Management De

Defining Inclusionary Intelligence: A Conceptual Framework with a Constructivist Perspective

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

ABSTRACT:

The aim of this paper is to examine inclusion as subjectively created knowledge individuals generate through their interactions within a social environment. The main purpose is to introduce an inclusion-related conceptualisation of intelligence by means of which an individual evaluates, understands and engages in action in a work-setting in order to achieve efficient outcomes while feeling belonged and unique in a work-setting.

Aiming at explaining a phenomenon and building a conceptual framework from the subjective perspective of a particular individual at work, such as a team member, the philosophical assumption embedded in this paper is social constructivism.

A substantive conclusion drawn in this paper is the importance of an individualâ€™s personal resources, such as optimism, resilience, self-efficacy, and positive psychology, to evaluate situational conditions, and take necessary actions, which in turn determines how included that individual feels in a work-setting. Moreover, dyadic interactions are also substantial, and one-to-one communication in every dyad is essential for the â€œco-constructionâ€ of an individualâ€™s inclusion.

A scale development effort to explore and validate a construct for inclusionary intelligence and its domains can be suggested for future research.

While management literature, in general, lays much emphasis on managing diversity in team and organisations, this paper puts stress on the perspective of the individual at work.

CUST_SOCIAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

The paper elaborates on the nature of inclusion with a social constructivist paradigm and approaches inclusion as a feeling, an experience, a subjective interpretation of oneâ€™s own position in a work-setting, and an important predictor of oneâ€™s job satisfaction and well-being at work.

Defining Inclusionary Intelligence:

A Conceptual Framework with a Constructivist Perspective

Abstract

Purpose— The aim of this paper is to examine inclusion as subjectively created knowledge individuals generate through their interactions within a social environment. The main purpose is to introduce an inclusion-related conceptualisation of intelligence by means of which an individual evaluates, understands and engages in action in a work-setting in order to achieve efficient outcomes while feeling belonged and unique in a work-setting.

Design/methodology/approach— Aiming at explaining a phenomenon and building a conceptual framework from the subjective perspective of a particular individual at work, such as a team member, the philosophical assumption embedded in this paper is social constructivism.

Findings— A substantive conclusion drawn in this paper is the importance of an individual's personal resources, such as optimism, resilience, self-efficacy, and positive psychology, to evaluate situational conditions, and take necessary actions, which in turn determines how included that individual feels in a work-setting. Moreover, dyadic interactions are also substantial, and one-to-one communication in every dyad is essential for the "co-construction" of an individual's inclusion.

Research implications— A scale development effort to explore and validate a construct for inclusionary intelligence and its domains can be suggested for future research.

Practical implications— While management literature, in general, lays much emphasis on managing diversity in team and organisations, this paper puts stress on the perspective of the individual at work.

Originality/value— The paper elaborates on the nature of inclusion with a social constructivist paradigm and approaches inclusion as a feeling, an experience, a subjective interpretation of one's own position in a work-setting, and an important predictor of one's job satisfaction and well-being at work.

Introduction

Diversity and inclusion have long been debated among scholars. Indeed, inclusion at work plays a key role for an organisation's success and in the past few decades, various strategies have been implemented to enable employees "to participate and contribute to their full potential" (Shore et al., 2011 with reference to Office of Personnel Management, 2011, p. 5). Achieving inclusion became a popular goal in many organisations today, and managers are potentially acknowledged as influential agents in maintaining successful diversity programmes in organisations (e.g. Jonsen et al., 2019). In fact, there is a substantial difference between inclusion and diversity. According to Winters (2014, p. 206), "the most salient distinction between diversity and inclusion is that diversity can be mandated and legislated, while inclusion stems from voluntary actions." To be more precise, inclusion originates in the consciously performed actions of an individual. It is, indeed, this distinctive notion what underlies the aim and focus of this paper, conceptualising and introducing a form of intelligence by means of which an individual subjectively evaluates, understands and takes action in order to achieve efficient outcomes while feeling belonged and unique in a work-setting.

Studies on diversity and inclusion in organisations overwhelmingly place management at the centre of discussion—acknowledging the issue as a problem of leadership, equality in organisations and even strategy—while relatively few studies tackle the problem from the perspective of the employee, or in other words, the very individuals themselves (e.g. Chen & Tang, 2018; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). In this regard, the philosophical assumption used in this paper is social constructivism. Applying a social constructivist paradigm to understand the emergent nature of inclusion is important because inclusion is a feeling, an experience, a subjective interpretation of one's own position in a work setting, and a vital predictor of one's job satisfaction and well-being at work (e.g. Findler et al., 2007; Ensher et al., 2001; Foley et al., 2005, Mor Barak et al; 2003). The basic assumption of constructivism is that individuals "actively construct their own knowledge and meaning from their experience" (Doolittle & Camp, 1999; Fosnot, 1996). As such, "multiple realities are constructed through our lived experiences and interactions with others" (Creswell, 2013: 36). There exists, in Doolittle & Camp's (1999) words, "a social nature of knowledge" (e.g. knowledge of

