

Running head: A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP, POWER AND INCLUSION

A Study of Leadership, Power and Inclusion: Survey Results from a New Scale

Beth Renninger, Georgia Durán, Anthony Edwards, Deborah Wise, and Curtis Lee

University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center

Abstract

This study used a correlational, comparative, and descriptive design to examine the associations among leadership, power, and inclusion and to test the Leadership, Power and Inclusion scale that assesses these items. This paper presents findings on the relationship of leadership, power and inclusion based on employee perceptions as indicated in the new survey. The authors collected data from employees in a financial services company located in Southern California. The sample included males and females who had been in the company for a wide range of time, with varied backgrounds. Part of the analysis compares the descriptive differences of the sample as they relate to perceptions of leadership, power and inclusion. Preliminary results indicate that there is a correlation between leaders who use non-coercive behaviors, and the degree that employees feel their organization provided an inclusive climate. Further research must statistically measure the internal validity, reliability and standard error of measurement of the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion scale. Furthermore, additional data must be collected from a variety of contexts to measure external validity and reliability.

Introduction

As part of a class project, students studying leadership, power and survey methods worked together to develop a new survey, the Leadership, Power and Inclusion scale. This scale was used to assess the relationship among leadership, power and a third variable. A large scope of the work was built on prior research by their professor (Mudiappasamy & Muth, 1984; Muth, 1984; Napier, Fox & Muth, 1994; Wilkinson & Muth; 1987). In addition to using uniform class survey questions that were based on Muth's previous work on leadership (Wilkinson & Muth, 1987; Napier, Fox & Muth, 1994), and his previous work on power (Mudiappasamy & Muth, 1984; Muth, 1984), each group selected an additional variable to analyze. Next, groups defined the variable and developed five survey questions that measured its impact, and distributed the survey to non-educational organizations per the parameters of the project.

The authors of this paper selected the topic of inclusion as their third variable. Their reason for selecting this third variable was due to their belief that there would be a correlation between perceptions of leaders, their use of non-coercive power, and the degree to which employees felt their organization provided an inclusive climate.

The goal of this paper is to provide a review of research on leadership, power, and inclusion; discuss the process for developing the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey; and presenting survey finding. The final portion of the paper provides a discussion of the implication of those findings, and suggestions for future research in this area.

When looking at leaders and leadership, one can look at leadership traits, skills, types or styles of leadership, and the impact that leaders have on followers. Power can be addressed in three areas: coercion, authority and influence. Inclusion focuses on the perception of value and

sense of “voice,” or contributions employees believe they make or offer in given situations or contexts.

Literature Review

There has been much research on leadership and power, some of which is discussed in this paper. However, there is little research that explores the relationship between leadership, power and inclusion. The following review of the literature provides an overview of these areas and indicates where there is actual and possible overlap. In addition, this section provides discussion of the conceptual framework that guided the work and development of the inclusion aspect of the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey.

Leadership

Research on leadership is vast as is analytical in discussion of the topic (Bass, 1985; Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Cashman, 1998,); Deal & Peterson, 1999; & Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee (2002). This research often focuses on what makes an effective leader. Buckingham and Clifton (2001) present a model of leadership that assumes leaders have specific traits and skills that impact their success and effectiveness with their followers. They offer a series of online tests that leaders can take to assess their own leadership strengths. The idea behind this is that leaders should focus on their strengths and worry less about their weaknesses. Cashman (1998) takes leadership further than simply looking at traits or skills of the individual leader, and focuses on the impact of leadership on others. “Leadership is *not* self-expression for its own sake; it’s self-expression that makes a difference, that enriches the lives of others,” (Cashman, 1998, p. 108).

Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) explore characteristics of leadership and how successful leaders create a good feeling in those they lead. They argue that a leader’s success is

based more on *how* a leader does things rather than *what* a leader does. A strong leader provides support and empathy that result in resonance for followers, whereas ineffective leaders create dissonance for followers. If leaders can reach a place of resonance or connection with followers, Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) believe these leaders will reach some success because of their own emotional awareness or their ability to impact feelings. Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) also support a skills approach to leadership because they claim that emotionally intelligent leaders are successful because they demonstrate specific behaviors. These behaviors include, mirroring, managing meaning, creating laughter, attracting positive people, and avoiding emotional hijacking or creating negative experiences. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) offer advice for creating resonance through a variety of skills, including communication. Effective leaders need certain skills including conflict resolution, teamwork, persuasion, and empathic listening. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) do not discuss power or inclusion directly, but the researchers believe that leaders who positively influence others are able to create resonance, and leaders who create an inclusive climate do so by creating resonance.

Like Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002), Fennell (2005) focuses on how leaders emotionally impact followers. Specifically, Fennell looks at how school principals can impact school change. Fennell (2005) views school leadership as an umbrella concept, with four subjects falling under it: (a) schools as collaborative professional communities; (b) valuing people and their unique contributions to the learning community; (c) viewing knowledge/power as an expandable resource; and (d) resisting practices and policies that could interfere with the goals of the learning community.

School principals who focus on (a) being designers with rather than designers of their school community; (b) who help all members of the learning community feel valued and

important; (c) who use knowledge and expertise to encourage and empower others, and (d) who use confrontational skills when confrontation is necessary are leaders who foster open communication with all members of their school community. This correlates with the authors' discussion on inclusion and their belief that empowering others, including others in decision-making, and being open to feedback will likely influence followers and create inclusion.

Bass (1985) moves away from the trait approach to focus on leadership type. He claims that transactional leadership is the most common type of leadership in business today.

Transactional leadership is made up of several factors, including contingent reward and management by exception. Contingent reward is the how leaders establish positive exchanges with followers. Management by exception is how leaders take corrective action with employees. Management by exception can be active or passive and depends on when the leader intervenes or interacts with employees. Leaders, who are active, monitor and respond to problems as soon as possible. On the other hand, leaders who are passive, wait until after problems take place before they do anything. Although Bass (1985) does not provide an explicit link between inclusion and transactional leadership, the authors believe that how a leader approaches problem solving will impact inclusion depending if the leader uses coercion, influence or authority.

Deal and Peterson (1999) also explore leadership types, and focus on school leaders who are visionaries. "Visionary leaders continually identify and communicate the hopes and dreams of the school... To arrive at a shared vision, they listen closely for the cherished dreams that the staff and community hold," (Deal & Peterson, 1999, p. 89). Visionary leaders must possess certain factors, including analytical and listening skills if they are to be successful. Although, they do not discuss power directly, the authors suggest that a visionary leader is one who uses power effectively, and who creates an inclusive climate.

Power

Hogg (2001) explores how leaders influence groups when they use different social elements and traits, including: the social attraction of the leader, group agreement with the leader's ideas, and constructs of a charismatic leader's personality. A leader who creates consensual attraction, and who is able to project the image of a leader is more influential. Hogg (2001) does not directly address how leaders can create consensual influence.

Lambert (1998) discusses power directly when she explores leadership capacity as a unique concept. She argues that leadership is not based on trait theories, and that everyone has the right and potential to serve as a leader. Individuals can develop a high level of skills that can positively impact followers. Lambert (1998) looks at school leaders and argues that learning is a shared activity that creates a democratic environment. As a result, power is shared because democracy allows followers to have a say in decision-making, so coercive and authoritative leaders would have to redistribute power to ensure democracy. Lambert (1998) identifies how democratic leadership and follower participation impact power. Leaders who have low skillfulness and low participating followers will create an autocratic system. Leaders with low skillfulness and high participating followers will create a laissez-faire system.

Gale and Densmore (2003) also advocate for democratic leaders in the field of education. They claim that this will result in inclusive schools where all can be involved in the educational process. "Democratic leaders enable the formation of social, learning and culturally responsive public educational institutions, in part by enabling contextually-specific struggles to determine what is needed, and by developing a politically-informed commitment to justice for all," (Gale & Densmore, 2003, p. 120). They believe that democratic leaders promote self-determination and decision-making. They also assert that leaders need to learn new strategies that allow for

distribution of power including trading, bargaining, arguing, stalling, maneuvering, and lobbying.

