

Chapter 2

Rethinking Diversity, Inclusion, and Inclusiveness: The Quest to Better Understand Indicators of Community Enrichment and Well-Being

Craig Talmage and Richard C. Knopf

Abstract Communities thrive on diversity in the long-run. Our communities are filled with diverse individuals and diverse groups of residents who, though they share a common place, may not experience their communities exactly the same as their fellow residents. Broad strokes are needed in our quests to better understand diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness indicators in our communities. These three concepts are the building-blocks to high levels of community well-being. This chapter synthesizes recent conceptualizations and research on these three concepts. Diversity is described as a community resource. Inclusion is highlighted as a community process, and inclusiveness is described as a community outcome. Three tools are proposed to leverage these building-blocks to increase community well-being. The three tools are policy, development, and enrichment in communities. This chapter proposes that community policy is best suited to address changes regarding indicators of diversity. Community development is best suited for inclusion, and community enrichment is best concentrated on inclusiveness.

Keywords Diversity · Inclusion · Inclusiveness · Community indicators · Community enrichment · Community development · Public policy

C. Talmage (✉)

Entrepreneurial Studies, Hobart and William Smith Colleges,
Geneva, NY 14456, USA
e-mail: talmage@hws.edu

R.C. Knopf

School of Community Resources and Development,
Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ 85004, USA

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

P. Kraeger et al. (eds.), *New Dimensions in Community Well-Being*,
Community Quality-of-Life and Well-Being, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55408-2_2

2.1 The Community Well-Being Questions

What do people want from their communities? This question remains timeless. Ideally, individuals and communities alike desire to be at their best and want to transform their community systems into the best possible iterations of those systems (Bilu 1988). Likely, community members share the goal of establishing communities of high well-being that they want to reside in. Community well-being is often construed as an outcome state. For instance, Lee et al. (2016) conceptualize community well-being in terms of fulfillment; community well-being is achieved through the fulfillment of needs and desires. More likely, fulfillment of needs and desires, as an outcome, is only the beginning. For example, Rath and Harter (2010) contend that community well-being is both an outcome and a process that reinforces and enriches community well-being (see also, Talmage 2014, 2015). Ultimately, this chapter aims to convince the reader that inclusiveness in regards to human diversity is an essential dimension of community well-being.

In regards to community well-being, this chapter focuses on addressing the question, *what resources and processes are needed to achieve, reinforce, and amplify inclusiveness in communities?* Inclusive public spheres are established through policy, cooperation, and psychological enhancement, which underlie community engagement (Tibaldeo 2014). The resources and processes that move community members from disengaged to not yet engaged are distinctly different than those that move members to become engaged in communities (Grillo et al. 2010). That is, satisfaction with social processes in communities appear more pivotal increasing involvement, while satisfaction with physical resources and community services seem only protective against decreases in involvement. Their findings are consistent with previous studies (e.g., Brackertz and Kenley 2002; Orthner et al. 1990). Satisfaction with social and community experiences must be enriched psychologically to sustain engagement (Grillo et al. 2010; Talmage 2015). Specifically, this chapter addresses the previous question by discussing various indicators of community resources, processes, and outcomes that may influence policy, development, and enrichment (Phillips and Pittman 2009; Talmage 2014).

Policy, development, and enrichment are three tools that can be used to build a community capacity's to increase their own well-being. Policy frees community resources, development betters community processes, and enrichment amplifies community outcomes. Diversity is seen as a community resource, inclusion is seen as a community process, and inclusiveness is seen as a community outcome. All three are building-blocks of a community's capacity to increase their own well-being. Based on these sets of tools and building-blocks, this chapter thus argues that community capacity may be increased through the following:

- (1) Community policy focused on diversity;
- (2) Community development focused on inclusion; and,
- (3) Community enrichment focused on inclusiveness.

To create a fuller picture, academic, civic, and practice-based resources are used to in our elucidation of definitions, themes, and indicators of diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness.

2.2 Three Building-Blocks: Diversity, Inclusion, and Inclusiveness

2.2.1 *Defining Diversity, Inclusion, and Inclusiveness*

Any assessment of diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness in a community context should begin with the primary question: *What is diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness?* A solid understanding of these building-blocks is crucial at the outset, so that there is not an excessive or distracting amount of conceptual fuzziness. With the dearth of research, perfect definitions are unreasonable to expect; however, basic framing remains possible. This chapter in particular focuses on these building-blocks in the human and social capital domains of the community capitals framework (Emery and Flora 2006); however, other forms of diversity that relate to physical and natural capital like biodiversity and spatial diversity exist as well (e.g., Black and Hughes 2001; Mohanty and Tanton 2012). Each section, hereafter, will connect the three building-blocks (i.e., diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness) of community capacity to community well-being and highlight the main themes explored through theory and measurement.

Resources are supplies that are present that can be raised up in communities. **Diversity** is heralded as a resource that is already present within communities that can be sourced to increase a community's capacity to improve their own well-being. The community resource called diversity refers to the composition of a community, which encompasses a wide range of differences within and between both individuals and groups (DECC 2012; Roberson 2006; The City of Edmonton, n.d.; U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011). Individuals vary in their own layers of diversity, such as variations in identities, attitudes, behaviors, and perspectives (Roberson 2006; The City of Edmonton, n.d.). Thus, diversity covers observable and hidden differences in perspectives, backgrounds, personalities, cultures, identities, and experiences (Jackson et al. 1995; Kochan et al. 1996; Milliken and Martins 1996; Thomas and Ely 1996; Tsui et al. 1992).

Processes are methods and actions that carry or move communities forward. **Inclusion** is put forth as a process that leverages human diversity to increase a community's capacity to improve their own well-being. The community process called inclusion encompasses approaches by community persons and groups to include, involve, and value differences between individuals and groups (DECC 2012; The City of Edmonton, n.d.). Inclusion views differences between individuals and groups in communities as strengths (The City of Edmonton, n.d.). Viewing differences as strengths in some ways shows honor for an individual's experience,

so that he or she may feel valued and included (DECC 2012; Roberson 2006). Inclusion creates a culture that connects and empowers individuals, so that they are able to fully contribute and participate (Miller 1998; Mor-Barak and Cherin 1998; Roberson 2006; U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011). To do so, they must be able to access the necessary information and resources to participate (Mor-Barak and Cherin 1998); thus, inclusion uses diversity as a resource to promulgate inclusiveness.

