

GENERATIONS: THE DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN PREFERENCES FOR
LEADERSHIP STYLES

by

ALYSIA A. BRANSFORD

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN PSYCHOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

MAY 2011

Copyright © by Alysia A. Bransford 2011

All Rights Reserved

To my parents – who reminded me to not focus on the mountain but to instead focus on moving
one rock at a time. Love you most, first, period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give a special thanks to my family and friends for always being there for me. To my parents, Ben and Suzanne, you have always been a steady rock for me to lean on. You have given me the strength and courage to keep moving forward no matter how defeated or exhausted I may feel. To my siblings, Benjamin and Natalie, you are both such amazing individuals and the best siblings a little sister could ask for. You have always been there for me and I cannot begin to express how much your encouragement, faith, love, and laughter have meant to me.

To my besties, Carolina, Lyndsay, Missy, and Miranda, you are all such amazing individuals and I am better for having each of you in my life. To my amazing friends at UTA, Caroline, Katy, Doni, and Ajal, you have kept me going everyday with your abilities to calm me down and make me laugh. I will always cherish our 'productive' days when it all simply became too much that we all ended up hanging out in an office laughing, joking, and making up random games to alleviate the stress. Each of you has helped me to accomplish things I never would have thought possible and have made me into a better person for knowing you. You are all so special to me, and I thank God for bringing you all into my life.

Finally, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, academic mentor, and friend, Dr. Nicolette Lopez, for all of her support and encouragement. She has truly been an amazing woman to look up to and I cannot express enough of my gratitude for her time, effort, and kind words of wisdom when it all felt like too much. I would also like to thank my thesis committee members, Dr. Shannon Scielzo and Dr. Angela Dougall, and the entire UTA Department of Psychology faculty who have played such an integral part in my education and success as an I/O Psychology consultant.

April 12, 2011

ABSTRACT

GENERATIONS: THE DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN PREFERENCES FOR LEADERSHIP STYLES

Alysia A. Bransford, M.S.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2011

Supervising Professor: Nicolette Lopez

This research examined what effects the characteristics of the Millennial generation had on the preferences for leadership style by investigating which qualities in leaders were more highly valued within this generational cohort. The Millennial generations' (i.e., individuals born between 1980 and 2000) potential preferences towards four leadership styles (i.e., charismatic, ideological, pragmatic, and servant) versus that of non-Millennials (i.e., individuals born before 1980) were investigated. In addition, this study investigated how Millennials' locus of control affects their leader preference. Two 2 x 3 Mixed ANCOVAs were run to assess leadership preferences between the two generational groups. Multiple regressions were run to assess for any significant relationships, as well as the direction of these relationships, between locus of control and leadership preference. Results showed that all generations had higher preferences for servant leaders, and that locus of control factors had an effect on leader preferences. A discussion of the findings, the limitations of the study and implications for the future are presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION SECTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.1.1 Perceptions of Leaders	1
1.1.1.1 The Effects of Culture	2
1.1.2 Leadership Development	3
1.1.2.1 Authentic Leadership Development Model	3
1.1.2.2 Shifting Leadership Styles	4
1.1.3 The Importance of “Good” Leaders.....	4
1.1.3.1 Effects of “Poor” Leadership	4
1.1.3.2 Effects of “Good” Leadership	5
1.1.4 Vital Leadership Theories	5
1.1.4.1 Leadership Categorization Theory.....	5
1.1.4.2 Normative Decision Theory.....	6
1.1.4.3 Path-Goal Theory.....	6
1.1.5 Exchange Theories	7
1.1.5.1 Social-Exchange Theory.....	7
1.1.5.2 Leader-Member Exchange Theory	7
1.1.6 Transformation vs. Transactional Leaders.....	8
1.1.6.1 Transformational Leaders	8

1.1.6.2 Transactional Leaders	9
1.1.7 Leadership Styles.....	9
1.1.7.1 Charismatic Leaders	10
1.1.7.2 Ideological Leaders	11
1.1.7.3 Pragmatic Leaders	11
1.1.7.4 Servant Leaders.....	11
1.1.8 Preference for Specific Leadership Styles	12
1.1.9 Generational Cohorts	13
1.1.9.1 Defining A Generation.....	13
1.1.9.2 WWIers	13
1.1.9.3 Swingers/Silents.....	14
1.1.9.4 Baby-Boomers	14
1.1.9.5 Generation X.....	14
1.1.9.6 Millennials	15
1.1.9.7 Six Factors Shaping Generations	16
1.1.9.8 Generational Differences	16
1.1.9.9 Generational Preference for Leaders	17
1.1.10 Focus of Study	18
1.1.11 Hypothesis Development	19
1.2 Pilot Study	24
1.2.1 Participants	25
1.2.2 Procedure.....	25
1.2.3 Results	25
1.2.4 Leader Profiles	27
2. METHODS SECTION	28

2.1 Method	28
2.1.1 Participants	28
2.1.1.1 Recruitment.....	29
2.1.2 Materials.....	30
2.1.3 Procedure.....	30
3. RESULTS SECTION.....	33
3.1 Results	33
3.1.1 Data Analyses	33
3.1.2 Data Screening	34
3.1.3 Analysis Findings	36
3.1.3.1 Hypothesis 1	37
3.1.3.2 Hypothesis 2	38
3.1.3.3 Hypothesis 3	39
3.2 Additional Analyses.....	43
3.2.1 Industry Type	43
3.2.2 Job Type	43
3.2.3 Preference Ranking	43
3.2.4 Leader Gender.....	44
3.2.5 Race	44
3.2.6 Leader Effectiveness, Liking, and Familiarity	45
3.2.6.1 Leader Effectiveness	45
3.2.6.2 Leader Liking.....	45
3.2.6.3 Leader Familiarity	46
3.2.7 Leader Ratings.....	47
3.2.7.1 Charismatic Leaders	47

3.2.7.2 Ideological Leaders	48
3.2.7.3 Pragmatic Leaders	48
3.2.7.4 Servant Leaders.....	49
4. DISCUSSION SECTION.....	50
4.1 Discussion	50
4.1.1 Implications	54
4.1.1.1 Implications for Research	54
4.1.1.2 Implications for Practice.....	55
4.1.2 Limitations	57
4.1.2.1 Generations or Stages of Life	57
4.1.2.2 Population Sample	58
4.1.2.3 Self-Report Surveys	59
4.1.2.4 Common Method Bias	59
4.1.2.5 Leader Preference Based On Job Task	60
4.1.3 Future Research	60
4.1.3.1 Longitudinal Study.....	60
4.1.3.2 In-lab Study	61
4.1.4 Conclusion	61

APPENDIX

A. LITERATURE REVIEW TABLES	63
B. MILLENNIAL PILOT STUDY MATERIALS.....	67
C. MILLENNIAL PILOT STUDY RESULTS	82
D. TOMORROW'S LEADERSHIP SURVEY MATERIALS	85
E. ADDITIONAL TOMORROW'S LEADERSHIP SURVEY MATERIALS	111
F. TOMORROW'S LEADERSHIP SURVEY RESULTS TABLES	117

REFERENCES.....	137
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	142

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
A.1 Comparison of Four Leader Styles	64
A.2 Comparison of the Differences Between Five Generations.....	65
A.3 Six Factors Believed to Shape a Generation.....	66
C.1 Correlation Matrix for Personality Factors of Millennial Participants	83
F.1 Leadership Preference Item Aggregation	118
F.2 Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables Between Generations	119
F.3 Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables Overall.....	120
F.4 Correlation Matrix for All Variables	121
F.5 Leadership Profile Manipulation Check Frequencies	125
F.6 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3a: Ideological Leaders.....	126
F.7 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3c: Ideological Leaders.....	127
F.8 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3b: Pragmatic Leaders.....	128
F.9 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3d: Pragmatic Leaders.....	129
F.10 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3e: Charismatic Leaders.....	130
F.11 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3g: Charismatic Leaders.....	131
F.12 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3f: Servant Leaders	132
F.13 Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypotheses 3h: Servant Leaders	133
F.14 Leader Preference Ranking Frequencies	134
F.15 Leader Gender Frequencies	135
F.16 Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Preference Differences Between Race	136

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION SECTION

1.1 Introduction

What makes a good leader? This question has been asked thousands of times throughout the history of business and has consequently plagued Industrial/Organizational Psychologists. The issue is that there is simply no straightforward answer to what makes a good leader and why employees prefer one leadership style to another. To many, the truth behind a good leader is hidden behind personal attributes, communication styles, and organization types (Mumford, Antes, Caughron, & Friedrich, 2008). Any one person could give a description of the ideal good leader and it would differ from another's description. According to Robert Sternberg (2007) and his Systems Model of Leadership, there are three components that make up leadership: wisdom, intelligence, and creativity. Sternberg's basic theory assumed that leaders are not born but rather shaped and developed through time and experience. He alleged that leadership should be viewed as flexible rather than rigid, modifiable rather than fixed, and dynamic rather than static. Avolio (2007) asserted that a person's idea of leadership forms due to their individual needs, their culture, and the task placed in front of them. Essentially, leadership can be thought of as a specifically subjective construct dependent upon the individual assessor.

1.1.1 Perceptions of Leaders

Researchers occasionally conclude that attempting to define a good leader is nearly impossible due to leadership categories being created at specific times for very specific moments. Lord, Brown, Harvey, and Hall (2001) wrote that perceptions of leadership and what leaders should be was completely subjective depending upon the (a) social constructs of the followers and (b) cultural aspect of the organization. Social constructs are developed over time

to create social phenomena, which occur due to group learning, knowledge, and perceived reality. Social constructs are not laws but rather commonalities of social rules, which develop due to group interactions and the reinforcement of shared group commonalities. Although theories of social constructs have been prominent within sociological research, they have come into play with much psychological research relating to the study of leadership. Lord et al. (2001) emphasize that leadership categories are “generated on-the-fly to correspond to the requirements of different contexts, tasks, subordinates or maturational stages of a group or organization” (p. 314) and that “leadership perceptions are grounded within a larger social, cultural, task and interpersonal environment” (p. 332). Thus, it is likely that the social constructs of a particular group will influence their perception of a “good” leader.

1.1.1.1 The Effects of Culture

The concept of culture has been discussed within many psychological articles and, depending on the context, can be defined in various ways. For example, Ayman and Korabik (2010) define culture as an “acquired and transmitted pattern of shared meaning, feeling, and behavior that constitutes a distinctive human group” (p. 158). Culture has been defined as prescribed standard beliefs and mutual behavioral expectations among followers and leaders (Cooke & Szumal, 1993). Likewise, culture can be explained as being made up of behavioral expectations, norms, values, and assumptions. Behavioral factors make up the visible aspects of culture (Rousseau, 1990) such as specific mannerisms related to a group. Alternatively, culture can be perceived as something more underlying such as a group’s value and belief systems, morality issues, religious standings, and/or philosophical beliefs. These invisible underlying facets of culture cannot readily be observed by followers but rather are indirectly ascertained from making assumptions about observable behaviors and statements of other followers and leaders (Hofstede, 1998). Regardless of the specific definition, culture is a shared

group phenomenon and thus is likely to have an influence on the group's perceptions of leadership.