In her analysis on traditional discourse by school district superintendents, Brunner (2002) explores leadership skills, and argues that communication norms resulting in top-down communication do not invite stakeholder feedback or participation. A coercive leader with low levels of organizational inclusion would value this approach, but a democratic leader or one who values influence would not. These leaders would strive for communication norms that distribute the interaction, which would invite feedback.

Leaders can utilize several strategies to promote a culture of inclusion. Increasing democracy and open discussions are great ways to increase participation by those who have not always been involved or had a voice in the discussion. Leaders can build their power bases by expanding their relationships and building bridges across former boundaries and by increasing listening opportunities of those who have traditionally been silent (Riehl, 2000).

Inclusion

Whether inclusion can be considered a function of a democratic society (Lambert, 1998) or a product of consensual attraction (Hogg, 2001), the issue of inclusion for this study centers around the *perception* of having one's voice heard, and how that perception affects information, decision-making and positions of power. During the civil rights era in the U.S., Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. became the embodiment of a cause not because of an office bestowed on him (his official job title was that of a preacher) but because he became the collective voice of thousands of people who didn't perceive their voices would be heard individually (Heifetz, 1994). King forced inclusion because he impacted perceptions with messages that went beyond the pulpit gaining a national and even international audience.

The subject of inclusion has been well researched and often focuses on groups, including gender, economic, social, and cultural issues. Artiles, Harris-Murri, and Rostenburg (2006) propose that a better understanding of inclusion as it relates to social justice will better help educators provide services to culturally and linguistically diverse students. They also look at how inclusive actions are implemented (through political discourse and practical application), which can be used in any corporate setting. This practical and political activity is also considered by Ebbers, Gallisath, Rockel, and Coyan (2002) in their research that addresses the lack of minority and woman leaders in institutions. Foley & Wurmser (2004) examine how cultural diversity and the mobilization of modern workforces demand new methods of leadership in the medical field, specifically between nurses and patients. Holvino, Federman and Merrill-Sands (2004) believe that inclusion must include a discussion of which groups have access to power and information. It was also from the work of Holvino, Fenderman, and Merrill-Sands (2004) that the authors derived definition of inclusion from.

Conceptual Framework

Lencioni (2002) identifies dysfunctions that prevent teams from becoming effective (see figure 1). Lack of trust is at the foundation of dysfunctional teams. Followers believe that either their voices are not heard or their leaders have personal agendas that will overpower the collective interests of their teams. This control on the part of the leader undermines the employee socialization that forms a company's specific organizational culture and results in low morale and a lack of goodwill (Khodyakov, 2007). This is consistent with Fennel (2005) who developed a view of leadership as an umbrella concept, with four subjects falling under it: professional communities; knowledge as an expandable resource; valuing people and their unique contribution; and resisting practices that can interfere with goals.



Figure 1. The Five Dysfunctions of a Team (Lencioni, 2002)

Because this conceptual framework is the basis on this study, questions about inclusion focused on trust, safety, commitment, accountability, and the opportunities for advancement that resulted from well-functioning teams. The methods section of this paper provides further discussion on survey question development.

Purpose

The purpose of this course project was to develop a new scale that measures the relationship between leadership, uses of power and the perception of inclusion in a non-educational organization. The foundation of this work stems from new research in the areas of power, leadership and inclusion and previous work by Mudiappasamy and Muth (1984), Muth (1984), Napier, Fox and Muth (1994), and Wilkinson and Muth (1987).

This study used a correlational, comparative, and descriptive design to examine the associations among leadership, power, and inclusion, and to test the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey, and assess these items. When the researchers considered the relationship of these three items, it was from a perspective of *value*; leaders value the opinions of followers and the followers value the leaders for their interest (Hogg, 2001). This reciprocal value proposition can result in increased communication, trust, delegated responsibility, and positive morale (Dinsbach, 2007).