Outcomes are the results of actions undertaken in communities. *Inclusiveness* is a community outcome that results from methods of inclusion that utilize diversity as a resource. The community outcome called inclusiveness has been defined as the inclusion of all individuals and groups, specifically individuals or groups who were previously not included or excluded (Bicchi 2006; Ibarra 1993; Pettigrew and Martin 1989). Inclusiveness is also the ability of a community to include all its members and avoid excluding any of them (Reynal-Querol 2005). Lockwood (2010) defines inclusiveness as “the opportunities available for all stakeholders to participate in and influence decision-making processes and actions” (760). In their review, Smith et al. (2012) describe inclusiveness as the integration of all members in systems (see also Roberson 2006). To be integrated, all members must be able to share and not compete for power and resources (Bicchi 2006; Lloyd et al. 2006; Townsend 1997). Therefore, inclusiveness is the result of the inclusion of diversity in communities; however, it still needs enhancement (Tibaldo 2014).

2.2.2 *Diversity Defined as a Resource*

Human diversity continues to be linked in the literature to community health, resilience, strength, and well-being (Black and Hughes 2001; Watts et al. 1994). Famously, Putnam (2007) has been *misquoted for noting that* diversity could be harmful to civic life, but he actually has contended that diversity is a long-run game. Putnam (2007) has emphasized that societies that work to overcome fragmentation between heterogeneous persons and groups and work to increase social solidarity are likely to benefit culturally, developmentally, economically, and fiscally. Diversity and tolerance of diversity have become recognized indicators of social progress and democratic success (Salvaris and Woolcock 2010). For example, stable, racially and ethnically diverse communities are more likely to have a larger middle-class and larger stocks of affordable housing (Nyden et al. 1997).

Hereafter, we present an overview of the key themes derived from indicators research surrounding diversity as a community resource, so that the reader may be aware of what avenues can be explored in the future work towards community well-being. Key themes of the overview, and affiliated indicator variables are summarized in Table 2.1.

Diversity is commonly viewed in terms of *demographics*, which are features that describe the composition of a population (Roberson 2006). Going back to the English and Greek linguistic roots of the word, “demography” literally means “map

Table 2.1 Key themes and indicators of diversity as a community resource

Themes	Common indicators	Source
Demographics	National origin, language, race, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, veteran status, and family structures	Roberson (2006), SHRM (2009), The City of Edmonton (n.d.), U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2011)
Tolerance and acceptance	Social capital, norms, habits, respect, cooperation, attitudes, and values	Black and Hughes (2001), Foote (2005), Mohanty and Tanton (2012), Thomson (2010)
Cultural	Plurality, awareness, visibility, languages, celebrations, policies, acknowledgment, promotion, artistic expression, storytelling, and multiculturalism	Black and Hughes (2001), Foote (2005), Mohanty and Tanton (2012), Palich and Edmonds (2013), Pstross et al. 2014, Salvaris (2007), Talmage et al. 2016, Thomson (2010)
Cohesion	Cognitions—trust, sense of community, and collective efficacy/empowerment; Behaviors—cooperation, neighboring, and participation; and, Social conditions—independence, autonomy, and recognition	Black and Hughes (2001), Falk, Golding, and Balatti (2000), Foote (2005), Perkins et al. (2002); Royal and Rossi (1996); Thomson (2010)
Activities and actors	Leaders, organizations, events, projects, programs, services, leisure, sport, recreation, dialogue	Foote (2005), Johanson et al. (2014), Mulligan et al. (2008), Palich and Edmonds (2013), The City of Edmonton (n.d.), Salvaris (2007), Schulenkorf (2012), Thomson (2010)

of the people.” In modern vernacular, demographic measurements “include, but are not limited to, characteristics such as national origin, language, race, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, veteran status, and family structures” (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011: 3). These demographics may include those who emigrate/immigrate or who are born and raised in a particular area (SHRM 2009; U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011). More importantly, these demographics cannot only be seen as differences among people based on origin or residence (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011). Notably, there are unseen layers to identity and indicators of diversity that are less apparent, such as sexual orientation (see Milliken and Martins 1996). Florida (2005) has emphasized the importance of indicators such as LGBTQ, bohemian, and creative class indexes in measuring cities’ potential to attract creativity and talent (see also Kanai 2014). He notes, “Talented people are attracted to locations that have a high degree of demographic diversity and are distinguished by a high degree of openness and relatively low barriers to entry” (100). As noted earlier, these layers and indicators

can be extended to differences in thought and life experience (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011: 4). Today, many assessments focus on how well communities tolerate and accept diversity (e.g., Black and Hughes 2001; Mohanty and Tanton 2012).

Tolerance and acceptance of diversity have been linked to community well-being. The social strength of heterogeneous communities appears to depend upon a high degree of tolerance and acceptance of diversity (Black and Hughes 2001). Black and Hughes (2001) note, "Some communities have a much greater diversity of composition than others. Where the diversity is greater, the issue of tolerance becomes more important. There is a particular strength in non-homogeneous communities that have a high degree of tolerance" (104). Thus, tolerance and acceptance can serve as an indicator of how well social capital functions in diverse communities (Foote 2005; Mohanty and Tanton 2012). Congruently, social capital's characteristics include value and respect from others (Black and Hughes 2001; Cox and Caldwell 2000; Thomson 2010). Measurements of acceptance and tolerance may involve attitudes as well (Black and Hughes 2001; Thomson 2010). Black and Hughes (2001) write, "Tolerance involves respect for those who have different ways of life, different norms and habits from oneself. It does not necessarily mean agreeing with such people, but means that the differences are not seen as a barrier to cooperation" (104). Respect can be extended to cultural differences (Thomson 2010).

Cultural diversity, which goes deeper than demography, has also been identified as an indicator of community well-being, specifically social capital (Mohanty and Tanton 2012). Cultural diversity refers essentially to pluralities of cultures and their respective composite parts (Foote 2005). Measurements of such pluralities include awareness and visibility of other cultures (Salvaris 2007; Thomson 2010). Many have looked at the number of minority community groups and the amount of equality and rights awarded to those particular groups (e.g., Foote 2005). Others have honed in on the multiplicity of languages spoken in communities and groups (Foote 2005; Mohanty and Tanton 2012). Specifically, celebrations of cultural diversity have been suggested to indicate cultural policy success (Salvaris 2007). Therefore, the acknowledgement and promotion of multiculturalism remain important indicators of social capital and tools in community development efforts (Black and Hughes 2001; Thomson 2010).

Diversity is related to the strengthening of community *cohesion* when the aim is to include diverse persons and cultures (Falk et al. 2000). For example, how individuals in communities view multiculturalism, a thought-process (i.e., cognition), has been identified as an indicator of diversity and community cohesion (Black and Hughes 2001). Congruently, social capital cognitions such as sense of community and collective efficacy appear relevant. For instance, Black and Hughes (2001) write, "Community strength is enhanced by a sense of community. It is weakened when sections of a community feel that they are marginalized or excluded from its activities and benefits, and particularly from its decision-making processes" (Black and Hughes 2001: 5, see also Royal and Rossi 1996). Feelings of belonging and connectedness, components of sense of community, are important to

building social capital, which can strengthen communities (Perkins et al. 2002; Royal and Rossi 1996; Thomson 2010).