inclusion), which is constructed as a result of a set of social interactions, and this "always occurs within a sociocultural context, resulting in knowledge that is bound to a specific time and place" (Doolitle & Camp, 1999 with reference to Prawatt & Floden, 1994; Gergen, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978). In this case, inclusion is a result of an individual's social interactions—thus an experiential knowledge—and this knowledge is created via particular interactions carried out by the individual with every other individual in the work-setting, respectively. Rather than attempting to describe what is constructed through the social interactions within a team, this paper aims at focusing on how one individual, in particular, learns and constructs meanings through interactions with other individuals of the team. In this regard, dyadic interactions are an integral part of this framework as, to some extent, individual behaviour is influenced by the dyadic context (e.g. Moore et al., 2013). By extension, functionality of a team utterly depends on interactions among its members, and dyadic interactions determine the overall behaviour of the team, which, in turn, affect the individual members and, again, their interactions with other individuals (e.g. Leenders et al., 2016; Brass et al., 2004). It is also worth to note that this paper draws on the optimal distinctiveness theory. The main tenet of this theory is that individuals strive to feel belonged, and at the same time, unique (Brewer, 1991). From the social constructivist perspective and building on the key aspects of optimal distinctiveness theory, this paper elaborates on inclusion from an individual's subjective perspective and the dyadic interactions that are carried out by the individual with each and every other individual in the work-setting.

In this regard, as a point of departure, this paper suggests that inclusion stems from the intentional efforts of an individual who sorts out own priorities, seeks opportunities and takes necessary actions in a given work-setting. However, the discussions here do not intend to presume an idea that diversity of the workforce must not be advocated, nor does it promote rational thinking in a way where all individual emotions and goals are left aside while, for example, looking for profit maximisation. The paper assumes a bottom-up approach to management and suggests that change begins from within the mind of an individual, and leads to a voluntary behaviour, and consequently, to individual's inclusion. Managing diversity is critical to an organisation's success and survival; however inclusion is emergent in nature — i.e.

individuals feel included once they feel belonged and unique in the work-setting. An important practical implication is that, by recruiting individuals high on inclusionary intelligence, organisations can ideally foster a climate that ensures everyone feels valued and supported.

Accordingly in this paper, first, an elaboration on the concept of inclusion is introduced from a constructivist perspective, and then a preliminary model for inclusionary intelligence is presented. Finally, a conceptual framework is presented with key concepts and a fictional case. In doing so, an illustration is provided in order to discuss how inclusionary intelligence is substantially associated with individual drives and behaviours, and why this matters.

1. Inclusion as an individual experience

In essence, inclusion is a feeling, and it is experienced in a work group or an organisation by an individual who feels the simultaneous satisfaction of two complementing needs—belongingness and uniqueness (Shore et al., 2011; Mor Barak, 2015). Drawing on the optimal distinctiveness theory, which posits the coexistence of human needs for "being similar to others" while being in need for "uniqueness and individuation" (Brewer, 1991: 477), this dual structure of inclusion was first suggested by Shore and colleagues (2011) and was used in later research (e.g. Boekhorst, 2015; Mor Barak, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2015; Guillaume et al. 2014). Indeed, there are efforts to explain inclusion drawing rather on an individual's performance and aspiration to become a member of a group (see Roberson, 2006), inclusion, in the form of belongingness and uniqueness, most importantly focuses much more on innate capacities, talents and knowledge held by an individual.

While an individual's sense of social belonging is a long-standing topic of research, it is possible to reach a vast amount of studies on belongingness (e.g. Rupp et al., 2006; Ferris et al., 2009; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Nifadkar & Bauer, 2016). However, few studies literally discuss what meaning was actually ascribed to the concept itself (May, 2013: 78). For instance, in accordance with Miller (2003), May (2013: 78) defined belongingness as a feeling that describes an individual's connection to self, and to people and cultures in a circle. Long before her definition, Baumeister & Leary (1995) conceptualised belongingness as "the need to

4

form and maintain strong, stable, interpersonal relationships", whereas it "appears to have multiple and strong effects on emotional patterns and on cognitive processes". Presenting a more analytical definition, on the other hand, Lee & Robbins (1995) suggested three main needs as three pillars of belongingness—"companionship" as the need for feeling secured; "affiliation" as the need for establishing peer relationships in order to act together with individuals having similar backgrounds and experiences; and "connectedness", which emerges after the satisfaction of the two former needs and becomes evident in the shape of a need for building relationships with individuals around, including those with different backgrounds and experiences.

While belongingness enables individuals to self-position themselves in a group as esteemed members, it is in fact an individual's unique characteristics that play the essential role for inclusion (Mor Barak, 2015). In exchange for being accepted as part of a group, individuals may need to conceal their unique characteristics, which, otherwise, would make them look "different" among their colleagues. In such cases, it is likely that these individuals feel belonged but not included. They attend all formal meetings, have access to all resources, and even enjoy socialising with their colleagues as long as they hold their differences back, suppress them or keep them unrevealed (Mor Barak, 1999). On the contrary, in a product development team, for instance, a young female engineer in her early twenties may be praised for her creativity and talent in successfully using latest technologies, but if she is not invited to team meetings for making decisions on planning future team goals or developing launching strategies for a new product, she may feel unique but not belonged—her talent is distinctive and useful for team operations, but she cannot act as part of the team. Inclusion allows different values, perspectives, styles, and approaches at work, while it helps individuals understand and experience "identity, interpersonal interactions, group dynamics, intercultural interactions, intergroup relations and the work itself" (Ferdman, 2017).

