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Preface

This book was intended to create a dialogue around the question: What does an inclusive society look like, and more specifically, how do future leaders and followers personify inclusiveness?

We live in a fractured world: from widening income disparities, to religious zealots, to the polarization resulting from elections and campaigning in developed democracies across the planet. The idea that for some to “win,” others must “lose” is prevalent. We too often today glorify victors as “heroes” relegating the opposition as the “other” which we then demonize. Events such as: the Occupy Wall Street or Black Lives Matter movements; Arab Spring; the political tide from left to right in Europe; the throngs of refugees fleeing from war-torn societies; and racial strife in the United States .... all are signs that people are tired of living in a zero-sum world. This book provides a powerful antidote, revolving around new cutting-edge theories and best practices, which can be applied to transform societies into more inclusive, diverse, and democratic entities.

Every chapter in this volume is a journey into a different type of society, one with alternative paradigms and thinking, inspired by our commonalities, rather than forces that divide us. This volume is an attempt to build symbolic and real bridges to inclusion by understanding ourselves and the “other.” Instead of competition, selfishness, and control (which have supported suprastructures of racism, inequality, and xenophobia), this volume is a living testimony that a functioning alternative reality does exist. Each author contributing to this volume insightfully probes the relationship between leaders and followers as positive change agents whom together can solve the “wicked” problems facing us today and bring forth a more inclusive society. Using the lens of inclusiveness, this volume also brings a global perspective that transcends cultures, disciplines, nation states, and other artificial boundaries.
Inclusive leadership may or may not be the silver bullet to get us to a Maslowian state of self-actualization, but it definitely can be viewed and studied as a transformative formula that can drive catalytic positive change. Edwin P. Hollander (2009) posits that inclusive leadership should be seen as an interpersonal process that entails mutual relationships with share goals and a common vision of the future. Hollander’s true genius was to shift away from leader-centric analysis to a persistent focus on followership. From that perspective, he argues we need to build an inclusive culture of legitimacy through the ethical nourishing of “idosyncrasy credits” as a basis by which followers are able to evaluate the leader’s performance. For Hollander “leadership is doing things with people, not to people.” As Donald Hantula (2009) summarizes Hollander’s work, “inclusive leadership is for every man and every woman. Along a leader’s thorny journey, beauty, strength and other traits depart quickly and knowledge can fade, leaving only the leader’s good deeds, building idiosyncrasy credits among the followers and gaining their support.”

We leave the reader with some profound questions the book raises: How do leaders and followers find new collaborations to supplant or improve upon top-down or bottom-up change? How does the next generation of inclusive leaders bring better tools and new technologies to move beyond hatred and division into forgiveness and reconciliation? In the era of post-globalization, how does inclusiveness work in bringing poor and underprivileged people into the development process? Have global organizations been able to maximize diversity to create a unified and inclusive global culture? Do the effects of governmental policy outputs include all stakeholders of society vis-à-vis race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status?

These questions are just some lingering thoughts the editors and authors of this volume wish to leave the reader not only to ponder but activate upon.

THE DESIGN OF THIS VOLUME

*Breaking the Zero-Sum Game: Transforming Societies Through Inclusive Leadership* is composed of five parts and a short introduction to each section. We move from the more theoretical (Part I: Pushing the Boundaries of Inclusiveness) into a more pragmatic overview (in Part II: Trials of Breaking the Zero-Sum Game). In Part III: Spiritual Inclusiveness examines in more depth how faith and spirituality may evolve into a more harmonious
plateau using inclusiveness as a bridge to our collective souls. Part IV: Inclusiveness and Diversity in Higher Education brings together some of the best practices in leadership education and higher education administration to demonstrate how equality and justice can radiate from global campuses into their respective societies. Lastly, Part V: Inclusiveness in the Field presents several authors’ writings about very specific case examples of applied inclusivity: from village women in sub-Sahara Africa; to the work of a leading NGO, Heifer International; to a global student-based organized campaign to stop ‘blood minerals’ exported from the Democratic Republic of the Congo into our mobile cellular devices used around the globe.

These are but tidbits of what awaits the reader as one delves into the richness of each chapter of this volume. We hope the overall take-away message is that inclusive leadership and followership matters, and that this book has been a catalyst in raising core questions and awareness leading to both continued dialogue and ultimately concerted action.

Aldo Boitano de Moras
Raúl Lagomarsino Dutra
H. Eric Schockman
Editors
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Foreword

It is a pleasure to introduce this volume of *Breaking the Zero-sum Game: Transforming Societies Through Inclusive Leadership*. The chapters in this volume reflect contemporary applications of inclusive leadership. They point to ways that inclusiveness can be significant in contributing to leadership research and practice.

