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INTRODUCTION

Gender diversity is beneficial for companies. The current over-representation of the dominant (unhealthy male) gender in leadership roles negates the perspectives of over half of the population in decisions that impact society. Furthermore, leadership discourses which are grounded in outdated notions of male privilege and superiority, control through force, and the negation of leadership ideals grounded in stereotypically feminine characteristics, are the underlying basis of our current hierarchical system. This is based on thousands of years of male dominance throughout history personified through archetypes of unhealthy and abusive males. This is most notably illustrated by the Western image of God as an all-powerful male—which has been found to have a direct
influence on the degree to which white men are perceived as fit for leadership (Roberts et al., 2020). It is only in recent decades that women have, for the most part, held leadership roles. They have done so only through taking on the mantle of stereotypically male characteristics. To be clear, the gender characteristics we are discussing are social constructs, not inherent and inflexible traits attached to male or female biological sex. Rather, we argue that in order to shift the discourse of leadership to better represent the totality of society, leadership needs to be exercised by people with a variety of lived experience. Leadership then has the potential to meet the needs of people across society, not just the needs of economically privileged men, as has been the case almost exclusively throughout history (until recently). Considering the current state of the planet, there is an overwhelming need for this shift in discourse, and concurrent shift in societal values to recognize the need to heal the planet and its peoples, who have been, and continue to be oppressed and exploited by the stereotypical values of power, privilege, and profit at any cost.

What Is Gender Diversity?

Gender diversity is most commonly defined as the equal ratio of men and women. One will frequently read stories or research about gender diversity in corporate boardrooms and other areas traditionally dominated by men. While this focus has brought some insight, it is superficial and, in fact, misrepresents and even marginalizes gender issues. This framing of gender diversity ignores the intersectional experience of gender discrimination and bias. Furthermore, while understanding the gaps between men and women is certainly important, much research fails to include the process toward the disparities that involve many variables. Recognizing and identifying the biases, practices, behaviors, cultures, structures, and systems that have created inequality between genders is key. The gender disparities cannot be addressed without first a discussion around the multiple ways in which people are marginalized. Gender diversity goes beyond the discussion around men and women and to those with non-binary gender identities.

Gender diversity as a starting point considers the ratio of men to women but is furthermore about respecting that there are multiple ways to identify beyond the male and female binary. While perceived gender is what people believe one’s gender to be, and while gender roles is what
one’s society deems is appropriate to men or women, the way in which one identifies as true is internal to that particular person. Gender inclusion is a higher value in that while diversity is merely acknowledging the different genders, inclusion is taking further action to create opportunities for all to be and feel part of the larger whole, be that the organization or a community. To be effectively gender inclusive, however, requires an awareness of bias not only in regard to gender but the various other identities that lead to bias against a person.

**Planetary Health and Toxic Leadership**

How might greater gender diversity help us achieve planetary health? In brief, planetary health is defined as “the health of human civilisation and the state of the natural systems on which it depends” (Horton & Lo, 2015, p. 1921). As noted above, this is not simply a superficial exercise in meeting gender quotas with no consideration of the characteristics of the people taking on the role of leader. Biological sex, while influential, is not a true indication of values or behaviors. Indeed, power-seeking women strive to compete with men on men’s terms, and often abandon the very characteristics which are stereotypically feminine, and which might enable them to make a significant contribution to leadership for planetary health, in order to achieve the power they crave. These women recreate themselves in the image of the unhealthy, abusive male—choosing competitiveness, greed, ambition, violence, and oppression of their peers over caring, compassion, nurturance, healing, cooperation, forgiveness, and inclusion. Such toxic women leaders have focused on individual and selfish gain over the wellbeing of the community and have been absorbed by a system that is creating ever greater inequalities throughout the world rather than refined it.

Yet not all women leaders have simply mimicked the most oppressive and unethical values and behaviors of male leaders. Some have taken on leadership roles that are changing the system in the ways that ideally reflect a greater diversity of perspectives. Research has indicated that firms with women CEOs or gender diverse boards have stronger business and equity practices, and gender diverse leadership teams demonstrate stronger business and equity outcomes than teams characterized by gender homophily (Cook & Glass, 2018). Similarly, there are many examples of male leadership and followership that reflect stereotypically feminine values of compassion and liberation.
These findings take us beyond superficial feminist arguments, and demonstrate that diversity is distinctly superior to homophily, regardless of gender. In this vein, research shows that just as male dominance is unhealthy, predominantly female teams can be detrimental, resulting in greater conservatism, and similar negative effects as homophily on male-dominated teams: lack of dissent, lower levels of team learning, and reduced innovation (Cook & Glass, 2018). Conversely, gender diversity at leadership and followership levels appear to be consistent with promoting the values of learning organizations (Senge, 1990).

