REVISITING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EUDAIMONIC WELL-BEING AND INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP: MEDIATING ROLE OF PERCEPTION OF INCLUSION

Khalid Javaid Anwer, Ph.D. Scholar, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: khalidnovo@hotmail.com

Dr. Adnan Riaz, Assistant Professor, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: adnan_riaz@aiou.edu.pk

Dr. Haji Rahman, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Science, University of Buner, Pakistan. Email: haji616@ubuner.edu.pk

Abstract. *The main goal of the current research is to investigate the mediator role of perception of*

inclusion between inclusive leadership and eudaimonic well-being. The partial least square method of structural equation modeling was incorporated to test the direct effect and the mediating effect based on data collected from 401 respondents of dissimilar sectors but mainly from the pharmaceutical sector. The results exposed an insignificant direct effect and significant indirect impact of inclusive leadership on eudaimonic well-being; however, the variable perception of inclusion was found to be a significant mediator. Nevertheless, the results contribute to the prior research studies that largely investigated the direct relationship between employee well-being and leadership, by showing that perception of inclusion mediates the relationship between eudaimonic well-being and inclusive leadership. The findings of the current research study certainly will help managers working in many industries set up and maintain behaviors that can improve employees' well-being, particularly eudaimonic well-being at work.

1   Introduction

In the modern competitive and dynamic business world, the word "Inclusion" is considered as a catchphrase today. Research scholars and practitioners have encompassed inclusion or perception of inclusion as a key for employee well-being at the workplace and sustained competitive advantage. The perception of inclusion is anticipated as a unique approach in managing a diversified workforce (Roberson, 2006), which addresses diversity positively instead of a problem to deal with it (Shore et al., 2009). Shore et al. (2011) also argued that the perception of inclusion among the employees can be inculcated by addressing their needs for uniqueness and belongingness since they could experience the feelings of being a part of the organization while at work along with their unique selves.

Thus, employees while at the workplace can capitalize their potential up to the full extent, collaborate with peers, respond to dissimilar challenges, and enhance their experience (Randel et al., 2018; Panicker et al., 2018). A leader's role in implementing and infusing perception of inclusion is very critical (Mor Barak et. al., 2021). Out of various contextual factors, Shore et al. (2011) considered the inclusive leadership as one of the critical and the most contributing factors in the development of perception of inclusion besides inclusive environment and inclusive practices. In the last decades, several researchers focused on investigating the effects of inclusive leadership especially on learning from mistakes (Ye et al., 2019), psychological safety (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), and work engagement (Choi et al., 2015).

Though, the concept of leadership received a raised level of attention in the literature due to its importance (Lacerenza et al., 2017), yet several fundamental questions exist to be answered regarding its theorization and conceptualization since inclusive leadership has been developed recently (Shore & Chung, 2021). As Carmeli et al. (2010), the concept of inclusive leadership has been described through different perspectives and perceptions yet there is least a common agreement on a universal definition. However, research scholars augmented the current definitions of inclusive leadership by their varied elucidations (Choi et al., 2015), and enthused the concept with more with more progressive models (Ye et al., 2019), the extent to which precise contribution was grounded in inclusive leadership philosophy. However, Van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013) argued that the fragmented comprehension of the concept and its mechanisms may cause possibly confusion about the nature and effects of inclusive leadership and this eventually deter obstruct theoretical advancements (Randel et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the primary goal of this paper is to appraise the current literature and synthesize the existing knowledge in order to comprehend the concept of inclusive leadership, models considered so far, and its outcomes in terms of eudaimonic well-being. The author hopes to deliver the answers to the questions below, in a systematic review of the literature available:

1. What relationship exists between Inclusive Leadership and Eudaimonic well-being?
2. Does perception of inclusion mediate the relationship between eudaimonic well-being at the workplace and inclusive leadership?

In order to respond to the aforementioned questions for the current research, we carried out a quantitative analysis This research study reveals nuanced aspects of leadership that have not before been fully discussed in relation to employee well-being (Eudaimonic well-being) and perceptions of inclusion (belonging-ness & uniqueness) on inclusive leadership under the light of underlying theories that underpin them.

Literature Review & Hypotheses Development

Inclusive leadership

Nembhard and Edmondson, first time defined Inclusive leadership as leader's words or deeds that refer to an invitation or appreciation against followers' contributions. They also projected the concept of inclusive leadership with three dissimilar perspectives: First, the leaders-subordinate relationship, that suggests that inclusive leadership inspires individuals to work autonomously and contribute to decision-making. Second, inclusive leadership, treats employees equally and fairly in different contexts. The *third* perspective was the cultural background that posits that individuals at the workplace should be inclusive of distinct behaviors, values, and also tolerant to mistakes (Tang et al., 2015).

However, this concept of inclusive leadership can be understood different ways. For instance, Carmeli et al. (2010) stated that when individuals demonstrate their availability, ensure accessibility, and are open to listening to their followers, it can be termed inclusive leadership. Hassan and Jiang (2021) on the other hand, reported that inclusive leadership ensures that followers receive adequate credit against their efforts and contributions, whatever their titles are in the organizational hierarchy.

Moreover, the existing literature on inclusive leadership has also proven its credibility for innovative behavior (Javed et al., 2017), creativity (Mikyoung & Moon, 2019), and learning environment (Rahman et al., 2016, Hassan & Jiang, 2021) and for workplace engagement (Wang et al., 2019).