Over 60 years ago, I began studying what was known about desirable qualities of leader–follower relations. Those of participation, support, and information flow showed greater overall benefits than traditional top-down forms. After many decades of research, I arrived at inclusive leadership as the best way to meet most criteria for effective leadership. It is opposed to authoritarian rule, as summed up in my phrase “doing things with people, not to people” (2009, 2013–2014). The emphasis is on listening in each role. It is conceptually derived from Mary Parker Follett’s 1930s (Graham, 1996) advocacy of “power with.” It is essential to processes of emergent leadership and intended social change.

Contemplating my personal history, as I approach age 90, I delight in recalling how new concepts challenged old “leader-centric” ones, like having “charisma” that actually depends on follower perceptions. The “situational view” of leadership arrived in the 1950s. The work and views of Hemphill (1949), Gouldner (1950), and Sanford (1950), among others, engaged me. I wanted to study and understand the leader–follower relationships. Among the research techniques I used are experiments, peer nominations, and “critical incidents” obtained in writing from respondents with work experience.

In my 1978 book, *Leadership Dynamics*, I offered a practical guide drawn from what I’d learned as a leader–follower, including as a Provost. I brought out essentials of leader–follower interdependence that are distinctly “relational,” such as followers accepting a leader’s legitimacy, an essential matter, to my advocacy of inclusive leadership.
Looking back 70 years, at age 19 I served as an Army private in 1946–1947 doing diagnostic testing in a psychiatric unit. I had completed 2 years of courses at Western Reserve, then given up a draft deferment. I returned to finish, and graduated in 1948 with Calvin Hall, and Daniel Levinson as mentors. Back on duty in the Korean War, I served for 3 years as a Naval Aviation Psychologist starting early in 1951, after earning a Master’s degree in 1950 at Columbia in psychological measurement, assisting Robert Thorndike. He and four other professors named here made lasting, and appreciated, impressions on my values, and career.

Conceptually, inclusive leadership drew on the work of George Homans (1961, 1974), whom I enjoyed when on a sabbatical at Harvard, with my wife and son, in 1969–1970. I was congenial with Homans’ view of leadership through the “social exchange theory” that he propounded, stressing the “norm of reciprocity.” Also, I used “systems theory” concepts, from contact with Herbert Simon, when working on his decision-making project at Carnegie Tech (now Carnegie Mellon University) leading to his Nobel Economics Prize two decades later. In 1954–1957 I taught there. I went on leave to teach at Istanbul University as a Fulbright Professor in 1957–1958.

While at Carnegie Tech, I also started doing small-group leadership experiments, with support from the Office of Naval Research (ONR). That led to the 20-year leadership research program I directed at SUNY-Buffalo, while serving in academic and professional leadership roles, including provost of social sciences and administration and earlier, as long-time director of the PhD program in social and organizational psychology, with National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) support. Raymond Hunt and I began it in 1962, with two other faculty members, when I arrived. With a core faculty of six, and leadership well-covered, we had 72 doctoral graduates when I retired 27 years later to join the CUNY doctoral faculty. The SUNY-Buffalo program alumni include a former State University President, Dean of Social Work at another public one, consulting firm heads, and a deceased Past-President of the Australian Psychological Society among others who have had productive academic careers.

As a leadership researcher in the early 1950s, studying training “sections” of Naval Aviation Cadets, I primarily used peer nominations. Among the findings using this sociometric technique was how well even early nominations predicted future leader performance. In addition to high validity, and reliability,
nominations for leader and follower were highly correlated, and not significantly affected by friendship. In this study I did with Webb (1955), we first introduced “followership” as a term in the research literature. It was a reminder that leaders originate as followers, who showed such qualities as communications skills and dependability. I earned my PhD from Columbia in 1952, having done my courses before, and taking those in social psychology from Otto Klineberg and Goodwin Watson, both of whom were on my dissertation committee, with Thorndike. The main finding was that cadets nominated highest on leadership were not high on authoritarianism (F Scale), even in this military setting. Similar result was found with emergent college student leaders who were “moderates” on the Machiavellianism Scale (Psychological Reports, 1979).

Prior research of mine found nominations made after early contact among cadets, three weeks, highly predictive of later performance ratings as an officer. These and many other findings, with emergent leadership implications, are presented in my 1964 book. My comparable follow-up study at the Newport Officer Candidate School (OCS) found similar validity and reliability (Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968).

My interest continued in gathering and analyzing good and bad leadership from the perspective of the followers’ experiences, and their written accounts provided an abundance of findings about them (2013, 2014a, 2014b).

Eventually, other colleagues, such as notable scholars James Burns and John Gardner, came to state more about followers and their perceptions of leaders. That came about 20 years after what I termed “Idiosyncrasy Credit” (1958). That is a follower-oriented concept of what leaders can and cannot do, as a result of follower perceptions of the leader. It becomes essential in understanding a deeper sense of this symbiotic relationship. Credits can provide a leader with greater latitude for expression, including flagrant deviation.

Credits are also based upon formal legitimacy of holding an office, but can impose restraint on latitude. Gaining credits that could allow one to be a bold leader may bring about change, but not always in followers’ interests. Alternatively, failing to use one’s credits can deplete them and, it becomes a test of a leader’s legitimacy with his or hers’ followers.

