

DESIGNING AN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT MODEL FOR CO-CREATING INCLUSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

Maria Socorro C.L Fernando*

Abstract

The aim of this research was to design an organization development model for co-creating inclusive organizations. Data was collected using an online structured questionnaire and interview protocol. The nine informants and 71 respondents worked at various job positions with multi-national companies based in Thailand. The 71 respondents were selected using non-probability random sampling, while purposive sampling was used to identify the nine informants. The quantitative data analysis utilized Pearson Correlation, Paired Sample T-test, and Priority Needs Index Modified (PNI mod), while the qualitative data analysis of the interview data utilized content analysis. The quantitative findings revealed significant relationships between the variables ($p < 0.01$). Results of the paired sample statistics revealed that only the paired samples of workplace inclusion and psychological safety obtained a significant mean difference, with significance values of .005 and .001, respectively, while the order of priority needs of the constructs showed psychological safety, workplace inclusion, perceived organizational support, innovation in the workplace, and self-efficacy, to have the respective order of priority. The qualitative data analysis resulted in three themes consisting of diversity, inclusive culture, and inclusive management. The research findings were used to design the model entitled “Co-creative Organization Inclusion” with three components, namely Component 1: Co-creative organization inclusion through representation that leverages individual & team potential; Component 2: Co-creative organizational inclusion by top-management championing representation; and Component 3: Co-creative organization inclusion through a supportive and collaborative culture.

Keywords: workplace inclusion, innovative work behavior, psychological safety, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support

* Dr. Maria Socorro C.L Fernando is currently working as a lecturer and Program Director of the MMOD and PhD OD Programs in the Graduate School of Business and Advanced Technology Management of Assumption University, Thailand. She holds a degree in PhD in Organization Development from SAIDI Graduate School of OD -Philippines and Assumption University. Email: mariaFernando@au.edu

1. INTRODUCTION

The world of work is a global village. Organizational boundaries are becoming seamless, involving a diversity of people, technologies, and organizational designs. The development of organizations sees the increasing mobility of people across regions. Organizations are more flexible and increasingly diverse in contexts, functions, and priorities. Intensified internationalization in the economic field is increasingly achieved through alliances and joint ventures, cross-border mergers, and acquisitions (Pongpayaklert & Atikomtrirat, 2011). Organizations have an increasing mix of age, gender, race, sexual orientation, culture, values, orientation, and disciplines, among many other characteristics. Increasing workforce diversity provides leaders and managers a challenging environment to pursue organizational effectiveness through management perspectives, strategic responses, and implementation approaches (Cummings & Worley, 2015).

The Asia Pacific region contains 60% of the world's population with more than 2,300 languages and dialects. There is a shifting of demographics. Leaders are responding to increasing evidence that diversity & inclusion improve financial performance, as growing numbers of well-educated younger generation workers demand modern, forward-thinking workplaces. Perceptions regarding ethnicity, socio-economic background, or

LGBTQ identity are also shifting. Thailand in particular, is now more integrated into the global market, with an increasing demand for various talents; Thai companies must be more pro-active in creating conducive and inclusive work environments (Kwa, 2019). Considering the current context of the pandemic, Dixon-Fyle, et al. (2020) further stated that business leaders who welcome diverse talents, including multiple perspectives, are likely to emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic crisis stronger.

Following on from these perspectives, this research aims to determine the various elements of workplace inclusion which are considered in each business case study, identifying organizational necessities for the Organization Development perspective, especially in the context of persons working in diverse teams in Thailand. Using the information collected from the representative organizations' members and managers, it is the purpose of this research to determine a set of needs and priorities regarding the various factors related to diversity and inclusion, ultimately crafting a model based on the findings.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the significant relationships between the variables, namely diversity & inclusion, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, psychological safety, and innovative work behavior.

2. To ascertain the significant mean differences between the perception of the respondents regarding the current and preferred situation for each of the variables in the study.
3. To determine a rank of priorities for the needs of organizations
4. To generate themes based on the interview data from the informants
5. To determine the components of the proposed OD model using a mixed method convergent design approach for data analysis
6. To propose an Organization Development (OD) model on co-creating inclusive organizations based on the synthesis of the findings and reviews of OD experts

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review presents studies related to the constructs (variables) chosen for this study, namely diversity & inclusion, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, psychological safety, and innovative work behavior.

Self- efficacy

Self-efficacy is a person's belief regarding his or her chances of successfully accomplishing a specific task. It arises from the gradual acquisition of complex, cognitive, social, linguistic, and/or physical skills through experience (Kinicki & Fugate, 2013). Fang et al. (2019) stated that inclusive leadership

positively impacts employee self-efficacy. When leaders pay attention to their employees' needs, motivations, and communication, the employees become more optimistic and confident.

Stashevsky et al. (2006) conducted research involving employees and supervisors in six Israeli organizations, examining the relationship between self-leadership skills and innovative work behavior. Their results showed a positive association with the self-leadership skills of both groups with innovative behavior. They recommend that companies recognize the importance of developing self-leaders who can successfully meet requirements to enhance innovative work behavior.

Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support (POS) includes the beliefs that employees form "concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being" (Eisenberger et al., 1986, p. 500, as cited in Scroggins et al., 2010). Choi et al. (2016) claim that employees who perceive that they are treated fairly reciprocate with high job performance and positive attitudes toward their job and organization. Perceived organizational support is reflected in employees making best efforts in performing their personal duties and giving a positive response to organizational goals; this results from a certainty of being valued, good well-being and being cared for, and having

significant support from their organization. Leveson and Joiner (2008) stated that managers must recognize the potential contribution of developing a positive workplace atmosphere for cultural diversity to strengthen employee's perceived organizational support, enhancing affective commitment. Hudie et al. (2017) reported that the influence of inclusive leadership on work engagement is mediated by perceived organizational support. When leaders adopt an inclusive leadership style, employees feel greater organizational support and increase their work engagement accordingly. The support of leaders effectively enhances employees' POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Similarly, Islam and Ahmed (2018) proved a positive significant association between perceived organizational support and self-efficacy, which is congruent with Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory and the Work Environment Framework (Moss, 2008), which both state that individuals reciprocate the effects of organizational support. Employees develop high self-efficacy when they perceive that they are in a supportive environment.