Inclusive leadership is an interactive, supportive, fault0tolerant, and fair style and critical organizational contextual variable which significantly impacts subordinate behaviors (Carmeli et al., 2013). Nonetheless, researchers' concept-tualized inclusive leadership based on social identity theory identity theory and optimal distinctiveness theory, as a set of behaviors, which are engrossed in developing members' perception of being a part of organizational team (sense of belongingness) a part of the team (belongingness) while maintaining their sense of being unique (uniqueness) during contributing towards organizational outcomes (Shore et al., 2011).

Whereas, Carmeli et al. (2010) explained the concept of inclusive leadership as "individuals who exhibit their availability, accessibility, and availability while interacting with their followers." Subsequently, this concept as been accepted broadly and also incorporated in later advanced research studies in inclusive leadership (Rahman, & Khan, 2016, Choi et al., 2017).

Inclusive leadership and eudaimonic well-being

Montano et al., (2017) argued that research studies carried so far examined the relationship between employees' well-being and leadership styles rather than the evaluation of leadership style. Although, the concept of well-being is broad and multi-facets construct that determines the level of work engagement, meaning in work, and a sense of involvement (Fisher, 2014). There is a general agreement about well-being as the "state of being well" with the presence of joyous moods and emotions, the lack of negative emotions, fulfillment, positive functioning, and satisfaction with life (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Since prehistoric times, response to the question "how personal well-being can be achieved" had been of two categories; Eudaimonia and Hedonia. An organized review of diverse descriptions was made on Eudaimonia and hedonia, eventually used in psychology research (Disabato et al., 2016). It will be challenging for those who are not familiar with the modern philosophy of well-being and happiness but only acquainted with the ancient philosophy of eudemonism, and they might not find the distinction between happiness and well-being.

The philosophical and theoretical roots of Eudaimonic well-being can be linked to the valuable works of Greek philosopher Aristotle, who explained Eudaimonia as a result of living by one's true self or 'daimon' and by one's values while fulfilling best potential (Waterman, 1990).

The concept of well-being is a classical notion derived from ancient Greek era that is academically deliberated to hold two different dimensions: Eudaimonia and hedonia; such dimensions are confirming and distinct (Rahmani et al., 2018). According to several scholars, Eudaimonia and Hedonia, both concepts can be traced back to the ancient conceptualization of well-being, even though they have different perspectives of human nature (Ryff & Singer, 2008).

The word "Eudaimonia" is conventionally interpreted as "happiness," while in modern philosophy is translated as "flourishing." While in modern philosophy, several commentaries on and explanations of "Eudaimonia" have been identified (Tiberius, 2013). Gale et al. (2013) defined well-being in terms of patterns of behaviors and thoughts that offer fulfillment. Similarly, Danker's (2019) Eudaimonic view of well-being focuses on connotation & self-realization that explains the concept of well-being in terms of the magnitude to which an individual is copiously functioning. It also refers to the psycho-social condition – a keystone of mental well-being (Danker, 2019). However, based on Aristotle's philosophy, Eudaimonic view refers to apprehending the human capital and growth to the ensuing pursuit of life (Waterman, 1990). Distinct leadership style can influence positively sense of being well, therefore, in the current research, the author hypothesized the association between well-being of employees at the workplace and inclusive leadership behaviour as follows:

H1. Inclusive leadership has positive impact *on employee's Eudaimonic well-being.*

Inclusion and inclusive leadership

The notion, inclusion incorporates old-fashioned definitions of diversity by examining the magnitude of one's feelings of being valued and unique team members. The basic principle is that gathering individuals from different backgrounds is not sufficient to realize the diversity initiatives; instead, individual employees must report feelings of belongingness and be valued for diversity potential benefits to be realized (Walker et al., 2019). Perception of inclusion refers to an employee's sense of belongingness towards the organizational system and having access to decision-making channels and information at the workplace (Barak, 2016). However, the concept of "Inclusion" can be delineated as an "employee's perception of being a valued member of the work team" in an organizational framework (Shore et al., 2011, Rahman et al.**,** 2016).

The exclusion of barriers, it is argued, hinder employees from contributing to the full extent enables employees to capitalize on organizational resources, participate in decision-making, and share ideas (Nishii, 2013). Thus, employees' feelings of inclusion at the workplace may develop upon satisfaction of two accompanying needs for uniqueness and belongingness (Shore et al., 2011).

Although, developing a sense of belongingness is important but if individuals have to have to compromise on their distinct (unique characteristics), then they would not be experiencing the genuine concept of inclusion. Cottrill et al. (2014) also reported that experiencing inclusion by the individuals at the workplace holds several potential and significantly positive outcomes, and such experiences are only possible by effective leadership behavior.

Therefore, Chrobot-Mason and Ruderman (2014) stated that various leadership challenges had been articulated by scholars connected to diversity in the organizational settings. Nevertheless, there is a little research or theory that emphasizes on leadership approaches to address challenges related to diversity through promoting the experience of feelings of inclusion in the workplace (Nishii & Mayer, 2009). Nonetheless, managers and business leaders who promote and enhance the employees' experience of inclusion at the workplace interact with the workforce in such a way that goes beyond discrimination, avoidance of bias and delivers value through diverse employees' retention (Simons et al., 2015).

More specifically, if an employee is not treated as a valued and respected member for unique attributes that he or she holds at the workplace but is asked to act like other employees, he or she may be experiencing a sense of belongingness; however, it will be at the price of compromised uniqueness. Similarly, when

someone is recognized for unique characteristics but not invited to share in meetings, his need for uniqueness is met at the cost of belongingness. Employees at the workplace must perceive that they are valued and respected members of the organization through a wide range of satisfying experiences that are needed for belongingness and uniqueness.

H₂. Inclusive leadership has significantly positive impact of employee's perception of inclusion.