For the purpose of this study, leadership was defined as the ability to influence and mobilize others (Napier, Fox & Muth, 1994; Wilkinson & Muth, 1987), while power was defined as the use of coercion, influence or authority (Mudiappasamy & Muth, 1984; Muth, 1984). Coercion was power that takes away choice from followers. Influential power was when followers are motivated or inspired by leaders to take action. Authority was power derived from organizational rules or expectations with which followers must comply. Lastly, and for the intent of this study, inclusion was defined as organizational members having equal access to information, decision making and positions of power (Holvino, Ferdman & Merrill-Sands, 2004). Each of the definitions formulated for this study are based from class and/or group discussions along with a review of relevant research.

The researchers of this study were interested in the relationship between leadership, power and inclusion. The genesis of this interest was based on an online class discussion about leadership and power. The authors were also interested in how leaders create inclusive climates where all participants have a voice, access to information, and the opportunity to succeed. These combined interests led to the development and distribution of the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey.

Methods

This study used a correlational, comparative, and descriptive design to examine the associations among leadership, power, and inclusion, and to test the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey. When the researchers considered the relationship of these three items, it was from a perspective of *value*; leaders value the opinions of followers and the follower value the leaders for their interest (Hogg, 2001). This reciprocal value proposition can result in increased communication, trust, delegated responsibility, and positive morale (Dinsbach, 2007). The creation of a democratic society within teams can also be perceived as a decreased use of power by the supervisor (Gale & Densmore, 2003). It is this perceived decrease in power that forms the hypothesis for inclusion used in this study and frames our research question: What is the relationship between the leader's use of power and the perception of inclusion in an organization? This research question led to two hypotheses. Hypothesis 1: Employees who report that their leaders use influence will view their organization as more inclusive. Hypothesis 2: Employees who see their leaders using coercion will view their organization as less inclusive. In order to test these hypotheses, the researchers surveyed employees in an informational technology organization.

Participants

Participants were members of an information technology division of a financial services corporation based in California, with employees located around the world. The division was chosen based on its perceived range of diversity both ethnically and in gender, which are pertinent to our research question and hypotheses. For purposes of analysis, researchers used a comparative analysis to assess similarities and differences on the descriptive questions by assessing participant demographics. Forty percent of the employees in this company are women. The company is ethnically diverse, and at least fifty percent of the employees are non-Caucasian, the majority being either Asian or Indian.

Researchers used a convenient sample of employees from the division; a contact in the company distributed the new Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey to those in his division. Of the 50 people contacted by email, 24 responded and 4 submitted incomplete surveys. There were 10 women and 14 men in the sample. Four individuals submitted the survey but did not complete it. The members of this organization ranged in age from thirty to fifty years old. The mean age was 31.8. The sample was 66 % Caucasian, 4% Hispanic/Latino, 25 % Asian, and 4 % American Indian. The years in the field ranged from eight to thirty years. The mean length of time on the job was 12.4 years. Eleven of the respondents have worked for the company for less than two years. The greatest length of service in the corporation was seven years, with the remaining respondents working between three and six years. All members of this organization attended some college, with 66% completing their degrees, and 20% having done post-graduate work. With regard to marital status, 13% were single, 83% married, and 4 % divorced. Positions in the organizations ranged from programmer/analysts (57%), to lead/managers (26%) and directors (17%). 43% percent of the respondents hold leadership positions.

Materials

The materials used in this study consisted of a newly developed instrument, the Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey, designed to measure the relationship between leadership, power and inclusion. The original items were part of the Leadership Assessment scale developed by Muth (1984). The researchers used fifteen questions related to leadership from this survey, eighteen questions related to power, and five questions related to inclusion. The survey was broken into four different parts with the authors clustering similar questions to minimize the respondent's mental set changes. The first part included background questions. These questions ranged from age, gender, education, and management tiers. The intent for this section was to utilize this data to support our dependent variable, which is inclusion.

