

Principles 5Cs Assessment

Scoring Update

Why We Updated the Scoring

We refined the scoring and benchmark system to make results **more accurate, representative, and intuitive**.

- **Prior benchmarks were too high**, which made many organizations appear artificially “low.”
 - **The updated norm sample (>100,000 participants)** allows us to set benchmarks that reflect real-world averages across industries and company sizes.
 - **The overall shape of results remains the same**—what’s changed is calibration and interpretability.
-

How Scores Are Calculated

Each of the **5Cs—Connection, Candid Communication, Clarity, Collaboration, and Contribution**—is made up of multiple **subfactors** (e.g., Trust, Psychological Safety, Accountability).

- **Each factor score** is now a **straight average** of its subfactor scores, making interpretation simpler and more transparent.
- **Benchmarks** are derived from our updated norm sample (100K+ responses), so scores are now **anchored to population averages**, not an arbitrary ideal.

Thriving / Coping / Languishing / Struggling Framework

To make results easier to understand, each item and factor is categorized by respondent distribution (seen below). These scores comprise the experience of the overall population and are calculated in a similar way to Net Promoter Scores (NPS)—albeit, the 5Cs are a *Net Thriver Score*:

Category	Meaning	Weighted in Score
Thriving	Positive, engaged, high-functioning experiences	Weighted positively
Coping/Languishing	mixed experiences	Weighted moderately
Struggling	Low engagement & satisfaction	Counted as “ <i>detractors</i> ”

We don’t treat “languishing” as negative because the data show that this group **does not reliably predict disengagement or negative outcomes**—they are best interpreted as neutral. This makes overall scores more stable and evidence-based.

Introducing Partial Thrivers and Partial Strugglers

The new system recognizes that people near the benchmark boundaries shouldn’t be calculated as absolute.

- **Partial Thrivers** and **Partial Strugglers** provide **finer-grained differentiation**, improving accuracy—especially in smaller samples.
- This reduces the “noise” seen in previous iterations of the survey when small shifts in responses caused large changes in the results.

How to Explain This to Clients or Teams

- 1. Benchmarks are now grounded in reality.**

Scores represent where a team or organization truly stands compared to thousands of others—not an unrealistic ideal.

- 2. Scores are easier to explain.**

Every factor is a direct average of its parts, and the category (Thriving / Coping / Languishing) shows how people are *experiencing* culture, not just a number.

- 3. Small differences matter.**

The partial categories reveal nuance; for example, a team moving from 68 to 72 might represent meaningful progress in the proportion of “thriving” employees.

- 4. It's about progress, not perfection.**

The goal is to help more people move *up the scale*—from Languishing → Coping → Thriving—over time.

Key Talking Points for Coaches and Partners

- “The new scoring is more representative and interpretable—your culture scores are now aligned to a large national norm sample.”
- “Each factor score is a simple average of its subfactors—no hidden weighting or complex formulas.”
- “We’ve added nuance so we can see movement more clearly without overreacting to small shifts.”
- “When you remeasure, you’ll see not only score changes but changes in the *proportion* of Thrivers and Copers—an actionable way to track cultural progress.”