

Community Quality-of-Life and Well-Being

Patsy Kraeger
Scott Cloutier
Craig Talmage *Editors*

New Dimensions in Community Well-Being

 Springer

Community Quality-of-Life and Well-Being

Series editor

Rhonda Phillips, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

The Community Quality of Life and Well-being book series is a collection of volumes related to community level research, providing community planners and quality of life researchers involved in community and regional well-being innovative research and application. Formerly entitled, Community Quality of Life Indicators: Best Practices, the series reflects a broad scope of well-being. Next to best practices of community quality-of-life indicators projects the series welcomes a variety of research and practice topics as related to overall community well-being and quality of life dimensions, whether relating to policy, application, research, and/or practice. Research on issues such as societal happiness, quality of life domains in the policy construct, measuring and gauging progress, dimensions of planning and community development, and related topics are anticipated. This series is published by Springer in partnership with the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies, a global society with the purpose of promoting and encouraging research and collaboration in quality of life and well-being theory and applications.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/13761>

Patsy Kraeger · Scott Cloutier
Craig Talmage
Editors

New Dimensions in Community Well-Being

 Springer

Editors

Patsy Kraeger
Institute for Public and Nonprofit Studies
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA
USA

Craig Talmage
Entrepreneurial Studies
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Geneva, NY
USA

Scott Cloutier
School of Sustainability
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ
USA

ISSN 2520-1093 ISSN 2520-1107 (electronic)
Community Quality-of-Life and Well-Being
ISBN 978-3-319-55407-5 ISBN 978-3-319-55408-2 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55408-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017937516

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Patsy Kraeger, Scott Cloutier and Craig Talmage	
Part I Community Well-Being: General Considerations		
2	Rethinking Diversity, Inclusion, and Inclusiveness: The Quest to Better Understand Indicators of Community Enrichment and Well-Being	7
	Craig Talmage and Richard C. Knopf	
3	Community Well-Being or Quality of Place? A Few Notes and Their Application in Czech Republic	29
	František Murgaš and Michal Klobučník	
4	Nurturing the Nurturing Mother: A Method to Assess the Interdependence of Human and Planetary Health Through Community Well-Being	61
	Neda Yousefi Movahed	
Part II Comparisons in Community Well-Being: Australia, Mexico and South Africa		
5	Subjective National Wellbeing and Xenophobia in Sub-Saharan Africa: Results and Lessons from South Africa	85
	Steven Lawrence Gordon	
6	A Closing Window of Opportunity—When Does Multidimensional Poverty Become Chronic? A Longitudinal Study of Australians	115
	Emily J. Callander and Deborah J. Schofield	

7	What Is More Important to Residents: A City's Attractiveness or Citizens' Residential Satisfaction? An Analysis of the Explanatory Attributes in Shrinking Cities of Portugal	129
	Ana Paula Barreira, Maria Helena Guimarães and Thomas Panagopoulos	
Part III Place Based Satisfaction and Happiness		
8	Happiness Insights into Migration Policy and Choice Behavior of Immigrants	155
	Martijn Hendriks	
9	Chapter House: A Vision for a Sustainable Future	179
	Paul J. Prosser and Scott Cloutier	
Part IV Work Place Satisfaction, Happiness and Well-Being		
10	Socioeconomers: New Organizational Actors in Hybrid Corporations	217
	Patsy Kraeger	
11	The Intersection of Positive Organizational Scholarship and Organizational Change	231
	Robbie Waters Robichau	
12	Conclusion from the Editors.	255
	Patsy Kraeger, Scott Cloutier and Craig Talmage	
Index	261

Contributors

Ana Paula Barreira Faculty of Economy, University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal

Emily J. Callander Australian Institute of Tropical Health and Medicine, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

Scott Cloutier School of Sustainability, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Steven Lawrence Gordon Democracy, Governance and Service Delivery Programme, Human Sciences Research Council, Durban, South Africa

Maria Helena Guimarães Instituto de Ciências Agrárias e Ambientais Mediterrânicas (ICAAM), Universidade de Évora, Évora, Portugal