2. Constructing inclusionary intelligence in contrast to cultural intelligence

Intelligence can simply be described as required abilities for an individual to understand and adapt to an environmental context (Sternberg, 1997; Wechsler, 1939; Thomas et al., 2015). In fact, one can say that we

are all being brought up to rely on our general intelligence (IQ) to survive our lives. However, at some point, some researchers rightfully felt the urge to pay closer attention to "the distinct abilities of perception, identification, understanding, and management of emotions" (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). In this connection, emotional intelligence (EQ) was defined as "one's ability to analyse and distinguish among own and others' feelings and emotions" (Lam & Kirby, 2002: 135; Chrusciel, 2006). The concept was introduced during the 1990s, and increasingly attracted attention among scholars in the following years. Additionally, cultural intelligence (CQ) was introduced to address, in a similar vein, the need for understanding and collaborating with others—but this time, with those who were culturally different. A fundamental definition for CQ was originally introduced as an individual's "capability to function effectively in culturally diverse contexts" (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008: 3-7; Earley and Ang, 2003). Subsequently, a revised definition was proposed by Thomas et al. (2015) as "the ability that individuals have to interact effectively across cultural contexts and with culturally different individuals". While the original definition focused on the individual's ability to function, the definition brought by Thomas et al. (2015), instead, gave attention to the individual's ability to interact. One point worth to note is that the culturally diverse contexts in the original definition seemingly centre around a work-setting in a multi-cultural country or a multinational company. On the other hand, by making reference to interactions among culturally different individuals, Thomas et al.'s (2015) definition aptly places emphasis on the essence of dynamic facts (e.g. interactions inside and outside the company with reference to both migration and global management) in the contemporary business setting.

In regard to the topic covered in this paper, cultural intelligence seems to offer a limited, yet suggestive example to conceptualise 'intelligence related to inclusion", or in other words, 'inclusionary intelligence' (InQ). This is not only because both culture and inclusion address differences at work, but also because from the epistemological standpoint, these two concepts potentially reveal contrasting perspectives applied to similar patterns.

While remaining indifferent to a possibly ceaseless debate on how and in what sense culture might shape the individual and the organisation; I believe that elaborating on a dyad with sole reference to the

cultural backgrounds of the two individuals will dismiss the true nature of their dyadic roles and their interactions. On one hand, it may seem interesting to determine an actor and a partner as an intercultural pair of colleagues and seek to explain how the actor's cultural intelligence could build a bridge between the actor's self and the partner. However, in a business setting this bridge is meant to build a sociologically significant relationship — the actor intends to achieve a particular goal, and invites the partner for a collaboration. Thus, these two individuals engage in an interaction forming a dyad. Rather than taking cultural assumptions as reference, the actor initiates the interaction with the partner to achieve a particular goal (for contrasts, see Table 1). Therefore, what attracts the actor is the selected partner's unique work-related characteristics that can potentially be directed to that particular goal. Depending on how promising the actor's goal looks to the partner, these two individuals eventually come together and start a one-to-one communication in order to achieve this particular goal.

Table 1. Constructing inclusionary intelligence in contrast to cultural intelligence

Dimension	Cultural intelligence	Inclusionary intelligence
Reasoning	Deductive, resource-based (culture is given)	Inductive, process-based (inclusion emerges)
Diversity notion	Cultures are different	Every individual is different
Dyad	Across cultures	Across two individuals
Basis of interaction	All levels – one-to-one and/or general	One-to-one, direct contact
Relationship notion	Building bridges	Socially and rationally significant
Environmental basis	Cultural context	Situational context
Reference for analysis	From culture to individual	Goal "and" individual
Argument based on	Respect (cultural) differences	Respect (individual) differences
Diversity	Diversity is good	Diversity is everywhere
Management style	Applicable to all styles	Zero hierarchy, self-management oriented

3. Inclusionary intelligence (InQ)

Thomas et al. (2015) defined CQ as both "a multifaceted" (referring to Gardner, 1985; and Sternberg et al. 2003) "and a unique construction of abilities that exists outside the cultural boundaries in which these abilities are developed". Unlike other studies, Thomas et al. (2015) avoided specifying motivation (or drive) as a facet of CQ—motivation for intercultural interaction may only have a recursive relationship with intelligence (referring to Ackerman, 1996; and Ceci, 1990), thus designating motivation as part of CQ would

not be correct (Gelfand et al. , 2008). The remaining three facets are cognitive CQ (knowledge), behavioural

CQ (skills) and metacognitive CQ. The scope and purpose of the arguments in this paper also correspond to

the idea that motivation and InQ can be related, but not include each other. More precisely, one would not

take action in order to be included, but one's goals and ways to achieve them would utterly require good

relationships with colleagues. Given the patterns in the three remaining facets of CQ and fundamental

principles of InQ in contrast to CQ, three domains can be suggested to outline a conceptual framework for

InQ, which are cognitive InQ, metacognitive InQ, and behavioural InQ.

Domain 1: Cognitive InQ

Cognitive InQ refers to the content and level of an individual's knowledge about inclusion. As suggested

by Thomas et al. (2015) and DiStefano & Maznevski (2000), this knowledge may help the individual to

assess internal logics and modal behaviours of others so as they can map themselves in a given situational

context. Thus, content of knowledge dictates that every individual is different—or more precisely,

individuals differ from each other—and these differences can be analysed by means of individual

characteristics (e.g. worldview, culture, family, education, experience, personality traits, identity, etc.). In this

respect, level of knowledge is dependent on the degree of complexity of an individual's knowledge about

inclusion.