Psychological Safety

Psychological Safety is the perception of being in a safe workplace environment where one can share one's identity, personality, uniqueness, and ideas, without negative consequences in a personal, interpersonal, or career context, and where there is little to no risk

associated with speaking up, through voicing one's ideas, clarifications, or mistakes. Javed et al. (2017) stated that inclusive leadership is positively related to innovative work behavior and psychological safety mediates the effect of inclusive leadership on innovative work behavior. Inclusive leaders provide a chance for employees to raise their voice for generating, promoting, and implementing useful ideas (Boekhorst, 2015). Psychological safety motivates employees toward creative process engagement through problem-identification, information-searching, and idea generation activities (Zhang et al., 2016).

Psychological safety awareness is positively correlated with inclusiveness among leaders (Hirak et al., 2010). Inclusive leaders are more willing to communicate with and give feedback to their subordinates (Edmonson, 1999), whilst also paying more attention to employee participation. Fang (2014) concluded that inclusive leadership can actively promote employees' psychological capital through strengthened self-efficacy and promoting their innovative behavior by recognizing, encouraging, and respecting employees, while also tolerating employees' failures (Fang et al., 2019).

The study of Roussin et al. (2017) indicated that participants with greater occupational self-efficacy levels spoke up more to clarify explanations and concluded that those with perceived greater psychological safety tend to speak up and discuss matters such as mistakes and further

explanations with colleagues. Edmonson and Roloff (2008) showed that psychological safety facilitates the ability of team members with diverse backgrounds to overcome communication barriers created by their differences and allows them to work together to accomplish goals. Psychological safety has intrinsic value as it allows employees to voice their ideas, questions, and concerns. Their research emphasized the key role of psychological safety in diverse teams in mitigating the negative effects of diversity on team collaboration and performance.

Innovative Work Behavior

The innovation capability of organizations is a key factor in attaining the company's sustainability and competitive advantage (Colino et al., 2014; Le & Lei, 2018; Liao et al., 2017, as cited in Le & Lei, 2019). Organizations must identify appropriate and effective processes for successful innovation (Le & Lei, 2018; Song, 2015, as cited in Le & Lei, 2019). This means identifying strategic factors which significantly develop the organization's innovation capability. Drucker (2014, as cited in Le & Lei, 2019) defined innovation as the capability for creating new products, services, work processes, and management procedures, to gain an organizational competitive advantage. Tsai et al. (2001, as cited in Le & Lei, 2019) defined product innovation as the organization's capability for providing new products or services in the market for

customers' satisfaction. Process innovation is the organization's capability to provide better processes to attain superior performance (Le & Lei, 2019).

Zhu and Wang (2011) concluded that inclusive leaders who exhibit positive expectations and tolerance for employees' mistakes, generate a perception of support from leaders among their employees; this allows them to generate more creative and innovative ideas (Jin et al., 2017).

Workplace Inclusion

Diversity is characterized by variety based on essential and deeper characteristics at the individual and organizational levels. As diversity is recognized, individuals and organizations take on the challenge of diversity, which involves inclusion. Avery et al. (2008, cited in Shore et al., 2011) believe that inclusiveness reflects the extent to which employees believe that their organization strives to accommodate everyone in their mission and operations.

Inclusion involves how well organizations, and their members fully connect with, engage, and utilize, people across all types of differences. Inclusion involves an individual or group experience; a set of behaviors; an approach to leadership; a set of collective norms and practices; or a personal, group, organizational, or social value (Ferdman & Deane, 2014).

Mor Barak (2017) states that an inclusive workplace values and utilizes individual and intergroup

differences within its workforce; cooperates with and contributes to its surrounding community; alleviates the needs of disadvantaged groups in its wider environment; and collaborates with individuals, groups, and organizations across national and international boundaries. Minghui and Yuanxu (2014) and Yao and Li (2014) found that inclusive leadership influences employee innovation behavior by influencing the organizational innovation climate.

Paolillo et al. (2016) explained that an employee's perception of inclusion, influences work quality, the worker's health, social functioning, and overall well-being. When employees perceive they are involved in some critical organizational processes such as decision making, they feel supported and empowered; this in turn, has positive effects on their stress levels, mental health, psychological well-being, and behavior at work.

Table 1 shows a summary of results for the related studies, indicating the present status of research on the relationships between the variables considered in this study which have showed a correlation or impact at some level (respondents' perceptions based on the current situation), mainly using quantitative research. No studies were found containing models designed using mixed method research, particularly using PNImod and qualitative data to craft a model. This is the research method used to craft the model in the current research.

Table 1 also shows that studies

determined the relationship between inclusive leadership and other variables. In this study, the variable workplace inclusion is also used; this involves an individual or group experience, a set of behaviors, an approach to leadership, a set of collective norms and practices, or a personal, group, organizational, or social value (Ferdman & Deane, 2014). Inclusive leadership is one of the elements of workplace inclusion.

The need for further research at another level is recognized, with this study seeking to add to the field of organizational development research by using the results obtained using mixed methods to co-create a model. The study employs a mixed method with results based on the correlation between the variables measured at two levels (current and preferred situations), the Priority Needs Index Modified (PNImod), a Paired Sample T-test (Quantitative Research) and Qualitative Research results using content analysis.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design and Hypotheses

This research employed a mixed-method research design to gain a stronger understanding of the research problem. Mixed methods research is simply "mining" the databases more, by integrating retrieval methods (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Mixed method research extends the consideration and draws distinctions based on the connections between theory and data, researcher and

Table 1 Summary of Related Studies and Implications to the Conduct of this Research