Leadership was the focus of the second section of the survey. Questions supporting the definition of leadership such as mobilization of efforts, common vision and the level that the worker feels involved in the decision making process made up this portion. There were 15 total questions on leadership. See Table 1 for a complete list of questions.

Table 1 Leadership questions

- | |
|--|
| <p>(11) I am encouraged to think creatively in completing my work.</p> <p>(12) We are empowered to complete our assignments.</p> <p>(13) We are supported in accomplishing our goals.</p> <p>(14) All of us work toward a common vision.</p> <p>(15) I understand my organization's goals.</p> <p>(16) We are encouraged to work collaboratively to get our jobs done.</p> <p>(17) I am inspired to do my best work.</p> <p>(18) We work together to do our jobs.</p> <p>(19) It is OK for me to take risks to achieve our objectives.</p> |
|--|

- (20) The importance of our goals and objectives is communicated through action.
- (21) We work as a team in this organization.
- (22) Our goals are clear to me.
- (23) It is clear that my contributions are valued.
- (24) Our goals and objectives are communicated effectively.
- (25) I feel inspired to accomplish my organization's goals.

The third section of the survey addressed power, specifically coercion, authority and influence, concentrating on levels that supervisors demand uniformity, interest in employees, and performance standards. There were 18 questions related to power. See Table 2 for a list of questions related to power.

Table 2 Power Questions

- My Supervisor...
- (26) Suggests that we push our new ideas.
 - (27) Demands uniform procedures.
 - (28) Works to increase interest of employees in organizational problems.
 - (29) Insists that things be done her/his way.
 - (30) Maintains definite standards of performance.
 - (31) Checks to see whether jobs have been completed.
 - (32) Rigidly enforces all of her/his decisions.
 - (33) Rules with an iron hand.
 - (34) Suggests changes in ways of doing things.
 - (35) Sees to it that everyone works up to capacity.
 - (36) Stresses getting the job done.

- (37) Seeks the approval of employees on important matters.
- (38) Asks employees to subordinate personal interests to getting the job done.
- (39) Alone makes decisions on major matters.
- (40) Discusses her/his new ideas with employees.
- (41) Acts without consulting her/his employees.
- (42) Asks that employees follow standard rules and regulations.
- (43) Looks out for the personal welfare of individual employees.

Both leadership and power were viewed as the independent variables of the study.

The final section of the study focused on the dependent variable, inclusion. The primary focus of this segment was to determine the degrees that workers felt that they had equal access to resources and the decision making process. Following are the inclusion questions in the survey, along with the functional areas based on the conceptual framework that they addressed:

- My voice as an individual is valued in decision-making (Trust).
- I feel safe to express my ideas at work (Safety/Fear).
- There is an organizational expectation that teams will work collaboratively (Commitment).
- I have sufficient access to the information necessary to perform my job successfully (Accountability).
- There are equal opportunities for advancement in this organization (Results).

The researchers used a four-point Likert scale to assess the Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey with participants indicating how much they agreed with statements on the organizations and their supervisor. The options were: 1-never, 2-sometimes, 3-often, and always. This format was chosen to reduce non-response to the questions.

The questions on leadership, power and inclusion need additional testing for validity. The researchers did test for face validity when they shared their questions with their classmates in guided discussion threads. They attempted to test for content validity by basing their questions on previous research on leadership and power and by sharing the work with their professor who is an expert in these areas. Much more work must be done to assess construct validity.

Procedures

An on-line survey website, Survey Monkey™, was used to create and collect the data for the study. This website allowed the researchers to develop multi-response questions and enabled respondents to provide confidential consent. The “Background” section of the survey included the descriptive design, which gave respondents the option to choose from choices most applicable to their demographic. Respondents were able to access the survey on-line and complete the survey without having to send the results to their supervisor, which created an opportunity to reply to the survey honestly and without worry of ramifications. The program automatically totaled the completion of each person’s survey so the authors were able to look at group totals and individual results.