The *activities and actors* (i.e., those who lead and plan activities) in communities are important indicators of diversity. The amount and variety of community activities and actors must be included in assessments of diversity (Mulligan et al. 2008; Salvaris 2007). Both the informal and formal participation of persons from different backgrounds must be recognized, dignified, and cultivated by creating favorable conditions for participation (Foote 2005). Assessments should consider how well diversity is reflected in the community decision-making and leadership (Black and Hughes 2001; Thomson 2010). Additionally, effective community engagement projects appear to require awareness and visibility to the vast variety of individuals and groups in communities (Palich and Edmonds 2013; Thomson 2010). Particular vantage points for surveying diversity might include leisure, recreation, sport, art showcases, and other community events (Johanson et al. 2014; Salvaris 2007; Schulenkorf 2012).

2.2.3 *Inclusion Defined as a Process*

Diversity alone does not guarantee inclusion, inclusiveness, or high community well-being (Laurence 2011); it requires the process of inclusion to promulgate well-being (Atkinson et al. 2004). Inclusion relates to a community's capacity to develop sustainably (Scerri and James 2010). It is objective-based and is aimed toward leveraging diversity to improve communities (Roberson 2006). Inclusion has been linked to social quality and strength (Berman and Phillips 2000). In particular, Correa-Velez et al. (2010) have linked the well-being of community members to indicators of belonging, where individuals and their differences feel valued and understood.

A number of large-scale performance indicators, if not scoreboards, of social inclusion have emerged (Atkinson et al. 2004; Cherchye et al. 2004). This chapter gives an overview of the key themes surrounding inclusion as seen in indicators research as a community process. This overview is illustrated in Table 2.2. A short synopsis is provided along with the table, so that the reader may be aware of what avenues can be explored in the future work towards community well-being.

Inclusion is aimed toward providing greater *access and pathways* to community resources (Azmat et al. 2014; Babacan 2005). Access is a key indicator of social exclusion and inequality (Atkinson et al. 2004; Berman and Phillips 2000). Inclusion gives individuals and groups, who may be currently excluded, greater influence on and access to social goods and services (Babacan 2005). The many targets for inclusion consist of social security and welfare systems, labor markets, housing markets, health services, educational systems and services, political systems, and community services (Atkinson et al. 2004; Berman and Phillips 2000). Often, researchers and policy-makers looking to foster inclusion look at indicators of poverty and low-income status of individuals, families, and minority groups

Table 2.2 Key themes and indicators of inclusion as a community process

Themes	Common indicators	Source
Access and pathways	Exclusion, barriers inequality, goods, services, markets, social systems, poverty, income, (un)employment, status, life expectancy and health	Atkinson et al. (2004), Azmat et al. (2014), Babacan (2005), Oxoby (2009), Ponc and Frisby (2010), Shortall (2004)
Organizational and civic participation	Voices, decision-making, democratic processes, volunteering, voting, collaborations, self-expression values, elite-challenging actions, emancipative social capital	Azmat et al. (2014), Babacan (2005), Gonzalez and Tyler (2008), Ponc and Frisby (2010), Prilleltensky and Gonick (1994), SHRM (2009), Thomson (2010), Welzel et al. (2005), Welzel and Deutsch (2012)
Perceptions of justice and fairness	Distributive justice, fairness, equity, equality, confidence in leadership, expressions of prejudice, design, institutional management and leadership, social interactions and communication	Brooke and Tyler (2010), Gonzalez and Tyler (2008), Plaut (2014), U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2011), Watts et al. (1994), Welzel et al. (2005)
Relationships	Welcoming, respect, support, social cohesion, social capital, social solidarity, belonging, frequency, amount, quality, friendships, interactions	Atkinson et al. (2004), Berman and Phillips (2000), Correa-Velez et al. (2010), Oxoby (2009), Paolini et al. (2004), Pettigrew and Tropp (2006), Ponc and Frisby (2010), Shortall (2004), Silver (1994), Tausch et al. (2007), Wilson (2006)
Psychosocial	Meaning, individuation, acceptance, safety, trust, recognition, sense of inclusion, sense of exclusion, social isolation, empathy, social processes	Anderson and Sabatelli (1990), Azmat et al. (2014), Brewer (2007), Gonzalez and Tyler (2008), O'Brien (2009), Oxoby (2009), Pagani and Robustelli (2010), Ponc and Frisby (2010), Reutter et al. (2009), Smart Richman and Leary (2009), Wirth and Williams (2009)

(Atkinson et al. 2004; Oxoby 2009). These indicators strongly relate to health care access and life expectancy, educational attainment, unemployment and employment, and the overall economic development of communities (Atkinson et al. 2004; Oxoby 2009; Shortall 2004). Moreover, the number and performance of organizations and other community-based structures in addressing barriers to access, increasing access to resources, and increasing social statuses are important indicators of inclusion (Ponc and Frisby 2010).

Organizations and individuals that seek inclusion to increase community well-being often do so through empowering those previously excluded to be included in *organizational and civic participation* (Babacan 2005). Civic participation benefits, if not depends on, the inclusion of all its citizens and their voices in

decision-making (Ponic and Frisby 2010; Prilleltensky and Gonick 1994; Thomson 2010) and in voting and democratic processes (Gonzalez and Tyler 2008; Ponic and Frisby 2010). Thus, the involvement and participation of previously uninvolved persons and groups in civic activities (e.g., decision-making, voicing, volunteering, voting, etc.) should be considered as indicators of inclusion (Azmat et al. 2014; Gonzalez and Tyler 2008; Ponic and Frisby 2010; SHRM 2009). Recently, researchers have begun to focus on elite challenging-actions and self-expression values, together termed emancipative social capital, which may serve as indicators of inclusion (Talmage et al. 2017; Welzel et al. 2005; Welzel and Deutsch 2012).

These more emancipative values and behaviors may push against injustice and unfairness in the social order (Welzel et al. 2005). *Perceptions of fairness and justice*, which include confidence in leadership, are important dimensions of inclusion to be measured in communities (Brooke and Tyler 2010; Gonzalez and Tyler 2008). These perceptions can be based on the freedom to voice diverse perspectives, perceptions of safety, perceptions of agency, and prevalence of expressions of prejudice (Brooke and Tyler 2010; Christens and Speer 2015). Inclusion can also be observed in institutional design (Plaut 2014; Roberson 2006), in particular, institutional missions, goals, objectives, staffing and budgets (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011). These institutions can purpose themselves to be diversity-conscious in promoting fairness, justice, and positive interactions in communities (Watts et al. 1994).