1.1.2 Leadership Development

1.1.2.1 Authentic Leadership Development Model

One main focus of leadership research has aimed at discovering whether good leaders can be made or whether they are simply born. If the latter, then creating a good leader will be impossible; however, if good leaders could be made or "engineered" into being more influential and productive, how would one go about doing that? Avolio (2007) promoted an integrative strategy of leadership, claiming that good leaders could be made if leaders were willing to take the necessary steps. He described how the authentic leadership development model might be used as an outline to facilitate a leader's development. According to this model, the first step to becoming a good leader is to focus on developing both the leader and follower's self-awareness skills. By developing high self-awareness, leaders and followers would have a better understanding of themselves and one another, thereby creating better communication and consideration about the organization's goals, as well as the individual goals of the follower. Self-awareness involves possessing balanced processing skills, which refers to how objectively a person could view information about their person and come to a decision about the needed steps to be taken in order to ensure future success. The idea is that leaders could develop these self-awareness skills through training programs that would focus on the introspection into one's self and how followers might perceive them.

The next step of the authentic leadership-model involves both leaders and followers to regulate the transition of their self-awareness into behaviors, which would therefore lead to better decision-making (Avolio, 2007). An example of this would be a leader frequently receiving feedback from his/her followers on how effective his/her actions are, as well as how he/she is being perceived. In short, Avolio concluded that in order for leaders to be created, individuals

had to first develop a strong sense of self-awareness in order to be more sensitive to both their surroundings and the situations at hand. A leader would need to continually receive feedback from his or her followers on how they are being perceived in order to help facilitate this. If the above actions are taken and successfully carried out, then good leaders can be made; however, the individual leader, his/her followers, and the leader's perseverance for betterment would determine future and continued success as a leader.

1.1.2.2 Shifting Leadership Styles

Another area of leadership research delves into whether leaders can shift between leadership types and leadership styles (Forsyth, Heiney, & Wright, 1997). Addressing this issue is essentially the same as creating good leaders using the authentic leadership model, with the one exception that the role of followers is much less emphasized. It has been reasoned that leaders can shift types and styles only if they have developed a high self-awareness and have attuned themselves to the changing needs of their organizational environment, as well as the needs of the followers. Forsyth and colleagues found that leaders easily shifted from using task-oriented leadership styles to using relational-oriented styles, as long as they were paying attention to the needs of the current situations (Forsyth et al., 1997).

1.1.3 *The Importance of "Good" Leaders*

1.1.3.1 Effects of "Poor" Leadership

So why would knowledge of differing leadership styles be so important to organizations? The answer is simply that perceived good (or bad) leadership can affect a plethora of elements within an organization, thus leading to a gain (or loss) in productivity and in some cases could make or break a company (Avolio, 2007). For example, perceived poor leadership could lead to low follower job satisfaction, thereby leading to low follower commitment. This, in turn could increase the follower turnover rate, which would increase the amount of money spent on selecting and training new followers. Perceived poor leadership

could also induce poor communication, which could have negative effects on any organizational change or development initiative. Another negative effect of poor leadership is its effects on organizational culture – if a leader is ineffective, it is reasonable to conceive that the work environment will be equally ineffective, which could negatively affect the organization's culture (Holtz & Harold, 2008).

1.1.3.2 Effects of “Good” Leadership

On the other hand, perceived good leadership can lead to increased follower job satisfaction and increased follower commitment (Chemers, 2000). This should dramatically reduce turnover rates, thereby saving the organization money otherwise spent on selecting and training new followers. Good leadership also promotes better communication throughout the organization; leading followers to better understand each other as well as being better able to implement the organization's goals. For example, if effective leaders are guiding an organizational change and/or development initiative, change will likely be more successful compared to a change initiative guided by an ineffective leader. Any time organizational change occurs, having an effective leader is vital to the success and productivity of that change (Sternberg, 2007). Good leadership can also enhance a positive and safe organizational culture – one that is free of negative attitudes and counterproductive behaviors. Overall good, effective, influential, and competent leaders are the backbone of an organization and are vital to the success of every organization.

1.1.4 *Vital Leadership Theories*

1.1.4.1 Leadership Categorization Theory

In the midst of leadership research, many theories form the foundation of leadership studies. Discussing each theory is beyond the scope of this paper; therefore, only the theories pertaining to group perceptions of leaders will be discussed. One such theory is Lord and Maher's (1991) leadership categorization theory. This theory assumed that members of a group

would hold implicit characteristics of leadership that outlined various behaviors, abilities, and traits that would be needed for a leader to be effective and successful. This theory explained followers' individual evaluations of leaders in terms of prototypicality. In other words, leadership categorization theory asserts that an individual's belief or idea about what a good leader is will be used to determine how they evaluated a leader. This again would be based on how well that leader matched their individual ideas of what a leader should be.

1.1.4.2 Normative Decision Theory

The normative decision theory was developed by Vroom and Yetton (1973) who attempted to offer a model of decision-making effectiveness that would integrate decision-making strategies for various organization circumstances that a leader could rely upon. They proposed that leaders had an arsenal of decision-making strategies that, depending on the situation; the leader could siphon through to choose the best strategy. As outlined in Chemers' (2000) article, decision-making strategies included (a) an autocratic style, where leaders make decisions without regard to their followers' needs; (b) a consultative style, where leaders make decisions based on their followers' needs and opinions; and (c) a group or participative style, where leaders and groups make decisions together. The normative model outlines specific organization or group situations, and describes which of the leadership decision-making styles would be most effective for each situation (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The normative decision model focuses on the leader as being the central key to the success of a group's efforts when converging with the task environment (Chemers, 2000). It emphasizes the importance of and need for leaders to gain the support of their followers to increase the likelihood of successful task or organizational change completion.

1.1.4.3 Path-Goal Theory

Another popular theory of leadership is called the path-goal theory, which argues that motivation should be the leader's main tactic in obtaining organizational goals (House, 1971). By the leader

motivating and helping followers to see how their task-related performance could help to achieve their own personal goals, the leader would also achieve the end goals of the organization. Under this framework, leadership directiveness behaviors would only be favorable in an environment where followers lacked the necessary training and motivation; however, when followers contained the necessary training and motivation, directiveness of the leader would not be needed (Chemers, 2000). In other words, the situation, environment, and the characteristics of the follower are taken into consideration when determining how authoritative a leader needs to be in order for the wanted goals to be carried out. The effectiveness of a leader would be determined based on how sensitive leaders are to the needs of their followers.

1.1.5 Exchange Theories

1.1.5.1 Social-Exchange Theory

Leadership has also been examined using two exchange theories – the social-exchange theory and the leader-member exchange theory. The social-exchange theory simply states that a rewarding service to another individual would lead that individual to reciprocate back to the original person (Holtz & Harold, 2008). In terms of leadership, when a leader does something for a follower, that follower would then feel obligated to return the favor by doing something for the leader. This exchange could happen in reverse as well, where a follower would do something for the leader and the leader in exchange would return the favor. This type of social exchange would increase follower trust of the leader and therefore promote better performance for goals implemented by the leader.

1.1.5.2 Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson's (2008) leader-member exchange theory is closely related to the social-exchange theory. It focuses on the "dyadic relationships between leaders and followers and contend[s] that leaders form different types of exchange relationships with their perspective followers" (Liden et al., 2008, p. 163). In short, leaders form different

relationships with various followers depending on followers' specific needs. Some followers might require a nurturing leader to take them step-by-step and help foster their ideas. Other followers might need a leader who will simply hand them their assignment and leave them alone. This theory suggests that in order for leaders to be effective, they must first be sensitive to their individual follower's needs and have an adaptive and flexible leadership style. This type of leader would in turn help to increase follower job satisfaction and ultimately decrease turnover rates and costs.

1.1.6 Transformational vs. Transactional Leaders

1.1.6.1 Transformational Leaders

As can be seen, there are numerous leadership types; however, due to all the factors that go into making and shaping a leader, two particular types of leaders frequently emerge within leadership literature – transformational and transactional. Chemers (2000) summarized that a transformational leader could be described as someone who attempts to influence his/her followers to “transcend personal interests” or goals and to “transform themselves [as followers] into agents of collective achievement” (p. 34). According to Bass and Avolio (1993), transformational leadership includes idealized influence, the individual consideration of followers, intellectual stimulation, and the use of inspirational motivation to achieve one's goals. An advantage of transformational leaders is their use of inspirational motivation to produce change and productivity from their followers. With transformational leadership, followers are more likely to go above and beyond due to their inspiring leaders. However, a disadvantage of transformational leadership is that some followers may not respond well to intellectual stimulation, but would rather be told what to do and how to do it. In this case, incentives might not be enough to motivate followers into complying or carrying out tasks. When transformational leadership is conducive to followers and the organizational environment, various effects on the organization could occur such as an increase in follower satisfaction, follower commitment, and

leader-follower communication, as well as the creation of a positive organizational climate and culture (Chemers, 2000).

1.1.6.2 Transactional Leaders

Transactional leadership on the other hand, is different from transformational leadership in that it involves a negotiated exchange relationship between a leader and a subordinate. Instead of motivating followers through inspiration, a transactional leader uses incentives (i.e., paid time off, personal recognition, paid bonuses, etc.) to motivate followers in reaching their goals (Holtz & Harold, 2008). An advantage of transactional leadership is that motivation through an incentive can be quite attractive for some followers who are more extrinsically motivated rather than intrinsically motivated. Therefore, change within followers could be more likely when tangible incentives for followers are present. A disadvantage of transactional leadership is that some followers might not be so easily bought by incentives or the offer of incentives might not be enough to motivate them into complying or carrying out tasks. When transactional leadership is carried out successfully, various effects on the organization could occur such as an increase in follower satisfaction and follower commitment; however, at the same time, transactional leadership might have a negative effect on organizational climate and culture if work productivity is based solely on incentives (Chemers, 2000). This effect might occur due to incentives losing their enticement due to their overuse.

