

Inclusive Leadership and Workforce Diversity Management Predicting Innovative Work Behaviour in Multigenerational Organisations: A Conceptual and Opinion-Based Framework

CHIKA OМУKPAI PHD¹, COLLINS VINCENT TAMUNOSEIPRIYE²
^{1,2}*Ignatius Ajuru University of Education*

Abstract- This conceptual paper examines the theoretical relationship between Inclusive Leadership and Innovative Work Behaviour in the context of multigenerational organisations operating across emerging and developed economies. Drawing on Social Identity Theory (SIT), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, and Organisational Learning Theory (OLT), the paper argues that organisations in which leaders embody and enact inclusive practices — characterised by openness, accessibility, and availability— are systematically better positioned to generate, promote, and implement innovative ideas across a generationally diverse workforce. The paper contends that inclusive leadership functions as a structural antecedent to innovative work behaviour, and that this relationship is conditioned by three critical organisational mediators: equal opportunity practices, intergenerational collaboration, and diversity training. While the transformative potential of inclusive leadership is affirmed, the paper acknowledges that its efficacy is not uniform — it is moderated by generational dynamics, organisational culture, and institutional context. The paper advances a conceptual framework, proposes empirically testable hypotheses, and contributes to both theoretical scholarship and practical leadership development.

Keywords: *Inclusive Leadership, Innovative Work Behaviour, Workforce Diversity, Multigenerational Organisations, Equal Opportunity, Intergenerational Collaboration, Diversity Training, Emerging Economies*

I. INTRODUCTION

The management of diverse, multigenerational workforces represents one of the defining organisational challenges of the twenty-first century. For the first time in recorded history, organisations must simultaneously engage and align up to five generational cohorts — from Traditionalists and

Baby Boomers to Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z — each characterised by distinct values, communication preferences, technological orientations, and expectations of leadership (Costanza et al., 2017; Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Deal & Levenson, 2016; Twenge et al., 2010). Within this complex generational mosaic, the question of leadership style and its relationship to workforce outcomes has assumed considerable theoretical and practical urgency.

Innovative work behaviour (IWB) — the intentional generation, promotion, and implementation of novel ideas to improve organisational performance — has emerged as a critical organisational capability in knowledge-intensive and rapidly changing economic environments (Janssen, 2000; Scott & Bruce, 1994; De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Kanter, 1988). Organisations that cultivate IWB at scale enjoy demonstrable advantages in adaptability, competitive differentiation, and long-term performance (Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Anderson et al., 2014; Zhou & Shalley, 2018). Yet the conditions under which IWB flourishes — particularly across generationally diverse teams — remain insufficiently understood.

In multigenerational organisations, inclusive leadership is not merely a matter of managerial style — it is an organisational architecture for releasing the innovative potential embedded in human diversity.

This paper proceeds from the position that inclusive leadership — defined by its constitutive dimensions of openness, accessibility, and availability — functions as a foundational antecedent to IWB by creating the psychological safety, procedural fairness,

and relational trust necessary for diverse employees to contribute their full creative capacity. The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews the relevant literature; Section 3 presents the theoretical framework; Section 4 develops the conceptual model and hypotheses; Section 5 articulates the authors' position and arguments; Section 6 discusses implications; and Section 7 concludes.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Inclusive Leadership: Conceptual Foundations

Inclusive leadership refers to a leadership approach characterised by the active demonstration of openness, accessibility, and availability in interactions with followers (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006; Carmeli et al., 2010; Shore et al., 2011; Randel et al., 2018). Rooted in the broader inclusion literature, the construct builds on Mor Barak's (2015) foundational distinction between inclusion and exclusion, positing that employees' sense of belonging and uniqueness is substantially shaped by the behaviours of their immediate leaders. Inclusive leaders are distinguished by their willingness to solicit diverse input, acknowledge the contributions of individual team members, and create equitable access to resources, information, and developmental opportunities.

The empirical literature on inclusive leadership has identified three core behavioural dimensions. First, openness refers to the leader's willingness to hear and engage with new ideas, differing perspectives, and critical feedback without defensiveness or dismissal (Carmeli et al., 2010; Randel et al., 2018; Qi & Liu, 2017). Second, accessibility refers to the degree to which leaders make themselves physically, emotionally, and temporally available to their followers — communicating through both words and actions that employees' concerns and ideas are legitimate and welcomed (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006; Javed et al., 2018; Choi et al., 2015). Third, availability refers to the leader's responsiveness to follower needs — including provision of time, attention, and resources — when followers approach them with challenges, ideas, or requests (Carmeli et al., 2010; Shore et al., 2011).