Respondents had seven days to complete the study and were able to access it during both work and non-work hours. The survey was given during the week of Thanksgiving, however, and did not strictly enforce that all questions be answered. These two factors may have impacted the percentage of surveys returned fully completed. This will be discussed in more depth in the findings section of this article.

Findings

28 respondents agreed to participate in the survey and provided their consent, while only 24 completed the survey. Although the survey instructions requested that all respondents answer

every question, at least eight of the participants chose not to answer some of the questions, specifically those around the supervisor's role. There are many reasons related to validity and reliability issues that prevent the data collected to be generalized.

Descriptive Data and Sampling Analysis

Part one of the survey allowed us to gather information about the backgrounds of our respondents. Based on data received, this organization consists of an average of 41 percent females and 58 percent males, when in fact there is an almost equal representation of both men and women in the company. The racial diversity of the company based on data collected consists of a population of 67 percent Caucasian, 25 percent Asian, 4.2 percent American Indian, and 4.2 percent Hispanic. This does not portray the actual racial demographics of the company. The inconsistencies may be the result of the convenient sample. Future research must employ random sampling. The inconsistencies limit the analysis of findings.

. From this section we have determined that our respondents are all educated, and experienced in their field, the least amount of time worked in this field was eight years. Forty-three percent of the respondents hold leadership positions, and while this is a large percentage, the number of surveys returned must also be considered as well as the fact that the convenient sample went to a specific division, which could have a management focus. When looking at the four respondents who did not participate in the study, though they gave their consent, the researchers could speculate that these people either did not feel comfortable sharing this particular information or that they did not find it pertinent to the study. Further research around decreasing non-response in this area would be beneficial. We also noticed that this organization is diverse, but still holds a majority of Caucasians with more males in various positions

Inclusion Analysis

The results of the survey with regard to inclusion present a picture of a relatively inclusive environment (see table 3). There were a clear majority of respondents that perceived they were safe to express ideas, expected to work collaboratively in teams, and felt they had sufficient information to perform their jobs successfully. There was less of a majority who felt their voice as an individual were valued (50% answered often but 30% answered only sometimes), and the division was more evenly split (40% often vs. 35% sometimes) for people who felt there were equal opportunities for advancement. Given that the majority of respondents were Caucasian (66.7%), college graduates (66.7%), and married (83.3%), issues of equality and voice might be related to gender (58.3% male vs. 41.7% female), position (56.5% technical), or age (most respondents were in their 30's).

Table 3: Inclusion findings

Survey question	Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
My voice as an individual is valued in decision making (Trust)	5%	30%	50%	15%
I feel safe to express my ideas at work (Safety)	0%	15%	50%	35%
There is an organizational expectation that teams will work collaboratively (Commitment)	0%	15%	55%	30%
I have sufficient access to the information necessary to perform my job successfully (Accountability)	5%	15%	55%	25%
There are equal opportunities for advancement in this organization (Results)	0%	35%	40%	25%

Inclusion Analysis Based on Hypotheses

Although this use of the Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey lacks sufficient analysis of validity and reliability, the researchers will discuss their general review of the data as it relates to their hypotheses.

- Hypothesis 1: Employees who report that their leaders use influence will view their organization as more inclusive.
- Hypothesis 2: Employees who see their leaders using coercion will view their organization as less inclusive.

To determine if these hypotheses were true, the authors focused on the survey questions related to coercion, influence, and inclusion. If the hypotheses hold true, the majority of respondents must feel that their leaders use influence, and that coercion is infrequent.

Survey items that addressed influence include 34, 40, 43, and 47. Hypothesis 1 suggests that when supervisors use influence, inclusion is increased. Item 34 asks respondents their view of whether or not the supervisor suggests changes in ways of doing things. A majority or 55% of respondents indicated that their supervisor used this tactic. This is not a strong indicator of influence, so the authors looked further. Item 40 asked whether or not leaders discuss ideas with employees. This time a much stronger majority provided a favorable response with 50% agreeing, and 15% strongly agreeing. This number is very close to the number of respondents that felt that their organization was inclusive. Many felt they were valued, and that their leaders made them feel esteemed by first exploring new ideas with stakeholders. Item 43 asked if supervisors look out for the personal welfare of individual employees. A whopping 85 percent felt that their supervisor cared enough to consider their welfare. Finally, item 47 asked if members felt safe expressing their ideas at work, and 85 percent said they did. The authors

acknowledge that statistical analysis of the data is needed, but based on an initial review they argue that there is a correlation between Hypothesis 1 and the selected data they analyzed. There is a positive relationship between use of influence and inclusion. The current data does not allow for further generalization to other organizations.