Critical incidents and individual reactions

Work characteristics as perceived by an individual team member, in general, can roughly be grouped into

two categories. On one hand, there is a complex set of situational characteristics shaped by the

organisation's demands and expectations from the team. On the other hand, there are structural

characteristics that stem from the composition of the team as well as job descriptions, such as job

autonomy, task interdependence, goal interdependence, work load, and mastery climate. While individuals

adjust themselves to these characteristics in order to perform their tasks, they proactively tend to change

these characteristics, redefine their goals and seek ways to improve the quality of their experience at work

(Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Ashford & Black, 1996; Frese et al., 2007; Bindl & Parker, 2011). In this direction,

individuals exhibit proactive work behaviours in terms of self-initiated and future-oriented actions with an attempt to change the situation or at least make improvements by self-goal setting, job crafting (e.g. changing the flow of work or the way work is done), or using their innate qualities and strengths (Bakker, 2017; Parker et al., 2006; Unsworth & Parker, 2003, Crant 2000).

A critical incident may disrupt an individual's inclusion feeling at any point while interacting with others. In response to this disruption, the individual will interrogate his/her current inclusionary assumptions. In a work-setting, this disruption could be observed in terms of a variety of strengths ranging from being perfectly treated on the basis of relevant abilities to unintentional but unjust prejudicial treatments, micro-aggressions, and even serious acts of discrimination (e.g. Chen & Tang, 2018; Ensher et al., 2001). In other words, a critical incident results in a change that will impact an individual's inclusion feeling at a particular point of time in a particular situation. For instance, an individual may become aware of an opportunity (or may believe so) to demonstrate a particular skill or acquire a unique experience. The individual will then set a goal and share this goal with the rest of the team. When thinking in terms of dyads, however, every team member will most likely have a different opinion. In one possible scenario, a team member may not support the idea or even may take a stand in opposition to the use of this opportunity. Depending on the views exchanged during one or more one-to-one communication sessions and on the individual's perceptions, if the individual believes that the treatment was fair—in other words, on the basis of the individual's relevant abilities—the individual may find this reaction reasonable. However, if the individual believes that this was an unjust prejudicial treatment, which is not based on the individual's abilities, the individual's inclusion feeling will be negatively disrupted and the individual will question current inclusionary assumptions (cognitive InQ). In an alternative scenario, the use of this opportunity may be granted to the individual, and from this point on, the individual's current inclusionary assumptions will be positively disrupted — the individual will feel even more secure, belonged and contributing. Obviously, many alternative critical incident scenarios can be created to depict the disruption of the individual's inclusion feeling in terms of both directions (negative and positive) and a variety of strengths depending on the individual's one-to-one

interactions with each and every one of the team members. Contextual factors in relation to work characteristics as perceived by the individual are also crucial. A critical incident, in a common work-setting, is more likely to occur while the individual is in search for a self-initiated and future-oriented action (proactive work behaviour). However, a serious disruption caused by an act of direct discrimination or even harassment is also possible. Undoubtedly, organisational policies, managers and, in particular, team leaders play essential roles in order to eliminate possibilities of negative disruptions in such occasions (e.g. Shore et al., 2018; Mitchell et al., 2015). However, inclusion is not a static state but a constantly changing feeling in response to the individual's own goals and expectations and one-to-one communications with other individuals in the work-setting.

Domain 2: Metacognitive InQ

Metacognition is a higher-order cognitive process used by an individual to revise and reassess current inclusionary assumptions and knowledge, and develop a strategy for a new and elevated state of inclusion. It is usually a non linear process, whereas the individual will need to apply these steps iteratively and for every dyadic interaction. In accordance with Ang & Van Dyne's (2008: 3-7) depiction of patterns for CQ, individuals with higher metacognitive InQ levels consciously question their inclusionary assumptions, reflect during interactions, and adjust their inclusionary knowledge when interacting with their colleagues. A critical incident's antecedent may be a change in the current situation (new markets, new products, changes in organisational strategies, etc.), a change in the individual's mind-set caused by involvement in social circles or mind-bending activities (influence of a feminist friend, taking yoga classes, etc.), an advanced social engagement with colleagues (social learning from colleagues, etc.), and changing work dynamics and structure (engagement with a newcomer to the group, a new task or goal assigned to the group, etc.).

Roughly in the same direction with suggestions made by Thomas et al. (2015), metacognitive InQ functions by regulating cognition and considers use of ability "to consciously and deliberately monitor one's knowledge processes, and cognitive and affective states, and to regulate these states in relation to some goal or objective". These are indeed the "core mental processes that transcend environmental context"

(Thomas et al., 2015; Sternberg, 1985), or in other words, the situational context, in which the individual is involved.

Domain 3: Behavioural InQ

Behavioural InQ is exhibited by the individual during interactions with colleagues. It is directly related to social experiences individuals express themselves as well as understand others, and while doing this, they are socially connected to others and feel part of a social life (Smillie et al., 2015). An individual's behavioural InQ is both a data collector and a message transmitter. It feeds and is fed by the cognitive/metacognitive InQ of the individual. It produces behaviours that are customised in particular for each dyad, which means an individual exhibits a different behaviour in each interaction. Nevertheless, inclusion depends on dyadic interactions due to its emergent nature. Thus, appreciating differences between one's self and the other, and adapting appropriate behaviours in a dyadic interaction are also associated with this domain.