Mediating role of perception of inclusion

Groysberg and Connolly (2013) reported that practitioners and business leaders always appreciated the role of diversity in organizational success since diversity in linked with multiple positive outcomes not limited to creativity and innovation. Business organizations deliberately focus on bringing an outstanding level of diversity in their workforce, but regrettably, it does not guarantee the potential benefits such as increased level of creativity, innovation, and decreased employee turnover (Cook & Glass, 2014). There are cases; managers feel wonder when they do not observe any change in organizational productivity and performance, even with a diverse workforce.

Even though many organizations added more diverse workforce to their employee pool but, they do not realize the potent benefits of diversity (Cook & Glass 2014). The existing literature suggests that merely increasing a diverse workforce's representation in an organization is not enough yet. To capitalize the optimum benefits of diversity, leaders are required to involve employees in various elements of organizational operations (MOR Barak et al., 2016; Shore et al., 2018). Nonetheless, to ensure a high degree of individuals' involvement in the workplace, managers and leaders attempted to offer all team members an opportunity to utilize their full potential. Hence, scholars are concerned about how involvement can be enhanced, thus they looked into "inclusion," which means "employees perceiving that they are esteemed members of a workgroup or organizations as a results of treatment that satisfies belongingness and uniqueness related needs" the means to accomplish such objectives (Shore et al., 2011), they also conceptualized the inclusion as distinct from other perspectives, they overtly viewed inclusion as one's need for belongingness, such as having a stable and positive interpersonal relationship (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). However, the sense of belongingness and the necessity to maintain the sense of self (Synder & Fromkin, 2012) should be addressed to establish the perception of inclusion. In the existing literature on inclusion, different themes were identified and captured (Shore et al., 2011), hence the concept of inclusion can be referred to a state of being acknowledged, appreciated, and heard with unique characteristics (uniqueness) and being accepted (belongingness) (Barak, 1999).

As per the optimal distinctiveness theory, individuals are supposed to be like others and different from others simultaneously and it also supports the definitions

of inclusion that is an extension of social identity theory (Brewer, 2011). The scholars increasingly started considering inclusion (individuals' feelings that they are valued member of the organization, and their needs for belongingness and uniqueness are met) as one of the critical factors of organizational success (Shore et al., 2011).

Correspondingly, Carberry and Meyers (2017) argued that leaders who aspire perception of fairness must not forget to consider the advantages of diversity because existing research studies consider the perception of inclusion as a vital component of organizational success for instance organizational and employees' well-being. Because, employees at the workplace are inclined to feel psychological safety and enhanced well-being when they are respected, appreciated for their distinctiveness (Guillaume et al., 2014).

However, based on the elements discussed, leaders may improve employees' well-being through an elevated sense of belongingness, because, it is inferred that the perception of inclusion can mediate the relationship between eudaimonic well-being and inclusive leadership at the workplace.

What level of perception of inclusion, employees feel depends on effective leadership (Cottrill et al., 2014), and the leader who emphasizes employees' feelings of inclusion at the workplace can lead to decreased level of employee turnover and higher performance (Mor Barak, 2015).

Shore et al. (2011) used optimal distinctiveness theory to theorize one's perception of inclusion as gratifying needs for belongingness and the need for uniqueness (Brewer & Roccas, 2001). The sense of being included in the organizational systems formally and informally builds their perception of fairness and organizational justice (Ashikali & Groeneveld, 2015).

Considering different leadership styles associated with employees' well-being, current literature seeks to comprehend through which process or mechanism employees' well-being gets increased and what triggers that process yet to be investigated (Guest, 2017). However, to discover the underlying mechanism deeply the leadership and well-being, the author is intended to explore the role of Perception of Inclusion as the intervening (mediating) variable to explain the association between employees' well-being and inclusive leadership. Therefore, this relationship was hypothesized as follows:

H3. Perception of inclusion mediates the relationship between inclusive leadership and eudaimonic well-being.

Research Methodology

The rivalry in present industrial sectors demands for employees to be more professional, innovative, and competent to encounter the hurriedly varying demands of the clients (Taghizadeh, 2015). Therefore, the target population was local and multinational organizations from the dissimilar sectors including Pharmaceutical, FMCG (fast moving consumer goods), and public sector organizations. More than five hundred questionnaires were distributed and out of which 430 questionnaires were returned reflecting the response rate around 86%, and out of which 29 questionnaires were incomplete. The entire set of items was measured by seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" and 7 "strongly agree." The predictor variable, Inclusive leadership was measured through Carmeli et al.'s (2010) three dimensions, availability, openness, and accessibility, with nine (9) items instrument based on the concept of leadership inclusion proposed by Nembhard & Edminson (2006). The dimension, availability, was measured with four (4) items, openness with three (3) items, and accessibility with two (2) items. Top-level journals and several scholars have acknowledged and recognized this inclusive leadership scale. The variable perception of inclusion was measured through the dimensions; belongingness and uniqueness, ten items were adopted from Shore et al. (2011) and the representative items related to belongingness (*e.g.*, *I am treated as a valued member of my organization*), and for uniqueness were (*e.g., People in my team listen to me even when my views are different).* Employee eudaimonic well-being was measured through interpersonal and intrapersonal dimensions with four items each (*e.g., I feel connected to others within my team or the work environment*) and (*e.g., I feel that I am doing a purposeful work at my workplace*) adapted from Bartels et al. (2019). Around 73% of the respondents were between the ages of 20-40 years and their average experience was about 7 years.