1.1.7 Leadership Styles

Aside from the two prominent leadership types of transformational and transactional, there are other leadership styles that have been discussed in more recent leadership literature. These styles include Weber's (1921) charismatic, ideological and pragmatic leaders, as well as Greenleaf's (2002) servant leader, which was coined in 1970. It is important to note that these four leadership styles have only recently been focused in on and thus have not been fully studied or examined. Yet in the continued pursuit towards a better understanding of what it

means to be an effective leader, the value of investigating these four styles is clear. Research seems to be expanding upon the original artifacts of leadership types (i.e., transformation vs. transactional) and developing more comprehensive profiles for various ways of leading. The previous concepts of leadership, although seemingly broad, have not encompassed the full complexity of leadership; therefore, recent leadership literature has turned its focus to parsing between various leadership niches and compiling a plethora of leadership attributes, characteristic, styles, and mannerisms. The following four leadership styles are the products of this recent extension of previous leadership research.

1.1.7.1 Charismatic Leadership

The first leadership style is that of charismatic leaders, which are the type of leaders people think of as being born to lead (Mumford et al., 2008). In addition, they are described as having had a certain “air” about them that causes people to turn to them and rely on them for advice and guidance. Charismatic leaders are known to emphasize positive, future-oriented goals and to motivate people towards long-term goals. Goal attainment is a key difference between charismatic and transformational leadership. While transformational leaders seek to influence their followers to transcend their own individual beliefs and goals in order to work for the greater good of the group, charismatic leaders promote both individual and group goals. Mumford et al. (2008) noted that charismatic leaders believe people are in charge of their own destiny and therefore have their own personal goals as well as group goals that they move towards attaining. John F. Kennedy was given as a prime example of a charismatic leader, quoting Kennedy’s famous words, “ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country” (Mumford et al., 2008, p. 146). Charismatic leadership theory suggests that role modeling and self-sacrificing explain how followers are inspired by their leaders; that is, followers observe their leaders acting in a certain way and therefore mimic those actions.

1.1.7.2 Ideological Leadership

Ideological leaders on the other hand do not focus on future goals but rather emphasize goals that have been proven effective based on the leaders' past personal experiences (Mumford et al., 2008). These leaders seek out followers who are intrinsically like them, and focus on followers who already believe in the same goals and values necessary for the end mean. As Mumford and his colleagues explained, these types of leaders seek out fellow like-minded individuals to help carry out their goals rather than using motivational methods (i.e., inspirational speeches) to gather followers for their cause. A historical example of this style of leadership can be encapsulated in the quote by Ronald Reagan, "let everyone do it together instead of one person telling us all what to do" (Mumford et al. 2008, p. 147).

1.1.7.3 Pragmatic Leadership

The third leader style under investigation is that of a pragmatic leader, which is described as a leader who does not enforce goals but rather focuses on the current issues of productivity and adjusts for any threats or violations (Mumford et al., 2008). These types of leaders deal with situational factors, waiting for the perfect set of situations and circumstances before attending to those issues. In other words, pragmatic leaders feel out a situation, making adjustments when the timing is right. Despite pragmatic leaders' aversions to future goal setting, these leaders are most likely to build lasting institutions through their leadership. Mumford and his colleagues listed Dwight D. Eisenhower as a prime example of a pragmatic leader, citing his leadership style and "patience in waiting for conditions that would allow him to act to halt McCarthyism" (Mumford et al. 2008, p. 147).

1.1.7.4 Servant Leadership

The fourth recent leadership style has been labeled as the servant leader. A servant leader, as described by Liden et al. (2008), is a leader who stresses the importance of personal integrity and focuses on serving others (e.g., followers, customers, and communities) as a

means of furthering the organization, fostering follower satisfaction and motivation, and increasing followers' commitment to the organization. Liden and colleagues explained that leaders who focused on individual followers' needs would achieve more by building the followers' trust. Therefore, a proactive relationship would evolve between the leader and followers, allowing the leader to have strongly committed followers. Servant leaders act as an example for followers to imitate by showing enthusiasm for change initiatives and inspiring other followers to challenge the status quo and convey their differing views (Liden et al., 2008). By first meeting the needs of the followers, the needs of the organization would likely be met due to followers feeling a sense of obligation and commitment towards the organization. Servant leadership is strongly based in the leader-member exchange theory and is relatively new to leadership literature. Table A.1 provides a comparison of the four different leader styles previously described above (see Appendix A).

1.1.8 Preference for Specific Leadership Styles

Research has shown that among other things, differences in leader characteristics, leader-follower relations, as well as perceived differences of the followers for their preferences on leader characteristics, personality, and behaviors, can be due to differences in gender, culture, and organizational specifics (Eagly & Chin, 2010). As previously mentioned, the differences of followers' preferences for specific types of leadership styles can also be due to the social constructs and culture differences among different groups of followers (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Cooke & Szumal, 1993; Hofstede, 1998; Lord et al., 2001; Rousseau, 1990). These social constructs and cultural differences are likely part of a larger entity of group differences, such as those that make up a generational cohort. Research has shown that social constructs and cultural differences are what shape and divide generations of people into their respective generational cohort (e.g., Anthony, 2006; Kupperschmidt, 2006; Tulgan, 1995;

Tulgan & Martin, 2000). Therefore, potential preferences for various leadership styles are likely influenced by the generation to which the follower belongs.

1.1.9 Generational Cohorts

1.1.9.1 Defining A Generation

A generation can be identified as “a meaningful psychological variable” (Twenge & Campbell, 2008, p. 863). A generation encapsulates the culture and upbringing of a group of people during a certain period of time and distinguishes them from people belonging to another period of time. Twenge and Campbell (2008) described a generation as being molded through common experiences and life events. These experiences range from the upbringing provided by parents, to the power of the media, to the pop-culture of that time, as well as the social values that become norms during that specific time frame. It is these facets that help to define a generation.

To date there are five generational cohorts studied in literature, the WWIIers, the Swingers or Silents (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Schuman & Scott, 1989; Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, & Brown, 2007), the Baby Boomers (Appelbaum, Serena, & Shapiro, 2004; Twenge & Campbell, 2008; Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, & Lance, 2010), Generation X (Tulgan, 1995), and the most recently studied Millennial Generation, which has also been referred to as Generation Y, the Net Generation, or Generation Me (Anthony, 2006; Busch, Venkitachalam, & Richards, 2008; Erickson, 2008; Glass, 2007; Kupperschmidt, 2006; Tulgan & Martin, 2000). A brief description of each generational cohort, with an emphasis on the Millennial generation, follows.

1.1.9.2 WWIIers

The WWIIers generation is made up of approximately 9 million individuals who were born between 1909 and 1933 (Sessa et al., 2007). This generational cohort's values and beliefs are believed to have been shaped by living through the Great Depression and Franklin D.

Roosevelt's presidency. This generation has controlled United States governmental agencies and programs for over 30 years and has established many programs that have helped to serve them in their elder years such as Social Security and health care programs.

1.1.9.3 Swingers/Silents

The Swinger or Silents generation is made up of approximately 30 million individuals who were born between 1934 and 1945 (Sessa et al., 2007). This generational cohort was raised during a period of economic prosperity due to the growth in job markets and increased promotional availabilities to employees. Due to these circumstances, this generation has been viewed as being practical individuals who were patient, loyal, hardworking in the workplace, and who had a high respect for authority and rule following.

1.1.9.4 Baby-Boomers

The Baby-Boomer generation is made up of approximately 78 million individuals born between 1940 and 1964 (Sessa et al., 2007). This generational cohort can be categorized as a social reform generation who battled many social injustices such as the civil rights and women's rights movements. Baby-Boomers dealt with the Vietnam War, the Kennedy assassination, Watergate, and the Woodstock phenomenon. They are seen as individuals who are highly independent, who believe in creating their own destinies, and who believe they are deserving of all the greater things in life. Appelbaum et al. (2004) explained that members of this generation have a higher need for security and stability in their jobs, as well as a need for freedom in their workplace to be creative on their own without the interference of others.

1.1.9.5 Generation X

The Generation X cohort is made up of approximately 44 million individuals who were born between the 1960s and 1975 to 1982 (Sessa et al., 2007). This generation developed during a time of social and economic turmoil, and were influenced by MTV, the widespread awareness of AIDS, international competition, and the fall of Communism. As a whole,

Generation X grew up in a time of economical uncertainty and social insecurity. Generation X-ers grew up as 'latchkey' kids (Tulgan, 1995). This means that they learned to take care of themselves from a very early age and developed an aptitude in creating novel solutions when solving intricate problems. This quite possibly led to their individualistic and untrusting nature, their cynical attitude towards authority and the workplace, but also their value of a good balance between the workplace and home life due to growing up with "financial/family/societal insecurity, diversity, rapid change, and no solid traditions" (Appelbaum et al., 2004, p. 9).

1.1.9.6 Millennials

The most current generation is the Millennial generation, which is made up of approximately 70 million individuals born in and after 1980; to date, a cutoff date has yet to be determined (Sessa et al., 2007, Tulgan & Martin, 2000). The Millennial generation is closely associated with an increase in technological advancements as they are considered to be the first "connected" generation. This cohort was born into a world that has been becoming increasingly wired through communication systems and the Internet. Thus, they are the first generation to be connected to people practically 24 hours a day through media, the Internet, and other types of wired and wireless communication. In addition, racial and ethnic diversity have been forefront topics in the current society; therefore, change and diversity have become highly valued among these individuals. Also, due to past social and economic issues such as the Stock Market crash, the vastly growing national debt, the Enron scandal, massive layoffs within the airline and automotive industries, as well as the steady increase in unemployment rates within the United States, this generation has good reason to be seriously concerned with the economy and instability of the workplace. Additionally, this generation is growing up against a backdrop of violence. For example, with an increase in foreign terrorist attacks against Americans in America, the Millennial generation has come to know terrorism more so than any other previous generation. Not only has this cohort experienced foreign attacks on American

soil, they have also experienced intra-country terrorism with the Oklahoma City bombings as well as numerous school shootings. Tulgan and Martin (2000) wrote that despite the acts of violence this generation has been exposed to while growing up, there are four positive truths that have come about from this generation's volatile and turmoil-laced surroundings and upbringing. First, this generation seems to be full of confidence, has an upbeat disposition, and is high in self-esteem. Second, this generation is thus far the most highly educated-minded generation in past history. Third, this generation seems to be paving the way for the most open and tolerant society yet in terms of race, gender, ethnicity, age, and other characteristics. And finally, this generation is leading a new wave of volunteerism, perhaps in large part due to the increase in violent acts against this nation. Generally, it is believed that this generation has a high understanding of both the many opportunities that lie ahead of them as well as the many problems that were left behind from previous generations to which still need tending. Table A.2 provides a comparison of the differences between all five generations (see Appendix A).