Lao Tzu, in 6th Century B.C. China, wrote, “The wise leader settles for good work, then lets others have the floor… and does not take all the credit for what happens.” Trust and loyalty
regarding a leader arise from the needs and expectations of followers, and their views of a leader’s actions, attitudes, and motives.

As the field of leadership has developed, it is still dominated by leader centrum. This appeal reveals the continuing attraction of the major actor. But it reveals a failure to recognize the importance of follower perceptions and demands, as interdependent feedback operating between leaders and followers.

While “transformational leadership” also implicates system relations, it is with less follower feedback on the leader. But, Burns does allude to participative leadership, in a gesture toward inclusiveness that brings the maximum number of individuals to the common table. Top-down, non-participative leadership still prevails, perpetuating the dichotomy of those who hold power and those who do not. Transformational and inclusive leadership styles both involve moral and ethical concerns (2015), which allow for future leaders to emerge. Leader attention to democratic practice, and collective interests, is essential, without marginalizing any of the populace. A “servant” commitment, as in Greenleaf’s concept, could bring leaders and followers to a higher plane.

As the field of inclusive leadership evolved, it has gained acceptance as a standard of conduct. For example, in higher educational institutions, student participation in a share of decision processes has occurred as they serve as elected representatives, with faculty and staff, on all committees, with benefits achieved.

Taking account of diversity is another ethical responsibility. Inclusion applies as well in such practices as with “employee stock ownership programs,” board membership, constituents as voters and advocates, indeed, all entitled as “stakeholders.” Autocrats who rule with absolute authority have shown their ability to crush aspirations of social movements like Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street. Eventually, greater political legitimacy can flow from inclusive leadership, as it has evolved from age, gender, immigration status and everywhere different cultures and arenas exist.

In conclusion, seen in a larger perspective, various streams of thought have converged on the concept of leadership as a process rather than a person or state. This process is essentially a shared experience, a voyage through time, with benefits to be gained and hazards to be surmounted by the parties involved. A leader is not a sole voyager, but a key figure whose actions or inactions can determine others’ well-being and the broader good. It is not
too much to say that communal social health, as well as achieving a desired destination, is largely influenced by a leader’s decisions and the information and values upon which based, so as to “perform and inform” at both ends. When pressed on the leader’s “accountability,” consider that participative decision-making is not “weaker” for taking in information and views, in contrast to just the leader doing it alone (2013–2015).

New York, New York, October, 2016
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Introduction

The authors of these chapters show us how the boundaries of inclusive leadership have been expanded past their previous confines — not only in geographic or demographic terms but also in terms of the core ideas and beliefs of what inclusiveness means.

The notions of democratizing leadership and of servant leadership are both tied to inclusiveness and are explored along with examples of the results of their application around the world. The idea of inclusive leadership starting first within a geographic community and then evolving with different views and perspectives into more of a regional and global movement that shares values, a common background, and world view is just one example of how, in the times we live in, ideas and social movements can start anywhere and also reach everyone.
‘Beyond the horizon of time is a changed world, very different from today’s world. Some people see beyond that horizon and into the future. They believe that dreams can become reality. They open our eyes and lift our spirits. They build trust and strengthen our relationships. They stand firm against the wind of resistance and give us the courage to continue the quest. We call these people leaders’


In contemporary times, rapidly changing demographics due to increase in women and ethnic minorities joining the workforce has incited changes in how organizations address and
tackle with diversity and its frameshift processes. Other drivers of diversity across organizational workforce include disability, age, sexual orientation and race. These combine together in creating the need to appreciate both the diversity of our workplace and the world at large, especially in response to the globalization trends in the recent times (Salib, 2014).

Contemporaneously, there exists a strong shift in global economic power from industrialized Western nations to the developing East, along with the increasing population and diversity in countries like Canada, which has created complex social environments. This also has mounted much pressure on leaders to meet their respective organizational goals — while fostering the effective achievement and advancing the development of their constituents at the individual level (Bishop & Mahoney, 2009; Lugg & Shoho, 2006; Salib, 2014).

Scientific researchers and practitioners continue to debate and deliberate on the most effective means of dealing with these resultant changes on all fronts and levels. These range from the macro to the micro social consequences, such as the definition of the terms ‘inclusion’, ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusive leadership’. This chapter attempts to examine theories, models and mechanisms of inclusion and inclusive leadership (IL), as well as the effective implementation processes by which they can be made practical and applicable in organizations.

According to Langdon, McMenamin, and Krolik (2002), labour force projections that predict of greater numbers of women and minorities moving into the workforce, both nationally and globally, have prompted organizations to begin focusing their efforts on managing the effects of this demographic shift.