Structural and measurement models evaluation

The proposed research model was evaluated through the structural assessment and measurement elements. The main reason behind this evaluation was to determine whether both structural and measurement models fulfill the quality standards for empirical investigations (Urbach & Ahlemann, 2010). The measurement validity was determined through internal reliability, indicator reliability, convergent reliability, and discriminant validity (Lewis et al., 2005).

Traditionally, the measurement models' internal reliability can be assessed through Cronbach's alpha (CA) values. Principally, the constructs with greater Cronbach's alpha (CA) value are destined that the items (questions) within the constructs carry similar meanings and the range (Cronabch, 1971). Cronbach's alpha values deliver an estimation for the reliability-centered indicator inter-correlation. Inter-item consistency can also be measured within SmartPLS (software) through Composite Reliability (Bacon et al., 1995). Although both

Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values measure internal consistency whereas composite reliability considers too that indicators carry different loadings. The Cronbach's alpha test may underrate or misjudge the internal consistency reliability since it does not undertake the equivalence among the measures and pre-assume all the indicators with equal weightage. The internal reliability is satisfactory when the value is greater or equal to 0.7. However, the composite reliability value and Cronbach's alpha value below 0.6 confirms the lack of reliability (Bacon et al., 1995).

Data Analysis and Results

Reliability and validity analysis

The reliability of the latent constructs was measured through Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha Reliability. All the composite reliability (CR) values computed from the analysis were more significant than the suggested value of 0.70 (Wasko & Faraj, 2005). Hence, a measurement model confirms acceptable reliability when CR (composite reliability) for each variable (constructs) exceeds the threshold values of 0.70. While the CR (composite reliability) values for all the constructs were between the ranges from 0.905 to 0.945 (see table 1), which confirms the measurement model's reliability.

Whereas the indicator's reliability of the measurement model was assessed through item loadings. If each item's loading is on the higher side (above 0.5), the measurement model has satisfactory and acceptable indicator reliability (Hair et al., 2017). The items considered in the measurement model showed outer loadings above 0.6 ranging from 0.624 to 0.890, and significant at the level of 0.001. However, all the items, based on analysis, showed good indicators reliability. The convergent validity of the measurement model was assessed through the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values of the latent constructs since the convergent value is known to be appropriate when the constructs exhibit AVE (average variance extracted) value is close or greater than 0.5. However, all the constructs of the current thesis are between the ranges of 0.546 to 0.702. (Table 1) Hence, the convergent validity was accepted since the AVE (Average variance extracted) values were more significant than 0.5.

Table 1: *Reliability and Validity*

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Eudaimonic Well-being	0.880	0.905	0.546
Inclusive Leadership	0.934	0.945	0.654
Perception of Inclusion	0.925	0.937	0.597

The Composite Reliability value for Eudaimonic Well-being 0.905, Inclusive Leadership 0.945, and Perception of Inclusion 0.937, were found that poses satisfactory internal reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values were found more significant than the acceptable and recommended value of 0.70.

Structural model

The structural model explains the paths hypothesized in the current study since it is measured based on path coefficients, R^2, and Q^2 values. The goodness of the structural model is determined by the strengths of each structural path that is ascertained by the R^2 value for endogenous construct (Briones Penalver et al., 2018), and R^2 value must be greater than or at least equal to 0.1 for a satisfactory level of goodness of the Model (Falk & Miller, 1992). The results revealed that all the R^2 values for endogenous constructs are more significant than 0.1, the goodness of the model fit was established successfully. Similarly, the model's predictive relevance was also assessed the Q^2 values for each endogenous construct, and the Q^2 values confirmed the predictive relevance of the endogenous constructs since the Q^2 value above zero demonstrates the model's predictive relevance. The results are presented in Table 2, which explains that there is significance in predicting endogenous constructs.

Table 2: *Coefficient of Determination – R^2 and Q^2 Values*

Constructs	R^2	Q^2
Eudaimonic Well-being (EWB)	0.670	0.379
Perception of Inclusion (PI)	0.634	0.369

The R^2 (coefficient of determination) value designates the extent of variance in endogenous constructs, influenced by the exogenous constructs. More specifically, the amount of variability exists in the data the measurement model describes. The value of R^2 is required to be high to elucidate the endogenous latent variable's variance adequately. Therefore, the greater value of R^2 is said to increase the structure model's predictive ability. In the current thesis, the R^2 values were acquired through the algorithm function of SmartPLS software. Similarly, the bootstrapping function of SmartPLS develops 5000 samples from 401 cases to find to calculate t-statistics values. The structural model results demonstrated that 67% of the change in eudaimonic workplace well-being could be accounted into Inclusive Leadership and Perception of Inclusion.

Each path connects two latent constructs representing a hypothesis in the structural model. Path coefficients permit the investigator to prove or disprove each hypothesis and better comprehend the strength of association between an endogenous (dependent) variable and exogenous variables (independent). The path coefficients can be described as standardized beta (ß) coefficients generated in the least-squares regressions. The bootstrapping function is incorporated to determine

whether the path coefficients are significant along with *t*-statistics. The significance levels, *t*-statistics, and path coefficients for hypothesized association among variables are presented in Table 3. This research study's five thousand (5000) re-samples create 95% confidence intervals (see table 3), and a confidence interval other than zero (0) confirms the significant relationship. The path assessment results can either prove or disprove the proposed hypotheses, and the findings are discussed in the sections below. After that, the proposed hypotheses were required to be tested to determine the relationships.