Self- Efficacy		
Fang et al. (2019)	Inclusive leadership positively impacts employee self-efficacy. When leaders pay attention to their employees' needs, motivations, and communication, the employees become more optimistic and confident.	The research cited considered the relationships between inclusive leadership and self-efficacy, and between self-efficacy and innovation
Stashevsky et al. (2006)	Research on employees and supervisors in six Israeli organizations examined the relationship between self-leadership skills and innovative work behavior. Results showed a positive association between the self-leadership skills of both groups and innovative behavior. They recommend that companies recognize the importance of developing self-leaders who can successfully meet the requirements to enhance innovative work behavior	What this study presents: This research considered the impact of self-efficacy towards innovative work behavior and of inclusion towards self-efficacy
Kumar and Uzokurt (2010)	The study explained the positive relationship between self- efficacy and innovativeness. Their research showed the positive effects of the "individualism" dimension on this relationship. The results of the study are important in the assessment of the innovation potential of an organization and the employee, training employees to prepare the organization to be ready for innovation, in response to the competitive business environment. The data were obtained in Turkey with 271 professional respondents	
Perceived Organizational Support		
Choi et al. (2016)	The research results claim that employees who perceive that they are treated fairly reciprocate with high job performance and positive attitudes toward their job and organization. Perceived organizational support reflects the employees' best efforts in performing personal duties and organizational goals as a positive response, which results from their certainty of being valued, being cared for, knowing their well-being is a concern for the organization, and having the significant support of their organization.	The research cited showed the relationships between perceived organizational support and positive job behavior; diversity strengthens perceived organizational support and inclusion that in turn affects work engagement as mediated by perceived organizational support.
Joiner (2008)	The author stated that managers must recognize the potential contribution of developing a positive workplace atmosphere for cultural diversity to strengthen employee's perceived organizational support, in turn enhancing affective commitment	What this study determines: This research determined the relationship between workplace inclusion and.

Table 1 Summary of Related Studies and Implications to the Conduct of this Research (Continued)

Self- Efficacy		
Hudie et al. (2017)	The researchers reported that the influence of inclusive leadership on work engagement is mediated by perceived organizational support. When leaders adopt an inclusive leadership style, employees feel organizational support and increases their work engagement.	innovative work behavior as mediated by perceived organizational support
Psychological Safety		
Javed et al. (2017)	The authors stated that inclusive leadership is positively related to innovative work behavior, while psychological safety mediates the effect of inclusive leadership on innovative work behavior. Inclusive leaders provide a chance for employees to raise their voice for generating, promoting, and implementing useful ideas.	The cited references show that a relationship exists between inclusive leadership and innovative work behavior, mediated by psychological safety.
Fang (2014 cited in Fang et al., 2019)	The study concludes that inclusive leadership can actively promote employees' psychological capital through strengthened self-efficacy and promote their innovative behavior by recognizing, encouraging, and respecting employees and tolerating employees' failures.	What this study determines: This research determines the relationship that exist between workplace inclusion and psychological safety.
Edmonson and Roloff (2008)	Their research states that psychological safety facilitates the ability of team members with diverse backgrounds to overcome communication barriers created by their differences, allowing them to work together to accomplish goals. Psychological safety has intrinsic value because it allows employees to voice their ideas, questions, and concerns. Their research emphasizes the key role of psychological safety in diverse teams in mitigating the negative effects of diversity on team collaboration and performance.	Previous studies have established the effect of psychological safety towards inclusion.
Innovative Work Behavior		
Zhu and Wang (2011)	The authors concluded that inclusive leaders who exhibit positive expectations and tolerance for employees generate employees' perceptions of support from leaders allowing them to generate more creative and innovative ideas.	Previous studies cited present that inclusive leadership has a relationship with the generation of creative and innovative ideas, and the effect of self- efficacy and innovative work behavior.
Carmeli et al. (2006)	The research explored the positive relationship between self -leadership (self-efficacy) skills and supervisors' ratings of innovative behavior at work. The study supports the role of self-leadership skills and recommends organizations to invest in the development of self-leaders for	What this study

Table 1 Summary of Related Studies and Implications to the Conduct of this Research (Continued)

Self- Efficacy		
	organizational effectiveness .	determines: This research determines the relationship between workplace inclusion and innovative work behavior, and between self-efficacy and innovative work behavior
Workplace Inclusion		
Mor Barak (2017)	The author states that an inclusive workplace values and utilizes individual and intergroup differences within its workforce; cooperates with and contributes to its surrounding community; alleviates the needs of disadvantaged groups in its wider environment; and collaborates with individuals, groups, and organizations across national and international boundaries.	The research cited shows that inclusive work values and inclusive leadership influences innovation behavior and perceived organizational support.
Minghui and Yuanxu (2014)	The research found that inclusive leadership influences employee innovation behavior by influencing the organizational innovation climate.	What this study determines: The research determined the impacts of workplace inclusion on psychological safety, self- efficacy, innovative work behavior and perceived organizational support
Yao and Li (2014)	The research findings indicated that inclusive leadership influences employee innovation behavior by influencing the organizational innovation climate.	
Paolillo et al. (2016)	The research explained that an employee's perception of inclusion influences their work quality, health, social function, and well-being. When employees perceive they are involved in some critical organizational processes such as decision making, they feel supported and empowered; this has positive effects on their stress levels, mental health, psychological well-being, and behavior at work.	
Zhu et al (2020)	The study explained the complex mediation mechanism of inclusive leadership in creativity. "Prior work of inclusive leadership mainly examined beneficial mediator variables. This framework presents an explanation of the contradictory results of inclusive leadership and creativity from the view of the mediation process. The study sought to explain that inclusive leadership's "bright side" and "dark side" may coexist by explaining the paradoxical effects of inclusive leadership on subordinates' creativity.	

research process, data and inference, which all follows from the research purpose (Burkholder et al., 2020). The mixed method employed in this study provides a holistic perspective of the phenomenon under study.

The data from the quantitative data analysis provided verifiable statistical results, while the results from the qualitative data provided an understanding of other dimensions of the phenomenon under study, coming from real stories and experiences which numbers alone cannot provide. The quantitative data results showed the statistical trends of the perceptions of the respondents while the qualitative data based on the interviews, provided the “story” behind the numbers. Therefore, employing a mixed method allowed the researcher to investigate the problem from various angles. The integration of the results from the quantitative data analysis and qualitative data analysis using a convergent method in the mixed method research led to a better understanding of the research questions for the design of the proposed model using the two dimensions of the analyzed data.