1.1.9.7 Six Factors Shaping Generations

Sessa et al. (2007) asserted that there are six factors or characteristics that help when defining and determining the scope of a generation. The six factors believed to shape a generation are: 1) "a traumatic or formative event such as a war," 2) "a dramatic shift in demography that influences the distribution of resources in society," 3) "an interval that connects a generation to success or failure," 4) "the creation of sacred space that sustains a collective memory," 5) "mentors or heroes that give impetus and voice by their work," and 6) "the work of people who know and support each other," (p. 49). Table A.3 provides examples of Sessa et al.'s six factors as they might apply for the Millennial generation (see Appendix A).

1.1.9.8 Generational Differences

Although there is not a lot of agreement among researchers about the Millennial generational cohort in terms of start and ending dates for cohort members, there have been

some commonly found shared characteristics, values, and beliefs. Researchers have asserted that this generation appreciates career growth and development but values a good work/life balance (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). The Millennials are comprised of individuals who have high technical skill and who place a greater value on freedom, autonomy and the intrinsic facets of work than prior generations. Personality characteristics include significantly higher levels of self-esteem and a lower need for social approval. However, this generation also values status and possesses high levels of narcissism as well as a more external locus of control. In addition, they suffer from anxiety and depression to a greater degree compared to previous generations (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). These personality differences indicate that a good deal of change within the workplace will be needed in order to manage and cope with these new followers.

1.1.9.9 Generational Preferences for Leaders

Research conducted by Sessa et al. (2007) examined the generational differences between preferred leader characteristics and found various differences between the generational groups. For example, although all generations ranked honesty as a highly important leadership quality, WWIlers, Swingers or Silents and Baby Boomers listed honesty as significantly more important than Generation X-ers and Millennials. For Generation X and the Millennials, events such as Watergate and Enron might have contributed to a more cynical attitude toward the honesty of leaders. Other findings showed that WWIlers, Swingers or Silents, and Baby-Boomers rated caring as a more important quality in preferred leaders, whereas Generation X-ers and Millennials rated determination and ambition as being more important when describing ideal leaders. These findings again could in large part be due to differing needs of the different groups. The older generations (i.e., WWIlers, Swingers or Silents, and Baby-Boomers) express the need for a stable and secure work environment; whereas, Generation X and the Millennial generation show a higher need for independence, individualism, and creative freedom over job security. Also, while the Silent generation preferred

a more militant command-and-control style of leadership, Generation X-ers preferred a team-oriented, participative, one-on-one partnership style of leadership. Taken together, these generational differences between leaders and followers in the workplace could explain a large amount of variance regarding the ill fit with leadership styles and employee preferences in current organizations. Potentially, this type of follower discontentment could filter down into other facets of the organization, leading to a loss of productivity.

1.1.10 Focus of Study

Researchers have made some theoretical inferences about the leadership preferences of the Millennial generation by reviewing the literature and examining this generation's overarching characteristics such as personality, values, beliefs, social constructs, and culture, as previously mentioned (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). However, to date, no research has empirically tested follower preferences of leader style. The focus of this paper centers specifically on the Millennial generation of followers and presents the following research questions:

R1: Will the Millennial generation of followers prefer a specific type of leader?

R2: Will certain personality characteristics of the Millennial generation influence their leadership style preference?

Research has demonstrated that organizations are beginning to implement new methods of leadership in recent years. For instance, it has been found that with the increase in self-esteem and narcissism, praise programs and rewards systems are becoming more prominent within the workplace (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). With the followers' locus of control becoming more externally focused, followers may not hold themselves responsible for successes or failures. Because of this, a greater number of organizations are increasing their use of work teams and are relying on their leaders to govern and hold followers and teams responsible for increasing performance levels. Also, due to the previously mentioned increase in

anxiety and depression of young followers, leaders will need to become more innovative in creating work environments that are more efficient, effective, and productive, while at the same time providing a less stressful environment.

Organizations have been implementing these newer creative work environments based on theoretical hunches and beliefs that have been drawn from past Millennial literature. To date, however, no research has directly addressed the leader-follower relationship in terms of follower preferences. Thus the question of the validity of the current organizational solutions remains. Do these newer styles of leadership meet the needs of the Millennial workforce? It is the purpose of the current research to help answer this question. The more knowledge gained about this new generation, the better-equipped organizations are in utilizing the talents of this sizeable Millennial workforce.

1.1.11 Hypothesis Development

Research has noted that the Millennial generation places a higher emphasis on authentication compared to other generations (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). Authentication is defined as “individuals who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character” (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004, p. 802). Peter Block (1981) asserted that authentic behavior was the most powerful thing a leader could use when attempting to leverage whatever is needed from his or her followers. Furthermore, authentic behavior has been found to lead to an increase of followers’ trust and commitment to that leader. Because of this affinity to authentication, this generation seems to prefer and work better with leaders whose behaviors reflect a more authentic style (i.e., highly conscientious about the world and people around them; more sensitive to the particular characteristics of this generation). As previously discussed, servant leaders are those leaders

who stress the importance of personal integrity. Therefore, it is likely that Millennials would prefer a servant style of leadership. Additionally, servant leaders cater to their subordinate's personal needs. Because the Millennial generation tends to be a narcissistic, idiocentric or "me-centric" generation compared to previous generations (Twenge & Campbell, 2008), it is reasonable to assume that followers who belong to the Millennial generation would have higher satisfaction with servant leaders than with pragmatic and ideological leaders (Liden et al., 2008). Servant leaders are likely to pay specific attention to each individual follower in an attempt to foster the followers' creative ideas. Thus the first hypothesis is presented:

H1: There will be significant differences between preferences of leadership styles such that, compared to non-Millennials, Millennials will prefer the servant leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles.

Along with a more authentic style, and based on the personality characteristics previously mentioned, it is likely that Millennial generation followers will prefer a leader who will let them question the status quo to allow their creativity to emerge in the workplace. Additionally, Millennial generation followers will likely desire leaders who will act as role models for them and lead by example, influencing them into the right directions (i.e., social movements such as equal rights for all genders/race, or ecological movements such as 'going green') and then holding them accountable for their behaviors. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the Millennial generation would work well under charismatic leaders who, as stated previously, encourage followers to be the creators of their own destiny and allow them a certain amount of freedom in their own work (Mumford et al., 2008). The role of a charismatic leader is to help inspire and guide followers while at the same time encourage them to express their own ideas and help shape the future goals of an organization. As Sessa et al. (2007) pointed out, Millennials want dedicated leaders who are focused on the organization, and creative leaders who will inspire and encourage followers to expand upon future goals and come up with their

own ideas and directions. The Millennial generation has been found to want leaders who will encourage, support, motivate, and listen to them (Sessa et al., 2007). Thus, the second hypothesis is presented:

H2: There will be significant differences between preferences of leadership styles such that, compared to non-Millennials, Millennials will prefer the charismatic leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles.

It should also be mentioned that gender bias within the workforce as related to leadership preference is not a new concept; however, it does deserve research attention in the hopes of better understanding people's preferences towards leaders. Past studies in literature have shown that there are significant gender differences in both the selection and evaluation of leaders. This phenomenon was first discussed within the concept of the glass-ceiling, which was described as a blockade of prejudice and inequality that bars women from higher-leveled leadership positions (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Social role theory alleges that perceivers of leadership would infer that there was a relationship between the types of procedures people engage in and their personal dispositions.

All persons have preconceived expectations of gender social roles; as a result, these can lead people to often select males for leadership roles more so than females. Likewise, people also tend to evaluate males as being better and more competent leaders than females. Eagly and Karau (2002) pointed out one key aspect of the social role theory, which explained that people attribute agentic traits or behaviors to males, whereas communal traits or behaviors are more likely to be attributed to females. Agentic traits are listed as being assertive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, self-sufficient, and self-confident – all of which are attributed as characteristics of a good leader. Communal traits on the other hand, are listed as being affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturing, and gentle – none of which are attributed to effective leadership. Because of these known gender biases, the gender

of the leadership candidates (i.e., the leader profiles) was unknown to the raters (i.e., participants). In other words, the leaders' gender was controlled for across participants; however, the participants' gender was taken into account. Therefore, participant (or rater) gender will be used as a control variable when testing the first two hypotheses.

As mentioned, certain differences exist concerning style and approach to leadership, thus preferences toward different styles have been hypothesized. One primary influence that may guide the Millennials' preference for one style over another may pertain to locus of control. Locus of control refers to whether one can control an outcome or whether outcomes are uncontrollable due to external factors and/or random chance. Levenson's (1973) Locus of Control scale divides locus of control into three types: (a) internal, where outcomes are controlled by and/or due to the individual; (b) powerful others, where outcomes are controlled by and/or due to external factors and situations; and (c) chance, where outcomes are determined by random chance. The charismatic and servant leadership styles seem to focus on the idea and approach that goals can be attained and outcomes controlled or changed due to people coming together and not stopping until the desired outcome is attained. This may allude to the fact that goal attainment is due in part to an internal locus of control. Essentially, the charismatic and servant leadership styles encourage their followers to actively reach for and pursue their desired goals. These two leader styles stress the importance of constantly trying to attain goals and stopping at nothing until the desired end is met. It is likely that followers who approach their goals in this manner possess a more internal locus of control and may therefore be more attracted to these two leader styles.

However, the pragmatic and ideological leadership styles seem to be guided by the situation (i.e., external factors) such that the situation controls the outcome of goal attainment. That is, both ideological and pragmatic leaders seem to lead on the basis that goal attainment and outcomes are heavily if not completely controlled by situational factors that might include

external factors such as other individuals (i.e., powerful others) or productivity changes due to a fluctuating market (i.e., random chance and fate). As discussed previously, these leaders believe that it does not matter how hard an individual or group tries to attain a desired outcome; if external factors are not perfect or do not lend themselves to the desired outcome, then the desired outcome will not be attained. Based on the differences between these leader styles, as well as on the results of a pilot study presented later in the paper, the following hypotheses are presented:

There will be significant differences between Millennials and non-Millennials' preferences toward leadership styles based on their locus of control scores such that compared to non-Millennials:

H3a: Millennials who are higher on powerful others locus of control will significantly prefer ideological leaders compared to Millennials who are lower on powerful others locus of control.

H3b: Millennials who are higher on powerful others locus of control will significantly prefer pragmatic leaders compared to Millennials who are lower on powerful others locus of control.

H3c: Millennials who are higher on chance locus of control will significantly prefer ideological leaders compared to Millennials who are lower on chance locus of control.

H3d: Millennials who are higher on chance locus of control will significantly prefer pragmatic leaders compared to Millennials who are lower on chance locus of control.

H3e: Millennials who are higher on internal locus of control will significantly prefer charismatic leaders compared to Millennials who are lower on internal locus of control.

H3f: Millennials who are higher on internal locus of control will significantly prefer servant leaders compared to Millennials who are lower on internal locus of control.