Table 1: *Descriptive Statistics*

Paths	β	STDEV	T Statistics	P Values	2.50%	97.5%
IL -> EWB	0.078	0.063	1.240	0.215	-0.047	0.200
IL -> PI	0.708	0.036	19.700	0.000	0.627	0.769
PI -> EWB	0.420	0.083	5.047	0.000	0.243	0.569

The hypothesis H1 weighs whether Inclusive Leadership (IL) has a positively significant impact on Eudaimonic well-being (EWB), and the results showed that Inclusive leadership has no significant impact on Eudaimonic well-being directly (H_{1b}: ß=0.078; t=1.240, and p=0.215); however, H1 was not supported. Whereas hypothesis H2 was projected to determine whether Perception of Inclusion (PI) significantly impacts Eudaimonic well-being (EWB)? The results after the analysis revealed that perception of inclusion has a significant impact on Eudaimonic well-being. (H2: ß=0.420 *t*=5.047, and p<0.001), therefore, H2 was fully supported.

Mediation analysis

Mediation processes are outlined in intermediate variables between exogenous and endogenous variables. Hence, three variables are required in total; *X*, *M*, and *Y*. Where *X* is the exogenous (independent) variable, *Y* is the endogenous (dependent) variable, and *M* is the mediator (hypothesized) variable, which is assumed to transfer the causal effects of exogenous variable to the endogenous variable (Agler & De Boeck, 2017). Whereas the total effect of exogenous variable on the endogenous variable is termed TE (total effect). Then it is split into direct effect (DE) of exogenous construct on the endogenous construct and indirect effect (IE) of exogenous construct on the endogenous construct, which is transmitted through moderating latent variable. The relationship between the independent and dependent variables is decomposed into direct effect or direct link and indirect effect or indirect link (Agler & De Boeck, 2017).

The hypothesis H3 was constructed to determine whether the perception of inclusion mediates the relationship between Inclusive leadership and Eudaimonic well-being. Based on the results presented in Table 4. The total effect of Inclusive

leadership (IL) on Eudaimonic well-being (EWB) was significant (H$_{5a}$: ß=0.576; *t*=10.713, p <0.001). With the inclusion of the mediating variable (Perception of inclusion), the impact of Inclusive leadership (independent variable) on Eudaimonic well-being (dependent variable) became insignificant (ß=0.090; *t*=1.160, p=0.246). The indirect effect of Inclusive leadership (independent variable) on Eudaimonic well-being (dependent variable) through the perception of inclusion (mediating variable) was found significant (ß=0.486; *t*=9.041, p<0.001). Nonetheless, it confirmed that the relationship between Inclusive leadership (IL) and Eudaimonic well-being (EWB) is completely mediated by perception of inclusion (PI). Thus, hypothesis H3 was supported and accepted (table 4)

Table 4: *H3 – Inclusive Leadership > PI -> Eudaimonic Well-being*

	Total Effect			**Direct Effect**				**Indirect Effect**		
	ß	*t*	*p*	*ß*	*T*	*p*	H3:IL -> PI -> EWB	*ß*	*t*	*p*
IL->EWB	0.58	10.71	0.00	0.09	1.16	0.25		0.49	9.04	0.00

Discussion and Research Questions

This study's principal objective was to comprehensively analyze the existing relationship among Inclusive leadership and Eudaimonic well-being with mediating mechanisms of perception of inclusion (sense of belongingness and uniqueness). A conceptual model was framed and tested through different statistical tools, integrating relevant theories such as optimal distinctiveness theory, self-determinant theory, job burnout theory, and social identity theory with literature on the selected variables. The contribution of this study is to address the questions of how Inclusive leadership can be constructive and functional. The research questions and hypotheses were formulated comprehensively for the current research study. The primary contribution of this research thesis was to fetch answers to the proposed research questions, how Inclusive leadership affects employee Eudaimonic well-being and the results have been discussed in the following sections with rational justifications.

To find the answer for the proposed research question, "Does Inclusive Leadership has a relationship with perception of inclusion and Eudaimonic well-being at the workplace. Hypotheses H1, H2, and H3 were framed and then tested. Consequently, the hypotheses, H2 and H3, were accepted, while H1 were rejected based on statistical results. The results for hypotheses H2 showed that Inclusive leadership behavior has a strong and significant influence on employee perception of inclusion. Hence, empirical results suggest that inclusive leadership is positively related to the perception of inclusion. In other words, inclusive leadership is a significant positive predictor of employee perception of inclusion.

More specifically, if a leader's behavior is inclusive and leader remains available, accessible, and open to listen and understand their employees' concerns,

needs, expectations, interests, and dissimilar viewpoints, then employees at the workplace feel a valued and respected members of the team that eventually, turns into an enhanced sense of belongingness. Furthermore, a leader's accessibility and availability bring to the followers' perception of approachability (Carmeli et al., 2010) and develops a quality leader-subordinate relationship (Nishii & Mayer, 2009). Employees are willing to return to the organization with "great performance and creativity" (Hollander, 2012) as an inclusive leader accomplishes work and pursues win-win outcomes with employees based on respect, recognition, reaction, and accountability.

However, the current literature on Inclusive leadership behavior proved its credibility for creativity, innovative behavior, workplace engagement, and learning environment (Hassan & Jiang, 2021).

Results also confirm that Hedonic employee well-being is also affected significantly by leaders' inclusive behavior. On the other hand, the results for hypotheses H2 explains that Inclusive leadership does not influence directly and significantly employee well-being, particularly Eudaimonic well-being at the workplace. Instead, inclusive leaders have a significant influence on employee perception of inclusion, and then the perception of inclusion has a substantial impact on employee eudaimonic well-being.