The proposed model designed from the research is based on the convergence of the data results from the quantitative survey and qualitative data from interviews and reviews from OD experts.

The hypotheses of the study are:

H1: There is a significant relationship between psychological safety and self-efficacy

H2: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and innovative work behavior

H3: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and psychological safety

H4: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and perceived organizational support

H5: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and self-efficacy

H6: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy and innovative work behavior

H7: There is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and innovative work behavior

Quantitative Respondents

Research

The researcher used non-probability purposive sampling to select respondents for the online structured questionnaire. There were 91 survey respondents but only 71 valid survey responses were analyzed. Respondents worked in multi-cultural teams in companies in Thailand. The online questionnaire was launched through SurveyMonkey™ from January to March 2020.

Sekaran and Bougie (2010) state that a sample size larger than 30 and less than 500 is appropriate. The sample size should be several times (preferably 10 times or more) as large as the number of variables in a multivariate study. This research has five variables and so a sample size of

50 people is sufficient to meet these criteria. Gay and Diehl (1992) state that generally the number of respondents acceptable for a study depends on the type of research involved: descriptive, correlational, or experimental. Descriptive research may have a sample equivalent to 10% of the population. However, if the population is small then 20% may be required, while in correlational research at least 30 subjects are required to establish a relationship. This study uses correlational research in determining the significant relationships between the variables and meets the required sampling size as indicated by Gay and Diehl (1992).

Qualitative Research Informants

Using purposive (homogenous) sampling, the “information-rich” informants interviewed for the qualitative research included nine informants who had worked for more than five years in various job positions in multi-cultural teams or companies in Thailand.

Patton (2002) states that qualitative study uses purposive sampling among selected people, communities, organizations, events, cultures, or incidences because they are “information rich” and “illuminative”. These informants are purposively selected because they offer useful manifestations of the phenomenon of interest. Sampling aims to gain insight regarding the phenomenon, not empirical generalization from a sample to a population. Creswell and Creswell

(2018) indicated that sample size depends on the type of qualitative design. This research used the Saturation approach in determining the number of informants for the interviews. Creswell and Crewsell (2018) stated that Saturation is a qualitative sampling approach that is equally viable to use. The concept of “saturation” is used, such that no more data is collected once the categories (or themes) are saturated. In other words, once the researcher finds that when gathering fresh data, no new insights are revealed, this indicates that an adequate sample of informants has been reached (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This research used the saturation approach by utilizing a saturation grid to plot the themes as derived from the interviews and discussed by the informants to determine the saturation point. Saturation of the answers and responses by themes was attained at the 7th interview but to further strengthen and validate that saturation had been achieved, two further interviews were undertaken.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

A structured questionnaire, using a 5-point Likert scale was used to rate the respondents’ perceptions on the current (“strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) and preferred situations (“not at all important” to “extremely important”) for each of the research constructs or variables: workplace inclusion, psychological safety, perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and innovative

work behavior. The interview protocol was designed using the SOAR template. SOAR stands for Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, and Results (Stavros and Hinrichs 2016). This type of interview questionnaire seeks to engage informants in a conversation to discover what happens when the organization is working at its best and how to utilize those best practices to create the desired future.

Quantitative data was analyzed using Pearson Correlation to determine the level of significant relationships between the variables. A paired sample t-test was used to determine the significant differences between the variables, while the Priority Needs Index Modified (PNI_{mod}) determined the gaps between the current situation/level of success and the preferred situation/level of importance (Chainut et al. 2019). The formula to determine the value of PNI_{modified} is $PNI_{mod} = (I-D)/D$, where: I=importance or

preferred state, and D=current state or degree of success.

The qualitative interview data was analyzed by three coders using content analysis to draw out common themes.

The initial design of the model was designed based on the results of the ranking of the gaps juxtaposed with the emerging themes.

A mixed method approach called convergent design was used, analyzing the results of the quantitative and qualitative data separately, and then comparing the findings to confirm or disconfirm each other (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The results from this convergent analysis were further analyzed, synthesized, and integrated to develop the first draft of model, which was subsequently subjected to expert review to gain better perspectives. The reviews obtained from the OD experts were considered and integrated into the final design of the OD model.

Table 2 Survey Questionnaire Results for Cronbach's Alpha and Item-Objective Congruence

Variables	Cronbach's alpha results*	Interpretation	IOC Results**	Interpretation
Workplace Inclusion	.871	High level of internal consistency	1.00	Items are congruent with objectives
Psychological Safety	.786		.667	
Perceived Organizational Support	.891		1.00	
Self- Efficacy	.795		1.00	
Innovative Work Behavior	.875		1.00	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reliability and Validity of the Research Instruments

The questionnaire was subjected to pilot testing with the results analyzed using the Cronbach's alpha reliability test, whereby a score of ≥ 0.70 is considered reliable (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The obtained Cronbach's alpha values were higher than 0.70, meaning that the set of scales or items in the structured

questionnaire are a consistent measure of the concepts and variables. Furthermore, the research instruments were subjected to an Item Objective Congruence (IOC) test for validity, by three experts. The obtained IOC results fell between 0.60 and 1.00, meaning that the questions were congruent with the research objectives (Table 2).

Quantitative Research Results

The presentation of the results

Table 3 Results of the Hypotheses Testing Using Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Hypotheses	Current Situation		Preferred Situation	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig (2 tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig (2 tailed)
H1: There is a significant relationship between psychological safety and self-efficacy	.367	.002	.679**	.000
H2: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and innovative work behavior	.555**	.000	.755***	.000
H3: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and psychological safety	.650**	.000	.703***	.000
H4: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and perceived organizational support	.584**	.000	.660**	.000
H5: There is a significant relationship between workplace inclusion and self-efficacy	.449*	.000	.628**	.000
H6: There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy and innovative work behavior	.606**	.000	.707**	.000
H7: There is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and innovative work behavior	.441*	.000	.682**	.000

Significance at $p < 0.01$ sig level (2 tailed)

Low positive correlation * moderate positive correlation**

high positive correlation***

consists of the Pearson Correlation results, paired sample t-test results, PNI modified results, content analysis results, and the resulting framework and approach.