H3g: Millennials' internal locus of control will significantly predict preferences for charismatic leaders over that of powerful others and chance locus of control.

H3h: Millennials' internal locus of control will significantly predict preferences for servant leaders over that of powerful others and chance locus of control.

It is because of this generational shift of Millennial followers' changing attitudes, values, and needs that have prompted the current research study. Sessa et al. (2007) emphasized that leadership is evolving and changing with time. This shift from a leader who simply gives directions, to a leader who inspires followers to be better, to be productive, to be innovative and creative in both group and individual endeavors, is where the current trend in leadership should be heading if the goal of the leader is to gain the most out of their followers, as well as to keep current followers and continue to draw in new, productive followers. Ultimately, leaders of the past will be outdated and not compatible with today and tomorrow's workforce. Results of this study will help organizations to take pre-emptive steps in reorganizing and training their current or incoming leaders in how best to interact with, relate to, and ultimately lead the current and future Millennial generation followers.

1.2 Pilot Study

In order to gain more insight on the unique characteristics of the Millennial generation, a pilot study was conducted to assess distinguishable personality attributes, values, beliefs and generational group similarities and/or differences. Research has noted several attributes such as being highly technologically connected, having an external locus of control, placing a high value on diversity and change, being distrustful of institutions, and being extremely socially active (Sessa et al., 2007). Despite the fact that a good deal of research has been devoted to the study of the Millennial generation in the recent years (Anthony, 2006; Busch et al., 2008; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Erickson, 2008; Glass, 2007; Kupperschmidt, 2006; Tulgan & Martin, 2000; Twenge, & Campbell, 2008; Twenge et al., 2010), much more is needed in order

to gain a better understanding this generation. As such, a pilot study was conducted on a sample of college students from The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), all belonging to the proposed Millennial generation (i.e., born after 1980) that assessed the cultural, historical, and technological factors important to them, as well as their personality characteristics.

1.2.1 Participants

Eligibility criteria for participants in this study were that participants must be an enrolled student of UTA. The data was collected from a total sample size of 198 participants, who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course at UTA. From the original 198 participants, 12 participants were excluded due to either belonging to a different generation cohort not under examination or due to large amounts of missing data from their surveys. The final sample size was 186 participants.

1.2.2 Procedure

This study was conducted in the form of a self-reported online survey questionnaire and was in accordance with the ethical guidelines regarding human subjects as outlined by the UTA Office of Research Compliance and Institutional Review Board. Students logged into UTA's Sona-systems website and selected to complete the online Millennial Survey. The survey included various personality inventories, a demographic questionnaire, and a variety of questions related to assessing various technological, historical, and cultural events. A complete list of survey question items can be found in Appendix B. All participant information was kept private and confidential.

1.2.3 Results

Only the data from those participants who belonged to the Millennial generation (i.e., born after 1980) were used for analyses. Means, standard deviations, and correlations can be found on Table C.1 (see Appendix C). As indicated in Table C.1, several overall correlations were found; however, one of the more interesting findings can be found in Table 4. While most

of the personality factors that were measured were found to have means around the average, internal locus of control was found to have an extremely high mean ($M = 5.05$, $SD = 0.82$), while chance locus of control and powerful others locus of control had more normally distributed means, $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.96$, and $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.08$, respectively. From this, it might be assumed that persons belonging to the Millennial generation have a higher belief that outcomes of various situations are directly due to their own internal/individual actions. In other words, they may have a high belief in the idea that they alone are the makers of their own destinies. Interestingly, these results contradict previous research that indicates in general Millennials have a more external locus of control (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). Because of this, Levenson's (1973) Locus of Control scale will be included in the proposed study to help answer hypotheses H3a through H3h.

Based on the data gathered from the pilot study, the tone and voice of the four leader profiles as well as four leader situational questions were created. Throughout the qualitative data that was collected in the pilot study, a few general themes emerged among the Millennial generation members. The majority of the important events discussed by this generation were viewed as having a great impact on the person's life. They also tended to focus on events that produced great change or forced them to adapt. Also, the majority of the events that were considered important were not world events but rather personal events (i.e., divorce, loss of a loved one, a failed relationship, or moving locations). From these findings it was deduced that individuals of the Millennial generation were very focused on events that affected themselves specifically rather than events that affected the world. They also seemed to place a high emphasis on the fact that the important things in their lives were those things that forced them to change, grow, and adapt. Because of this, the leader profiles were heavily centered on the self, as well as focused on changing, adapting, and impacting persons involved in the leader's group of followers.

1.2.4 Leader Profiles

Information from the pilot study survey as well as the literature on leadership was used to guide the development of the leader profiles. From reviewing past literature on charismatic, ideological, pragmatic, and servant leaders, key aspects of each leadership approach were selected to be included within the four leader profiles. From there, previously obtained qualitative data from the Millennial generation pilot study was used as a means of writing the leadership profiles in a similar voice and manner (i.e., similar word usages, phrasings, etc.) as well as any themes that seemed to present themselves within the Millennial participants' responses.

CHAPTER 2
METHODS SECTION

2.1 Method

2.1.1 Participants

There were two eligibility criteria for participants in this online survey study. For the experimental group of participants (Millennials), they must have been born in or after 1980. For the control group of participants (non-Millennials), they must have been born prior to 1980. The reason for the inclusion of individuals belonging to other generations (i.e., the control group) is to provide evidence that these leadership preferences were due to specific differences between the generations, rather than one type of leader being generally preferred over another.

Participants were recruited from UTA as well as outside UTA. The data were collected from a total sample size of 110 participants based on G*power analyses. These analyses were based on an effect size of $f^2 = 0.1894$. This effect size was taken from Fein, Tziner, and Vasiliu's (2010). Fein et al.'s (2010) study aimed at examining whether there were leadership preference differences (i.e., towards transformational and transactional leadership types) between various age cohort groups (i.e., those 34 years of age and younger versus those 35 years of age and older). The authors found significant differences in these two age cohorts preference ratings of transformational leadership, $F = 7.07$, $p = 0.008$, with a sample size of 265 Romanians. An effect size from this study was calculated and used in the G*power analyses – hence an effect size of $f^2 = 0.1894$, alpha error probability of 0.05, and a beta error probability (i.e., power) of 0.95 were used. Through G*power analyses the following sample size requirements were found: for H1 and H2, a total of 110 participants was needed in order to detect significant effects and obtain a critical F value of 2.63, meaning that 55 Millennial participants and 55 non-Millennial participants were needed; for H3a through H3f, 95 participants (i.e., approximately 48

Millennials and 48 non-Millennial participants) were needed to detect significant effects and obtain a critical F value of 2.70; and for H3g and H3h, 85 participants (i.e., approximately 38 Millennials and 38 non-Millennial participants) were needed in order to detect significant effects and obtain a critical F value of 3.11. After obtaining the needed sample sizes for all of the analyses, it was determined that a total of 55 Millennial participants and 55 non-Millennial participants were needed to find significant effects; thus, at least 110 participants were required. The requested sample size and participants should be a representative sample of both the general Millennial population, as well as a general sample of non-Millennials (i.e., Generation Xers, Baby-Boomers, etc.).

2.1.1.1 Recruitment

All registered UTA students who were enrolled in a psychology class were eligible for participation in this study, as well as all individuals born before 1980 who received study information. Individuals born before 1980 were recruited through: Sona-systems, recruitment snowballing e-mails, and word-of-mouth from the researcher. A total sample size of 252 participants was used in the analyses. Participant demographics were representative of the general population.

All Millennial participants were registered students in psychology classes at The University of Texas at Arlington, while the non-Millennial sample was comprised of students from various locations: UTA Psychology Department, UTA Business and Management Department, UTA Social Work Department, UTA Engineering Department, Our Lady of the Lake in San Antonio, TX, and various other universities. The non-Millennial, non-student sample was collected from various locations around the United States through family and friend connections.

After completing the data collection, 812 individuals participated in the survey. For hypothesis testing, a total sample size of 252 participants was used, with 126 Millennial and 126 non-Millennial participants.

2.1.2 Materials

The leadership profiles outlining the general leadership styles of the four leaders were provided to participants to give them an idea of each leader's outlook and style of leadership (see Appendix D for leader profiles). The four leaders in the profiles were equal in education, experience, and age; gender and racial information was not provided to participants. The only differences between the four leader profiles were their differing leadership styles and their approaches to an identical situation.

Locus of control was measured using Levenson's (1973) Locus of Control scale (see Appendix D). This scale was measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 representing 'Not True' and 7 representing 'Very True'. As mentioned previously, the scale measures locus of control on three factors: internal, powerful others, and chance. See above for definitions of each factor.

In addition to participants being measured on locus of control ratings, participants were also asked to give their ratings on Paulhus' (1991) Balanced Inventory of Socially Desirable Responding (Version 6) scale (BIDR). This is a 7-point Likert-type measure consisting of 40 items that focuses on assessing two constructs: Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SD) and Impression Management (IM) (see Appendix D). This measure was included to account for ratings that were given by participants who had high social desirability, which therefore could drive the ways in which they answered and rated various items.

2.1.3 Procedure

Participants were recruited in a variety of ways. Millennial participants either (a) logged onto UTA's online Sona-systems website and selected to participate in the Tomorrow's Leadership research online survey study or (b) responded to flyers placed around and outside of UTA's campus. Non-Millennial participants either (a) logged onto UTA's online Sona-systems website and selected to participate in the Tomorrow's Leadership research online survey study,

(b) responded to flyers placed around and outside of UTA's campus, or (c) were recruited using snowballing techniques via word of mouth and/or networking through e-mails and e-newsletters by the researcher. Participants were required to log onto the SurveyMonkey survey website in order to complete the survey. Participants were also required to carefully read and agree to the conditions of the online survey informed consent before being able to continue with the online survey study (see Appendix E for additional study materials: the informed consent, instructional page, and debriefing form). Once participants agreed to participate, they then filled out demographic information. Once that was completed they then proceeded on to complete the Levenson's (1973) Locus of Control scale, as well as Paulhus' (1991) BIDR scale. The participants then proceeded on to an instructional page explaining that they were being asked to rate four different leaders on their preference for the leader and their beliefs of the leader's effectiveness (see Appendix D for survey items).

Participants were instructed that all four of the leader candidates had the same educational background (i.e., degree attainment, etc.) and all leaders were around the same age. As a manipulation check, participants were presented with four leader profile scenarios and four short synopses describing leader behaviors (see Appendix D). Participants were then instructed to read through each leader profile scenario and then indicate which synopsis of leadership accurately reflected the behavior of the leader in that scenario.