Another research question, "Does perception of inclusion mediates the relationship between inclusive leadership and eudaimonic well-being," was required to be answered through this research study. For the same, the hypotheses H3 was constructed and later tested. The results revealed that the construct, perception of inclusion plays a mediating role significantly between endogenous variable (eudaimonic well-being) and exogenous variable (inclusive leadership). Therefore, hypothesis H3 was accepted. Therefore, eudaimonic well-being at the workplace is recognized as a significant and fundamental element of an organization's success that causes desirable outcomes, such as improved performance and decreased employee turnover (Pitts, 2017).

Conclusion

The statistical analysis and outcomes from the data gathered for the current study demonstrate that the conceptual model, which was based on different theories such as; optimal distinctiveness theory, self-determination theory and social identity theory are supported since the two hypotheses were accepted. Moreover, integrating the model with the different theories discussed above enabled the author to comprehend the relationships among the study variables better. The statistical results also demonstrate how leaders' inclusive behavior at the workplace can affect the perception of inclusion and other functional outcomes. The results

also reveal that Inclusive leadership behavior does not directly lead to enhanced Eudaimonic well-being but through other constructs such as perception of inclusion.

Although, a reasonable number of studies have been conducted to examine the association between leadership styles and employees' subjective well-being. Nevertheless, in the current study, the author investigated the Eudaimonic perspective of well-being and leaders' inclusive leadership style and how leaders can positively affect employees' Eudaimonic workplace well-being. An enhanced employee Eudaimonic well-being consequently led to better individual productivity and overall organizational performance.

Statistical findings designate that inclusive leadership is a significant positive predictor of employees' perception of inclusion, which means employees' perception of inclusion (sense of belongingness and uniqueness) is affected positively by Inclusive leadership behavior. If leaders are easily accessible, available, and open to listening to their employees' perspectives, then employees' sense of belongingness (perception of inclusion) gets triggered. Furthermore, employees' perception of inclusion is affected when they feel respected and treated as valued members of the team. This conclusion substantially matches a previous one of the "leadership is closely related to work attitude and employee behavior"; for example, transformational, transactional, servant, authentic leaderships can significantly affect employee engagement (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). However, these researches mostly explored leadership, while inclusive leadership stressed the two-way interaction between leaders and employee, and leadership's effect mechanisms on employee engagement should be studied from the employees' perspective. Therefore, the conclusion enriched further the theory and study perspective of leadership's effect on employee's work behavior.

Implications

A few implications, either theoretical or practical ones, can be drawn from this study, for instance, this research study further develops our understanding of the phenomenon, how employee eudaimonic well-being at the workplace is affected by different constructs directly or indirectly, including the perception of inclusion, and the inclusive behaviors of the leaders. However, employees at the workplace desire to combine the self with position and exerts more energy and time at work.

If inclusive managers at the workplace recognize, value, and respect them and remain open to listening to their perspectives, and maintain a conducive environment. Therefore, it can be suggested that employee Eudaimonic well-being can be enriched by inclusive leadership; if leaders behave in such a way, employees' sense of belongingness gets developed. In practicing management, the concept of inclusive leadership can be cultured through the guidance of self-correction, consultation, and systematic reporting systems. Leaders are just meant

to exert the efforts and optimum utility to create an inclusive culture and enhance employee sense of belongingness or perception of inclusion while being unique.

Nonetheless, employee Eudaimonic workplace well-being can shape the core strength in today's competitive world. Nonetheless, the organizations must concentrate more on developing their managers as inclusive leaders, and planned training and development programs could help develop inclusive leaders (Kolbe et al., 2013). The management must formulate a strategy regarding recognizing and respecting employee differences, adequate compensation against their potential talent, and teamwork. An inclusive leader's way of giving respect and recognition to employees can positively drive the hope, tenacity, sense of belongingness, work engagement, and Eudaimonic/Hedonic well-being of employees at the workplace. Inclusive leadership is required to be allowed to develop employees' perception of inclusion (sense of belongingness) to promote Eudaimonic well-being.

Limitations

The influence of inclusive leadership on employee Eudaimonic well-being was examined through an empirical approach. However, subjective and objective conditions raised the following limitations; since the data were collected from different industrial sectors, the equal representation of all the sectors got narrowed; therefore, it might confine the external validity of the conclusions. Another limitation in research design, assumed by the author, was that inclusive leadership takes time to impact employees' Eudaimonic workplace well-being, perception of inclusion (sense of belongingness), and work alienation. Nevertheless, the cross-sectional study setting (design) seems compromised to determine the causal relationship between the variables since it represents the same time point. Although, the structural equation modeling (SEM) can be incorporated to test the entire model instantaneously and facilitate the finding of causal relationships positively among the variables, there are some limitations to interpret the results.

Nonetheless, the current was the quantitative research study, and data were gathered through a self-reported questionnaire which gives rise to common method variance. No doubt, the data, collected through self-reported questionnaires, was based on respondents' subjective feelings or statements. Therefore, Chan et al. (2009) argued that the data that inherit defects fail to deliver a precise parametric estimation of the structural relationship and risk the validity. According to the literature, employee well-being, either eudaimonic or hedonic, is influenced by the individual, group, corporate characteristics, personal and workplace resources. According to situational theory, the leadership effect is the product of a combined function of the leaders, followers, and environment; thus, no leadership can fit all environments.

Recommendations and Future Research Directions

Given the methodological and theoretical limitations for future research, the recommendations are put forward now. According to many scholars, management style and management practices are subject to the sector's characteristics and management life cycle. However, the applicability of any study conclusions depends on relevant management situations. Therefore, a comprehensive future verification and careful deduction with a more significant sample are necessary to determine whether the conclusions apply to other sectors, regions, and organizational developmental stages. So, the applicability of Eudaimonic/Hedonic workplace well-being and Inclusive leadership measuring scales should be further tested, particularly in this regional context.