Relationships that are welcoming and show respect and support have been suggested to be components of inclusion in communities (Ponic and Frisby 2010). Past research has demonstrated the relevance of social cohesion, social capital, and social solidarity (Atkinson et al. 2004; Oxoby 2009; Shortall 2004; Silver 1994; Wilson 2006) as reflective of inclusion. Other researchers have suggested that relationship-based indicators of inclusion might include levels of identification with, participation in, and belonging felt within families, groups, and communities (Berman and Phillips 2000; Correa-Velez, Gifford, and Barnett 2010). When working to decrease prejudice, researchers have focused on the frequency and quality of interactions between individuals from different backgrounds and cross-group friendships (Paolini et al. 2004; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006; Tausch et al. 2007). Thus, the amount and quality of relationships can indicate inclusion (Ponic and Frisby 2010).

In addition to the measuring relationships on a primarily social level, researchers have called for an understanding of *psychosocial* indicators as well (Ponic and Frisby 2010). O'Brien (2009) writes of the need for, and benefits of, "a richer comprehension of the psychology of inclusion in the significant cultural systems that imbue our lives with meaning" (18). Feelings of, and actions toward, promoting acceptance, safety and trust, and recognition are posited to be important psychosocial indicators (Ponic and Frisby 2010). It is important to measure individuals' senses of inclusion, exclusion, and isolation in all aspects of the community system (Azmat et al. 2014; Gonzalez and Tyler 2008; Reutter et al. 2009; Smart Richman and Leary 2009; Wirth and Williams 2009). Additional psychosocial dimensions of inclusion have been suggested to include empathy towards

others (Pagani and Robustelli 2010) and individuation (Anderson and Sabatelli 1990; Brewer 2007). These components of inclusion can help create and establish inclusive communities with high well-being (Oxoby 2009), but now we address *what does inclusiveness look like?*

2.2.4 *Inclusiveness Defined as an Outcome*

Inclusiveness is a critical aim related to the democratic strength and well-being of communities (Reynal-Querol 2005). Social inclusiveness has been emphasized to be a moral imperative in modern communities (Britz 2008). Strong indicators of inclusiveness characterize communities with high social quality (Abbott and Wallace 2012). Specifically, inclusiveness has been tied to community empowerment (Laverack 2006), voluntary association and civic participation (Jackson 2007), and sustainable community and economic development (Jackson 2007). More dramatically and specifically, Reynal-Querol (2005) indicated that a country’s level of inclusiveness in its political system can predict potential for civil war, such that a negative relationship existed between the two variables.

This chapter provides an overview of how the community outcome that is inclusiveness is conceptualized and measured in indicators research. The overview is summarized in Table 2.3. A short synopsis is provided along with the table, so that the reader may be aware of what avenues can be explored in the future work toward community well-being.

Table 2.3 Key themes and indicators of inclusiveness as a community outcome

Themes	Common indicators	Source
Decision-making and participation	Eligibility, opportunity, equity, equality, poverty, (un) employment, income, wealth, recreation, geography, health, education	Babacan (2005), Barsh (1993), Dewhurst et al. (2014), Lloyd et al. (2006), Townsend (1997)
Leadership	Representation, decision-making, governance, accountability	DECC (2012), Reynal-Querol (2005), Scarrow (2005), Sindre (2014)
Structure	Political, organizational, institutional, environments, cultures, workplaces, communication, policies	DECC (2012), SHRM (2009), Thomson (2010), U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2011)
Functions	Cooperation, satisfaction, services, programs, involvement, volunteering, associations, civic participation	Jackson (2007), Marschall and Shah (2007), The City of Edmonton (n.d.)

Inclusiveness has been defined and measured in terms of eligibility, opportunities, and involvement in community *decision-making and participation* (Barsh 1993; Dewhurst et al. 2014; Reynal-Querol 2005; Scarrow 2005; Sindre 2014). Indicators of inclusiveness have included looking at the proportion of eligible individuals or subgroups that actually participate in a community process (Barsh 1993; Dewhurst et al. 2014). For example, if a community was seeking a greater inclusion of young adults in voting processes, they could quantify the number of young adults in the community and how many turned out to vote. Inclusiveness as an aim then would be to provide opportunities for the participation of all “eligible” persons (Barsh 1993; Dewhurst et al. 2014). Other indicators of inclusiveness would include equality and equity in opportunities for participation in society (Lloyd et al. 2006; Townsend 1997). Therefore, indicators of inclusiveness might include poverty, unemployment, income, wealth, recreation, geography, health, and education trends of individuals and groups (Babacan 2005; Lloyd et al. 2006).

Inclusiveness extends beyond eligibility, opportunity, and involvement. Inclusiveness indicators often concern heterogeneity in community *leadership*. Scarrow (2005) and Sindre (2014) note that it is important to examine the width of the circle of decision makers. Reynal-Querol (2005) writes that, “Democratic governments with multiparty decision-makers are more inclusive than democratic governments with just one decision-maker” (446). Therefore, it is also important to investigate trends and changes in leadership, governance, and accountability as indicators of inclusiveness (DECC 2012).

For there to be inclusive community leadership, there likely needs to be inclusive political and organizational *structures* in communities. Indicators of such structures may include the presence and promotion of inclusiveness within missions, goals, objectives, staffing and budgets (DECC 2012; Thomson 2010; U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011), legal frameworks (SHRM 2009), and political and organizational cultures (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011). Here again, it is important to look at changes and trends in workplaces, work environments, policies, communication, and cultures (DECC 2012; SHRM 2009; Thomson 2010; U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2011).

Functions, that is, how well community members work together to be inclusive, must be considered as well. Community program and service satisfaction by different individuals and groups has been noted as important to assess (Grillo et al. 2010; The City of Edmonton, n.d.). Additionally, the involvement of diverse persons and groups as both recipients and providers of quality community services should be measured (Marschall and Shah 2007). The amount of cooperation and success of cooperation in community development efforts are also essential indicators. Even more so, Jackson (2007) highlights that the degree of heterogeneity in the voluntary sector is a crucial foundation of civic participation. Inclusiveness, therefore, stands a key foundation of civil society, which cannot be ignored.

**2.3 Rethinking Diversity, Inclusion, and Inclusiveness:
A Framework and Implications**

For psychological research to be able to usefully theorize and study diversity in everyday lives, it needs to find new ways to incorporate the impact on individual lives of both large and small sociocultural, and sometimes political, contexts into research (Magnusson 2011: 88).