Martijn Hendriks Erasmus Happiness Economics Research Organisation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Michal Klobučník Department of Human Geography and Demography, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia

Richard C. Knopf School of Community Resources and Development, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Patsy Kraeger Institute for Public and Nonprofit Studies, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA, USA

Neda Yousefi Movahed Arizona State University, Tempe, USA

František Murgaš Department of Geography, Faculty of Science, Humanities and Education, Technical University, Liberec, Czech Republic

Thomas Panagopoulos Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal

Paul J. Prosser School of Sustainability, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Robbie Waters Robichau Institute for Public and Nonprofit Studies, Georgia Southern University, Georgia, USA

Deborah J. Schofield Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Craig Talmage Entrepreneurial Studies, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, NY, USA

Chapter 1

Introduction

Patsy Kraeger, Scott Cloutier and Craig Talmage

Abstract An overview of new dimensions of conceptual and applied work in community well-being and quality of life studies across the globe.

Keywords Community well-being · Quality of life

1.1 Introduction from the Editors

Our book was conceived when a New Scholars Group was formed in anticipation of the 12th annual *International Society for Quality of Life Studies* (ISQOLS) conference convened in Berlin, Germany in 2014. New scholars who attended that conference came from Africa, North and South America, Asia, Europe and the United Kingdom. New scholars are early scholars within the international field of Quality of Life Studies and include doctoral students, candidates, recent PhDs, fellows, and assistant professors across a variety of disciplines in the sciences and liberal arts. This collection of chapters, consisting of both conceptual and applied work, represents the diversity of that convening, along with other new scholars who presented at the 13th annual *International Society for Quality of Life Studies* (ISQOLS) in Phoenix, Arizona, 2015.

Several perspectives are used when considering quality of life and well-being from both the individual perspective and the larger institutional perspectives uti-

P. Kraeger (✉)

Institute for Public and Nonprofit Studies, Georgia Southern University,
Statesboro, GA, USA

e-mail: pkraeger@georgiasouthern.edu

S. Cloutier

School of Sustainability, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

e-mail: scott.cloutier@asu.edu

C. Talmage

Entrepreneurial Studies, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, NY, USA

e-mail: Talmage@hws.edu

© 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_1

lizing theory development and both quantitative and qualitative methods. This first chapter, the introduction by the editors, discusses the relationships between the different perspectives to inform the fields of quality of life and well-being studies across the globe. The ten chapters present commonalities, organized in key themes, to promote connections across these areas of scholarship to be applied in practice.

1.2 Community Well-Being: General Considerations for Our Work

The volume opens with two chapters focused on the general considerations for work, both research and applied, regarding quality of life and well-being. We felt compelled to emphasize the importance of diversity, inclusion, and inclusiveness in our work. Our second chapter, *Rethinking Diversity, Inclusion, and Inclusiveness: The Quest to Better Understand Indicators of Community Enrichment and Well-being*, provides researchers with a general roadmap for exploring these three topics in quality of life and well-being research. The chapter highlights the different resources of diversity and processes of inclusion needed to achieve, reinforce, and amplify inclusiveness in communities. Our third chapter, *Community well-being or quality of place? A few notes and application in Czech Republic*, deconstructs the concepts community well-being and quality of life for readers, so that they may have a fuller understanding of the larger research field. The chapter examines the notion of a good life and good place, which reflect the psychological and geographic underpinnings of well-being and quality of life research.

1.3 Community Well-Being: Across the Globe

The volume continues with a grouping of three chapters covering varying levels of community well-being. The section starts with a global perspective in our fourth chapter—*Nurturing The Nurturing Mother: A Method to Assess The Interdependence of Human and Planetary Health Through Community Well-Being*. The chapter highlights a planetary perspective, stating that ecological boundaries must be considered when striving to enhance human-well-being. In our fifth chapter, *Subjective National Wellbeing and Xenophobia in Sub-Saharan Africa: Results and Lessons from South Africa*, the researchers take a national focus by analyzing subjective national wellbeing using South African public opinion data and mapping the linkages between national wellbeing and xenophobia. The section concludes with our sixth chapter, *A Closing Window of Opportunity—When Does Multidimensional Poverty Become Chronic? A Longitudinal Study of Australians*. Chapter six takes an individual perspective, via an international lens, by conducting a longitudinal analysis of the Australian Household, Income and Labour Dynamics dataset to determine the temporal scale that limits one's ability to escape poverty.