Survey items 27, 29, 32, 33, 39, and 41 were aimed at identifying the amount of coercion used by leaders in this organization. If the second hypothesis is true, coercion should be low because overall inclusion is high. Item 27 addresses coercion by asking whether or not your supervisor demands uniform procedures. There was an equal distribution between respondents who agreed and disagreed with this statement. Item 29 asked respondents if they felt their supervisor insist that things be done his/her way. Ninety percent of our respondents disagreed with this statement. Question 32 asked if the supervisor rigidly enforces all of her/his decisions. 80% of respondents disagreed with this statement. The question researchers believed most strongly, hinted at the use of coercive power 33: "my supervisor rules with an iron hand." 100% of the respondents disagreed with this statement. Through this selective analysis, the authors argue that overall, respondents felt that the use of coercive power in the organization is limited, and is hardly utilized by organizational leaders. If there were higher levels of coercion, there would be lower levels of inclusion. In other words, there is a positive relationship between low use of coercion and positive perceptions of inclusion. For this study, the lack of coerciveness has contributed to making the organization more inclusive. As a result there is a correlation between Hypothesis 2 and the selected data we analyzed. There is a negative relationship between use of coercion and power. Again, the current data does not allow for further generalization to other organizations.

The researchers also explored the use of authority with items 30, 31, and 42. Looking at these items, there were mixed views of whether or not this type of power was used in the organization. At least half of the respondents always disagreed that this type of power was in place, which further supports Hypothesis 1 and the positive relationship between influence and inclusion. For example, item 42 asked if employees must follow standard rules and procedures. 52 percent disagreed, which indicates that the majority felt they had some voice in the matter. Further analysis of the use of authority is needed, but this was not central to the research question or hypotheses in this study.

Analysis of missed or blank questions

Approximately fifty percent of all the employees within this division responded to the Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey. Among the respondents, 20 completed the survey in its entirety with 8 others missing some or all data. The researchers developed an initial analysis for this. One reason can be attributed to simple curiosity. Members may have opened up the survey and glanced at some of the items because they were intrigued by the survey request, but chose not to participate. Second, some respondents may have begun the survey, but may have become uncomfortable with the nature of the questions and perhaps questioned the degree of confidentiality they would be afforded. Finally, given that study was administered during a U.S. holiday week, some may simply not have wanted to spend additional time on answers. Regardless, roughly fifty percent of the division members responded to Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey. The authors believe that this gave them some initial insight into construction of a survey and interpretations of the survey itself as it relates to the research question and hypotheses they put forth.

Discussion

Although the sampling method and lack of quantitative analysis of the data limits external validity and reliability, the researchers offer the following conclusions. The data indicates support of both hypotheses presented. Based on this, one may expect that the leadership in this survey used little coercive power, and generally used influence to inspire employees to complete tasks. As suggested by the hypotheses, the lack of coercion helped contribute to a more inclusive climate. Leaders use of influence encouraged the participation of all employees (or at least a majority), which may have helped create the inclusive environment indicated by our respondents. Overall, it seems that the majority of respondents felt that they work in an inclusive environment, coercion is used at a minimum, and organizational leaders frequently utilize influential power. There is much room for future research with the Leadership, Power and Inclusion survey. First, this study and sample could be analyzed in greater details. The researchers could examine estimates of reliability by calculating a Chronbach's coefficient alpha on current responses to the Leadership, Power and Inclusion scale. To reassess the integrity and reliability of this study, the researchers could obtain one-month test-retest reliability data.