2.2 Innovative Work Behaviour: A Multidimensional Construct

Innovative work behaviour is broadly defined as the intentional creation, introduction, and application of new ideas within a work role, group, or organisation in order to benefit role performance, the group, or the organisation (Janssen, 2000; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Kanter, 1988). Contemporary scholarship operationalises IWB as a three-stage process construct encompassing idea generation — the creative production of novel concepts or solutions; idea promotion — the active championing and socialisation of ideas within the organisation; and idea implementation — the conversion of ideas into tangible products, processes, or services (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Anderson et al., 2014; Farr & Ford, 1990).

This three-dimensional structure is particularly relevant in multigenerational organisational contexts, where different generational cohorts may excel at different stages of the innovation process. Research suggests that younger generational cohorts — particularly Millennials and Generation Z — demonstrate higher propensity for idea generation through comfort with digital technologies and exposure to diverse information ecosystems (Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Twenge et al., 2010; Deal & Levenson, 2016). Older cohorts, by contrast, often possess greater organisational knowledge and stakeholder networks that are critical for idea promotion and implementation. Inclusive leadership, by creating conditions that honour and integrate these generational strengths, can unlock a multigenerational innovation dividend that homogeneous or generationally exclusionary leadership approaches cannot.

2.3 The Multigenerational Workforce Context

Multigenerational workforce management has become a central concern for human resource scholars and practitioners globally (Costanza et al., 2017; Lyons & Kuron, 2014; North & Fiske, 2015; Joshi et al., 2011). The convergence of extended working lives, declining birth rates, and changing retirement patterns has produced organisations in which generational diversity is not a transitional phenomenon but a structural feature (Twenge et al., 2010; Deal & Levenson, 2016; Biggs et al., 2017).

Managing this diversity effectively requires leaders who are equipped to navigate intergenerational tensions, create shared organisational purpose, and draw productively on the distinct competencies of each generational cohort.

Research on intergenerational dynamics in the workplace reveals a complex picture. While generational diversity carries the potential for enhanced creativity, broader perspective-taking, and greater organisational resilience, it also introduces risks of value-based conflict, communication friction, and differential engagement with leadership and institutional authority (North & Fiske, 2015; Joshi et al., 2011; Finkelstein et al., 2015; Rudolph et al., 2021). Inclusive leadership, by

explicitly addressing these dynamics through its foundational behaviours, offers a theoretically and practically viable response to the managerial challenges of generational diversity.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This paper draws upon three complementary theoretical lenses to anchor the proposed relationship between inclusive leadership and innovative work behaviour in multigenerational organisations. Each framework contributes a distinct explanatory layer: Social Identity Theory illuminates the identity dynamics that drive inclusion and exclusion; LMX Theory explains the relational mechanisms through which leadership behaviours produce differentiated individual outcomes; and Organisational Learning Theory elucidates the organisational conditions under which knowledge diversity translates into innovation.

3.1 Social Identity Theory (SIT)

Social Identity Theory, originally advanced by Tajfel and Turner (1979) and subsequently elaborated by Hogg and Abrams (2015) and Ellemers et al. (2013), proposes that individuals derive a significant portion of their self-concept from their membership in social groups. In organisational settings, generational cohorts function as potent social identity groups, and leaders who fail to acknowledge or respect the identity distinctiveness of different generational cohorts' risk triggering inter-group bias and intra-group closure — both of which are antithetical to

innovation. Inclusive leadership, by affirming the value of diverse identities and creating conditions of psychological inclusion, mitigates the identity threat that can suppress idea sharing and collaborative problem-solving across generational lines.