One-to-one communication lies in the very essence of a dyadic interaction; and behavioural InQ is at the heart of this process. As Armstrong (2002) and Follett (1925a) noted, differing interests meet whereas two individuals come together, and a confrontation rather than opposition is expected from these two individuals. In other words, an individual communicates with another individual in order to reach some kind of agreement on what needs to get done. This communication, according to Follett (1925a), should end neither with a victory of one side over the other, nor with compromise, where individuals give up a little in order to end the discussion. Instead, she suggested that differences must be brought "into the open" and must be integrated to reach the best possible end results. Integration, in Follett's terms, is a bridge between individuals, and thanks to this bridge, these two individuals are acknowledged as co-creators of a solution against the demands imposed by the situation (e.g. Kurt et al., 2014; Elias & Alkadry, 2011). Therefore, it is the knowledge, experience and other personal resources of these individuals that can effectively respond to demands of a particular situation rather than hierarchical positions. Building on this perspective, it can be suggested that a one-to-one communication in a dyad based on the agreement of both sides would ideally lead to a consensus among members of a group of individuals, or, as Follett (1925b) named it, an "integrative

unity", in a work setting. As a consequence, this integration will potentially fulfil both needs, belongingness and uniqueness, of every team member.

4. Individual member's experience at the team level

To elaborate on the experience of a particular member of a team, a fictional case is used here to represent a focal individual and colleagues and illustrate a conceptual framework with key concepts.

Jamie is a 24 year old industrial designer in a product development team. Three years ago, while he was studying at the college, he was sent to Japan to be trained as an intern for a year in an international design company. During his visit, he had the chance to work with the latest technologies in his field and gained considerable experience in integrating complex customer needs into R&D projects. Jamie now works, as part of a product development team in an electrical goods manufacturing company with its headquarters based in London, UK. There are six members on the team, and they are all male. Except for Jamie, all members are married and over 40 years of age. Jamie is the youngest, and indeed a very young member, and the only industrial designer on the team.

It is quite possible, at least in the initial stage, that Jamie can feel some sort of friendly and even elder brotherly attitudes directed towards him (companionship). It is also possible, however, that some of his colleagues may still have doubts on why Jamie was recruited to the company and joined the team. Yet, Jamie is ready to take responsibilities and serve in the interests of the team and the company. He adapts to instructions quickly (affiliation). His colleagues, in general, support his efforts and show respect to his opinions in relation to his area of expertise (connectedness). He is the youngest member on the team with a perspective of the new generation customers, and more importantly, he is the only designer on the team (uniqueness). In this initial stage, Jamie's cognition for inclusion at work is generally based on this composition, thanks to his personal resources (e.g. he is agile, a quick-learner, sociable, disciplined at work, etc.). He also makes good use of the knowledge he accumulated during his studies in the college, as well as his invaluable internship experience. This cognitive inclusion will, more or less, remain the same as long as he uses it as reference for his daily communications and relationships with his colleagues as long as it is not

disrupted by a critical incident. If one day, for instance, the company's entry into a new market inspires Jamie to craft his job and implement a change in his workflow, Jamie will become in need to exhibit a proactive work behaviour that may possibly have an impact on the individual tasks of his colleagues. Drawing on his past experience in Japan, he may believe that putting his idea into action will provide a high quality return. However, there is the inevitable truth that he will need to promote his idea to the team and seek consensus in order to gain support for the change in the workflow. From this stage on, the story may continue towards different directions and result in different outcomes.

One possible path for Jamie to follow is to discuss the idea directly with the team leader and to seek immediate support. Team members' "generalised beliefs about the capabilities of the team across tasks and contexts" (Gully et al., 2002) and the team psychology in the form of a "shared belief that the team is a safe environment for interpersonal risk taking" (Edmondson, 1999; Schaubroek et al., 2011) are crucial in this stage. In particular, high team psychology can encourage members for open and active participation without fear of derogation for their ideas (Schaubroek et al., 2011). On the other hand, an immediate manager has a critical role for an experience of inclusion (Shore et al., 2018), which, in turn, assigns the team leader a responsibility for providing the most efficient team environment for members to feel themselves included. Team leader's mediating role, in this case, is clearly evident and particularly important. Yet, the voice of every other member in the team is also required whereas each member has a particular role and responsibility, and interdependence of individual tasks performed in a team plays a restrictive role in allowing a team member exhibit a proactive behaviour (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). In this regard, the whole team should interact and behave "as an interdependent and goal-directed combination of individuals" (Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999; Tims et al., 2013). In other words, both parties in every possible dyad in the teamwork setting must evaluate the consequences of the idea on the grounds of their own respective circumstances. Since Jamie is the originator of the idea, the process will be centred around Jamie's dyads. It is also worth to remember that this whole process is utterly important because all team members will individually have to evaluate, or even test, their own inclusion feelings while interacting in their dyads—and

Jamie is no exception. Table 2 presents an example set of reactions which Jamie receives in each of his dyads. These example reactions are fictional, randomly determined, and by all means, are not prescriptive. The main idea is to illustrate a variation in individual reactions.

As seen in Table 2, Jamie has the opportunity to conduct a one-to-one communication on professional basis with every colleague in his team except for M2. In this particular case, M2 exhibits a discriminatory behaviour against Jamie. Once Jamie realises that he was exposed to an unjust prejudicial treatment based on his age during his communication with M2, his inclusionary assumptions will possibly be disrupted. Apparently, this may have negative effect on his commitment to the team, and even to the company (e.g. Snape & Redman, 2003; Boone James et al., 2012). On the other hand, Jamie's personal resources (e.g. his self-efficacy, sociability) may change the direction of the course. In this case, following the disruption of his inclusionary assumptions, his metacognitive InQ will be triggered and will work actively during his interactions with his colleagues. At this point, Jamie will need a strategy. In one of the many possible scenarios, given the strength of the disruption he encountered, Jamie can remain silent and ignore this discriminatory behaviour — for example, he may evaluate possible consequences before taking an action and choose to excuse this behaviour, at least this time. Accordingly, in fact, relationships are subject to change as individuals get to know more about each other over time and disclosure research shows that trust can be enhanced by further social engagement with others, whereas one particular discriminatory act of a person is insufficient to fully understand the consequences of discrimination within a particular relationship (Jones et al., 2017 with reference to Turner et al., 2007; Collins & Miller, 1994; Manne et al., 2004).