To conclude our discourse on indicators, we weave together diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness with the community well-being approaches. Diversity is paired with policy, inclusion is paired with development, and inclusiveness is paired with enrichment. The inclinations of each of the three approaches with the three building-blocks are discussed (Table 2.4).

2.3.1 Policy’s Diversity Inclination

Community policy is both the result of decisions made by governing bodies (Dye 1992) and reflection and discovery of what should ought to be done or ought not to be done (Simon 2015). These decisions and actions of policy-makers are put forth with the intentions of promoting and improving the well-being of community members (Alcock 1997); thus, it is important that policy-makers understand what might promote or deflate well-being in communities. Policy focuses on balancing and managing risks to community members (Esping-Andersen 1999: 36). With knowledge of such risks, policy is hopefully made and enacted through comprehensive strategies directed towards improving quality-of-life and well-being (Rodgers et al. 1968). Hall (2007) highlights that policy-making, by definition, is intended to be positive. Ideally, policy-making aims to promote economic growth and promote social justice through providing equal opportunities, institutional reform and equality of agency, and social integration vertically, so that all of society benefits (see review by Hall 2007). Policy-making appears then, at least in some normative circles or in some forms of political discourse, to be intended to benefit all.

Table 2.4 Summarizing diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness in the community system

Diversity policy	Inclusive development	Enriched inclusiveness
Demographics	Access and pathways	Participation
Tolerance and acceptance	Organizational and civic participation	Leadership
Cultural	Perceptions of justice and fairness	Structure
Cohesion	Relationships	Functions
Activities and actors	Psychosocial	Experiences

Policy likely has much to leverage in utilizing diversity indicators in promoting community well-being (see Table 2.4). Policy works well to remove barriers to community development, enrichment, and overall well-being. Policy-makers at the community level can enact policies that exclude particular individuals and groups based on demographics, identity, and culture. And, they can enact policies that particularly welcome inclusion of such previously excluded or overshadowed individuals and groups as well. Still there is a debate to be had on whether such policies achieve inclusion or address the social mechanisms of exclusion. Policies can be enacted to ensure the broad inclusion of previously excluded or underrepresented individuals and groups in decision-making and leadership. Community-level policies that promote activities and organizations that foster bridging and inter-group relationships also may help increase tolerance and acceptance as well as community well-being (see Pettigrew 1998; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006).

Community groups (i.e., organizations, associations, or clubs) can enact policies within themselves to honor and utilize diversity. These policies may mirror those enacted by the larger community. Groups, however, have the unique advantage of being more targeted, inviting, and inclusive to outsiders likely because they are not bogged down in as large of bureaucratic processes (Hirst 1994; 2002). These groups can enact policies that ensure the broad representation in decision-making and leadership as well. Community groups also have the potential to challenge the status quo of the larger community through inclusive policies and advocacy (e.g., Welzel et al. 2005). They also might host events or activities whose policies and communication intentionally, promote social cohesion and inclusiveness as well (Fabiansson 2006).

2.3.2 *Development's Inclusion Inclination*

Community development has been defined as “an effective change process aimed towards positive impact that is facilitated through the efficient use of resources” (Talmage 2014: 1601). The best use of resources, the best processes, or the best outcomes are ideally determined by community members, themselves (Rogers and Ryan 2001). Ideally, development is a process aimed towards producing positive community outcomes like increased community well-being (Matarrita-Cascante and Brennan 2012; Phillips and Pittman 2009; Robinson and Green 2011; Talmage 2014). Therefore, development in this chapter is focused on bettering *community processes*. Inclusion in this chapter is a community process, which can be undertaken in development to increase a community's capacity to improve community well-being.

Development likely has much to leverage in utilizing inclusion indicators in promoting community well-being (see Table 2.4). At the community level, agencies and organizations may try to connect previously excluded or overlooked individuals with greater access and pathways to community resources and opportunities for participation. This kind of work may also be tied to greater perceptions

of justice and fairness as well as confidence in leadership. Community development efforts may also focus on fostering cross-group friendships and providing cross-group interactions, such that relationships based on trust and reciprocity may form. In general, community development efforts can aim to: create safe spaces and foster a sense of inclusion; show acceptance, empathy, and recognition; and, inspire meaning in living life (e.g., Azmat et al. 2014; Gonzalez and Tyler 2008; Pagani and Robustelli 2010).

Community groups are likely the primary actors in community development efforts aside from government entities. These groups can seek to provide similar opportunities for individuals inside their own organizations and associations as well. These groups can also work around barriers impeding access of community resources and act as models of inclusion and/or inclusiveness to others. They can foster positive social interactions between different groups and individuals from differing backgrounds and experiences. They can also provide experiences in which individuals can learn more about their backgrounds and learn to appreciate themselves for who they are.

These experiences can be created at community events. Individuals can interact with different individuals and groups at events whether through informal interactions or formal participation and leadership at these events. It appears that community events have the potential to promote welcoming, respectful, and supportive behaviors, such that attendees or participants will feel like they belong. These events might also serve as places for protest of exclusion, prejudice, or injustice in policy and process for individuals and groups as well.

Individuals can daily enact thought-processes and behaviors that are inclusive of others and/or that promote inclusion. They can seek out opportunities to interact with individuals or groups who have different backgrounds from their own. They can act as models to others in how they approach and interact with those who may be different from themselves. These connections with others different from themselves can likely help them psychologically grow as individuals.

2.3.3 *Enrichment's Inclusiveness Inclination*

Community enrichment serves as an add-on process to community development; it can be seen as the amplification or enhancement of already positive community outcomes that are tied to quality-of-life and well-being (Greenhaus and Powell 2006; Morris and Madsen 2007; Talmage 2015; Thompson and Bunderson 2001). Essentially, enrichment works to endow current experiences with deeper meaning and pleasure (Schumacher et al. 1998) and expand the range of or opportunities for positive experiences in social situations (Farnworth and Muñoz 2009; Herzberg 1966, 1987). More specifically, expansion of roles, ranges, and opportunities as part of enrichment have been tied to improved health and well-being (Gareis et al. 2009). In fact, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have noted that positive experiences in one role (e.g., community leadership) can positively influence, that is overflow or

spill over, to other elements of well-being (e.g., family interactions). Overall, community enrichment's main purpose is the amplification of *community outcomes*.

For communities who wish to amplify inclusiveness, there may be many entry points in the community system to amplify or enrich community outcomes. At the community level, fun, meaningful, and interesting (i.e., enriching) experiences should be cultivated in community participation and leadership experiences (Schumacher et al. 1998; Talmage 2015). Community structures and functions can be positioned so that they can recognize and celebrate diversity, inclusion, and any milestones achieved towards inclusiveness. These enriching experiences can occur through community groups or at community events.