3.2 Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory
Leader-Member Exchange Theory, developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) and extended by Erdogan and Bauer (2010) and Dulebohn et al. (2012), posits that the quality of the dyadic relationship between a leader and individual followers has profound consequences for follower motivation, performance, and creativity. High-quality LMX relationships are characterised by trust, respect, mutual obligation, and latitude — precisely the relational conditions that inclusive leadership is designed to cultivate. In multigenerational contexts, the theory predicts that inclusive leaders who develop high-quality exchange relationships with employees across generational cohorts will generate broader and more equitable distributions of IWB. The accessibility and availability dimensions of inclusive leadership are particularly salient to LMX quality, as they determine the degree to which followers perceive the leader as relationally invested in their success.

3.3 Organisational Learning Theory (OLT)

Organisational Learning Theory, grounded in the foundational work of Argyris and Schön (1978) and subsequently developed by Senge (2006), Crossan et al. (2011), and Argote and Miron-Spektor (2011), examines how organisations acquire, interpret, and apply knowledge from diverse sources. A multigenerational workforce constitutes a rich and heterogeneous knowledge ecosystem — one that contains tacit insights, technical competencies, historical knowledge, and emergent perspectives distributed across generational cohorts. Inclusive leadership, by facilitating the psychological safety, information-sharing norms, and cross-cohort dialogue necessary for organisational learning, transforms this knowledge heterogeneity into organisational innovation capacity. The openness dimension of inclusive leadership is especially critical in this process, as it signals to employees across generational cohorts that their knowledge contributions are valued and will be seriously engaged.

IV. CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

The conceptual model proposed in this paper posits that inclusive leadership — operationalised through its three dimensions of openness, accessibility, and availability — exerts a positive and significant influence on the three dimensions of innovative work behaviour: idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation. This relationship is conceptualised as being mediated by three organisational mechanisms: equal opportunity practices, intergenerational collaboration, and diversity training. Together, these mediating mechanisms constitute the organisational infrastructure through which inclusive leadership behaviours are translated into innovation outcomes.

4.1 Proposed Hypotheses

- H1: Leader openness is positively associated with idea generation among employees in multigenerational organisations.
- H2: Leader accessibility is positively associated with idea promotion among employees in multigenerational organisations.
- H3: Leader availability is positively associated with idea implementation in multigenerational organisational contexts.
- H4: The positive relationship between inclusive leadership and innovative work behaviour is stronger in organisations with higher levels of diversity training investment.
- H5: Intergenerational collaboration mediates the relationship between inclusive leadership and idea implementation in multigenerational organisations.

4.2 Conceptual Framework Narrative

The conceptual model visualises a pathway structure in which the three dimensions of inclusive leadership (IV) feed into their corresponding innovative work behaviour outcomes (DV), with equal opportunity, intergenerational collaboration, and diversity training functioning as organisational mediators. Openness by leaders creates a psychologically safe environment in which employees across generational cohorts feel secure in proposing novel ideas without fear of ridicule or dismissal — thereby stimulating idea generation. Accessibility ensures that followers have

reliable channels through which to share emergent ideas with decision-makers — enabling idea promotion. Availability signals to employees that their ideas will receive genuine engagement and resource consideration, providing the motivational foundation for idea implementation.

The model is not deterministic. It recognises that the translation of inclusive leadership behaviours into innovative outcomes is contingent upon the quality of organisational systems, the maturity of diversity management practices, and the cultural context of the organisation — factors that vary considerably across generational compositions and institutional environments (Randel et al., 2018; Shore et al., 2011).

V. AUTHOR POSITION AND ARGUMENTS

5.1 The Transformative Case for Inclusive Leadership

This paper takes the position that inclusive leadership represents one of the most consequential developments in organisational management in the current era, particularly in the context of rapidly diversifying and ageing workforces. The traditional leadership paradigm — hierarchical, homogeneous in perspective, and premised on deference to seniority — is structurally inadequate for the demands of knowledge-intensive, innovation-dependent organisations that must simultaneously engage employees across five generational cohorts, each with distinct expectations, competencies, and values (Costanza et al., 2017; Deal & Levenson, 2016; Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Twenge et al., 2010). Inclusive leadership offers a fundamentally different paradigm: one grounded in relational transparency rather than hierarchical opacity, equity rather than uniformity, and participatory engagement rather than directive compliance.