The Question of Leadership

Leadership has been under intense and rigorous study for the past few decades. Its importance and significance are difficult to overstate. Nevertheless, researchers and authorities do not seem any closer to an agreement on the essential underpinnings and substantive nature of leadership (MacLean, 2008). The nature of both work and the workplace, as well as people and places, has changed drastically (Billett, 2006). The recent state of corporate scandals (Wong, 2002), the increasing diversity of the workforce and the quickening pace of social and technological change
require a fundamental rethinking in leadership research (Wong, 2007).

In recent years, leading researchers have dealt on the subject of leadership in various dimensions. For example, Northouse (2007) contends that leadership is ‘a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal’ (p. 3). Bolman and Deal (2008) propose that good leaders have a clear vision, make their expectations known and direct organizations towards attaining desired goals; they must be goal-focused and keep their staff on track, despite distractions that may occur. Although a scholarly consensus on the definition of leadership has proven challenging due to its complexity, researchers, however, conclude that ‘leadership is the ability to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members’ (McShane, 2004, p. 400).

Conversely, Drucker (1993) believed that the quality of product/service and performance of managers are deciding factors of organizational success. Bass (1990), in a study, concluded that 45% to 65% of the total factors that cause success or failure of an organization are decided by leaders. Thus, it is important to note that the leadership style, theory, framework or model adopted by a leader has the key relationship with the success of an organization.

Legends and myths about the characteristic distinctions between ‘great leaders’ and ‘commoners’ have always had a huge magnetic attraction to people and societies. Bass (1990) notes: ‘The study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders, as much as it was shaped by them. From its infancy, the study of history has been the study of leaders — “what they did and why they did it”’ (p. 3). Leadership still fascinates scholars, as well as the general public. However, the term ‘leadership’ means different things to different people. Definitions of leadership vary in terms of emphasis on leader abilities, personality traits, influence relationships, cognitive versus emotional orientation, individual versus group orientation, and appeal to self- versus collective interests (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001, p. 166). Definitions also vary in whether they are primarily descriptive or normative in nature, as well as in their relative emphasis on behavioural styles (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001; Den Hartog et al., 1997). For example, leadership is described as the process of influencing the activities of an organized group towards goal achievement (Rauch & Behling, 1984),
the influence processes affecting the interpretation of events for followers, the choice of objectives for the group or organization, the organization of work activities to accomplish the objectives, the motivation of followers to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships and teamwork and the enlistment of support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization (Yukl, 1994, 1998); and in terms of a process of social influence whereby a leader steers members of a group towards a goal (Bryman, 1992).

Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, and Johnson (2011) observe that it is not uncommon for both leadership practitioners and academics to lament the range of definitions that are typically used in the literature to describe leadership. The differences in how leadership has been defined have resulted in disparate approaches to conceptualizing, measuring, investigating and critiquing leadership. For example, some authors have focused solely on the leader to explain leadership, whereas others have examined leadership from a relational, group or follower-centred perspective. To add to the differentiation that has emerged in the leadership literature, other authors have focused on examining leader traits versus behaviours, while still others have drawn from the cognition and affect literatures to explicate leadership and its effects (p. 1165).

Summarily, influence, people, group, goal and objectives are the underlying recurrent themes and concepts that reverberate in leadership theory and research studies (Bryman, 1992; Parry & Bryman, 2006). Nonetheless, far too many leading scholars recognize the reality that the concept of leadership remains in its growing stages and lacks a grand, unifying theory to provide general direction to thinkers and researchers (Burns, 2003, p. 2).

Perspectives of Leadership — A Comprehensive Review

According to Boyce (2006), the quest to classify, catalogue, sort and understand the breadth of leadership scholarship and practice is not new. The works of Stogdill (1981), Kellerman (1984), Bass (1990) and Northouse (2001) represent well-known writings that provide a broad perspective on the theory and practice of leadership, and are frequently cited in leadership literature reviews (p. 71).
St-Hilaire (2008) points out that among the copious literature on leadership theory, several overarching trends can be distinguished, sifted and differentiated. He argues that there is no agreed upon classification among researchers. However, he suggests drawing up a picture of the major trends: An early period, consisting of such well-known theories as Traits Theory, Behaviour Theory and Contingency/Situational Theory; a second period, consisting of Multilevel Approaches; the New Leadership period, which emerged in the 1980s and included both Transformational and Charismatic theories; and finally, Post-Charismatic and Post-Transformational Leadership Approaches, which emerged in reaction to New Leadership theories. St-Hilaire also contends that although the above mentioned approaches are presented chronologically, some approaches (e.g. Leader-Member Exchange, one of the Multilevel Approaches) are still relevant to current empirical and theoretical works (p. 5).

Den Hartog and Koopman (2001, p. 167) suggested that another way to view leadership is in terms of the different domains which leadership encompasses. Most approaches to leadership have been leader-centred. They also observe that one can distinguish between the leader, follower and relationship domain of leadership (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In all three domains, different levels of analysis (i.e. individual, dyad, group or larger collectivities) can be the focus of investigation in leadership research (e.g. Yammarino & Bass, 1991).