**Tokenism**

It follows then, that it is naïve to assume that simply placing women in traditionally male leadership roles without addressing the underlying power dynamics and values of individuals and organizations will automatically result in improvements. Research indicates that in spite of improving organizational integrity, employing greater numbers of female employees can be detrimental to organizations, particularly when the most senior leader is a woman, for example, by increasing the number of sexual harassment and sexual violence incidents (Choi et al., 2018), and promoting lateral violence (Sheridan-Leos, 2008). Female-dominated workplaces increase the risk of workplace bullying for both women and under-represented men (Salin, 2015). Furthermore, representation of women in top corporate leadership may create a false sense of having addressed the problem of gender diversity, through creating an inaccurate view of women’s equality and decreasing concern with gender inequality in other domains (Georgeac & Rattan, 2019). The woman leader may be little more than a token, without true change in terms of representation of women or the values that people of different genders could contribute to organizations, and ultimately, to planetary health.

The importance of greater diversity of genders, however, is not only related to the value of inclusion as part and parcel of decolonizing our organizations and workplaces, but also supports endeavors to take steps toward, for example, Truth and Reconciliation, a process as part of an overall holistic and comprehensive response to the Indian Residential School legacy in Canada, with Indigenous peoples, whose marginalized are foremost women. Recognizing and identifying the biases, practices, behaviors, cultures, structures, and systems that have created inequality between genders is key. The gender disparities cannot be addressed
without first a discussion around the multiple ways in which people are marginalized.

This work adds to a growing number of studies that recognize the significance of gender diversity in organizations by investigating the link between the gender diversity of organizations and performance, well-being, and consequently, beyond the organization to bringing awareness to planetary health. We argue that diversity enhances innovation and the ability of the organization to thrive. We suggest that the impact of a thriving organization is important, not just to the organization as a whole or an entity but as a building block for a thriving civilization. Consequently, the chapter provides recommendations for companies and organizations to uncover unconscious bias as a first step to recognizing the multiple ways in which diversity is not enacted, and how to take the appropriate steps to enhance gender diversity, equality and inclusion, which includes shifting one’s organizational culture for the health of the organization and ultimately planetary health.

Hence, our definition of gender diversity goes beyond the discussion around sex and socially prescribed gender roles; it provides a focus on the need to include those marginalized at the leadership levels and within organizations through inclusive leadership. It illustrates awareness of the unconscious bias of decision makers to facilitating diversity (Perry et al., 2015) as a key barrier to achieving gender diversity. Clearly, socialization processes have created different ways of leading according to gender identity, which bring therefore different leadership styles, lenses, and approaches to policy and to how people work and engage with one another. Finally, we identify the steps to enhancing gender diversity and inclusion for organizational and planetary health.

This work makes a number of contributions to the literature. First, it adds to diverse perspectives on the topic. Second, an increased role for women in organizations has been the subject for a number of years but without a recognition for diversity of gender, meaning the lines of demarcation are not only subject to sex difference, although it is of importance to discuss increasing women’s participation into the workforce and the various forms of organization. Third, while the gender gap debate has been advocated for in view of the value of equality, other ethical reasons to redress such imbalance adds value to the discussions around racial diversity and more importantly, as a result of bias enacted by the same gender, inclusion of women by women, as part and parcel of a wider discussion
around gender bias. Fourth, what is perceived to be an underrepresentation of women in organizations must be viewed as an ethical issue around marginalization along gender lines, race, religion, color, and identities. Fifth, this discussion is of significance to not only organizational health but planetary health.