Once the manipulation check was completed, participants continued on to complete section four. In this section, participants were presented with the full leadership profiles (i.e., consisting of a leadership style description and a situational response) and were instructed to carefully read and rate each profile on a Likert scale (i.e., 1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree) on a variety of items. Each of the four leader profiles, along with their individual rating forms, were located on a page separate from each of the other leader profiles and rating forms. Each participant received the leader profiles one at a time and rated each one before going on

to the next leader profile. The four leader profiles were counter-balanced and randomized between participants to control for order effects. Participants were also instructed that they were not allowed to go back and look at the previous leader profiles once they had been rated.

Once all four of the leader profiles were rated, participants were presented with the fifth section of the survey, which consisted of a final rating form that asked participants to make ratings based on all four of the profiles (i.e., "Rate each of the previously discussed leader profiles on the level of your preference towards working with them."). At this point, participants were shown the four synopses of each leader in case they needed to be reminded of each leader style. In addition, participants were instructed to rank order the leader profiles from most preferred to least preferred. This was done in order to obtain comparative preferences from the participants to see if there was a trend in which leaders were preferred more often and/or more highly than the others. Participants were also given the chance to explain why they made their rankings of leadership preference. These short answers were collected from participants so that they could express any reasoning for which they preferred one leader style to another. This qualitative analysis provided additional information regarding the preferences for leadership styles.

After participants had completed the Tomorrow's Leadership online survey study, they were shown a short debriefing page, which explained the purpose of the study. They were then thanked for their participation and allowed to exit the online survey. All participant information was kept confidential throughout the entire study. No other materials or apparatuses were used during the study.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS SECTION

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Data Analyses

There were three main hypotheses being assessed in this research study, with the third hypothesis containing eight parts. It was previously mentioned that gender would be used as a control variable; however, after conducting Mixed ANOVAs for gender on leadership preferences and gender on locus of control, no significant effects were found: $F(3, 804) = 0.76$, $p = 0.51$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$, and $F(2, 536) = 0.02$, $p = 0.96$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$, respectively. Between-subject effects for gender on leadership preference and gender on locus of control were also not found to be significant, $F(1, 268) = 0.93$, $p = 0.34$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$, and $F(1, 268) = 0.88$, $p = 0.35$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$, respectively. Due to these non-significant effects, gender was not used as a control variable.

The first hypothesis proposed that there would be significant differences between preferences of leadership style such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials would prefer the servant leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. For this hypothesis, a 2 X 3 Mixed ANCOVA was used to analyze if there were significant differences in the leadership preference ratings between the two generational cohorts. This analysis was chosen to examine the means of the three leadership preference ratings (i.e., servant, ideological, and pragmatic leader preference ratings) between the two levels of the independent variable generation cohort (i.e., Millennials vs. non-Millennials). All assumptions necessary for conducting a 2 X 3 Mixed ANCOVA were met.

The second hypothesis proposed that there would be significant differences between

preferences of leadership style such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials would prefer the charismatic leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. For this hypothesis, a 2 X 3 Mixed ANCOVA was used to analyze if there were significant differences in the leadership preference ratings between the two generational cohorts. This analysis was chosen to examine the means of the three leadership preference ratings (i.e., charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leader preference ratings) between the two levels of the independent variable generation cohort (i.e., Millennials vs. non-Millennials). All assumptions necessary for conducting a 2 X 3 Mixed ANCOVA were met.

Hypotheses H3a through H3h proposed that there would be significant differences between Millennials and non-Millennials' preferences toward leadership styles based on their locus of control scores. In order to determine significance, multiple regression analyses were run. All continuous variables were centered and a series of multiple regressions were used in the analyses. The dependent variable was the leader preference ratings.

3.1.2 Data Screening

A total sample size of 812 participants participated in this study. Based on the psychometric literature, data that contained more than 10 missing data points or had "Not applicable" answered throughout the entire survey were deleted (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). It was decided that surveys with more than 10 missing data points should be considered incomplete and deleted from the study analyses, especially if those 10 data points were missing from pivotal items on the survey that specifically related to the hypothesis testing. The reasoning behind this decision was to try and prevent too many items from one participant being replaced with the mean average. It was believed that individual differences would not fully be accounted for if multiple items were replaced with mean averages on each participant. This brought the total sample size to 741 participants – roughly 9% of participants were deleted due to this criterion. Patterns in the missing data could not be found; therefore, these were

considered to be random missing data. Mean imputation was used to replace any remaining missing data points with the overall mean score of the item. This method was chosen due to its conservative nature. Because there were more Millennial participants ($N = 606$) than non-Millennial participants ($N = 126$), a random sample of 126 participants from the Millennial group was generated in SPSS in order to have equal sample sizes between the Millennial and non-Millennial groups. All hypotheses were tested using a total sample size of 252.

The next step involved reverse coding 20 items from the BIDR scale. Once all appropriate items were reverse coded, all scale items were collapsed into their respective construct and sub-constructs (e.g., Locus of control: internal, powerful others, and chance). The researcher then examined all variables used in testing the hypotheses by checking frequencies and assessing for normality. Five of the variables (charismatic effectiveness, servant preference, servant effectiveness, servant liking, and servant familiarity) were found to be strongly negatively skewed. Only servant preference was a primary variable used in the proposed hypotheses analyses. Due to a large enough sample, transformations were not conducted (Howell, 2010). In addition, since these items are opinion items, the researcher chose to keep the original data in order to see test for effects. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics on all variables used in analyses. Also, see Table F.4 for a correlation matrix of all variables used in hypothesis-related and additional analyses.

Results of the manipulation check yielded support for the construct validity of the leader profiles. Participants were expected to accurately match the four leadership profiles with the four leadership synopses. Manipulation checks for the four leaders found the following: 65.9% of participants accurately matched the charismatic leader profile with the charismatic leader synopsis; 71.7% of participants accurately matched the ideological leader profile with the ideological leader synopsis; 80.2% of participants accurately matched the pragmatic leader

profile with the pragmatic leader synopsis; and 63.9% of participants accurately matched the servant leader profile with the servant leader synopsis. See Table F.5 for frequency information.

The researcher then examined whether there were significant differences in leadership preferences between student and non-student participants. A 2 X 4 Mixed ANOVA was conducted. Due to the assumption of sphericity being violated, $p < 0.01$, Huynh-Feldt was used for determining significance. Results from this test concluded that there was not a significant interaction between student and non-student participants and their leadership preference ratings, $F(6, 747) = 0.55$, $p = 0.77$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$. A significant between-subjects main effect was also not found, $F(2, 249) = 0.94$, $p = 0.39$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$. Likewise, a 2 X 3 Mixed ANOVA was run to assess for a significant effect of student vs. non-student participants on the locus of control variables. Again, due to the assumption of sphericity being violated, Huynh-Feldt was used to determine significance of effects. Results concluded that there was an interaction between student and non-student participants on their locus of control ratings, $F(4, 498) = 3.42$, $p = 0.02$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$. However, a significant between-subjects main effect was not found, $F(2, 249) = 1.91$, $p = 0.15$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$. Therefore, student and non-student participants were aggregated for analyses due to non-significant differences between student and non-student participants (126 Millennials and 126 non-Millennials).

Correlations were run to assess the relationships between the continuous variables (e.g., leader preference, locus of control, social desirability). As can be seen in Table F.4, social desirability was significantly correlated with ideological leader preference ratings and all three of the locus of control variables. Due to these findings, participants' social desirability was controlled for in analyzing the hypotheses.

3.1.3 Analysis Findings

Means, standard deviations and correlations among the hypothesized variables are presented in Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 7.

3.1.3.1 Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis proposed that there would be significant differences between the preferences of leadership style such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials would prefer the servant leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. As mentioned above, social desirability was used as a control variable. The results of the 2 X 3 Mixed ANCOVA showed that Mauchly's test of sphericity was significant, $p < 0.05$. This meant that the assumption of sphericity was violated and, as such, the Huynh-Feldt test was used for determining significance. From this, a significant within-subjects main effect of leadership preference was found, $F(2, 496) = 24.41, p < 0.01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.09$. A significant interaction between leader preference and generation was also found, $F(2, 496) = 4.35, p < 0.05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.02$. No effect was found for social desirability, $F(1, 248) = 0.08, p = 0.78, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 < 0.01$.

When assessing the between-subject effects, it was noted that Levene's test of equality of error variances was found to be significant for pragmatic preference ratings, $p < 0.01$; therefore, more stringent p -values ($p < 0.025$) were required for reporting the following significant effects. Pairwise comparisons revealed that overall servant leaders were significantly preferred to ideological and pragmatic leaders, $p < 0.001$. It was also found that Millennials and non-Millennials both preferred servant leaders to ideological and pragmatic leaders, $p < 0.001$. Pairwise comparisons also revealed that compared to non-Millennial participants, Millennial participants had higher preferences for ideological leaders, $p < 0.025$.

From the findings, H1 was partially supported in that Millennials did significantly prefer servant leaders to ideological and pragmatic leaders. However, a significant between-subjects main effect for generation was not found, $F(1, 248) = 2.51, p = 0.11, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.01$; therefore, this relationship was not significantly different from that of non-Millennial participants. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics.

3.1.3.2 Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis proposed that there would be significant differences between the preferences of leadership style such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials would prefer the charismatic leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. As with before, social desirability was controlled for in assessing for this hypothesis. The results of the 2 X 3 Mixed ANCOVA showed that Mauchly's test of sphericity was non-significant, $p = 0.052$, which means the assumption of sphericity was not violated. From this, a significant within-subjects main effect of leadership preference was found, $F(2, 496) = 7.65$, $p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$. However, a significant interaction was not found between leader preferences and generation, $F(2, 496) = 1.81$, $p = 0.17$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$. No effect was found for social desirability, $F(1, 248) = 0.47$, $p = 0.49$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$.

Between subject effects were examined revealing that Levene's test of equality of error variances was significant for pragmatic preference ratings, $p < 0.01$; therefore, more stringent p -values ($p < 0.025$) were required for reporting the following significant effects. A significant between-subjects main effect for generation was found, $F(1, 248) = 5.39$, $p < 0.025$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$. As such, Millennials were found to have significantly higher preference ratings for all four leaders compared to non-Millennials. Pairwise comparisons revealed that, overall, charismatic leaders were significantly preferred compared to ideological and pragmatic leaders, $p < 0.001$. It was also found that Millennials and non-Millennials both preferred charismatic leaders to ideological and pragmatic leaders, $p < 0.01$. Pairwise comparisons also revealed that compared to non-Millennial participants, Millennials participants had higher preferences for ideological leaders, $p = 0.01$.

From the findings, H2 was partially supported in that Millennials did significantly prefer charismatic leaders to ideological and pragmatic leaders. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics.