Community groups can host activities and events where inclusiveness can be recognized and celebrated. These groups can foster a sense of ownership and responsibility regarding inspiring others to be more inclusive in their policies and processes. Their events can serve as moments for enrichment. Individuals are often motivated to attend events where they can explore new cultures, meet new people, learn new things, and experience something new in general (Crompton and McKay 1997; Mohr et al. 1993). Surrounding themes of diversity and inclusiveness, these events may act as moments where intense physical or emotional experiences, learning and interactions, sharing cultural values, and temporary feelings of closeness occur with others. Events can also serve as mechanisms for individuals to fulfill their higher-order needs, such as recognition, achievement, autonomy, responsibility, fun and interesting tasks, and positive social interactions and relationships like mentorships and friendships from their social experiences and contexts (see review by Talmage 2015).

2.4 Conclusion

Diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness span a wide range of normative discourses and institutional structures, policies, and practices (Vertovec 2012); thus, this chapter should not serve as defining piece on the matter. It is our hope that readers of this chapter have felt invited to consider the many complex elements of diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness that characterize communities and that help build community capacity to foster well-being. This chapter presented a framework for understanding indicators of diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness; however, many additional indicators, sources of knowledge and wisdom, and methods for elucidating knowledge and wisdom surrounding diversity must be accessed and explored. Ideally, readers of this chapter will also feel inspired to explore such directions in their own community well-being work.

Far too often, research, assessment, and evaluation stop at indicators, but what is more important is that change comes after such endeavors. Communities that assess diversity can discover the amazing resources available to them for inclusion in their communities. The process of inclusion of those diverse resources can create communities that demonstrate inclusiveness. This chapter has highlighted

inclusiveness as an essential element of community well-being, which should not be forgotten in future research and practice.

Community policy, development, and enrichment are the tools by which the building-blocks of diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness can be leveraged in communities to foster increased well-being. We outlined in this chapter that policy is best focused on diversity, development is best concentrated on inclusion, and enrichment is best suited for inclusiveness. These notions need further empirical investigation, and likely all three tools overlap regarding the indicators they incorporate, not just the linear presentation featured in this chapter. We hope readers feel compelled to continue to infuse diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness in both indicators and community well-being work, so that we can create communities of high well-being that we all would like to reside in.

References

- Abbott, P., & Wallace, C. (2012). Social quality: A way to measure the quality of society. *Social Indicators Research*, 108(1), 153–167.
- Alcock, P. (1997). The discipline of social policy. In P. Alcock, A. Erskinem, & M. May (Eds.), *The student's companion to social policy* (pp. 5–22). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Anderson, S. A., & Sabatelli, R. M. (1990). Differentiating differentiation and individuation: Conceptual and operation challenges. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 18(1), 32–50.
- Atkinson, A. B., Marlier, E., & Nolan, B. (2004). Indicators and targets for social inclusion in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies (JCMS)*, 42(1), 47–75.
- Azmat, F., Fujimoto, Y., & Rentschler, R. (2014). Exploring cultural inclusion: Perspectives from a community arts organisation. *Australian Journal of Management*, 40(2), 375–396.
- Babacan, H. (2005). Challenges of inclusion: Cultural diversity, citizenship and engagement. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Engaging Communities*. Queensland Department of Main Roads. Available online at: <http://core.kmi.open.ac.uk/download/pdf/11574960.pdf>
- Barsh, R. L. (1993). Measuring human rights: Problems of methodology and purpose. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 15(1), 87–121.
- Berman, Y., & Phillips, D. (2000). Indicators of social quality and social exclusion at national and community level. *Social Indicators Research*, 50(3), 329–350.
- Bicchi, F. (2006). ‘Our size fits all’: Normative power Europe and the Mediterranean. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(2), 286–303.
- Bilu, Y. (1988). The inner limits of communitas: A covert dimension of pilgrimage experience. *Ethos*, 16(3), 302–325.
- Black, A., & Hughes, P. (2001). The identification and analysis of indicators of community strength and outcomes. *FaHCSIA Occasional Paper*, (3). Joondalup: Edith Cowan University. Available online at: http://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/05_2012/no.3.pdf
- Brackertz, N., & Kenley, R. (2002). Evaluating community facilities in local government: Managing for service enablement. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 1(3), 283–299.
- Brewer, M. B. (2007). The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist*, 62(8), 728–738.
- Britz, J. J. (2008). Making the global information society good: A social justice perspective on the ethical dimensions of the global information society. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(7), 1171–1183.

- Brooke, J. K., & Tyler, T. R. (2010). Diversity and corporate performance: A review of the psychological literature. *North Carolina Law Review*, 89, 715–748.
- Cherchye, L., Moesen, W., & Puyenbroeck, T. (2004). Legitimately diverse, yet comparable: On synthesizing social inclusion performance in the EU. *Journal of Common Market Studies (JCMS)*, 42(5), 919–955.
- Christens, B. D., & Speer, P. W. (2015). Community organizing: Practice, research, and policy implications. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 9(1), 193–222.
- Correa-Velez, I., Gifford, S. M., & Barnett, A. G. (2010). Longing to belong: Social inclusion and wellbeing among youth with refugee backgrounds in the first three years in Melbourne. *Australia. Social Science & Medicine*, 71(8), 1399–1408.
- Cox, E., & Caldwell, P. (2000). Making policy social. In I. Winter (Ed.), *Social capital and public policy in Australia* (pp. 43–73). Melbourne, Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425–439.
- DECC. (2012). *Equality, diversity and inclusion strategy: Delivery action plan and impact indicators*. United Kingdom: Department of Energy and Climate Change. Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47888/6028-equality-diversity-inclusion-strategy.pdf
- Dewhurst, C. K., N'Diaye, D. B., & MacDowell, M. (2014). Cultivating connectivity: Folklife and inclusive excellence in museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 57(4), 455–472.
- Dye, T. R. (1992). *Understanding public policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Emery, M., & Flora, C. (2006). Spiraling-up: Mapping community transformation with community capitals framework. *Community Development*, 37(1), 19–35.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fabiansson, C. (2006). Being young in rural settings: Young people's everyday community affiliations and trepidations. *Rural Society*, 16(1), 47–61.
- Falk, I., Golding, B., & Balatti, J. (2000). *Building communities: ACE, lifelong learning and social capital*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Centre for Research and Learning in Regional Australia, University of Tasmania Launceston.
- Farnworth, L., & Muñoz, J. P. (2009). An occupational and rehabilitation perspective for institutional practice. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 32(3), 192–198.
- Florida, R. L. (2005). *Cities and the creative class*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Footo, J. (2005). *Intercultural dialogue, cultural policies and the compendium*. Technical Report. Bonn, Germany: ERICarts. Available online at http://pike.kw.nl/files/projects/kw/2010/p4ie/panorama/source/resources-1.0/resources/publications%20used/COMPENDIUM%20Intercultural%20Dialog_John%20Foot_2004.pdf
- Gareis, K. C., Barnett, R. C., Ertel, K. A., & Berkman, L. F. (2009). Work-family enrichment and conflict: Additive effects, buffering, or balance? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(3), 696–707.
- Gonzalez, C. M., & Tyler, T. R. (2008). The psychology of enfranchisement: Engaging and fostering inclusion of members through voting and decision-making procedures. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(3), 447–466.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72–92.
- Grillo, M. C., Teixeira, M. A., & Wilson, D. C. (2010). Residential satisfaction and civic engagement: Understanding the causes of community participation. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(3), 451–466.
- Hall, A. (2007). Social policies in the World Bank paradigms and challenges. *Global Social Policy*, 7(2), 151–175.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and nature of man*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Herzberg, F. I. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 65(5), 109–120, including a retrospective commentary (reprint from 1968).