The Role of Unconscious Bias

Unconscious bias is defined as “a particular tendency or inclination, especially one that prevents unprejudiced consideration of a question” (FreecDictionary.com). Unconscious (or sometimes referred to as implicit) bias occurs during rapid and automatic judgments and assumptions of people and situations, without conscious awareness of the mental processes making such quick and automatic assessments and conclusions. Our quick judgments arise from a variety of sources. These arise from our upbringing, the educational, social, political, or economic environment that shaped our formative years, our past and current cultural environments, individual experiences, our internal states, such as fear or openness to those experiences, which are also shaped by observing our parents’ reactions to such or similar stimuli, level of exposure to different peoples and perspectives, and arguably also level of particular competencies and traits, such as, trust-building, empathy, intercultural communication, inquiry, humility, curiosity, resilience, and adaptability. This latter category influencing unconscious bias, thus, comprises capabilities that one might learn to help one peel back the many layers of unconscious bias that we all have. After all, every one of us has bias.

Unconscious bias happens favorably and unfavorably when we make judgments regarding promotions between genders in the workplace, choose which person to offer more training, decide on who is ready to lead a particular group or project, and who is of lesser competence. It is important, however, to understand that we can also make judgments with awareness that we are being biased toward or against a person or group. It may not be so uncommon to many to have heard a co-worker disparage a particular ethnic group or make dismissive statements in private about a particular gender only then in front of a larger audience or the boss to utter praises of or engage appreciatively with the same mentioned group or gender. People conceal their true biases to be politically correct or say or do what is expected by those present, because of fear of personal consequences.
Unconscious bias intensifies under conditions perceived as threatening and is more likely when we are rushed or have cognitive overload. That is because we reach into the unconscious mind to fill in gaps. When we are in a rush, we resort to bias. People are grouped not just according to gender, race, and ethnicity but age, religion, class, sexuality, and disability, among other things. Hence, discrimination against a particular gender may be compounded for that gender if they are perceived to have other identities that involve unfavorable bias. Women can also internalize misogyny and cultural conditioning and have been shown to be biased against other women (Agrawal, 2018). According to the “queen bee syndrome,” as defined by Staines, Tavris, and Jayaratne (1973), women who are individually successful in male-dominated environments and attain positions of high status are more likely to endorse gender stereotypes. According to this view, women they supervise are viewed as competitors and, as a result, the queen bee expresses negative attitudes toward them and, thus, tends to discriminate against these female subordinates (Blau & Devaro, 2007, p. 13). This phenomenon has been documented by several studies where women are seen to be bullied more by their female counterparts and managers (Agrawal, 2018).

In a United States survey, conducted by the Pew Research Center with a nationally representative sample of 4,914 adults, gender bias was found to have numerous negative consequences. About four in ten working women (42%) in the United States say they have faced discrimination on the job because of their gender (Parker & Funk, 2017). This research found that women are about three times as likely as men to have experienced sexual harassment at work. However, gender bias cannot be fully understood without grasping the confounding variables that lead to bias as well as the intersectional variables that can increase bias. For example, about three in ten women with a postgraduate degree (29%) say they have experienced repeated small slights at work because of their gender, as compared with 18% of women with a bachelor’s degree and 12% of women with less education (ibid). Black women stand apart in their reporting of having been passed over for the most important assignments due to their gender with 22% of employed black women saying this has happened to them, as compared with 8% of white women and 9% of Hispanic women (ibid.).
Gender Diversity for Planetary Health

In the final report of The Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on Planetary Health, planetary health is defined as “the achievement of the highest attainable standard of health, wellbeing, and equity worldwide through judicious attention to the human systems—political, economic, and social—that shape the future of humanity and the Earth’s natural systems that define the safe environmental limits within which humanity can flourish” (Horton & Lo 2015, p. 1921). In other words, it concerns the health of human civilization and the state of the natural systems on which our civilization depends and can thrive. What does gender diversity mean for planetary health? There are two key dimensions that working toward gender diversity and inclusion has for supporting and advancing planetary health.

First, working toward gender diversity and inclusion situates the health of organizations, as a form of human systems, and the health of societies, as a form of human organization, as integral to the health of the planet—the system upon which we all rely. Any form of chaos or imbalance within the smaller system creates chaos and imbalance within the overall health and wellbeing of our world. This is a systems perspective that sees all parts supporting the whole. Hence, we do not see planetary health as only concerning the natural systems but the system within which we exist. Therefore, “[t]he threats that our species faces are not abstract physical risks … The risks we face lie within ourselves and the societies we have created” (Horton & Lo, 2015, p. 2021), and as a result human cultures contain both the threat and opportunity for human flourishing.