Apart from his interaction with M2, as seen in Table 2, Jamie's one-to-one communication with other colleagues are conducted at the professional level with no reference made to Jamie's personal characteristics. Each of these dyads, of course, will potentially have a different story in regard to how Jamie's inclusionary assumptions will be disrupted (either negatively or positively), and how Jamie will respond to these incidents. In one scenario a colleague may disapprove Jamie's idea because he finds it not feasible. In another scenario, his colleague may find the idea quite useful and give Jamie his full support. In general, the more

14

engaged the two parties in a dyad are, the more integrated their ideas and efforts will be. Inclusion, once again, is a constantly changing feeling, and at any point, a new critical incident may disrupt an individual's inclusionary assumptions. For instance, during a one-to-one communication, Jamie may perceive an unexpected prejudgment from another colleague and may have to revise his strategies again.

Table 2. Constructing inclusionary intelligence in contrast to cultural intelligence

Dyad	Reaction received	Critical incident
Jamie's dyads		
JM1	M1: *"Not feasible; Japanese culture is different."*	Need for task change
JM2	M2: *"Jamie is young, and besides, he's new in the team!"*	Prejudice
JM3	M3: *"I'm afraid, I have no idea..."*	Need for task change
JM4	M4: *"Not profitable. Market won't like this."*	Need for task change
JM5	M5 (team leader): *"Hard to put this into practice, but, let's give it a go!"*	Need for task change
Other dyads	Embedded in M1M2, M1M3, M1M4, M1M5, M2M3, M2M4, M2M5, M3M4, M3M5, and M4M5	

In accordance with suggestions and findings drawn from studies on work groups and teams (e.g. Kozlowski & Chao, 2012; Arrow et al., 2000), aggregation may begin with one dyad (in this particular case, with JM5) incorporating other dyads until a team consensus is reached and all dyads are ideally incorporated to a whole. This "integrative unity" (Follett 1925b), will lead to one of the three possible consequences. If the ideal integrative unity is achieved, Jamie and each of his colleagues will exhibit their own individual proactive work behaviours, respectively. In this case, Jamie would feel a high level of inclusion as his idea is now implemented and became part of the teamwork — e.g. he experiences a new form of belongingness and uniqueness.

5. Conclusions

Among the substantial conclusions drawn in this paper is the essence of an individual's personal resources such as optimism, resilience, self-efficacy, and positive psychology. Thanks to these resources, individuals in a work-setting can evaluate situational conditions, become aware of how included they are, and take

15

necessary actions. Dyadic interactions are also essential. Effective and efficient one-to-one communications in dyads can result in the co-construction of one's inclusion. It is worth to note once again that inclusion is not a static state but a constantly changing feeling, and this feeling changes in response to the individual's goals and expectations and one-to-one communications with other individuals in the work-setting depending on circumstances, social experiences and critical incidents encountered.

Applying management practices promoting proactive work behaviours can enhance inclusion. These practices can engage into the very essence of inclusion as they aim at a better work engagement and creation of meaningfulness at work by the very individuals themselves. Additionally, in team settings, future studies could explore individualised leader – subordinate relations. One potential area of research could be leader-member exchange relationship differentiation (i.e., LMX differentiation; Erdogan & Bauer, 2010) which suggests that employees develop unique relationships with their leaders. Because of this unique pattern of relationship, some subordinates might feel less valued while some others might feel more valued. Thus, conceptualising leader's awareness of InQ can constitute future avenues for research.

Additionally, a scale development and validation study to explore and validate a construct for InQ and its domains can be suggested for future research. A future study can also include testing different scenarios with experimental designs where manipulations could be differing levels of proactivity, team cohesion, and team leader behaviours in order to better illustrate the possible situations. In this direction, a more significant emphasis on psychological, behavioural and emotional aspects will be necessary in order to fully understand the dynamics that underlie an individual's sense and intention of being included in the work setting. Details regarding individual's responsibility, in-role and extra role behaviours, the effect of manager and colleagues, along with an exploration of InQ's relationship with particular proactive work behaviours as well as work engagement and team performance constructs can introduce a more comprehensive understanding of inclusion at work.

References

Ackerman, P.L. (1996), "A theory of adult intellectual development: Process, personality, interests, and knowledge", *Intelligence*, Vol. No. 22, pp. 227–257.

Ang, S., and Van Dyne, L. (2008), "Conceptualization of cultural intelligence", in S. Ang and L. Van Dyne (Eds.), Handbook of Cultural Intelligence, Routledge, pp. 3-15.

Armstrong, H.D. (2002), "Mary P. Follett: Conflict resolution through integration", *Peace Research*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp.101-116.

Arrow, H., McGrath, J.E., and Berdahl, J.L. (2000), Small Groups as Complex Systems: Formation, Coordination, Development, and Adaptation. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Ashford, S.J., and Black, J.S. (1996), "Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 2, pp. 199-214.

Ashforth, B.E., and Mael, F. (1989), "Social identity theory and the organization", Academy of management Review, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 20-39.

Ashkanasy, N.M., and Daus, C.S. (2002), "Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 76-86.

Bakker, A.B. (2017), "Strategic and proactive approaches to work engagement", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 67-75.

Baumeister, R.F., and Leary, M.R. (1995), "The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol 117 No. 3, pp. 497-529.