The Significant Relationships between the Variables

The results of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient analysis showed significant positive relationships between all the variables at various degrees (Table 3). The results also showed the trend that the relationships between the variables are stronger in the preferred situation (ranging from a moderate positive to a high positive correlation) than between the same variables in the current situation (ranging from a low positive to a moderate positive correlation), except for self-efficacy. The closer the correlation to +1 the stronger the linear correlation, indicating that the values are strongly associated with each other. Therefore, it can be concluded that all the hypotheses of the study are supported and that the proposed relationships between variables are valid, as indicated in the framework.

The Significant Mean Differences between the Perception of the Respondents in the Current and Preferred Situations for each of the Variables in the Study

The results of the paired sample statistics determine the significance of the difference between the means of the pairs of variables (current situation and preferred situation). These results indicated that only the paired samples of workplace inclusion and psychological safety obtained a significant mean difference based on the obtained significance values of .005 and .001, respectively. The results of the paired sample correlation show that there is a significant positive relationship (p value < 0.01) between the current situation and preferred situation in every paired sample (Table 4).

The Rank of Priorities of the Needs

The Priority Needs Index Modified (PNI_{mod}) of the constructs was used to rank the needs. The qualitative analysis utilized content analysis with three coders and triangulation. Table 4 shows the

Table 4 Inferential Analysis with Paired Sample T-Test (N=71)

All variables Paired Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	Sig	Paired Sample Correlation	Sig
POS _b - POS	.117	.727	.178	.399	.001
SE _b - SE	-.026	.480	.651	.548	.000
WPI _b - WPI	.190	.557	.005	.558	.000
PS _b - PS	.263	.608	.001	.436	.000
IWB _b - IWB	.097	.583	.167	.479	.000

results summary for the PNImod.

- Psychological safety was ranked as the first priority (PNImod = 0.069). The order of the priority index of the constructs shows that respondents indicated that psychological safety should be improved in terms of generating ideas, feedback, support, and information sharing, respectively.

This PNImod result for psychological safety aligns with the paired sample T-test results for significant difference (sig 0.001 < 0. 01) and the Pearson correlation results which indicated a moderate to strong positive relationship.

- Workplace inclusion was ranked as a second priority (PNI mod = 0.050). The order of the priority index of the constructs indicates priority in the order of: acceptance of differences based on a common endeavor; leadership qualities show appreciation, value, and involvement of diverse people through inclusion and building an inclusive culture; and acceptance of diversity and organizational practices that foster an inclusive culture.

This result aligns with the results of the paired sample T-test of significant difference (sig. 0.005 <0.01) and with the Pearson correlation results which indicated a moderate to strong positive relationship ($p < 0.01$).

- Perceived organizational support was ranked third (PNI mod = 0.030). The constructs that employees considered as evidence of their preferred situation of organizational support included being listened to, being cared for, work satisfaction, decisions made consider their best interests, valuing their interests, development, and support for their job performance.
- Innovative Workplace Behavior was ranked fourth (PNI mod = 0.025). The first three priority constructs related to the need for team members to generate innovative ideas were: receive encouragement to develop new ideas and solutions for the company's processes; find new ways to execute tasks; and encourage team members to be creative in developing new ideas and solutions. The results show that the priority results emphasize team effort or collective innovative behavior.
- Self-efficacy obtained a PNImod of -0.006. The negative value shows that respondents perceive that they are already accomplishing this characteristic relatively well in terms of self-confidence, overcoming challenges to reach their goals and accomplish their job. Self-efficacy is not a priority.

Themes Generated based on the Interview Data from the Informants

The qualitative data analysis used content analysis to analyze the interview data and was done using multiple coders. The validity and reliability of the emerging codes and categories was verified by triangulation using member checking (informant), confirmation of multiple coders, and by validation by a neutral person (neither 1 nor 2)

Table 4 shows the summary of the common themes from the multi-coders with the frequency and percentage that these ideas or constructs were mentioned in the interviews (via data and coding).

Informants' best experiences included roles, tasks, or jobs in the organization as the highlights of their experience of diversity, inclusion in the workplace, and innovative work behavior. Diversity was experienced in terms of physical characteristics,

demographics, socio-economic background, beliefs, competence, multiple disciplines, and others (100%). This was followed by the experience of recognition of uniqueness and accomplishment of jobs, creativity, and innovation (89%). The next highest value was for teamwork and collaboration, creativity, and generation of ideas, processes, products, and services, is acknowledged (78%). This was followed by communication and organizational support (67%), leadership support, initiative, and shared vision (56%), and lastly training, company procedures, and policies (44%).

The Components of the Proposed OD model Using Mixed Method Convergent Design Approach for Data Analysis

Table 5 shows the results from the PNImod and content analysis. Using convergent design and a mixed

Table 5 Summary of The Results by Ranking (PNImod) and Percentage of Themes (Content Analysis)

Rank	Constructs (PNI mod)	Codes (Content Analysis)	Frequency/ Percentage
1	Psychological Safety (PNI mod = 0.069) • Team members can suggest new ideas without fear of embarrassment • Team members seek feedback form others that promotes learning • Team members provide feedback that supports improvement	• Role, involvement, and contributions • Diversity and inclusion of nationalities, age, gender, socio-economic background, beliefs, thinking processes and multi-disciplinary backgrounds • Results of innovation and efficiency	f= 9/9 100%

Table 5 Summary of The Results by Ranking (PNI mod) and Percentage of Themes (Content Analysis) (Continued)