For organisations operating in multigenerational contexts, the strategic stakes are uniquely high. In environments where talent scarcity, knowledge transfer risks, and engagement differentials across generational cohorts represent measurable business risks, inclusive leadership practices that actively valorise generational diversity and create equitable conditions for contribution are not merely ethically

desirable but economically necessary (Biggs et al., 2017; North & Fiske, 2015; Joshi et al., 2011; Finkelstein et al., 2015). The paper argues that organisations that fail to develop inclusive leadership capacity are systematically forfeiting an innovation dividend that their generationally diverse workforces are capable of generating but that homogeneous or exclusionary leadership practices systematically suppress.

5.2 Openness and Idea Generation: The Psychological Safety Mechanism

One of the most compelling arguments for inclusive leadership in multigenerational organisations lies in its capacity to generate the psychological safety that idea generation fundamentally requires. Edmondson's (1999) seminal research on team psychological safety — the shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking — has been consistently replicated and extended across diverse organisational and cultural settings (Newman et al., 2017; Frazier et al., 2017; Baer & Frese, 2003). The openness dimension of inclusive leadership is the primary behavioural driver of psychological safety: when leaders consistently demonstrate receptivity to diverse perspectives, acknowledge their own fallibility, and avoid punishing or dismissing unconventional ideas, they create the relational conditions under which all employees — regardless of generational cohort, tenure, or hierarchical position — feel safe to offer novel ideas.

In multigenerational contexts, this openness function is particularly critical. Research on organisational silence suggests that employees who perceive their generational perspective to be undervalued or systematically discounted are significantly less likely to speak up, share ideas, or engage in proactive innovation behaviour (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Milliken et al., 2003; Detert & Burris, 2007; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2012). Inclusive leaders who explicitly signal respect for generationally diverse perspectives — acknowledging the experiential wisdom of older cohorts and the digital fluency of younger ones — actively mitigate this silencing dynamic and expand the organisational pool of idea-generating voices.

5.3 Accessibility and Idea Promotion: The Relational Channel

The causal pathway from leader accessibility to idea promotion rests on a fundamental organisational reality: novel ideas, however creative, require sponsorship, advocacy, and visibility to traverse organisational hierarchies and resource-allocation processes (Kanter, 1988; King & Anderson, 2002; Howell & Boies, 2004; Janssen et al., 2004).

Accessible leaders — those who are physically present, emotionally engaged, and temporally available — provide followers with the relational channels necessary to promote their ideas beyond the immediate work context. When employees across generational cohorts perceive their leaders as genuinely accessible, they are significantly more likely to proactively champion their own and their colleagues' ideas, knowing that such advocacy will receive fair and serious consideration.

In multigenerational organisations, the accessibility dimension of inclusive leadership addresses a specific and recurring tension: generational differentials in informal access to leadership. Research consistently documents that younger employee — particularly those from Generation Z and Millennial cohorts — are more likely than their older counterparts to perceive barriers to informal access to senior leaders (Deal & Levenson, 2016; Twenge et al., 2010; Lyons & Kuron, 2014; North & Fiske, 2015). Inclusive leaders who deliberately structure their accessibility to span generational cohorts — through mentoring relationships, open-door norms, and inclusive communication platforms — create more equitable distributions of idea promotion opportunity across the generational spectrum of their organisations.

5.4 Availability and Idea Implementation: The Resource Commitment Signal

Idea implementation — the most proximate dimension of innovative work behaviour to organisational performance — requires more than creative inspiration and social advocacy. It demands access to resources, managerial support, risk tolerance, and sustained organisational commitment (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Anderson et al., 2014; Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Baer, 2012). The availability

dimension of inclusive leadership functions as the critical signal to employees that this resource commitment is both possible and forthcoming. When leaders are consistently available to problem-solve, remove barriers, and provide time and material resources in response to employee innovation initiatives, they communicate that the organisation's commitment to innovation is substantive rather than rhetorical.

In emerging economies and developing organisational contexts, where resource scarcity frequently creates structural barriers to implementation, the availability signal provided by inclusive leaders takes on heightened significance. Employees who perceive their leaders as genuinely and consistently available are more likely to invest the discretionary effort required to move ideas from concept to execution — overcoming the organisational friction, bureaucratic resistance, and resource competition that frequently stall innovation implementation processes (Baard et al., 2015; Baer, 2012; Howell & Boies, 2004; Janssen et al., 2004). The paper therefore argues that leader availability is the dimension of inclusive leadership most directly linked to the organisation's innovation implementation capacity.