The scales and theories of inclusive leadership and Eudaimonic workplace well-being that seem to fit the culture should be developed to enhance the practical significance and theoretical contribution. In the present research study, the impact of leadership behavior on employee eudaimonic well-being and perception of inclusion was examined solely from employees' perspectives, yet future research studies may include a broad range of other topics. The most measuring scales and theories of Inclusive leadership, perception of inclusion, and Eudaimonic workplace well-being adopted were developed and used in Western culture and have seldom been verified under Indo-Pak culture. Although the scales used in the current research are mature and widely accepted due to their verified reliability and validity yet, certain variations might be affected by administrative aspects and environment.

References

Agler, R., & De Boeck, P. (2017). On the interpretation and use of mediation: multiple perspectives on mediation analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1984.

Ashikali, T., & Groeneveld, S. (2015). Diversity management for all? An empirical analysis of diversity management outcomes across groups. *Personnel Review*, *44*(5), 757-780.

Bacon, D. R., Sauer, P. L., & Young, M. (1995). Composite reliability in structural equations modeling. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *55*(3), 394-406.

Bansal, A. (2017). A revelation of employee feelings of alienation during post-mergers and acquisition: An outcome of perceived organizational justice. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 30*(3), 417-439.

Bansal, A. and Thakur, M. (2013). The impact of perception of organizational transfer climate factors and trainees' characteristics on training transfer: The context of M&A. *Journal of International Business and Economics, 1*(1), 50-66.

Barak, M. E. M. (1999). Beyond affirmative action: Toward a model of diversity and organizational inclusion. *Administration in Social Work*, *23*(3-4), 47-68.

Bartels, A. L., Peterson, S. J., & Reina, C. S. (2019). Understanding well-being at work: Development and validation of the eudaimonic workplace well-being scale. *PloS One*, *14*(4), e0215957.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497-529.

Brewer, M. B. (2011). Optimal distinctiveness theory: Its history and development. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology, 2,* 81-98.

Brewer, M. B., & Roccas, S. (2001). Individual values, social identity, and optimal distinctiveness. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self* (pp. 219–237). Psychology Press.

Briones Peñalver, A. J., Bernal Conesa, J. A., & de Nieves Nieto, C. (2018). Analysis of corporate social responsibility in Spanish agribusiness and its influence on innovation and performance. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *25*(2), 182-193.

Carberry, E. J., & Meyers, J. S. (2017). Are the "best" better for everyone? Demographic variation in employee perceptions of Fortune's "Best Companies to Work For". *Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion: An International Journal*. *36*(7), 647-669.

Carmeli, A., Gelbard, R., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2013). Leadership, creative problem-solving capacity, and creative performance: The importance of knowledge sharing. *Human Resource Management*, *52*(1), 95-121.

Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, *22*(3), 250-260.

Chan, Y. K., Chen, W. T., Yu, S. S., Ho, Y. A., Tsai, C. S., & Chu, Y. P. (2009). A HDWT-based reversible data hiding method. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *82*(3), 411-421.

Choi, S. B., Tran, T. B. H., & Kang, S. W. (2017). Inclusive leadership and employee well-being: The mediating role of person-job fit. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *18*(6), 1877-1901.

Choi, S. B., Tran, T. B. H., & Park, B. I. (2015). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Mediating roles of affective organizational commitment and creativity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *43*(6), 931-943.

Chrobot-Mason, D., Ruderman, M., & Nishii, L. (2013). Leadership in a diverse workplace. In Q. Roberson (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity and work* (pp. 315–340). Oxford, UK: University Press.

Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2014). Above the glass ceiling: When are women and racial/ethnic minorities promoted to CEO? *Strategic Management Journal*, *35*(7), 1080-1089.

Cottrill, K., Lopez, P. D., & Hoffman, C. C. (2014). How authentic leadership and inclusion benefit organizations. *Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *33*(3), 275-292.

Danker, J. (2019). *Enhancing the Well-Being of Students on the Autism Spectrum: Learning from Students, Parents, and Teachers*. Routledge.

Disabato, D. J., Goodman, F. R., Kashdan, T. B., Short, J. L., & Jarden, A. (2016). Different types of wellbeing? A cross-cultural examination of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Psychological Assessment, 28*(5), 471-482.

Falk, R. F., & Miller, N. B. (1992). *A Primer for Soft Modeling*. University of Akron Press.

Fisher, C. D. (2014). Conceptualizing and measuring wellbeing at work. In P. Y. Chen & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Work and Wellbeing* (pp. 9–33). Wiley Blackwell.

Gale, C. R., Booth, T., Mõttus, R., Kuh, D., & Deary, I. J. (2013). Neuroticism and Extraversion in youth predict mental wellbeing and life satisfaction 40 years later. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(6), 687-697.

Groysberg, B., & Connolly, K. (2013). Great leaders who make the mix work. *Harvard Business Review*, *91*(9), 68-76.

Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee wellbeing: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *27*(1), 22-38.

Guillaume, Y. R., Dawson, J. F., Priola, V., Sacramento, C. A., Woods, S. A., Higson, H. E., & West, M. A. (2014). Managing diversity in organizations: An integrative model and agenda for future research. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *23*(5), 783-802.

Hair, J., Hollingsworth, C. L., Randolph, A. B., & Chong, A. Y. L. (2017). An updated and expanded assessment of PLS-SEM in information systems research. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 117*(3), 442-458.