Horton and Lo (2015, p. 2022) argued that we underestimate the intricate interplay of environmental, political, and sociocultural resilience, and quoted Butzer’s argument to focus on “leaders, elites, and ideology” as a way of creating planetary health. Our concern with gender diversity within organizations is not disconnected, but rather part of a larger concern for human and civilizational flourishing, here viewed as of significance to planetary health. From this wider systems perspective, gender diversity is not merely viewed as a rights issue for marginalized genders. Planetary health is a global health issue (Demaio & Rockström, 2015, p. 36). The final report of The Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on Planetary Health emphasizes the need to work toward the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), among several key
goals, for planetary health. The special event on Women Leaders for Planetary Health at the UN Climate Summit (COP25) in Madrid in 2019 was a new initiative of the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS) focused on women’s empowerment as prerequisite for addressing our current climate crisis and effectively implementing the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). However, to date, very little has been contributed from civil society research, research on organizational well-being and particularly gender, although SDG 5 specifically relates to gender. Hence, in way of bridging the link between gender in organizations and planetary health, we seek to support a better understanding of gender imbalance in organizations to offer concrete recommendations about the kind of leadership needed for organizational and planetary health.

Second, working toward gender diversity and inclusion through inclusive leadership offers us greater understanding around the concept of harmony. The dominant perspective on gender disparity and inequality offers a binary view based on sex, excluding and marginalizing the deeper and holistic understanding or worldview of planetary health and harmony through the balancing of genders along the feminine and masculine. It also excludes the different ways of looking at and interpreting equality and equity, as well, dignity, harmony, and balance. The complex issue of balance between opposing forces can also be expressed in terms of the principle: “balance between feminine and masculine energy” (Arahmaiani & Campbell, 2019, p. 204). These authors argue that every culture can make valuable contributions and valuing difference and supporting equality make for a bright and sustainable future (p. 208).

The feminine and masculine principles are also important. Unhealthy masculinity is not just harmful to men and society as a whole—it’s also harmful to the planet (Brough, 2017). While this specific study focused on men, we would argue two important points. One, the unhealthy masculinity or masculine is toxic and not confined to one sex. This unhealthy masculinity that is fearful of the healthy feminine can reside in women too. For example, women in the “queen-bee” theory or women who feel they have had to fight so hard to get to their positions of power and take action to ensure their female subordinates experience just as much difficulty breaking through the “glass-ceiling” are also uncomfortable with supporting feminine expression among female and male employees. Consequently, this fear, or even hate, of feminine power, then, requires a mindset change around the essences that are of value
to the harmony, balance, and health of the organization. Equally, fear, and hate, of healthy masculine power requires a mindset change. Feminist approaches that bash men and throw all men into a category of those to be wary of and fight to get equal rights is not just harmful to women and society as a whole—it is also harmful to the planet.

This imbalance requires healing. However, Western mindsets focused on binaries is resistant to a holistic approach to transformation. A holistic approach or framework, however, is reliant upon the principle of healing as the way forward to health, harmony, and sustainability. A yin-yang approach, that appreciates the healthy interplay of supports between the masculine and feminine, or, in taking an Indigenous approach, through what Atleo (2011) refers to as habuulism which “can be defined by the struggle for balance and harmony” and which requires what he refers to as “protocols of Tsawalk,” which are agreements “to move competitive relationships away from conflict and towards harmony” (p. 156) provide examples of inclusion in orientation. We require a framework that recognizes inclusive approaches, including primarily holistic approaches, and those which enables a healthy masculinity and healthy femininity to shine and co-create in their multiple forms, and to engender transformation for organizational and planetary health.

Leadership for Organizational and Planetary Health

Inclusive leadership is concerned first and foremost with inclusion, both in its processes and the ends for which it strives (Ryan, 2006, p. 3). Inclusive leadership focuses on relationships that promote mutual benefit (Hollander, 2008, p. 3). Here, inclusive leadership will be defined as leadership that enables individuals and collectives to be recognized, respected, dignified, whole and well, and their interconnections enhanced for mutual benefit. Key principles of inclusive leadership are working “with” others who are different, exercising the opposite of homophily, which is the essence of inclusion. They include actively involving others in decision-making, which is the essence of self-determination; strengthening and valuing relationships and connections, social justice, plurality, fairness and welfare, which form the essence of civil society. It is, therefore, imperative to understand the kind of leadership that is generative and enabling of diversity and inclusion for organizational and planetary health.