The paper takes the view that inclusive leadership tools and development frameworks should be designed as capability-building investments, not compliance exercises. The motivational and strategic risks of treating inclusion as a box-ticking exercise are significant, particularly in high-diversity, multigenerational organisations where employees across cohorts are acutely sensitive to the authenticity of inclusion commitments (Randel et al., 2018; Shore et al., 2011).

5.5 The Mediating Architecture: Equal Opportunity, Collaboration, and Training

The paper argues that inclusive leadership behaviours do not translate directly and uniformly into innovative work behaviour outcomes. Rather, they operate through an organisational mediating architecture consisting of three structural mechanisms. Equal opportunity practices — encompassing equitable access to development opportunities, project assignments, and performance

recognition across generational cohorts — translate the normative signal of inclusive leadership into tangible organisational equity. When equal opportunity practices are robust, inclusive leadership behaviours produce broader and more equitable distributions of IWB across the generational spectrum.

Intergenerational collaboration — the deliberate creation of cross-generational team structures, knowledge-sharing forums, and project-based learning opportunities — functions as the organisational mechanism through which the generationally diverse knowledge assets activated by inclusive leadership are recombined into novel ideas. Research on knowledge recombination and innovation suggests that cross-boundary collaboration is one of the most powerful structural drivers of organisational creativity (Hargadon & Sutton, 1997; Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017; Obstfeld, 2005; Fleming & Waguespack, 2007). Intergenerational collaboration extends this insight to the dimension of generational knowledge diversity, proposing that structured interaction across generational cohorts produces innovation synergies that age-homogeneous teams cannot replicate.

Diversity training — when designed rigorously and implemented with fidelity — serves as the organisational mechanism through which the inclusive leadership philosophy is institutionalised beyond individual leaders and embedded in organisational norms, processes, and culture (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Kalev et al., 2006; Roberson et al., 2017; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). Effective diversity training programmes that explicitly address generational stereotypes, communication preferences, and collaborative styles equip employees across cohorts with the interpersonal competencies necessary for productive intergenerational idea exchange. The paper therefore argues that the IWB-generative potential of inclusive leadership is substantially amplified in organisations that invest in sustained, evidence-based diversity training.

5.6 The Multigenerational Paradox: Opportunity and Tension

The paper does not advance a naively optimistic position. It acknowledges what may be termed the

'multigenerational innovation paradox' — the simultaneous existence of high creative potential and significant relational tension in generationally diverse organisations. On the opportunity side, generationally diverse organisations possess extraordinary knowledge heterogeneity: the accumulated experiential wisdom of Traditionalists and Baby Boomers, the pragmatic institutional knowledge of Generation X, the collaborative digital fluency of Millennials, and the socially conscious technological innovation of Generation Z represent a formidable innovation ecosystem when effectively integrated (Costanza et al., 2017; Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Biggs et al., 2017; Rudolph et al., 2021).

On the tension side, the challenges of multigenerational management are real and must not be trivialised. Generational stereotyping — the attribution of fixed characteristics to individuals solely on the basis of birth cohort — remains a pervasive and empirically underchallengeable bias in organisational settings (North & Fiske, 2015; Finkelstein et al., 2015; Joshi et al., 2011; Lyons et al., 2019). Inclusive leaders must navigate the productive paradox of simultaneously acknowledging generational identity as a legitimate source of organisational diversity while resisting the temptation to reduce individual employees to generational stereotypes. The paper therefore argues that the positive relationship between inclusive leadership and innovative work behaviour in multigenerational organisations is real but contingent — contingent on the authenticity of inclusion commitments, the quality of diversity management systems, and the leader's capacity for nuanced intergenerational engagement.

VI. IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This paper makes several theoretical contributions. First, it extends the application of Social Identity Theory, LMX Theory, and Organisational Learning Theory to the intersection of inclusive leadership and multigenerational innovation management — a domain that has received relatively limited integrated theoretical treatment in the extant literature (Hogg & Abrams, 2015; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Argote & Miron-Spektor, 2011). Second, it advances a

contextually grounded conceptual model that disaggregates both the IV and DV into operationally distinct dimensions, thereby providing a more granular basis for empirical testing than aggregate constructs allow. Third, it introduces a structured mediating architecture — comprising equal opportunity, intergenerational collaboration, and diversity training — that provides a theoretically generative and practically actionable account of the organisational mechanisms through which inclusive leadership translates into innovation.

