ prejudice: Confrontation Style Affects Inferred Motive and Expected Outcomes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 60*(1), 50–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12405>

- Woodward, I. C., & Vongswasdi, P. (2017). More That Unites Than Divides: Intergenerational Communication Preferences in the Workplace. *Communication Research and Practice*, 3(4), 358–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2017.1275259>
- Wormley, A. S., Scott, M., Grimm, K., Li, N. P., Choy, B. K. C., & Cohen, A. B. (2021). Loosening the Definition of Culture: An Investigation of Gender and Cultural Tightness. *Current Research in Ecological and Social Psychology*, 2, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cresp.2021.100021>
- Ziegert, J. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2005). Employment discrimination: The role of implicit attitudes, motivation, and a climate for racial bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 553–562. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.553>