3.1.3.3 Hypothesis 3

H3 comprised of eight specific hypotheses (H3a through H3h). See Table F.4 for correlation matrix of H3 related variables. H3a and H3c proposed that there would be significant differences between Millennials and non-Millennials' preferences toward leadership styles based on their locus of control scores such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials who were higher on powerful others (H3a) and who were higher on chance (H3c) would significantly prefer ideological leaders compared to Millennials who were lower on powerful others and who were lower on chance. A 3-step multiple regression was run one each for H3a and H3c to assess participants' preference ratings for ideological leaders. For H3a, the continuous variable of social desirability was entered into step 1, age and powerful others were centered and entered into step 2, with the interaction variable of ageXpowerfulothers entered into step 3. Model 1 revealed no overall significant effect on ideological leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 3.39, p = 0.07, ns$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.01$. Model 2 did not reveal any significant additional variance for ideological leader preferences being accounted for by participant age and powerful others, $\Delta F(2, 248) = 2.13, p = 0.12, ns$. Likewise, model 3 did not reveal any significant additional variance for ideological leader preference ratings being accounted for by the interaction of ageXpowerfulothers, $\Delta F(1, 247) = 0.29, p = 0.59, ns$. For H3c, the continuous variable of social desirability was entered into step 1, age and chance were centered and entered into step 2, with the interaction variable of ageXchance entered into step 3. Model 1 revealed no overall significant effect on ideological leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 3.39, p = 0.07, ns$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.01$. Model 2 did not reveal any significant additional variance for ideological leader preferences being accounted for by participant age and chance, $\Delta F(2, 248) = 2.44, p = 0.09, ns$. Model 3 also did not reveal any significant additional variance for ideological leader preference ratings being accounted for by the interaction of ageXchance, $\Delta F(1, 247) = 0.02, p = 0.89, ns$. Due to these findings, the

interaction of age and the locus of control factors did not significantly predict ideological leadership preferences; therefore both H3a and H3c were not supported. See Table F.6 for H3a multiple regression results; see Table F.7 for Hypothesis 3c multiple regression results.

H3b and H3d proposed that there would be significant differences between Millennials and non-Millennials' preferences toward leadership styles based on their locus of control scores such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials who were higher on powerful others (H3b) and who were higher on chance (H3d) would significantly prefer pragmatic leaders compared to Millennials who were lower on powerful others and who were lower on chance. A 3-step multiple regression was run one each for H3b and H3d to assess participants' preference ratings for pragmatic leaders. For H3b, the continuous variable of social desirability was entered into step 1, age and powerful others were centered and entered into step 2, with the interaction variable of ageXpowerfulothers entered into step 3. Model 1 did not reveal an overall significant effect on pragmatic leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 0.64$, $p = 0.42$, *ns*, adjusted $R^2 = -0.001$. Model 2 did not reveal any significant additional variance for pragmatic leader preferences being accounted for by participant age and powerful others, $\Delta F(2, 248) = 2.02$, $p = 0.14$, *ns*. Likewise, model 3 did not reveal any significant additional variance for pragmatic leader preference ratings being accounted for by the interaction of ageXpowerfulothers, $\Delta F(1, 247) = 0.04$, $p = 0.84$, *ns*. For H3d, the continuous variable of social desirability was entered into step 1, age and chance were centered and entered into step 2, with the interaction variable of ageXchance entered into step 3. Model 1 did not reveal an overall significant effect on pragmatic leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 0.64$, $p = 0.42$, *ns*, adjusted $R^2 = -0.001$. Model 2 did not reveal any significant additional variance for pragmatic leader preferences being accounted for by participant age and chance, $\Delta F(2, 248) = 2.29$, $p = 0.11$, *ns*. Model 3 also did not reveal any significant additional variance for pragmatic leader preference ratings being accounted for by the interaction of

ageXchance, $\Delta F(1, 247) = 1.49, p = 0.22, ns$. Due to these findings, the interaction of age and the locus of control factors did not significantly predict pragmatic leadership preferences; therefore both H3b and H3d were not supported. See Table F.8 for H3b multiple regression results; see Table F.9 for H3d multiple regression results.

H3e and H3g proposed that there would be significant differences between Millennials and non-Millennials' preferences toward leadership styles based on their locus of control scores such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials who were higher on internal locus of control would significantly prefer charismatic (H3e) and that internal locus of control would predict this relationship over and above powerful others and chance (H3g). A 3-step multiple regression was run, one for H3e and another for H3g, to assess participants' preference ratings for charismatic leaders. For H3e, the continuous variable of social desirability was entered into step 1, the continuous variables of age and internal locus of control were centered and entered into step 2, and the interaction variable of ageXinternal was entered into step 3. Model 1 revealed that there was no significant effect on charismatic leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 1.64, p = 0.20, ns$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.003$. Model 2 revealed that no significant additional variance was being accounted for by participant age and internal locus of control, $\Delta F(2, 248) = 2.13, p = 0.12, ns$. Finally, model 3 also did not reveal any significant additional variance for charismatic leader preference ratings being accounted for by the interaction of ageXinternal, $\Delta F(1, 247) = 0.20, p = 0.65, ns$. For H3g, model 1 revealed that there was no significant effect on charismatic leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 1.64, p = 0.20, ns$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.003$. Model 2 revealed that no significant additional variance was being accounted for by participant age, powerful others, and chance, $\Delta F(3, 247) = 1.30, p = 0.28, ns$. Finally, model 3 also did not reveal any significant additional variance for charismatic leader preference ratings being accounted for by participants' internal locus of control scores, $\Delta F(1, 246) = 0.42, p = 0.52, ns$. Due to these

findings, neither the interaction of age and internal locus of control nor internal locus of control over powerful others and chance were found to be significant predictors of charismatic leadership preferences; therefore both H3e and H3g were not supported. See Table F.10 for H3e multiple regression results; see Table F.11 for H3g multiple regression results.

H3f and H3h proposed that there would be significant differences between Millennials and non-Millennials' preferences toward leadership styles based on their locus of control scores such that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials who were higher on internal locus of control would significantly prefer servant leaders (H3f) and that internal locus of control would predict this relationship over and above powerful others and chance (H3h). A 3-step multiple regression was run, one for H3f and another for H3h, to assess participants' preference ratings for servant leaders. For H3f, the continuous variable of social desirability was entered into step 1, the continuous variables of age and internal locus of control were centered and entered into step 2, and the interaction variable of ageXinternal was entered into step 3. Model 1 revealed that there was no significant effect on servant leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 0.14, p = 0.71, ns$, adjusted $R^2 = -0.003$. Model 2 revealed a significant additional 3.9% variance was being accounted for by participant age and internal locus of control, $\Delta F(2, 248) = 5.10, p < 0.01$. However, model 3 did not reveal any significant additional variance for servant leader preference ratings being accounted for by the interaction of ageXinternal, $\Delta F(1, 247) = 0.17, p = 0.68, ns$. For H3h, model 1 revealed that there was no significant effect on servant leader preference ratings after controlling for social desirability, $F(1, 250) = 0.14, p = 0.71, ns$, adjusted $R^2 = -0.003$. Model 2 revealed no significant additional variance being accounted for by participant age, powerful others, and chance, $\Delta F(3, 247) = 0.45, p = 0.72, ns$. However, model 3 did reveal that a significant 3.9% additional variance for servant leader preference ratings was being accounted for by participants' internal locus of control scores, $\Delta F(1, 246) = 10.07, p < 0.01$. Due to these findings, H3f was not supported.

However, internal locus of control was found to significantly predict servant leader preferences over powerful other and chance; therefore, H3h was supported. See Table F.12 for H3f multiple regression results; see Table F.13 for H3h multiple regression results.

3.2 Additional Results

In addition to leadership preference differences, the survey included other questions related leadership styles as well as demographic information; therefore, exploratory analyses were run to examine other potential relationships among the variables.

3.2.1 Industry Type

A Mixed ANOVA was run to assess the effects of industry type on leadership preferences. The interaction of industry type and leadership preferences was not significant, $F(27, 699) = 0.82, p = 0.73, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.03$. Between-subject effects were also not found for generation, industry, or the interaction of generation and industry type, $F(1, 233) = 0.04, p = 0.85, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 < 0.01, F(9, 233) = 0.23, p = 0.23, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.05$, and $F(9, 233) = 1.40, p = 0.20, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.05$, respectively.

3.2.2 Job Type

Effects of job type were also examined by running a Mixed ANOVA that assessed for the effects of participants job type affecting their leadership preference ratings. However, job type was not a significant predictor of leader preference ratings, $F(15, 738) = 1.49, p = 0.11, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.03$. Likewise, there was not a significant between-subjects effect of job type on leader preferences, $F(5, 246) = 1.77, p = 0.12, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.04$.

3.2.3 Preference Ranking

Along with participants being asked to give ratings for their preferences towards the four leaders, participants were also asked to provide a preference ranking from 1 (most preferred) to 4 (least preferred) of the four leaders. Servant leaders were ranked 1st, charismatic leaders

were ranked 2nd, and both ideological leaders and pragmatic leaders were ranked 3rd. See Table F.14 for frequencies of each leader's preference rankings.

3.2.4 Leader Gender

Participants were also asked if they could identify the four leaders' gender. Of those who answer, 38.1% responded that they could not tell the gender of the charismatic leader; 38.1% responded that they could not tell the gender of the ideological leader; 37.7% responded that they believed the pragmatic leader was a male; and 35.3% responded that they believed the servant leader was a female. Despite higher percentages of participants rating the pragmatic as male and the servant leader as female, approximately 32-33% of the participants responded that they could not tell the gender of these two leaders. See Table F.15 for frequencies of leader gender responses.

3.2.5 Race

The effects of race on leader preference ratings for the four leaders were also examined, regardless of generation cohort, by running a Mixed ANOVA, using all 252 participants. The interaction of leader preference and race was not found to be significant, $F(9, 711) = 1.41, p = 0.18, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.02$. Levene's test of equality of error variances was found to be significant; therefore a more stringent p -value was used to determine significance (i.e., $p < 0.025$). Between-subjects effects were not found to be significant for race, $F(3, 237) = 1.89, p = 0.13, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.02$. Pairwise comparisons revealed no significant differences between the four racial groups. All participants preferred servant leaders to charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders, and preferred charismatic leaders to ideological and pragmatic leaders, $p < 0.01$. These findings should be interpreted with caution due to the small and unequal sample size representations for each of the racial groups. See Table F.16 for descriptive statistics of these findings.

3.2.6 Leader Effectiveness, Liking, and Familiarity

This study's hypotheses focused on the preference for leader style. However, questions on the survey also included leader effectiveness, leader liking and leader familiarity (Appendix F). Therefore, Mixed ANOVAs were also run to assess the generational differences on leadership effectiveness, liking, and familiarity ratings.