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) propose that leader behaviour, characteristics and their effects are the primary issues of concern in the leader-based (leader-centric) domain. A follower-based (follower-centric) approach would lead to hypotheses focusing on follower issues such as follower characteristics, behaviours, and perceptions or topics such as empowerment (Hollander, 1992a, 1992b; Meindl, 1990). Further, a relationship-based model takes the relationship between leader and follower as the starting point for research and theory building. Issues of concern are reciprocal influence and the development and maintenance of effective relationships (e.g. Bryman, 1992; Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001; Graen & Scandura, 1987, p. 167).

Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity has become a topical research theme in the recent past. Initially, it was dominated by a focus on the ‘problems’
associated with diversity, such as discrimination, bias, affirmative action and tokenism (Shore et al., 2009, 2011). Nevertheless, this research area has and continues to spawn numerous significant and insightful body of knowledge through empirical research undertakings (Jackson & Joshi, 2011). Interestingly, as the diversity field of study continues to evolve, researchers have adaptively poised themselves and focused on ways in which diversity may enhance work processes and organizational mechanisms that promote the potential value in diversity (Gonzalez & DeNisi, 2009; Homan et al., 2008; Shore et al., 2011). As set forth by Cox (1991) and his views on the multicultural organization, there exists a strong measure of consistency with scholars and their bid in researching ways to incorporate and integrate diverse individuals in organizations (Thomas & Ely, 1996). One of such emerging research efforts is directed towards creating work environments where people of diverse backgrounds feel included in social and organizational settings (Bilimoria, Joy, & Liang, 2008; Roberson, 2006; Shore et al., 2011).

According to Roberson (2006), the concept of inclusion has been nascent in the organizational literature for the past decade, with comparable avenues of research occurring earlier in areas such as social work and social psychology. However, while this concept has recently gained mounting recognition, as yet, inclusion remains a fairly new concept without consensus on the nature of this construct or its theoretical underpinnings. This crucial lack of consensus hampers the utility of inclusion, both theoretically and practically (Shore et al., 2011, p. 1263).

As earlier indicated, research on diversity and its extensions has concentrated on understanding both positive and negative outcomes associated with difference (Shore et al., 2009). However, according to Cottrill, Lopez, and Hoffman (2014), concepts of diversity and inclusion are fundamentally distinct but interconnected (p. 275). They posit that while definitions of diversity focus on demographic make-up of groups and organizations, the definitions of inclusion underscore systematic participation and moving beyond appreciating diversity towards leveraging and integrating diversity into everyday work life (Roberson, 2006; Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008). Additionally, some scholars opined that the concepts of diversity and inclusion are rooted in social justice, which seeks to eliminate oppressive marginalization by creating systems in which all people can participate and thus experience equality and equity in
regard to distribution of organizational resources (Cottrill et al., 2014; Plummer, 2003).

In the recent past, several scholars, through research, have accentuated the critical importance of leadership in diversity and inclusion (e.g. Cox, 2001; Podsidiowski, Gröschke, Kogler, Springer, & van der Zee, 2013). They contend that leaders of diverse and inclusive organizations must, as a matter of fact, exemplify a welcoming comfort with diversity, ensure its broad utility and application, create opportunities for dialogue about and across various divides, as well as, demonstrate strong authenticity in driving effective leadership (Cottrill et al., 2014; Wasserman, Gallegos, & Ferdman, 2007).

Thematically, organizational research literature has defined diversity in several ways. Largely, it focuses on the composition of work groups through the lens of (1) distinguishing factors that set aside individuals from one another (Kreitz, 2008), (2) observable individualities such as gender, race, ethnicity and age or (3) non-observable elemental distinctives such as education or socio-economic status (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Roberson, 2006). Resultantly, Thomas and Ely (1996) describe diversity as ‘the varied perspectives and approaches to work that members of different identity groups bring’ (p. 80). Overall, diversity has its direct implications on individual, group and organizational behaviour and performance (Cottrill et al., 2014, p. 277).

INCLUSION FRAMEWORK

In their work, Inclusion and diversity in work groups, Shore et al. (2011) defined inclusion 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). The scholars contended that even though the themes of belongingness and uniqueness were apparent in the diversity and inclusion literature, existent research had not focused on the need to balancing them in order to foster inclusion (p. 1265).

Thus, the authors advanced a framework to support their definition of inclusion. The framework proposes that uniqueness and belongingness work together to produce feelings of inclusion in people. They also suggested that that uniqueness provides opportunities for improved group dynamics and performance when a unique individual is an accepted member of the group and the group values the particular unique characteristic (p. 1265);
thus indicating that both aspects can occur simultaneously. For instance, minority members (who are unique) with developed networks (and thus a sense of belongingness) report a high level of career optimism (Friedman, Kane, & Cornfield, 1998; Shore et al., 2011).