Hassan, S., & Jiang, Z. (2021). Facilitating learning to improve performance of law enforcement workgroups: the role of inclusive leadership behavior. *International Public Management Journal*, *24*(1), 106-130.

Hollander, E. (2012). *Inclusive Leadership: The Essential Leader-Follower Relationship*. Routledge.

Javed, B., Naqvi, S. M. M. R., Khan, A. K., Arjoon, S., & Tayyeb, H. H. (2017). Impact of inclusive leadership on innovative work behavior: The role of

psychological safety. *Journal of Management and Organization*, *25*(1), 117–136.

Kolbe, M., Weiss, M., Grote, G., Knauth, A., Dambach, M., Spahn, D. R., & Grande, B. (2013). Team Gains: a tool for structured debriefings for simulation-based team trainings. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *22*(7), 541-553.

Lacerenza, C. N., Reyes, D. L., Marlow, S. L., Joseph, D. L., & Salas, E. (2017). Leadership training design, delivery, and implementation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(12), 1686.

Lewis, B. R., Templeton, G. F., & Byrd, T. A. (2005). A methodology for construct development in MIS research. *European Journal of Information Systems, 14*(4), 388-400.

Mikyoung, K., & Moon, J. (2019). Inclusive leadership and creative performance: The role of psychological safety, feedback-seeking behavior, and power-distance. *Korean Journal of Human Resources Development*, *22*(4), 181–205.

Montano, D., Reeske, A., Franke, F., & Hüffmeier, J. (2017). Leadership, followers' mental health, and job performance in organizations: A comprehensive meta-analysis from an occupational health perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38(*3), 327-350.

Mor Barak, M. E. (2015). Inclusion is the key to diversity management, but what is inclusion? *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, *39*(2), 83-88.

Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M. K., Hsiao, H. Y., & Brimhall, K. C. (2016). The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, *40*(4), 305–333.

Mor Barak, M. E., Luria, G., & Brimhall, K. C. (2021). What leaders say versus what they do: Inclusive leadership, policy-practice decoupling, and the anomaly of climate for inclusion. *Group & Organization Management*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2F10596011211005916

Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *27*(7), 941-966.

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader-member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1412-1426.

Panicker, A., Agrawal, R. K., & Khandelwal, U. (2018). Inclusive workplace and organizational citizenship behavior. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 37(6), 530–550.

Pitts, J. S. (2017). Creating More Engaging and Relevant Evaluations: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches for Assessing the Context and Support for Well-Being in Employer Organizations. *New Measures for New Directions Jessica Grossmeier, Ph.D., MPH*, *31*(5), 445.

Rahman, H., Rahman, W., Ali, N. & Khan, F. (2016). Organizational learning culture and employees' career development: Empirical evidence from colleges in Malakand Division, KPK, Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Sciences, 10* (1), 15-29.

Rahman, H., Rahman, W., Khan M. A, Anwar K. J. (2016). The Mediating Role of Career Development in its Antecedents and Outcomes: Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *Sarhad Journal of Management Sciences*, 2 (2), 164-175.

Rahman, H., & Khan, H. G. A. (2016). Examining the interceding role of leader-member exchange (LMX) in the relationship between trust and employee engagement. *Sarhad Journal of Management Sciences*, *2*(1), 66-73.

Rahmani, K., Gnoth, J., & Mather, D. (2018). Hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: A psycholinguistic view. *Tourism Management*, *69*, 155-166.

Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*(2), 190-203.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(2), 212–236.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(4), 719-727.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(1), 13-39.

Shore, L. M., & Chung, B. G. (2021). Inclusive leadership: How leaders sustain or discourage work group inclusion. *Group & Organization Management*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2F1059601121999580

Shore, L. M., Chung-Herrera, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., Jung, D. I., Randel, A. E., & Singh, G. (2009). Diversity in organizations: Where are we now and where are we going? *Human Resource Management Review, 19*(2), 117–133.

Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*(2), 176–189.

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in workgroups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1262-1289.

Synder, C. R., & Fromkin, H. L. (2012). Uniqueness: The human pursuit of difference. *Springer Science & Business Media.*

Taghizadeh, S. K. (2015). *The Relationship Between Service Innovation Management Practices on Performance Within Telecommunications Industry in Malaysia* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Sains Malaysia).

Tang, N., Jiang, Y., Chen, C., Zhou, Z., Chen, C. C., & Yu, Z. (2015). Inclusion and inclusion management in the Chinese context: An exploratory study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *26*(6), 856-874.

Tiberius, V. (2013). Recipes for a good life: Eudaimonism and the contribution of philosophy. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *The best within us: Positive psychology perspectives on Eudaimonia* (pp. 19–38). American Psychological Association.

Urbach, N., & Ahlemann, F. (2010). Structural equation modeling in information systems research using partial least squares. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application, 11*(2), 5-40.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic—transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *Academy of management Annals*, *7*(1), 1-60.

Wang, Y. X., Yang, Y. J., Wang, Y., Su, D., Li, S. W., Zhang, T., & Li, H. P. (2019). The mediating role of inclusive leadership: Work engagement and innovative behavior among Chinese head nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *27*(4), 688–696.

Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S. (2005). Why Should I Share? Examining Social Capital and Knowledge Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice. *MIS Quarterly*, *29*(1), 35–57.

Waterman, A. S. (1990). The relevance of Aristotle's conception of Eudaimonia for the psychological study of happiness. *Theoretical & Philosophical Psychology*, *10*(1), 39-44.

Ye, Q., Wang, D., & Li, X. (2019). Inclusive leadership and employees' learning from errors: A moderated mediation model. Australian Journal of Management, 44(3), 462–481.

Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of management journal*, *53*(1), 107-128.