A discussion around what both diversity and inclusion constitute must take place around how to address power imbalance. This includes conflict,
exclusion, marginalization, colonization, imperialism, imbalance of “haves and have nots,” and the underlying power and economic and organizational structures that continue to create barriers to a healthy life for all. These anti-inclusive forces may be echoed at an organizational level, through nepotism, favoritism, cliques, and workplace bullying, which may be implicitly rewarded through practices which encourage competition over collaboration. Individual health and flourishing is about personal happiness; however, personal happiness or feeling good also relates to or is influenced by the degree to which an individual feels they are equal, have equal rights, equal access, such as to promotion, have means for equity, feel dignified, feel respected, have the means, capacity and context for living and working purposefully, have choices, opportunities, and enjoy safety and security, among myriad factors that contribute to how an individual defines their wellbeing.

The prescriptive advantage of inclusive leadership is, that being inclusive, it does not place the burden on individuals to take care of themselves, but emphasizes instead the relational and structural nature shaping a healthy whole (Ryan, 2006, p. 6). The subject of individual and organizational health is a collective one. One’s health isn’t merely a personal goal that could be achieved passively; it is the responsibility of the organization (People Diagnostics, 2019, p. 3). When people are excluded, they often do not have the resources, tools, or skills to create their own wellness, or the means to acquire them. Purposeful inclusion, then, requires that the system change (Ryan, 2006, p. 6).

For an environment to be inclusive, people must believe that they are treated fairly, valued for who they are, and included in core decision-making (Gottfredson, 2019). Whether organizational participation and leadership or larger systems participation and governance, leadership that is inclusive means that leaders acknowledge power structures and that particular contexts and environments influence how well one feels. Hence, the prerogative of an inclusive leader is also acknowledging context that shapes wellbeing and health. This includes others who are marginalized from power structures of inequality, and means taking a step beyond mere inclusion into a hierarchy of power relations but toward plurality. Inclusion requires the transformation of the environment of imbalance and inequity for inclusion to shift into plurality; that is, plurality of individual and collective participation and contribution for meaningful co-creation.
It must be recognized that employee mental health can be impacted at work from both the design of work (e.g., workload, co-worker and supervisor support, autonomy), and individual factors (e.g., practicing self-care, nurturing positive relationships, savoring positive experiences). The development of relationships with particular people can be influenced by not only bias against a particular gender but that gender in addition to other intersectional identities outside one’s usual in-group. Psychological health and cultural safety at work is a shared responsibility (People Diagnostics, 2019, p. 3). In connecting the benefit of individual health to the organization as a whole, and to planetary health, the subject of health becomes a concern and imperative for leaders within organizations, within the state, region—and despite these seemingly neat divisions, categories and borders, health considers a global view of leadership and followership for mutual benefit and wellbeing.

Participation is not apolitical. It should entail leadership that seeks to recognize, respect, dignify, and make whole and healthy. It should be inclusive and aim to be transformative and purposeful. Embracing the ethic of human flourishing and planetary health and the constituent parts will be one of the greatest challenges for the inclusive leader, but gives promise of a future that is sustainable and hopeful of possibilities. It is, therefore, of significance to leadership research and work to understand how best to support individual and planetary health and collaboratively create change on the individual, collective, and planetary levels. The concept of inclusive leadership enables us to better secure health for the benefit of individuals, the whole, and so for the common good. We assert that by extension these principles entail a broader sense of health—individual, communal, and planetary.

A Roadmap for Greater Inclusion of Gender Diversity

Protocols, or a roadmap, “are hammered out of apparent contradictions over an appropriate period of time” (Atleo, 2011, p. 156). For greater inclusion of gender diversity, we suggest a framework based on an integral model and leadership that is inclusive. We adapt the integral model, originally developed by Wilber (1997), to understand and work with key dimensions of reality. “Integral” means comprehensive, balanced, and inclusive (Wilber, Patten, Leonard, & Morelli, 2008, p. 27). This model has four areas or quadrants to illustrate at least four key perspectives: (1) the individual subjective (including bias, worldviews, masculine
and feminine health, as well mental and spiritual health), (2) the individual behaviors we can observe, (3) collective norms and culture (as #1, less easy to observe), and (4) larger macro systems (such as planetary health). We can plan an inclusive leader’s steps within and across each area or quadrant that entail a systematic, linear, circular, and emergent process. With this framework, we can work with an overview of health that helps us see how, depending on which area we are focusing, we can map overlap, connections, and interdependencies. This framework, thus, enables us a process for change that is inclusive of the different dimensions of wellbeing and health and supports evolution in each dimension that is interdependent. It rests on the individual and collective approach and worldview to see ourselves as interconnected, interdependent, and, at our best, co-developing with each other (Schieffer & Lessem, 2016, p. 15). The following presents steps for an inclusive leader’s strategic plan for enhancing gender equality and one that would recognize the intricacies of bias from an intersectional lens, as would be focused on an organization.