6.2 Practical Implications

For HR practitioners and organisational leaders, the paper offers several actionable insights. Organisations should prioritise the development of inclusive leadership capability at all managerial levels, recognising that the behaviours of immediate supervisors — rather than senior executive statements of inclusion intent — are the primary drivers of employee psychological safety and innovation behaviour. Leadership development programmes should be redesigned to explicitly cultivate openness, accessibility, and availability as measurable and assessable behavioural competencies, rather than treating inclusion as a value-based aspiration that resists operationalisation.

Equal opportunity practices should be reviewed and redesigned to ensure that equitable access to development opportunities, high-visibility projects, and recognition processes is genuinely achieved across generational cohorts — not merely asserted. Intergenerational collaboration should be embedded as a structural feature of team composition, project assignment, and knowledge-sharing systems, rather than being left to emerge organically in organisational cultures that may default to generational clustering. Diversity training investment should be sustained, evidence-based, and explicitly designed to address the interpersonal competencies required for productive cross-generational collaboration.

6.3 Policy Implications

Policymakers and regulatory bodies should consider developing enabling frameworks that incentivise inclusive leadership development and multigenerational workforce management as strategic

priorities, rather than treating workforce diversity exclusively through a compliance and anti-discrimination lens. Government agencies and development institutions in emerging economies should fund the creation of locally contextualised inclusive leadership development programmes that reflect the specific generational dynamics, cultural values, and labour market conditions of their societies — rather than defaulting to imported frameworks developed for very different institutional and cultural contexts. Regional bodies should also encourage the systematic collection and analysis of generational diversity data in organisations as a basis for evidence-based policymaking on workforce inclusion.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper has advanced the conceptual argument that inclusive leadership — encompassing openness, accessibility, and availability — holds significant potential to enhance innovative work behaviour in multigenerational organisations, as measured through idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation. Grounded in Social Identity Theory, Leader-Member Exchange Theory, and Organisational Learning Theory, and informed by the specific dynamics of multigenerational workforce management, the paper has developed a conceptual model and a set of empirically testable hypotheses. Three organisational mediators — equal opportunity practices, intergenerational collaboration, and diversity training — have been proposed as the structural mechanisms through which inclusive leadership behaviours generate innovation outcomes.

The paper has argued, with conviction but without naivety, that realising the innovation potential of multigenerational workforces requires more than demographic diversity. It requires a simultaneous investment in inclusive leadership development, equitable organisational systems, cross-generational knowledge architecture, and sustained diversity management capacity. The organisation that achieves this integration will not merely manage its generational diversity more effectively — it will transform that diversity into a genuine and durable source of competitive innovation advantage. Future research should move beyond conceptual framing to

empirically test the proposed hypotheses across diverse organisational and national contexts, employing rigorous mixed-methods designs that capture both the statistical relationships and the lived leadership experiences that quantitative models alone cannot fully illuminate. The field is nascent, the stakes are high, and the intellectual territory is rich. This paper is an invitation to engage it with the seriousness it deserves.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157-183.
- [2] Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297-1333.
- [3] Argote, L., & Miron-Spektor, E. (2011). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1123-1137.
- [4] Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- [5] Baard, S. K., Rench, T. A., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2015). Performance adaptation: A theoretical integration and review. *Journal of Management*, 40(1), 48-99.
- [6] Baer, M. (2012). Putting creativity to work: The implementation of creative ideas in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1102-1119.
- [7] Baer, M., & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(1), 45-68.
- [8] Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training

- evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227-1274.
- [9] Biggs, S., Carr, A., & Haapala, I. (2017). Workplace identity and the older worker. In K. S. Shulz & G. A. Adams (Eds.), *Aging and Work in the 21st Century* (2nd ed., pp. 119-142). Routledge.
- [10] Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(3), 250-260.
- [11] Choi, S. B., Tran, T. B. H., & Park, B. I. (2015). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Mediating roles of affective organisational commitment and creativity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 43(6), 931-944.
- [12] Costanza, D. P., Badger, J. M., Fraser, R. L., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2017). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394.
- [13] Crossan, M. M., Maurer, C. C., & White, R. E. (2011). Reflections on the 2009 AMR decade award: Do we have a theory of organizational learning? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(3), 446-460.
- [14] De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23-36.
- [15] Deal, J. J., & Levenson, A. (2016). *What millennials want from work: How to maximize engagement in today's workforce*. McGraw-Hill.
- [16] Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behaviour and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869-884.
- [17] Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715-1759.
- [18] Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- [19] Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2013). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 161-186.
- [20] Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Differentiated leader-member exchanges: The buffering role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1104-1120.
- [21] Farr, J. L., & Ford, C. M. (1990). Individual innovation. In M. A. West & J. L. Farr (Eds.), *Innovation and Creativity at Work* (pp. 63-80). Wiley.
- [22] Finkelstein, L. M., Truxillo, D. M., Fraccaroli, F., & Kanfer, R. (Eds.). (2015). *Facing the challenges of a multi-age workforce: A use-inspired approach*. Routledge.
- [23] Fleming, L., & Waguespack, D. M. (2007). Brokerage, boundary spanning, and leadership in open innovation communities. *Organization Science*, 18(2), 165-180.
- [24] Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113-165.
- [25] Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- [26] Hargadon, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Technology brokering and innovation in a product development firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(4), 716-749.
- [27] Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (2015). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. Routledge.

- [28] Howell, J. M., & Boies, K. (2004). Champions of technological innovation: The influence of contextual knowledge, role orientation, idea generation, and idea promotion on champion emergence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 123-143.
- [29] Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
- [30] Janssen, O., Van de Vliert, E., & West, M. (2004). The bright and dark sides of individual and group innovation: A special issue introduction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(2), 129-145.
- [31] Javed, B., Abdullah, I., Zaffar, M. A., ul Haque, A., & Rubab, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership and innovative work behaviour: The role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(4), 554-571.
- [32] Joshi, A., Dencker, J. C., Franz, G., & Martocchio, J. J. (2011). Unpacking generational identities in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 392-414.
- [33] Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589-617.
- [34] Kanter, R. M. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: Structural, collective, and social conditions for innovation in organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, 169-211.
- [35] King, N., & Anderson, N. (2002). *Managing innovation and change: A critical guide for organizations*. Thomson Learning.
- [36] Kulik, C. T., & Roberson, L. (2008). Diversity initiative effectiveness: What organizations can and cannot expect from diversity recruitment, diversity training, and formal mentoring programs. In A. P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at Work* (pp. 265-317). Cambridge University Press.
- [37] Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139-S157.
- [38] Lyons, S. T., Urick, M., Kuron, L., & Schweitzer, L. (2019). Generational differences in the workplace: There is complexity beyond the stereotypes. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12(3), 300-322.
- [39] Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476.
- [40] Mor Barak, M. E. (2015). Inclusion is the key to diversity management, but what is inclusion? *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 39(2), 83-88.
- [41] Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706-725.
- [42] Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(7), 941-966.
- [43] Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), 521-535.
- [44] North, M. S., & Fiske, S. T. (2015). Modern attitudes toward older adults in the aging world: A cross-cultural meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(5), 993-1021.
- [45] Obstfeld, D. (2005). Social networks, the tertius iungens orientation, and involvement in innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 100-130.

- [46] Perry-Smith, J. E., & Mannucci, P. V. (2017). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(1), 53-79.
- [47] Qi, L., & Liu, B. (2017). Effects of inclusive leadership on employee voice behaviour and team performance: The mediating role of caring ethical climate. *Frontiers in Communication*, 2, 8.
- [48] Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 190-203.
- [49] Roberson, Q., Ryan, A. M., & Ragins, B. R. (2017). The evolution and future of diversity at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 483-499.
- [50] Rudolph, C. W., Rauvola, R. S., & Zacher, H. (2021). Leadership and generations at work: A critical review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 44-57.
- [51] Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- [52] Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (Revised ed.). Doubleday.
- [53] Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262-1289.
- [54] Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Brooks/Cole.
- [55] Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2012). Ask and you shall hear (but not always): Examining the relationship between manager consultation and employee voice. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(2), 251-282.
- [56] Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142.
- [57] Zhou, J., & Shalley, C. E. (Eds.). (2018). *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.