A combination of other facets of the framework, as expressed in Figure 1, creates the descriptive results of Assimilation, Differentiation and Exclusion. For example, at polar end of the spectrum is the low-belongingness/low-uniqueness combination labelled exclusion. The authors also proposed that this typified a situation where the individual is ill-treated as an organizational outsider with unique value in the work group, as opposed to other employees or groups who are considered insiders. Some scholars argue that when the need for belongingness is frustrated, there will exist harmful cognitive, emotional, behavioural and health outcomes (Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Twenge, 2005; Blackhart, Nelson, Knowles, & Baumeister, 2009; DeWall, Maner, & Rouby, 2009; Shore et al., 2011).

INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP

Broadly speaking, diversity, while being the multidimensional admixture of people, attributes, perspectives and input, inclusion is the systematic means of making the resulting admixture work homogenously. IL, on the other hand, is the capability needed in managing the diverse perspectives and leading out the desired effective outcomes.

IL means not just accepting, but actively seeking out diverse viewpoints and making sure everyone on your team feels their voice is heard. It means not just paying lip service to concepts like equality and engagement, but actually implementing them and believing in them. Inclusive leaders ask people what they think, stop to listen to the answers and actively engage through positive participative implementation.

Hollander (2008) declared that IL is essentially about relationships that can accomplish significant objectives for mutual benefit between leaders and followers. This leadership attainment or achievement level entails ‘doing things with people, rather than to people’, which is the core and essence of inclusion. Additionally, improving decision making and achieving desired ends are part of its goals and objectives, without the sole reliance on just one person’s capabilities alone. Hollander (2008) suggested that IL also ensures a climate that installs fairness of input
Hollander (2008) also emphasized that IL can find expression in political circles, where its influence is significantly centred on the ‘consent of the governed’ and taking responsibility, as well as being accountable to them. Here, a greater degree of leader-centric notions of leadership continue to stress and highlight traditional leader qualities such as character and charisma, which in themselves have limited effects by neglecting the essential relationship with followers (p. 3).

It is to be understood that an important objective of IL is to demonstrate how followers can be actively included in leadership, with a role in an effective mutual process. Nonetheless, the primary goal of IL is to positively enhance the understanding and practice of effective leadership. It is also important to note that leaders commonly possess greater initiative. However, followers are critical for success, as they too can become leaders in the long term (Hollander, 2008). The author also stresses on the notion that leadership, at all levels, benefits from active followers, in a unity, including ‘upward influence’ on a two-way, rather than a one-way street (Hollander, 1992, 1992, 2004).

Fundamentally, this two-way operation of leadership and followership is founded on the four Rs of IL that are vital to successful practice, namely: Respect, Recognition, Responsiveness and Responsibility, both ways (Hollander, 2008). This suggests that a leader’s vision, or cognitive acumen, alone will not suffice. According to Byrne, Symonds, and Silver (1991), this phenomenon is called ‘CEO Disease’ due to shortcomings associated with power and insularity observed oftentimes in leadership that is less inclusive.

Further, Mor Barak’s (2005, 2011) inclusion model categorizes the leader as a key factor in influencing the employee or follower experience of inclusion. Correspondingly, Shore et al.’s (2011) theoretical framework of inclusion classifies leader philosophy, values, strategies, decisions and practices as antecedents of perceived work group inclusion. Overall, leadership commitment to diversity is important in diversity management (Gavino, Eber, & Bell, 2010; Podsiadlowski et al., 2013) and inclusive workplaces (Roberson, 2006). Additionally, in order to create a culture of inclusion, some authors suggest that leaders must view and treat others as unique and different, engage individuals and groups in genuine dialogue, model appropriate behaviours and
actively address resistance to diversity efforts (Cottrill et al. 2014; Wasserman et al., 2007, p. 277).

INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES

McClelland (1973) defines leadership competency as ‘a set of underlying characteristics that an individual or team possesses which have been demonstrated to predict superior or effective performance in a job’ (Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, & Maznevski, 2008, p. 64). The evolution from exclusion to IL requires leaders with global mindsets and skill sets. These global analytical skills are essential part of a global mindset that is able to use global logic for understanding the global dimensions of customers, standards, industry, competition, environmental challenges, and differences in leadership practices (Jeannet, 2000).

Jokinen (2005) defined global leadership competency as: [A set of] universal qualities that enable individuals to perform their job outside their own national, as well as, organizational culture no matter what their educational or ethnic background is, what functional area their job description represents, or what organization they come from (p. 200).

Fundamentally, IL is a team process. According to Kouzes and Posner (2012), ‘Collaboration is a critical competency for achieving and sustaining high performance. As organizations become increasingly diverse, collaborative skills are essential to navigating conflicting interests and natural tensions that arise’ (p. 218).