Bindl, U. K., and Parker, S. K. (2011), "Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations", in S. Zedeck (Ed.), APA Handbooks in Psychology. APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2., pp. 567-598.,

Boekhorst, J.A. (2015), "The role of authentic leadership in fostering workplace inclusion: A social information processing perspective", *Human Resource Management,* Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 241-264.

Boone James, J, McKechnie, J., Swanberg, J., and Besen, E. "Exploring the workplace impact of intentional/unintentional age discrimination", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 28 No. 7/8, pp. 907-927.

Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H. R., and Wen- pin, T. (2004), "Taking stock of networks and organizations: a multilevel perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.47 No.6, pp. 795–817.

Brewer, M.B. (1991), "The social self: On being the same and different at the same time", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 475-482.

Ceci, S. J. (1990), On Intelligence – More or Less: A Bio-ecological Treatise on Intellectual Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chen, C., and Tang, N. (2018), "Does perceived inclusion matter in the workplace?", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 43-57.

Chrusciel, D. (2006), "Considerations of emotional intelligence (EI) in dealing with change decision management", *Management Decision,* Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 644-657.

Collins, N.L., and Miller, L.C. (1994), "Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytical review", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 116 No. 3, pp. 457-475.

Crant, J.M, and Bateman, T.S. (2000), "Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 63-75.

Creswell, J.W. (2013), Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches, Sage.

DiStefano, J.J., and Maznevski, M.L. (2000), "Creating value with diverse teams in global management", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 45–63.

Doolittle, P.E., and Camp, W.G. (1999), "Constructivism: The career and technical education perspective", Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 23-46.

Earley, P.C., and Soon A. (2003), *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford University Press, 2003.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999), "Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 350–383.

Elías, M. V., & Alkadry, M. G. (2011). Constructive conflict, participation, and shared governance. *Administration & Society*, *43*(8), 869-895.

Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J., and Donaldson, S.I. (2001), "Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 53-72.

Erdogan, B., and Bauer, T. N. (2010), "Differentiated leader–member exchanges: the buffering role of justice climate", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95 No. 6, pp. 1104-1120.

Ferdman, B.M. (2017), "Paradoxes of inclusion: Understanding and managing the tensions of diversity and multiculturalism", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 53 No. 2, pp. 235-263.

Ferris, D.L., Brown, D.J., and Heller D. (2009), "Organizational supports and organizational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 108 No. 2, pp. 279-286.

Findler, L., Wind L.H., and Mor Barak, M.E. (2007), "The challenge of workforce management in a global society: Modeling the relationship between diversity, inclusion, organizational culture, and employee well-being, job satisfaction and organizational commitment", *Administration in Social Work,* Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 63-94.

Foley, S., Hang-Yue, N., and Wong, A. (2005), "Perceptions of discrimination and justice: Are there gender differences in outcomes?", *Group and Organizational Management*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 421-450.

Follett, M.P. (1925a) Constructive conflict. Paper presented before a Bureau of Personnel Administration conference group, New York, January.

Follett, M.P. (1925b) "The Psychological Foundations: Business as an Integrative Unity." Paper presented before a Bureau of Personnel Administration conference group, New York, January.

Follett, M.P. (1930) Creative experience. New York / London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Fosnot, C.T. (1996), Constructivism: Theory, Perspective, and Practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Frese, M., Garst H., Fay, D. (2007), "Making things happen: Reciprocal relationships between work characteristics and personal initiative in a four-wave longitudinal structural equation model.", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92 No. 4, p. 1084.

Gardner, H. (1985), Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. New York: Basic Books.

Gelfand, M., Imai, L., and Fehr, R. (2008), "Thinking critically about cultural intelligence: the road ahead" in S. Ang, and L. Van Dyne (Eds), Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications, Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, pp. 375–387.

Gergen, K. J. (1995), "Social Construction and the Educational Process" in L.P. Steffe and J. Gale, Constructivism in Education, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum: pp. 17-39.

Guillaume, Y.R., Dawson, J.F., Priola, V. (2014), "Managing diversity in organizations: an integrative model and agenda for future research", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 783-802.

Gully, S. M., Incalcaterra, K. A., Joshi, A., and Beaubien, J. M. (2002), "A meta-analysis of team-efficacy, potency, and performance: interdependence and level of analysis as moderators of observed relationships", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp. 819–832.

Hackman, J.R., and Oldham, G.R. (1976), "Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* Vol.16 No. 2, pp. 250-279.

Jones, K.P., Arena D.F., Nittrouer, C.L., Alonso, L.M., and Lindsey, A.P. (2017), "Subtle discrimination in the workplace: A vicious cycle", *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 51-76.

Jonsen, K., Point, S., Kelan, E. K., & Grieble, A. (2019). Diversity and inclusion branding: a five-country comparison of corporate websites. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-34.

Kelly, J.R., and Barsade S.G. (2001), "Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 86 No. 1, pp. 99-130.

Kozlowski, S.J, and Chao, G.T. (2012), "The dynamics of emergence: Cognition and cohesion in work teams" *Managerial and Decision Economics*, Vol. 33 No. 5-6, pp. 335-354.

Lam, L.T., and Kirby, S.L. (2002), "Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 142 No. 1, pp. 133-143.

Lee, R.M., and Robbins, S. (1995), "Measuring belongingness: the social connectedness and the social assurance scales", *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 232-241.

Leenders, R. T. A., Contractor, N. S., and DeChurch, L. A. (2016), "Once upon a time: understanding team processes as relational event networks", *Organizational Psychology Review*, Vol.6 No.1, pp. 92-115.