**Step 1: Begin developing inclusive leadership competencies first.** Before leading others you must begin to lead yourself. The process of leading change often omits the idea that transforming leaders is part of the overall transformation process (Metcalf, 2013, p. 11). Develop greater awareness around who you are, which involves peeling back your unconscious bias. These are the particular biases we all have and with which we interpret and make meaning of the world. How you reason and the logic you use depend on the values you aspire to and currently live. An insecure leader may feel threatened by their subordinates, whether, for example, based on their being male or female, or gender fluid, or additionally connected with further identities, and, thus, the leader may consciously or unconsciously undermine their progress, in an effort to retain superiority. As mentioned above, according to the “queen bee syndrome” women who are individually successful in male-dominated environments and attain positions of high status are more likely to endorse gender stereotypes. Hence, awareness of actions that lead to inclusion and exclusion are not related to men in particular.

Thus, an inclusive leader continually aspires to develop their intelligence and consciousness “with a sufficient altitude that they gain the widest lenses and new capacities” (Hamilton, 2008, p. 115). An inclusive leader is one who embodies the values and competencies of an inclusive and planetary citizen and steward, and continually works on expanding
into capacity to hold greater perspectives. These are leaders who speak about matters that impact the whole planet, can catalyze interconnectedness, and improve the flow of products, profits, people, priorities, energy, security, and resources for all (ibid. pp. 116–118). One might consider reflecting on the values one actually does embody and set a vision for oneself of who one wants to become and the values they want to espouse with goals for evolving into embodying these and presencing these in one’s life, work and sphere of influence. How one evaluates and co-creates human flourishing and health with others will hugely depends on this first step.

**Step 2: Evaluate the state of affairs.** There are multiple methods an inclusive leader can use to evaluate where an individual, team, organization, and/or community is at on a scale measuring, for example, health. This stage involves collecting the information one needs to set direction for greater health of the organization. The process involves mapping a starting point from within the organization for creating and enhancing human and planetary flourishing and health and which entails mapping that starting point at (1) the individual and subjective area, (2) the behavioral and competency area, (3) the culture and communal area, and (4) the systems or planetary.

Actions in this second area aim to uncover behaviors, practices, habits, or techniques used, etc., that are supporting gender diversity or undermining diversity, thus, the health of the organization. For creative, exploratory and positive momentum, one would want to lead inquiry into what is working for enhancing gender diversity and healthy states and behavior. However, appreciation for what is working cannot run the risk of minimizing what is not working and posing barriers to greater health. Inquiry does need to uncover what and where needs to shift in behavior, actions, techniques, and practice. Thus, inquiry in the third area would work toward understanding and learning what collective needs for health exist. Here the “collective” might mean different groups with different understandings of what the groups need to feel healthy, culturally safe, respected, balanced, be included, dignified, and work productively without fear of discrimination. These need to be explored. Inquiry in the fourth area involves exploring the systems factors that relate to unequal relationships, processes of colonization and decolonization, and, thus, the structures that oppress some and privilege others, and policies, laws, and regulations that are similarly differentially disabling and enabling. It is important, if not more important, to be attentive to
informal practices, protocol, or “unwritten laws” that are not necessarily part of official policy, laws, or governance structures.

**Step 3: Prioritize and plan.** Prioritizing and planning, for the inclusive leader, involves co-decision-making with others and setting direction together. Such processes entail that the leader is in service of the vision and mission of the organization and its people and puts health front and center. To prioritize, the inclusive leader uses data collection methods that rely on collaboration and engagement to come to prioritization and planning. Examples are world café or focus group methods. These are good examples because of the collaborative objective as process. How the groups are divided depends on the gaps and issues identified around diversity and inclusion, particularly paying close attention with an intersectional lens to gender discrimination, and whether the diverse groups wish to form around those gaps and issues or whether they see utility in forming groups representing of diversity in different or newer and evolving ways.