Rank	Constructs (PNI mod)	Codes (Content Analysis)	Frequency/ Percentage
2	Workplace inclusion (PNI mod=0.050)	• Teamwork • Efficiency, determination and accomplishment in various events and projects • Quality, innovation, creativity of results and outcomes comes from the inclusion of a diversity of people • Communication- considering diversity • Inclusion and connectedness • Common goals • Commitment • Creation of diverse teams that delivers results and generates new ideas due to the diversity	f=8/9 88.89%
	• Similarities and differences are allowed at both the individual and the group levels while at the same time we are joined together in a common endeavor. • Leaders appreciate different perceptions in decision making • Leaders invite contributions from various perspectives in discussion. Leaders show qualities (e.g., flexibility, openness, self-awareness, courage) that build a culture of inclusion in the organization		
3	Perceived Organizational Support (PNI mod= 0.030)	• Creativity - generation of new ideas, products, services, and processes • Organizational support of leaders and development • Aspirations and results • Constructive and collaborative approach	f=7/9 77.78%
	• The organization listens to my opinions • The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work • The organization considers my best interests when making decisions that affect me		
4	Innovative Workplace Behavior (PNI mod=0.025)	• Communication at personal, team and company levels (dialogue, listening, forum, meetings) • Leaders and managers foster inclusion through various teams and projects • Awareness building, training, and education	f=6/9 66.67%
	• Team members are encouraged to systematically introduce innovative ideas into the workplace • Team members are encouraged to be proactive to develop new ideas and solutions related to the company's processes or find new ways to execute tasks • Team members are encouraged to be creative in developing new ideas and solutions related to our company's products or services		

method approach, only four constructs, namely psychological safety, perceived organizational support, workplace inclusion, and innovative work behavior were considered. Self-efficacy was excluded in the final consideration as the PNImod value obtained shows that it is not a priority (less than zero). Furthermore, categorized themes with frequencies of at least 50% as

mentioned by the informants were utilized for design of the model.

Table 6 shows the juxtaposed quantitative and qualitative results using a mixed method convergent design, from which the emerging themes were derived and elaborated to form the main components of the model. Color codes were used to indicate how the themes were further derived and elaborated.

Table 6 Derived Constructs Elaborated as Components of the Model

Derived themes: elaborated as the main components of the model		
Psychological Safety and Workplace inclusion	Diversity: workplace reality and potential	Appreciating diversity representation and inclusive collaboration • Recognition and acceptance of diversity in the workplace: nationalities, age, gender, socio-economic backgrounds, beliefs, thinking processes, and multi-disciplinary backgrounds • Diversity and inclusion realized through project teams - acceptance of individual differences, role involvement and unique contribution • Collaboration of diverse people in project teams generates a better quality of innovative and creative ideas, products, processes, and services.
Workplace inclusion and Perceived organizational support	Inclusive Workplace: supportive and interdependent culture	Cultivating a diverse and inclusive organizational culture • Shared purpose: Vision and Goals • Generative, positive, and collaborative approach • Open communication at personal, team and company levels (dialogue, listening, forum, meetings) for learning, knowledge sharing, and development • Human resource development that leverages diversity and inclusion of people and talents in the workplace
Workplace inclusion and organizational support	Inclusive Workplace: top management priority and support	Championing workplace diversity, inclusion, and collaboration • Conscious support of leaders and managers for diversity and inclusion to drive collaboration, creativity, and innovation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study presents the following conclusions:

The results of the quantitative data analysis shows that significant relationships exist between the variables, namely diversity & inclusion, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, psychological safety, and innovative work behavior. The results of the paired sample t-test showed that significant mean differences exist between the perceptions of the respondents regarding the current and preferred situations for each variable in the study. The results of the PNImod showed that ranked priorities include three elements, namely - psychological safety, workplace inclusion, and perceived organizational support, in that order of importance.

The qualitative data analyzed using coding analysis resulted in categorized themes. Categorized themes with frequencies of at least 50% as mentioned by the informants were utilized for the design of the model. The themes generated from the coding analysis of the interview data are shown in Table 6, juxtaposed with the quantitative results to generate the components for the proposed OD model using a mixed method convergent design approach for data analysis.

The proposed Organization Development (OD) model is a model for co-creating inclusive organizations. The model has been

validated by two rounds of critical review by three global OD experts and related studies. The model is presented as the conclusion of the study.

Designing the Model Based on the Findings and Expert Reviews

The researcher synthesized the findings and designed an initial model which was sent for review by three international organization development experts who are active OD practitioners in the field as well as academicians in higher education. The researcher then considered all comments of the expert reviewers to simplify the model, reconsidering ideas, and highlighting themes with operational words. The final OD model was designed and titled “Co-creative organization inclusion model”.

The OD model (Figure 1) shows that the collective preferred situation is co-creative organization inclusion. In this study, co-creation refers to the generation of new concepts through collaborative effort with experts or stakeholders done by sharing ideas and knowledge for innovative ideas and processes. Co-creative organization inclusion means reframing organization inclusion as a participative process where organizational stakeholders contribute to advancing inclusion by leveraging representation, and management support, and by fostering a collaborative and supportive organizational culture.

The model has three components,



Figure 1 The Final OD Model: “Co-Creative Organization Inclusion Model”

namely: (1) Co-creative organization inclusion through representation that leverages individual & team potential; (2) Co-creative organization inclusion by top-management championing representation; and (3) Co-creative organization inclusion through a supportive and collaborative culture.

Component 1: Co-Creative Organization Inclusion Through Representation that Leverages Individual & Team Potential

The first component of the model is co-creative organization inclusion through representation and collaboration that leverages individual and team potential. This component is operationalized through recognition and acceptance of workplace diversity, with inclusion realized through project teams by acceptance of individual differences, role involvement, and unique

contributions; and collaboration of diverse people in project teams to co-create innovative and creative ideas, products, processes, and services.

The Optimal Distinctiveness Theory is one of the supporting theories and proposes that individuals have two fundamental and competing human needs, which are the need for inclusion as well as the need for differentiation (Leonardelli et al., 2010).

From the findings of this research (Table 5 and 6) the 1st priority rank of psychological safety shows that people in organizations need to feel that they are recognized, valued, safe, and secure to be who they are, so that they can contribute whatever they can in the workplace. Companies must “ensure fair and equal opportunities in the representation of talents from talent acquisition and advancing talents into executive, management, technical, and board roles. They also must set the correct data-driven

targets for representation of diverse talents” (Dixon-Fyle et al., 2020).