Manne, S., Ostroff, J., Rini, C., Fox, K., Goldstein, L., and Grana, G. (2004), "The interpersonal process model of intimacy: the role of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and partner responsiveness in interactions between breast cancer patients and their partners", *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 589-599.

May, V. (2013), Connecting Self to Society: Belonging in a Changing World. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Miller, L. (2003), "Belonging to country: A philosophical anthropology", *Journal of Australian Studies*, Vol. 27 No. 76, pp. 215-223.

Mitchell, R., Boyle, B., Parker, V., Giles, M., Chiang, V., and Joyce, P. (2015), "Managing inclusiveness and diversity in teams: How leader inclusiveness affects performance through status and team identity", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 217-239.

Moore, G. A., Powers, C. J., Bass, A. J., Cohn, J. F., Propper, C. B., Allen, N. B., and Lewinsohn, P. M. (2013), "Dyadic interaction: greater than the sum of its parts?", *Infancy*, Vol.18 No.4, pp. 490-515.

Mor Barak, E. (1999), "Beyond affirmative action: Toward a model of diversity and organizational inclusion", *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 47-68.

Mor Barak, M., Findler, L., and Wind, L. (2003), "Cross-cultural aspects of diversity and well-being in the workplace: An international perspective", *Journal of Social Work Research and Evaluation*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 49-73.

Mor Barak, M.E. (2015), "Inclusion is the key to diversity management, but what is inclusion?", *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance,* Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 83-88.

Mor Barak, M.E., Cherin, D.A. and Berkman, S. (1998), "Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions", *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 82-104.

Morgeson, F.P., and Hoffmann, D.A. (1999), "The structure and function of collective constructs: Implications for multilevel research and theory development", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 249 - 265.

Nifadkar, S.S., and Bauer, T.N., (2016), "Breach of belongingness: Newcomer relationship conflict, information, and task-related outcomes during organizational socialization", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 101 No. 1, p. 1.

Office of Personnel Management (USA) (2011), Government-wide diversity and inclusion strategic plan.

Parker, S.K., Williams, H.M. and Turner, N. (2006), "Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol.93 No. 3, p. 636.

Prawatt, R. S., and Floden, R. E. (1994), "Philosophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning", *Educational Psychology*, Vol. 29 No.1, pp. 37-48.

Roberson, Q.M., (2006), "Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 212-236.

Rofcanin, Y., Bakker A.B., Berber, A., Gölgeci, I., and Las Heras, M. (2019), "Relational job crafting: Exploring the role employee motives with a weekly diary study", *Human Relations*, Vol. 72 No. 4, pp. 859-886.

Rousseau, D. (1995), Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements. Sage Publications.

Rupp, D. E., Ganapathi, J., Aguilera, R. V., and Williams, C. A. (2006), "Employee reactions to corporate social responsibility: An organizational justice framework", *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 537-543.

Ryff, C.D. (1995), "Psychological well-being in adult life", *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol.4 No. 4, pp. 99-104.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam SSK, and Peng, A.C. (2011), "Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 96 No. 4, p. 863.

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., and Singh, G. (2011), "Inclusion and diversity in work groups: a review and model for future research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1262-1289.

Shore, Lynn M., Jeanette N. Cleveland, and Diana Sanchez. (2018), "Inclusive workplaces: a review and model", *Human Resource Management Review* , Vol. 28 No.2, pp. 176-189.

Smillie, Luke D., Wilt, J., Kabbani, R., Garratt, C., and Revelle, W. (2015), "Quality of social experience explains the relation between extraversion and positive affect", *Emotion*, Vol. 15 No. 3, p. 339.

Snape, E., and Redman, T. (2003), "Too old or too young? The impact of perceived age discrimination", *Human Resource Management Journal* , Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 78-89.

Sternberg, R.J. (1985), Beyond IQ: A Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. (1997), "The concept of intelligence and its role in lifelong learning", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 10, pp. 1030–1037.

Sternberg, R.J., Lautrey, J., and Lubart, T.I. (2003), Models of Intelligence. Hyattsville, MD: American Psychological Association.

Thomas, D.C., Liao, Y., Aycan, Z., Cerdin, J.L., Pekerti, A.A., Ravlin, E.C., Stahl, G.K., Lazarova, M.B., Fock, H., Arli, D., and Moeller, M. (2015), "Cultural intelligence: A theory-based, short form measure", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 46 No. 9, pp. 1099-1118.

Tims, M., Bakker, A.B., Derks, D., and van Rhenen, W. (2013), "Job crafting at the team and individual level: Implications for work engagement and performance", *Group & Organization Management,* Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 427-454.

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., and Voci, A. (2007), "Reducing explicit and implicit outgroup prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and intergroup anxiety", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 93 No. 3, pp. 369–388.

Unsworth, K.L., and Parker, S.K. (2003), "Proactivity and innovation: Promoting a new workforce for the new workplace" in D. Holman, T.D. Wall, C.W. Clegg, Sparrow, P., A. Howard (Eds.) *The New Workplace: A Guide to the Human Impact of Modern Working Practices*, pp. 175-196.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978), Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Process. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wechsler, David. (1939), The Measurement of Adult Intelligence. Baltimore: Williams & Witkins.

Winters, M. F. (2014), "From diversity to inclusion: An inclusion equation" in B. M. Ferdman, and B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*, pp. 205–228. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wrzesniewski, A., and Dutton, J.E., 2001, "Crafting a job: revisioning employees as active crafters of their work", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp.179-201.