- Hirst, P. (2002). Renewing democracy through associations. *The Political Quarterly*, 73(4), 409–421.
- Hirst, P. Q. (1994). *Associative democracy: New forms of economic and social governance*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 56–87.
- Jackson, T. (2007). Mainstreaming sustainability in local economic development practice. *Local Economy*, 22(1), 12–26.
- Jackson, S. E., May, K. A., & Whitney, K. (1995). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision making teams. In R. A. Guzzo & E. Salas (Eds.), *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations* (pp. 204–261). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johanson, K., Glow, H., & Kershaw, A. (2014). New modes of arts participation and the limits of cultural indicators for local government. *Poetics*, 43, 43–59.
- Kanai, J. M. (2014). Whither queer world cities? Homo-entrepreneurialism and beyond. *Geoforum*, 56, 1–5.
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., et al. (1996). The development and validation of the workforce diversity questionnaire: An instrument to assess interactions in diverse workgroups. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9(3), 296–337.
- Laurence, J. (2011). The effect of ethnic diversity and community disadvantage on social cohesion: A multi-level analysis of social capital and interethnic relations in UK communities. *European Sociological Review*, 27(1), 70–89.
- Laverack, G. (2006). Improving health outcomes through community empowerment: A review of the literature. *Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition*, 24(1), 113–120.
- Lee, S. J., Kim, Y., & Phillips, R. (2016). Exploring the intersection of community well-being and community development. In C. Wong & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Community well-being and community development*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Lloyd, C., Tse, S., & Deane, F. P. (2006). Community participation and social inclusion: How practitioners can make a difference. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health*, 5(3), 185–194.
- Lockwood, M. (2010). Good governance for terrestrial protected areas: A framework, principles and performance outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 91(3), 754–766.
- Magnusson, E. (2011). Women, men, and all the other categories: Psychologies for theorizing human diversity. *Nordic Psychology*, 63(2), 88–114.
- Marschall, M., & Shah, P. R. (2007). The attitudinal effects of minority incorporation examining the racial dimensions of trust in urban America. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(5), 629–658.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D., & Brennan, M. A. (2012). Conceptualizing community development in the twenty-first century. *Community Development*, 43(3), 293–305.
- Miller, F. A. (1998). Strategic culture change: The door to achieving high performance and inclusion. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(2), 151–160.
- Milliken, F., & Martins, L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(2), 402–433.
- Morris, M. L., & Madsen, S. R. (2007). Advancing work—Life integration in individuals, organizations, and communities. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 439–454.
- Mohanty, I., & Tanton, R. (2012). *A well-being framework with adaptive capacity* (No. 12/17). National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling, University of Canberra. Available online at: <http://natsem.com.au/storage/1-WP%2017%20-%20Well-being%20and%20adaptive%20capacity%20-%20Mohanty%20and%20Tanton.pdf>
- Mohr, K., Backman, K. F., Gahan, L. W., & Backman, S. J. (1993). An investigation of festival motivations and event satisfaction by visitor type. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(3), 89–97.
- Mor-Barak, M. E., & Cherin, D. A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion-exclusion. *Administration in Social Work*, 22(1), 47–64.

- Mulligan, M., Scanlon, C., & Welch, N. (2008). Renegotiating community life: Arts, agency, inclusion and wellbeing. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 1, 48–72.
- Nyden, P., Maly, M., & Lukehart, J. (1997). The emergence of stable racially and ethnically diverse urban communities: A case study of nine U.S. cities. *Housing Policy Debate*, 8(2), 491–534.
- O'Brien, J. (2009). Sociology as an epistemology of contradiction. *Sociological Perspectives*, 52(1), 5–22.
- Orthner, D. K., Esther, D., & Stawarski, C. (1990). Community satisfaction: Implications for army communities. *ARI Research Note 90–96*. Chapel Hill, NC: United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Oxoby, R. (2009). Understanding social inclusion, social cohesion, and social capital. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 36(12), 1133–1152.
- Pagani, C., & Robustelli, F. (2010). Young people, multiculturalism, and educational interventions for the development of empathy. *International Social Science Journal*, 61(200–201), 247–261.
- Palich, N., & Edmonds, A. (2013). Social sustainability: Creating places and participatory processes that perform well for people. *Environment Design Guide* (November 2013). Available online at: http://environmentdesignguide.com.au/media/misc%20notes/EDG_78_NP.pdf
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(6), 770–786.
- Perkins, D. D., Hughey, J., & Speer, P. W. (2002). Community psychology perspectives on social capital theory and community development practice. *Community Development*, 33(1), 33–52.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 65–85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Martin, J. (1989). Organizational inclusion of minority groups: A social psychological analysis. In J. P. Van Oudenhoven & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities: Social psychological perspectives*. Swets North America: Berwyn, PA.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783.
- Phillips, R., & Pittman, R. H. (2009). A framework for community and economic development. In R. Phillips & R. H. Pittman (Eds.), *An introduction to community development* (pp. 3–19). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Plaut, V. C. (2014). Diversity science and institutional design. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1(1), 72–80.
- Ponic, P., & Frisby, W. (2010). Unpacking assumptions about inclusion in community-based health promotion: perspectives of women living in poverty. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(11), 1519–1531.
- Prilleltensky, I., & Gonick, L. S. (1994). The discourse of oppression in the social sciences: Past, present, and future. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 145–177). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pstross, M., Talmage, C. A., & Knopf, R. C. (2014). A story about storytelling: Enhancement of community participation through catalytic storytelling. *Community Development*, 45(5), 525–538.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137–174.
- Rath, T., & Harter, J. (2010). *Well-being: The five essential elements*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.
- Reutter, L. I., Stewart, M. J., Veenstra, G., Love, R., Raphael, D., & Makwarimba, E. (2009). “Who do they think we are, anyway?”: Perceptions of and responses to poverty stigma. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(3), 297–311.
- Reynal-Querol, M. (2005). Does democracy preempt civil wars? *European Journal of Political Economy*, 21(2), 445–465.

- Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(2), 212–236.
- Robinson, J. W., Jr., & Green, G. P. (Eds.). (2011). *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodgers, B. N., Greve, J., & Morgan, J. S. (1968). *Comparative social administration*. New York, NY: Atherton Press.
- Rogers, M., & Ryan, R. (2001). The triple bottom line for sustainable community development. *Local Environment*, 6(3), 279–289.
- Royal, M. A., & Rossi, R. J. (1996). Individual-level correlates of sense of community: Findings from workplace and school. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(4), 395–416.
- Salvaris, M. (2007). *Cultural well-being indicators in programs and policy making*. Technical Report. Melbourne, Australia: Cultural Development Network. Available online at <http://www.culturaldevelopment.org.au/downloads/CulturalIndicatorsreport.pdf>
- Salvaris, M., & Woolcock, G. (2010). Changing society's DNA codes: Democracy and the global movement for community progress measures. *Australian Journal of Social Issues (Australian Council of Social Service)*, 45(1), 25–40.
- Scarrow, S. (2005). *Political parties and democracy in theoretical and practical perspectives: Implementing intra-party democracy*. Washington, D.C.: The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.
- Scerri, A., & James, P. (2010). Communities of citizens and 'indicators' of sustainability. *Community Development Journal*, 45(2), 219–236.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for sport-for-development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 1–12.
- Schumacher, K. L., Stewart, B. J., & Archbold, P. G. (1998). Conceptualization and measurement of doing family caregiving well. *Image: The Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 30(1), 63–70.
- Shortall, S. (2004). Social or economic goals, civic inclusion or exclusion? An analysis of rural development theory and practice. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(1), 109–123.
- SHRM. (2009). *Global diversity and inclusion: Perceptions, practices, and attitudes*. Technical Report. Alexandria, Virginia: Society for Human Resource Management. Available online at: <http://graphics.eiu.com/upload/eb/DiversityandInclusion.pdf>
- Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms. *International Labour Review*, 133(5, 6), 531–578.
- Simon, C. A. (2015). *Public policy: Preferences and outcomes* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sindre, G. M. (2014). Internal party democracy in former rebel parties. *Party Politics*. Available online at: <http://ppq.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/09/12/1354068814550436.abstract>
- Smart Richman, L., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review*, 116(2), 365–383.
- Smith, A. N., Morgan, W. B., King, E. B., Hebl, M. R., & Peddie, C. I. (2012). The ins and outs of diversity management: The effect of authenticity on outsider perceptions and insider behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(S1), E21–E55.
- Talmage, C. A. (2014). Development. In A. C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 1601–1604). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Talmage, C. A. (2015). Making the ordinary extraordinary: A fresh look at satisfaction in communities. In F. Maggino (Ed.), *A new research agenda for improvements in quality of life, social indicators research series* (pp. 61–86). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Talmage, C. A., Dombrowski, R., Pstross, M., Peterson, C. B., & Knopf, R. C. (2016). Discovering diversity downtown: Questioning Phoenix. *Metropolitan Universities Journal*, 26(1), 113–145.
- Talmage, C. A., Peterson, C. B., & Knopf, R. C. (2017). Punk rock wisdom: An emancipative psychological social capital approach to community well-being. In *Handbook of Community Well-Being Research* (pp. 11–38). Netherlands: Springer.

- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., Cairns, E., & Christ, O. (2007). Cross-community contact, perceived status differences, and intergroup attitudes in Northern Ireland: The mediating roles of individual-level versus group-level threats and the moderating role of social identification. *Political Psychology*, 28(1), 53–68.
- The City of Edmonton. (n.d.). *Diversity and inclusion framework and implementation plan*. Edmonton, Alberta. Available online at: http://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/PDF/Final_Diversity_Inclusion_Framework_Implementation_Plan.pdf
- Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 74, 79–90.
- Thompson, J. A., & Bunderson, J. S. (2001). Work-nonwork conflict and the phenomenology of time beyond the balance metaphor. *Work and Occupations*, 28(1), 17–39.
- Thomson, M. (2010). *Literature review: Outcomes and indicators of welcoming and inclusive communities and workplaces initiatives*. Technical Report. Vancouver, BC: Social Planning and Research Council on BC. Available online at: http://www.amssa.org/sites/default/files/kcfinder/files/program/diversity/WelcomeBC_report.pdf
- Tibaldeo, R. F. (2014). Reframing and practicing community inclusion. The relevance of philosophy for children. *Childhood and Philosophy*, 10(20), 401–420.
- Townsend, E. (1997). Inclusiveness: A community dimension of spirituality. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 64(3), 146–155.
- Tsui, A., Egan, T., & O'Reilly, C. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549–579.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2011). *Guidance for agency-specific diversity and inclusion strategic plans*. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Personnel Management. Available online at: <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/diversity-and-inclusion/reports/diagencyspecificstrategicplanguidance.pdf>
- Vertovec, S. (2012). “Diversity” and the social imaginary. *European Journal of Sociology*, 53(3), 287–312.
- Watts, R. J., Trickett, E. J., & Birman, D. (1994). Conclusion: Convergence and divergence in human diversity. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 452–464). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Welzel, C., & Deutsch, F. (2012). Emancipative values and non-violent protest: The importance of ‘ecological’ effects. *British Journal of Political Science*, 42(02), 465–479.
- Welzel, C., Inglehart, R., & Deutsch, F. (2005). Social capital, voluntary associations and collective action: Which aspects of social capital have the greatest ‘civic’ payoff? *Journal of Civil Society*, 1(2), 121–146.
- Wilson, L. (2006). Developing a model for the measurement of social inclusion and social capital in regional Australia. *Social Indicators Research*, 75(3), 335–360.
- Wirth, J. H., & Williams, K. D. (2009). They don’t like our kind’: Consequences of being ostracized while possessing a group membership. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 12(1), 111–127.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-55407-5>

New Dimensions in Community Well-Being
Kraeger, P.; Cloutier, S.; Talmage, C. (Eds.)
2017, VIII, 263 p. 19 illus., Hardcover
ISBN: 978-3-319-55407-5