“Inclusion and diversity should start from the hiring process to ensure that we do not hire people who already think like us because we do not like a company with people who think like each other and that we also use assessment tools to make people know themselves and consider representing diverse people in teams to work together. These data driven measures are used to assure that a team’s members are diverse and have the potential to deliver results”.

(Interview Informant 1)

Representation used to be defined by gender, race, and demographic differences, but now has a broader context which includes the concepts of diversity of thought, cognitive differences (Bourke et al., 2017), affiliation, and competencies, among many others. Representation is not enough as employees must feel and perceive equality and fairness of workplace opportunity. Representation and collaboration involve the deliberate option to put together diverse people in teams at the executive, middle management, and project team levels, ensuring that each team consists of a range of people who bring in different perspectives and ideas. Diverse teams are more likely to radically innovate and anticipate shifts, while helping their companies to gain a competitive edge (Dixon-Fyle et al., 2020, p 1).

This research has extensively presented that inclusion is no longer an option for consideration in today’s workplaces. It is an imperative business case for companies to gain a competitive advantage.

Component 2: Co-Creative Organizational Inclusion by Top-Management Championing Representation

“Co-creative organizational inclusion by top-management championing representation” is based on workplace inclusion and perceived organizational support with a focus on leaders.

The research findings (Table 5 and 6) show that top-management support for inclusion in the workplace means having leaders and managers who support and initiate inclusion through various teams and projects, appreciating the different perceptions in decision making, inviting contributions from various perspectives, and showing the qualities of flexibility, openness, self-awareness, and courage, that build a culture of workplace inclusion. It is noteworthy to consider the demographics of the respondents and informants that show that the majority were involved in management and executive positions. This implies that they as company leaders consider themselves as key drivers of organizational inclusion.

This component is operationalized through champions who are managers and leaders who give conscious support for inclusion

to drive collaboration, creativity, and innovation. The terms of “conscious support” or “conscious leadership” were mentioned by two informants during the interviews. This means that management have a keen sense of understanding of inclusion in the workplace, making deliberate decisions and actions that drive organizational inclusion. Bourke et. al (2017 p. 112) recommended to “ensure that top leadership understands the importance of diversity by sharing research on the value of inclusion, building a consensus at the top management level and making them accountable through metrics, transparent reports on diversity in promotion, hiring, and compensation. Dixon-Fyle et al., (2020) suggest the need to “strengthen leadership accountability and capability for inclusion and diversity and put their leaders and managers at the heart of the inclusion and diversity efforts-beyond their HR functions or employee-resource group leaders.”

Organizations need leaders and managers who are in a continuous process of learning, implementing, and championing inclusion management. The mind set of leaders must change to reflect an understanding and appreciation for the power and influence of diversity and inclusion across all stakeholder groups.

Component 3: Co-Creative Organization Inclusion Through Supportive and Collaborative Culture

The component refers to the

aspect of perceived organizational support in co-creating inclusive organizations that are relevant, responsive, and supported by their company’s structures, processes, and policies (Table 5 and 6). This component implies the co-creation of an organizational culture that leverages diversity & inclusion talents. Both the tangible and intangible aspects of the organizational culture are considered in the development of organizational inclusion. These aspects include shared purpose, vision, and goals; cultivating a generative, positive, and collaborative approach; open communication at personal, team and company levels (dialogue, listening, forum, meetings) for learning, knowledge sharing and development; and human resource development that leverages the inclusion of people and talents in the workplace.

Asian companies practice inclusion by “Harmony” or “Happy workplace” creating a workplace environment where everyone can happily work together, which is different from the west where they focus more on each person’s unique talents (Fifer, et al., 2019). Creating a diverse and inclusive culture is the responsibility of all employees, not just those who identify with a certain gender, ethnicity, or affinity (Dixon-Fyle et al., 2020, p.22).

Mor Barak’s (2017) inclusive workplace model includes five principal areas, namely management leadership, education and training, performance and accountability, work-life balance, and career

development and planning. These areas support the intangible aspects of an inclusive workplace culture. The structures and systems support the organization's case for inclusion and diversity as a glue and driver of organizational performance.

As an organization model, the model developed in this research is intended for use in various settings, and for further operationalization of the components of the model based on different organizational contexts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results contribute to academic research on organizational inclusion. The proposed OD model can be utilized by OD practitioners, managers, and leaders to further design and implement change management interventions, strategies, and tools, to enhance inclusion towards individual and organizational agility and effectiveness.

The proposed model should be pilot tested in specific companies or industries to obtain more robust and context-specific applications.

Further studies may be conducted with various generational groups, leadership groups, or in new contexts brought about by the Covid-19 global pandemic which "has created new class divides among people and in the workplace in terms of support, benefits, opportunities, risk, social and economic impacts, and other emerging scenarios" (Madgavkar et al., 2020). Further studies could verify if the variables or constructs used in this study, which were

obtained during the onset of COVID-19 would take on different perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Boekhorst, J. A. (2015). The role of authentic leadership in fostering workplace inclusion: A social information processing perspective. *Human Resource Management, 54*(2), 241–264
- Bourke, J., Garr, S., van Berkel, A., & Wong, J. (2017). *Diversity and inclusion: The reality gap*. Deloitte University Press. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/focus/human-capital-trends/2017/diversity-and-inclusion-at-the-workplace.html>
- Burkholder, G.J.; Cox, K.A., Crawford, L.M., Hitchcock, J.H. (2020) *Research design and methods*. Sage Publications,
- Chainut, A., Suwanjan, P., Pupat, P., & Pimdee, P. (2019). Needs assessment for the global mindedness of vocational certificate students under the office of the vocational education commission *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 10 (2) 25-33
- Choi, K. B., Moon, H. K., Ko, W., & Kim, K. M. (2016). A cross-sectional study of the relationships between organizational justices and OCB. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 35*(6), 530-554. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-08-2012-0103>

- Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches*. Sage Publications
- Cummings, T.G., & Worley, C.G. (2015). *Organization development and change*. Cengage
- Dixon-Fyle, S., Hunt, V., Dolan, K., & Prince, S. (2020). Diversity win: how inclusion matters. McKinsey and Co. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-wins-how-inclusion-matters>
- Edmondson, A., & Roloff, K. (2008). "Overcoming barriers to collaboration: psychological safety and learning in diverse teams." In *Team Effectiveness in Complex Organizations: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives and Approaches*, edited by E. Sales, G. G. Goodwin, and C. S. Burke. Organizational Frontiers Series. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2008.
- Fang Y. C. (2014). The Influence of inclusive leadership on team performance-based on the mediating role of employees' self-efficacy. *Sci. Res. Manag.* 5 152–151.
- Fang, Y. C., Chen, J. Y., Wang, M. J., & Chen, C. Y. (2019). The impact of inclusive leadership on employees' innovative behaviors: The mediation of psychological capital. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1803. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01803>
- Ferdman, B.M. ed, & Deane, B. R., Associate ed (2014). *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*. Jossey Bass
- Fifer, K., O'Neill, H., McAlinden, S, & Padmanabhan, G. (2019) Diverse region, inclusive workplaces: *Asia Pacific Diversity and inclusion survey 2019*. Heidrick and Struggles International Inc.
- Gay, L.R. & Diehl, P.L. (1992). *Research methods for business and management*. Mc. Millan Publishing Company.
- Hsiao, H., Chang, J., Tu, Y., & Chen, S. (2011). The impact of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior for teachers. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1 (1)
- Hirak R., Peng A. C., Carmeli A., & Schaubroeck J. M. (2010). Linking leader inclusiveness to work unit performance: The importance of psychological safety and learning from failures. *Leadersh. Q.* 2012 107–117. 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.11.009
- Hudie, X., Chen, Y. & Zhao, F. (2017). Inclusive leadership, perceived organizational support, and work engagement: The moderating role of leadership-member exchange relationship. 10.2991/sncc-17.2017.48. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320178366>
- Islam, T., & Ahmed, I. (2018). Mechanism between perceived organizational support and transfer of training: Explanatory

- role of self-efficacy and job satisfaction *MRN MRN. Management Research Review*, 41(3), 296-313. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2022948861?accountid=8401>
- Javed, B., Khan, A.K., Naqvi, S., & Arjoon, S. (2017). Impact of inclusive leadership on innovative work behavior: The role of psychological safety. *Journal of Management and Organization* <https://researchgate.net/publication/313902404>
- Jin, M., Lee, J., & Lee, M. Y. (2017). Does leadership matter in diversity management? assessing the relative impact of diversity policy and inclusive leadership in the public sector. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 38, 303–319. doi: 10.1108/lodj-07-2015-0151
- Kinicki, A., & Fugate, M. (2013). *Organization behavior*. (5th ed.). McGraw Hill Education
- Kwa, E. (2019). HR Asia announces Thailand's best companies to work for in Asia. PR Newswire Asia. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2281685909?accountid=8401>
- Le, P.B., & Lei, H. (2019). Determinants of innovation capability: the roles of transformational leadership, knowledge sharing and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23 (3) 527-547. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-09-2018-0568>
- Leonardelli, G., Pickett, C., & Brewer, M. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 43:63-113 doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(10)43002-6
- Leveson, L., & Joiner, T. A. (2008). Managing cultural diversity and perceived organizational support: Evidence from Australia. www.emeraldinsight.com/0143-7720.htm
- Madgavkar, A., Krishnan, M. White, O., Mahajan, D. (2020). COVID-19 and gender equality: Countering the regressive effects. *McKinsey Global Institute*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/covid-19-and-gender-equality-countering-the-regressive-effects>
- Minghui, Y., & Yuanxu, L. (2014). Research on the Mechanism of Inclusive Leadership on Employees' Innovative Behavior. *Journal of Science and Technology Progress and Policy*, 10.
- Mor Barak, M.E. (2017). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. (4th ed.). Sage
- Moss R.H. (2008). *Work environment scale manual: Development, applications, research*. (4th ed.). Mind Garden, Inc.
- Paolillo, A., Silva, S. A., & Pasini, M. (2016). Promoting safety participation through diversity and inclusion climates.

- International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 9(3), 308-327. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-01-2015-0002>
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd ed). Sage
- Pongpayaklert, T., & Atikomtrirat, W. (2011). *Managing diversity: Managing diversity in international context*. Lambert Academic Publishing
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(2), 212–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104273064>
- Roussin, C., Larraz, E., Jamieson, K., & Maestre, J. (2017). Psychological safety, self-efficacy, and speaking up in interprofessional health care simulation. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2017.12.002>
- Scroggins, W.A., Benson, P.G., & Rabl, T. (2010). Age, discrimination, and achievement motives: A study of German employees. *Personnel Review*, 39 (4) 448-467. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011045416>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. (5th ed.), Wiley India (Pvt) Ltd,
- Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Deane, M.A., Ehrhart, K.H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*. 37 (4) doi: 10.1177/0149206310389543
- Stashevsky, S., Burke, R., Carmeli, A., Meitar, R. & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and innovative behavior at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27 (1) 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720610652853>
- Stavros, J.M., & Hinrichs, G. (2009). *The thin book of SOAR: Building strengths-based strategy*. The Thin Book Publishing
- Tavakol, M. & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's Alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Yao, L., & Li, P. (2019). Moral leadership and employee work–family conflict: A moderated mediation model. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 47(12).
- Zhang, L., Yang, F., & Gu, Y. (2016). Inclusive leadership: conception, measurement, and relationships to related variables. *Adv. Psychol. Sci.* 24 1467–1477

Zhu, Y., & Wang, Y.F. (2011). The relationship between entrepreneur psychological capital and employee's innovative behavior: the strategic role of transformational leadership and knowledge sharing. *Adv. Mater. Res.* 282-283, 691-696. doi: 10.4028/www.sceintific.net/amr.282-283.691