1.4 Place Based Satisfaction and Happiness

The volume proceeds with a grouping of three chapters focused on place-based satisfaction and happiness. The Seventh chapter, *What Is More Important: City's Attractiveness or Citizens' Residential Satisfaction? An Analysis of the Explanatory Attributes in Shrinking Cities of Portugal*, starts the section with an international focus on migration issues. The author provides a timely chapter focused on outcomes of migration choices and how both objective and subjective happiness measures of happiness are affected. In our eight chapter, *Happiness Insights into Migration Policy and Choice Behavior of Immigrants*, the authors consider how inhabitants in shrinking Portuguese cities assess their level of residential satisfaction and the features that make their city attractive. The volume continues with Chap. 9, *Chapter House: Vision for a Sustainable Future*, in which the authors detail a project on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona, United States. The chapter describes technical ecological knowledge (TEK) as a tool to broaden opportunities for happiness in community development projects.

The tenth and eleventh chapters explore the concepts of well-being and quality of life in the more corporate realms. *Socioonomers: New Organizational Actors In Hybrid Corporations* introduces readers to a new type of actor in the United States (and likely worldwide). This actor, "the Socioonomer" is likely to be found in hybrid organizations, those with social missions such as benefit corporations (B corps) or low profit liability companies (L3C). These socially minded businesspersons may be keys to co-creating better organizations and communities, specifically through increasing financial and social well-being. Socioonomers are motivated for change. They embody the concept of "flow" recognizing the challenge of the task and the required corresponding skill set. Flow allows Socioonomers to achieve the optimal work experience through meaningful or purposeful work. Our eleventh chapter, *The Intersection of Positive Organizational Scholarship And Organizational Change*, emphasizes the dynamic role of change in quality of life and well-being. The emerging movement of positive organizational scholarship is presented as a foundation for discussion. The chapter concludes by highlighting the intersection of change in positive organizational scholarship and how understanding this intersection can help improve quality of life and well-being.

The common thread throughout the chapters is the alignment of multiple disciplines aimed towards addressing large social issues and questions surrounding quality of life and well-being. We conclude this volume letter that synthesizes the chapters present, so that we may better understand how to enhance quality of life and well-being across the globe. Our letter moves between individual to institutional perspectives. Larger issues such as employment, migration, poverty, culture, and well-being are highlighted as exemplars of the good work that is being done today the work and the great work needing to be conducted in the future. In the final chapter, we strive to find both commonalities and differences in the insights presented in this volume, so that a preliminary framework for quality of life and

well-being by scholars, new and old alike, can be utilized in future research and applied projects in our communities around the world.

We would like to thank all our authors for their contributions to the growing field of quality of life and well-being studies. We are grateful to organizations like the *International Society of Quality of Life Studies* (ISQOLS) for their support of new scholars. We would also like to offer special thanks to Dr. Rhonda Phillips for her mentorship in compiling and publishing this volume.

A lot of work went into making this volume rigorous in its scientific quality. Drawing on the inspiring volumes derived from ISQOLS conferences and networks, we hope, as Maggino (2015) writes, to “testify how this research field is not only lively in the present but also promising for the future” (p. vi). We wish you the best in your own endeavors around quality of life and well-being, and hope you find this collection inspiring and useful in your own good work. We would also like to acknowledge, Dr. Rhonda Phillips, President of ISQOLS during the 2014 and 2015 conference in Berlin, Germany and Phoenix, Arizona for encouraging this scholarship from both conferences to be presented in this publication.

Reference

Maggino, F. (2015). *A new research agenda for improvements in quality of life* (Vol. 57). Berlin: Springer.

Part I
Community Well-Being:
General Considerations

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 (Tibaldeo 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, 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), Schulkorf (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