

Structural Inclusion Framework

A diagnostic system for evaluating whether inclusion operates as structure or signal.

This framework helps evaluate whether inclusion is embedded into how an organisation operates or merely expressed through language and representation. It assesses structure, not intent.

Core principle

Inclusion becomes credible when it is observable without explanation. When inclusion is structural, it shapes access, authority, and value distribution. When it is symbolic, it requires constant narration. The difference is legibility.

The framework

All components must be present for inclusion to operate structurally.

THE FIVE COMPONENTS

1. Authorship

Who defines meaning?

Who sets direction, originates ideas, and holds decision-making authority?
If representation exists without authorship, inclusion remains fragile.

2. Access

Who gets in, and on what terms?

How people enter, progress, and remain within the system.
Access determines whether inclusion is episodic or repeatable.

3. Distribution of Value

Who benefits materially?

Who receives pay, ownership, credit, and long-term upside?
Inclusion without redistribution produces recognition without consequence.

4. Operational Consistency

Do values repeat under pressure?

Whether decisions align across time, teams, and conditions.
Credibility forms through repetition, not declaration.

5. Contextual Accountability

Does the organisation respond to its environment?

How historical, social, and spatial realities are acknowledged and engaged.
In unequal contexts, neutrality reinforces existing hierarchies.

HOW TO USE + FAILURE MODE

How to use this framework

Use this framework to:

- Diagnose credibility
- Surface hidden risk
- Guide strategic decisions
- Evaluate organisations without relying on stated values

Ignore brand statements. Only observable decisions count.

Common failure modes

- Representation without authority
- Cultural reference without redistribution
- Values that change under pressure
- Context treated as backdrop, not condition

Each weakens credibility.

Rule of application (emphasised but quiet)

If one component is missing, inclusion weakens.

If multiple are missing, credibility erodes.

Structure precedes trust.