Global Mindset

Jeannet (2000) considers global mindset as a ‘state of mind that is able to understand a business, industry, or particular market on a global basis’ (p. 46). In Dalton et al.’s (2002) work, a global mindset is measured by an assessment of a series of cross-cultural skills (mastering foreign languages) and behaviours (extensive international travel and global assignments). The authors argued that a global mindset can lead to superior overall firm’s performance. Calori, Johnson, and Sarmin (1994) refer to global mindset as a ‘cognitive structure or mental map that allows the leader to understand the complexity of the firm’s global environment’ (p. 68). Therefore, the global mindset is a necessity for global leadership and an essential competency that aids in advancing them to achieve competitiveness in the current dynamic business environment (Konyu-Fogel, 2011).
Self-Awareness
Stein and Book (2011) asserted, ‘Emotional self-awareness is crucial for success, whatever our role’ (p. 63). Campbell (2002), in support contended that, ‘Self-awareness of one’s leadership style is an essential first step in identifying key strengths, targeting areas for improvement, and creating a successful action plan for development’. (p. 92). According to Mavrinac (2005), effective leadership development starts with self, specifically self-awareness. The author identified this self-awareness process as crucial success factor achieved through reflection and insight that will lead to development and change.

Mavrinac (2005) submitted that reflecting is a key strategy to gaining insight and knowledge about patterns of behaviour, emotions and perceptions to determine their appropriateness in relation to the context or situation at hand (Mavrinac, 2006; Schon, 1987). Effective reflection can lead to intrinsic and extrinsic change through adopting new patterns of behaviour and discontinuing undesirable ones (Argyris, 1999). This entire process is essential in the process of leadership development (Mavrinac, 2005).

Empathy
According to Geller (2000) the term ‘empathic leadership’ embodies a leader who takes time to thoroughly understand the perspective of another person before giving advice or direction (Wan, 2012). Everding and Huffaker (1998) asserted that a significant benefit to greater empathic skill, from an organizational leadership perspective, is ‘an increased ability for leaders to become aware of the similarities and differences in relationships and to acquire the capability to act on those differences appropriately’ (Washington, 2004, p. 24). Empathy is an important element of emotional intelligence (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). The scholars contended that leaders with higher emotional intelligence have deeper understanding, are more sensitive, and are more likely to have higher awareness about their employees’ feelings.

Cultural Intelligence
According to Earley, Ang, and Tan (2006), cultural intelligence (CQ) encompasses not only cultural awareness or cultural sensitivity, but also an individual’s capability for successful adaptation to new and unfamiliar cultural settings. Some authors hold that CQ is a person’s capability to function effectively in settings characterized by cultural diversity (Ang et al., 2007; Van Dyne & Ang, 2005).
Earley and Peterson (2004) assert that CQ reflects one’s capacity for adapting across cultures and for gathering, interpreting, and acting upon ‘radically different’ (p. 105) cultural cues to function effectively in another cultural setting or multicultural situation (Tan, 2004). According to Dean (2007), culturally intelligent persons can see the importance of building relationships that bridge the differences among various cultural perspectives.

Similarly, development in CQ equips leaders with a better understanding of cultural difference and the reasons for valuing cultural distinctives (Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Earley et al., 2006). Thus, CQ affords major organizational benefits as a tool for understanding, identifying, and developing global leadership (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Earley & Mosakowski, 2000, 2004; Earley et al., 2006). Organizations can thus benefit significantly by embracing CQ as a part of their global leadership selection and development programs (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Earley & Peterson, 2004; Earley et al., 2006).

Janssens and Brett (2006) declared that the principles of CQ can also guide leaders in the process of building well-performing global teams. Other researchers posit that CQ is important because it provides a useful means of evaluating and developing intercultural competency at all levels of an organization (Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley et al., 2006; Van Dyne & Ang, 2005) and enabling cross-cultural relationships and extensive team building and teamwork dynamics.

Collaborative Teamwork

Inclusive leaders are successful at building relationships at varied levels. They understand that ‘Paying attention, personalizing recognition, and creatively and actively appreciating others increase their trust in you. This kind of relationship is even more critical as work forces are becoming increasingly global and diverse’ (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 288). Researchers proposed that an important incentive for creating and developing multicultural teams is that they possess an enormous potential wealth of resources from which to create innovative approaches to complex challenges and to provide a broad range of ways to implement solutions (e.g. Distefano & Maznevski, 2000; Janssens & Brett, 2006). Another significant motivation for expanding the use of global teams is the recognition that the creative value afforded by high-performing global teams is indispensable (Distefano & Maznevski, 2000). Janssens and Brett (2006) declared that, the quality of a global team’s decisions is closely related to the degree
to which the team utilizes the members’ unique perspectives in the team tasks of information extraction and decision making.

**INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP BENEFITS AND OUTCOMES**

*Salib (2014)* categorized IL into two broad outcomes — servant leadership outcomes and inclusion outcomes.

**Servant Leadership Outcomes**

*Salib (2014)* contends that organizational and team citizenship is considered an extra role, helping behaviour that positively affects the workplace (p. 13). The author maintains that although these behaviours are not the main job or task, they support overall organizational/team functioning. Several studies suggest that servant leadership positively influences employee engagement in citizenship behaviours (*Ebener & O’Connell, 2010; Ehrhart, 2004; J. Hu & Liden, 2011; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010*).