There should be further analysis of construct validity to ensure that the questions are truly measuring aspects of leadership, power and inclusion. Once questions are further refined and further tested for reliability and validity, there is much room for future research. Additional studies could use a cross-sectional approach and gather data from multiple divisions and employee groups in this company. In addition, it would be valuable to gather data from employees in other organizations to assess reliability of the data.

To further validate findings and determine convergent validity as well as to determine reliability, the researchers must find another organization where coercive power is used

frequently, and then determine the amount of inclusion occurring at that particular organization. If inclusion is perceived to be low; there may be a more solid foundation of data to prove that the hypotheses are correct.

Future research can also build on the existing literature review. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) do not discuss power or inclusion directly, so additional studies or analysis can explore how influential leaders create resonance, and how these leaders may create an inclusive climate by creating resonance. Studies could also address if leaders who coerce others will create dissonance and low perceptions of inclusion from followers.

Summary

This project enabled students studying leadership and power to further explore inclusion. In addition, it provided them ample opportunity to develop a survey instrument, to administer a survey, collect data and provide initial analysis of the data. There is clearly more work for these students in terms of learning more about the three topics, leadership, power and inclusion. Furthermore, then can only grow in terms of effectively crafting a survey, administrating and testing for validity and reliability.

References

- Artiles, A. J., Harris-Murri, N., & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions, and the road ahead. *Theory into practice, 45*(3), 260-268.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Brunner, C. C. (2002). A proposition for the reconception of the superintendency: reconsidering traditional and nontraditional discourse. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(3), 402-431.
- Buckingham, M. & Clifton, D.O. (2001). *Now Discover Your Strengths*. Simon & Schuster Trade.
- Cashman, K. (2002). *Leadership from the inside out: Becoming a leader for life*. Minneapolis, MN: TCLG.
- Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership, 56*(1), 28.
- Devadoss, M., & Muth, R. (1984). Power, involvement and organizational effectiveness in higher education. *Higher Education, 13*, 379-391.
- Dinsbach, A., Jan A. Feij, and Reinout E. De Vries. (2007). The role of communication content in an ethnically diverse organization. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 725*(21).

- Ebbers, L.H., Gallisath, G., Rockel, V., & Coyan, M.N. (2000). The leadership institute for a new century: Linking women and minorities into tomorrow's community college leadership roles. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24(5), 375-382.
- Fennell, H. (2005). Living leadership in an era of change. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8(2), 145-165.
- Foley, R. & Wurmser, T.A. (2004). Culture diversity/a mobile workforce command creative leadership, new partnerships, and innovative approaches to integration. *Nurse Administrator Quarterly*, 28(2), 122-128.
- Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2003). Democratic educational leadership in contemporary times. *International Journal of Education*, 6(2).
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). Primal Leadership (Book). *T+D*, 56(3), 81.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hogg, M, A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership, *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5(3), 184-200.
- Holvino, E., B. M. Ferdman, et al. (2004). Creating and sustaining diversity and inclusion in organizations: strategies and approaches. The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity. M. S. Stockdale and F. J. Crosby. Malden, MA, Blackwell Pub.
- Khodyakov, D. M. (2007). The complexity of trust-control relationships in creative organizations: Insights from a qualitative analysis of a conductor less orchestra. *Social Forces*, 86(1), 1-22.
- Lambert, L. (1998). How to build leadership capacity. *Educational Leadership*, 55(7), 19-19.

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mudiappasamy D. S. J, & Muth, R. (1984). Power, involvement, and organizational effectiveness in higher education. *Higher Education (13)*, 379-391.

Muth, R. (1984). Toward and integrative theory of power and educational organizations. *Education Administration Quarterly (2)*20, 25-42.

Muth, R. (1984). Toward and integrative theory of power and educational organizations. *Education Administration Quarterly (2)*20, 25-42.

Muth, R., & Wilkinson, G. (1987, April). Leadership: A question of clarity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Riehl, C. J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 55-81.