Changing organizational culture is one of the hardest tasks for any leader. But when we have a shared understanding of what individual and planetary health means to us as individuals and as a collective in an organization, and have critical social supports in place, we can be well placed to keep disciplined in reaching and maintaining health and inclusion as values. All cultures are based on value systems and to create change in any value system takes a common framework, support and discipline until health, enhanced gender diversity, and inclusion are intrinsic values. There will be times ahead in an increasingly turbulent world, more immediately as a consequence of COVID-19, when the market share sees even greater competition, but that is when we will need to rely on individual health and engaged individuals to make it through. Individual health and gender diversity is the new model for economic growth leading organizations and planetary health.

**Step 4: Create supports.** The ability to set direction and make any headway will be contingent upon the inclusive leader’s active support. Inclusive leaders will communicate to the wider community the objective to put health front and center as a value and practice. As a result, leadership will be responsible for including health as an objective in communications, priorities, espoused values, policies, and programs. What health among all groups and individuals will look like would be under development and co-lead with a committee; however, to get traction involves putting the goal of health on the radar and providing structural supports. Creating time to work on a plan for individual spiritual, mental,
and emotional health demonstrates seriousness. Creating a budget shows commitment and capacity. Ensuring processes for health that are officially recognized will be significant too; for example, risk, injury, promotion, or bullying mitigation steps or policies.

Putting wellbeing on the radar means the leader is attuned to the culture of individual and organizational health in the organization as identified in Step 2. This is where incremental shifting needs to take place simultaneously in the communications and work with the committee, individuals at all levels of an organization—those who are impacted by policy and programs and those who have influence and power by virtue of their positional roles in the organization, as well as key stakeholders, and those who are in a position to and are willing to champion the action plan for wellbeing.

Creating supports holistically means being attuned to and responsive to behaviors, as they show up, that support or pose barriers to health, diversity, and inclusion. This means being aware of multiple collectives and their perhaps different if not conflicting needs or goals, to that of the collective, within and outside the organization. For the latter, the inclusive leader is mindful that actions, choices, and behaviors can potentially contribute to in-group (i.e., the organization one leads) interests that exclude and may even harm those considered as outside the group. The inclusive leader seeks to build and expand on what is working to extend extraterritorial (inter-organizational) collaborations and networking for the strengthening of relationships and support for addressing broader planetary issues. Creating supports means leading health, diversity, and inclusion by example and being aware of individual needs also to ensure equity.

Step 5: Create the organizational and planetary health plan of action. The plan of action is dreaming big about what the planet would look like in a healthy, harmonious state, and designing an appropriate learning and change strategy. What this plan looks like is co-created and emergent with the criteria of health developed into higher levels and betterment considering all four areas or perspectives listed above. It will continue to be iterated and developed through tracking and evaluating transformation within the organization. The strategy to embed health will entail that the steps, strategies, and process are sustainable and reinforced by mapping those supports across the four areas. The plan of action can look different depending on the organization. Hence, no plan created can be plugged into a new setting and expected to work. Further, the
agreed upon priorities, plan, and strategy to embed wellbeing will require ongoing commitment, conversation, refining, and repeating these five steps. This takes time and commitment to the process and vision for ensuring diversity and inclusion.

**Chapter Takeaways**

The takeaways from this chapter that we hope to offer is for greater awareness of the need for gender diversity within organizations.

- Enhanced gender diversity is critical not merely for the sake of gender rights or a feminist objective to decrease the gender gap between the sexes in organizations.
- This chapter offered a deeper understanding of the interrelatedness between individual and collective health within organizations as aligned to the impact that human flourishing has on the outside world, in particularly what concerns planetary health.
- Recognizing and identifying the biases, practices, behaviors, cultures, structures, and systems that have created inequality between genders is key.
- Planetary health cannot be addressed without first a discussion around the multiple ways that chaos, disorder, and disharmony is entrenched.
- The gender disparities cannot be addressed without first a discussion around the multiple ways in which people are marginalized.
- This chapter offered an inclusive framework to map how to create transformation toward greater diversity, inclusion and individual and collective health within the organization. Such transformation puts the organization and those within the organization in a position of being a healthy pillar for supporting and evolving a trajectory of mindful inclusion of all for a better world, a world that can sustain all those living upon it. We hope that a planetary ethic can evolve through the conscious and deliberate shifts in thinking, behavior, collective action, and structures within the organization as one major and essential step.
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