**Inclusion Outcomes**

As discussed earlier, the theory of inclusion predicted that both creativity and citizenship are consequences of inclusion (*Shore et al., 2011*). According to *Salib (2014)*, evidence of inclusion, and the proposed model of inclusion, increasing creativity and citizenship behaviours was present in organizational research literature. By the same token, *Carmeli, Reiter-Palmon, and Ziv (2010)* also found that IL positively impacted self-reported creativity in the workplace.

According to *Cottrill et al. (2014, p. 278)*, some perspectives underscore the information-processing and problem-solving benefits of heterogeneous groups (*Mannix & Neale, 2005; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998*) and argue that diverse organizations offer the potential for greater creativity, innovation, organizational adaptability, recruitment and retention of better employees and enhanced profit and corporate image (*Acquavita, Pittman, Gibbons, & Castellanos-Brown, 2009; Holvino, Ferdman, & Merrill-Sands, 2004; Phillips, Kim-Jun, & Shim, 2011*).

Conversely, theoretical paradigms such as similarity-attraction theory (*Newcomb, 1961*) self-categorization (*Turner, 1985*), suggest negative implications for diverse organizations, such as personnel issues and financial costs due to harassment and discrimination, lower commitment, greater turnover and
inhibited decision making and change processes (Cottrill et al., 2014; Cox, 2001; Stevens et al., 2008, p. 278).

Organizational Culture and Change

Some researchers assume that change in organizational culture occurs by means of interventions at three levels: individual, group/organizational, or societal. While it is unclear which level of intervention is most effective at producing organizational change under a given set of conditions (Dansereau & Alutto, 1990), Burke (2002) concluded that change efforts are best directed at the systemic, rather than at the individual, level. This is because ‘the objective for (organizational) change is systemic; that is, some aspect of the (organizational) system is pinpointed for change’ (p. 50). Therefore, the appropriate level for examining culture’s role in organizational change is likely at the organizational level as well (Wildenberg, 2006).

According to Lijewski (2013), change is defined as moving from an existing state to an altered or different state. Hoyte and Greenwood (2006) defined organizational change as ‘a transformation which moves an organization from an existing condition to a future state that represents a targeted strategic ideal’ (p. 92). A chief component of the internal structure is the organization’s human capital. As Ian Smith (2005) stated, ‘The people in the organizations can be either the key to achieving effective change, or the biggest obstacles to success’ (p. 411). Therefore, resulting organizational change is a functional transformation of both the internal business structure and its human capital (Lijewski, 2013).

One of culture’s most evident roles in organizations lie in resisting change, with research (Campbell, 2002) demonstrating culture’s ability to hold organizational values stable, despite extensive, changes in top organizational leadership and environmental pressure to change. According to Weick (2001), organizational culture advances as a force that holds together the organization or its subgroups and increases the tightness of the organizational coupling. Such organizational cohesion protects the organization from external environmental pressures, but at the same time makes the organization less adaptable to future environmental changes. Consequently, the organization’s culture can be seen as a source of high organizational reliability, but also the source of resistance to change (Wildenberg, 2006). This is quite profound in organizations, especially, in accommodating
inclusion that extends to a section of under-represented people groups, for example, the aging, disability and LGBT communities.

According to Hewlett and Yoshino (2006), LGBT inclusion is top of mind for the business community — and not just because it’s the right thing to do. The Center for Talent Innovation’s newest report, ‘Out in the World: Securing LGBT Rights in the Global Marketplace’, demonstrates that countering LGBT discrimination makes an organization competitive in three areas, namely: Fostering an LGBT-inclusive workplace helps a company (1) attract and retain top talent, (2) woo and win critical consumer segments and (3) innovate for underserved markets.

In confronting the complexities that surround such issues, it is critical to gain the unique insights on the specific barriers to inclusion which comprehensive diversity and inclusion strategies must address as a means and way forward.

Inclusive Leadership — Why Does It Matter?

The contemporary human and business ecosystems are rife with the constant pressure of change (Anderson, 2014). This presents a significant challenge for leaders of the 21st century in every framework of human activity and social exchange. It has become imperative that surviving and thriving under the immensity of such change pressures demand the skillset and competencies that transcend beyond the norm as was readily obtainable a few decades ago. Resultantly, today, personal and corporate successes require a whole new mindset, toolset and skillset.

Ryan (2000) submits that IL is an approach in which leaders include staff, community members, students and stakeholders in organizational processes to create socially just organizations through ‘meaningful’ participation — not simply by integrating marginalized groups for the sake of the satisfying the status quo. Another researcher suggests that IL is an interactive management of diversity and difference in organizations and social exchange groups (Rayner, 2009).

Essentially, IL matters because we increasingly live in a deeply interconnected, global environment and also research suggests that inclusive organizations with diverse workforce perform better financially than those without (Shore et al., 2011). As the
organizations strive to become more inclusive, it is important that they focus on issues of inclusive climate, inclusive practices and IL.
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