3.2.6.1 Leader Effectiveness

A significant within-subjects main effect was found for leader effectiveness ratings, $F(3, 750) = 93.18, p < 0.01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.27$. A significant interaction was found between leader effectiveness ratings and generational cohorts, $F(3, 750) = 5.84, p < 0.01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.02$. Levene's test of equality of error variances was found to be significant; therefore, a more stringent p -value was used to determine significance of pairwise comparisons (i.e., $p < 0.025$). Due to this more stringent p -value, a significant between-subjects main effect of generation and leader effectiveness was found, $F(1, 250) = 6.21, p < 0.025, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.02$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that overall, Millennials gave higher effectiveness ratings to all four leaders compared to non-Millennials, $p < 0.025$. It was also found that Millennial participants significantly ($p < 0.01$) rated ideological leaders with higher effectiveness ratings than did non-Millennials. In addition, both Millennials and non-Millennials had significantly higher effectiveness ratings ($p < 0.01$) for charismatic leaders compared to ideological and pragmatic leaders, and significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher effectiveness ratings for servant leaders over ideological and pragmatic leaders. Effectiveness ratings between charismatic and servant leader did not significantly differ. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics of these findings.

3.2.6.2 Leader Liking

The Mixed ANOVA revealed a significant within-subjects main effect of leader liking ratings, $F(3, 750) = 126.14, p < 0.01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.34$. A significant interaction between leader

liking ratings and generational cohorts was also found, $F(3, 750) = 2.86, p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$. Levene's test of equality of error variances was found to be significant; therefore, a more stringent p -value was used to determine significance of pairwise comparisons (i.e., $p < 0.025$). A significant between-subjects main effect of generation on leader liking ratings was not found, $F(1, 250) = 0.87, p = 0.35, ns$, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$. Pairwise comparisons did reveal that Millennials had significantly ($p < 0.025$) higher liking ratings for ideological leaders than did non-Millennials. Pairwise comparisons also revealed that Millennials had significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher liking ratings for charismatic leaders over ideological and pragmatic leaders, as well as higher liking ratings for servant leaders over ideological and pragmatic leaders ($p < 0.01$). However, non-Millennials reported roughly the same liking ratings, with the one exception that they did have significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher liking ratings for servant leaders than for charismatic leaders. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics of these findings.

3.2.6.3 Leader Familiarity

The Mixed ANOVA revealed a significant within-subjects main effect of leader familiarity ratings, $F(3, 750) = 48.34, p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.16$; however, the interaction between leader familiarity ratings (e.g., "I have worked with a leader such as this before" and "I know a leader such as this.") and generations was not found, $F(3, 750) = 0.87, p = 0.46, ns$, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$. Levene's test of equality of error variances was significant; therefore, a more stringent p -value was used to determine significance of pairwise comparisons (i.e., $p < 0.025$). A significant between-subjects main effect of generation on leader familiarity ratings was found, $F(1, 250) = 12.45, p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that non-Millennials had significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher familiarity ratings for all four leaders compared to Millennials. Non-Millennials were also found to have significantly higher familiarity with charismatic leaders than did Millennials. Pairwise comparisons also revealed that both Millennials and non-Millennials had significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher familiarity ratings for charismatic leaders over ideological and

pragmatic leaders, as well as higher familiarity ratings for servant leaders over ideological and pragmatic leaders ($p < 0.01$). See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics of these findings.

Due to familiarity ratings of leaders being significantly different between the generational cohorts (i.e., non-Millennials having higher familiarity with the four leaders than Millennials), both H1 and H2 were re-run, this time controlling for both social desirability and the familiarity ratings associated with the leaders under examination. The results of these analyses did not differ from the prior findings, except for a significant between-subjects main effect of generation. However, this effect pertained to Millennials having significantly higher preferences for ideological leaders than non-Millennials. As such, the findings for H1 and H2 were considered to be unchanged.

3.2.7 Leader Ratings

The survey also included questions assessing whether a leader could be viewed as preferred but not be liked, or be rated as highly effective but not preferred. Therefore, additional Mixed ANOVAs were conducted to assess if the participants' ratings of preference, effectiveness, liking, and familiarity of each of the four leaders differed, regardless of age.

3.2.7.1 Charismatic Leaders

For the charismatic leader's ratings, a significant within-subjects main effect was found, $F(3, 750) = 17.49, p < 0.01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.07$. Likewise, a significant interaction between charismatic ratings and generation was found, $F(3, 750) = 7.11, p < 0.01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.03$. A between-subjects main effect of generation was not found, $F(1, 250) = 0.41, p = 0.52, ns, \text{partial } \eta^2 < 0.01$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that the charismatic leader's preference ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their liking ratings, and significantly ($p < 0.01$) lower than their effectiveness ratings. Their effectiveness ratings were also significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their liking and familiarity ratings. Finally, their effectiveness ratings were

significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their familiarity ratings. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics.

3.2.7.2 Ideological Leaders

For the ideological leader's ratings, a significant within-subjects effect was found, $F(3, 750) = 14.38$, $p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$. Likewise, a significant interaction between ideological ratings and generation was found, $F(3, 750) = 17.16$, $p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.06$. A between-subjects main effect of generation was also found, $F(1, 250) = 6.03$, $p < 0.025$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$. Overall, Millennials were found to have higher liking ratings for all leaders compared to non-Millennials, $p < 0.025$. Millennials were also found to have significantly higher preference ($p < 0.01$), effectiveness ($p < 0.01$), and liking ($p < 0.025$) scores for the ideological leader than did non-Millennials. Pairwise comparisons revealed that ideological leader's preference ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their liking ratings, and significantly ($p < 0.01$) lower than their familiarity ratings. Lastly, their familiarity ratings were also significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their preference, effectiveness, and liking ratings. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics.

3.2.7.3 Pragmatic Leaders

For the pragmatic leader's ratings, a significant within-subjects main effect was found, $F(3, 750) = 16.26$, $p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.06$. However, a significant interaction between pragmatic ratings and generation was not found, $F(3, 750) = 2.57$, $p = 0.08$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$. A between-subjects main effect of generation was not found, $F(1, 250) = 0.27$, $p = 0.61$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that the pragmatic leader's preference ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their liking ratings. Their effectiveness ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their preference and liking ratings. Lastly, their familiarity ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their preference, effectiveness, and liking ratings. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics.

3.2.7.4 Servant Leaders

For the servant leader's ratings, a significant within-subjects main effect was found, $F(3, 750) = 9.63, p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.04$. However, a significant interaction between servant ratings and generation was not found, $F(3, 750) = 0.04, p = 0.94, ns$, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$. A between-subjects main effects of generation was found, $F(1, 250) = 4.74, p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$. Overall, non-Millennials were found to have significantly higher ratings for servant leaders compared to Millennials. Generational differences were also found in that Millennials had significantly higher preference ratings of servant leaders compared to their familiarity ratings for servant leaders – this relationship was not found to be significant among the non-Millennials. Pairwise comparisons revealed that the servant leader preference ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their familiarity ratings. It was also found that servant leader's liking ratings were significantly ($p < 0.01$) higher than their familiarity ratings. See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for descriptive statistics.

CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION SECTION

4.1 DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current research was to assess potential generational differences that might exist in individuals' preferences towards specific leadership styles. The two research questions that sparked the proposed hypotheses were:

1. Does the Millennial generation of followers prefer a specific type of leader?
2. Do certain personality characteristics of the Millennial generation influence their leader style preference?

The overall hypothesis for this research was that Millennials would have higher preferences for servant and charismatic leaders due to their specific personalities and generational attributes, while non-Millennials would have higher preferences for ideological and pragmatic leader. The following is an overall summary of the findings for each of the hypotheses.

Hypothesis one stated that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials would prefer the servant leadership style to the ideological and pragmatic. As can be seen in Tables 6.1 and 6.2, while controlling for social desirability, Millennials did have a higher preference for servant leaders than they did for ideological and pragmatic leaders; however, this relationship was not found to be significant when compared to non-Millennials. Results revealed that there was a within-subjects main effect of generational group on participants' leadership preferences. However, this generational effect was only significant for participants' preferences towards ideological leaders – showing that Millennial participants had higher preferences ratings towards ideological leaders than did non-Millennial participants. A possible reason behind this finding may be that Millennials prefer ideological leaders more so than non-Millennials due to the

ideological leader's focus on correcting the mistakes of the past (e.g., going green to help correct for past environmental issues). Also, in the additional analyses, it was found that Millennials gave ideological leaders higher effectiveness and liking ratings than did non-Millennials. Clearly, Millennial participants have a different view of ideological leaders than do non-Millennials. There were no significant generational differences in participants' preferences towards servant or pragmatic leaders. Due to these findings, the first hypothesis was partially supported. Millennials did have higher preferences for servant leaders compared to ideological and pragmatic leaders; yet, this effect was not significant between generational cohorts – all participants regardless of generational cohort had higher preferences for servant leaders.

Hypothesis two stated that compared to non-Millennials, Millennials would prefer the charismatic leadership style over the ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. As can be seen in Tables 6.1 and 6.2, compared to non-Millennials, Millennials did have a higher preference for charismatic leaders than for ideological and pragmatic leaders; however, this relationship was not significant when compared to non-Millennials. Results revealed that there was not a significant main effect of generational group on participants' leadership preferences. However, as with the first hypothesis, it was found that Millennial participants had significantly higher preferences towards ideological leaders than non-Millennial participants. There were no significant generational differences in participants' preferences towards charismatic or pragmatic leaders. Due to these findings, the second hypothesis was not fully supported, leading to the conclusion that all participants, regardless of generational cohort, do not differ in the ratings towards charismatic leaders.

Although the findings did not fully support H1 and H2, the information gained is valuable in that it allows for a better overall understanding of the four leadership styles and the preferences for each, regardless of generation cohort. Knowing that generations do not exert a preference towards servant and charismatic leaders is also important for research and practice. One reason for these results might be explained by the overall nature of these types of leaders.

Servant leaders are depicted by their friendliness and their overall all approach of mutually benefiting all members. It is reasonable to acknowledge that individuals from all generational cohorts prefer a leader who is going to be their friend and help them get where it is they wish to go. This was found to be true when assessing the additional analyses, where the mean liking ratings for servant leaders were found to be exactly the same as the mean preference ratings of servant leaders (see Tables 6.1 and 6.2).

As revealed through the additional analyses, significant effects were found within-subjects on their ratings of effectiveness, liking, and familiarity, with a significant main effect of generation for ratings of leader familiarity. For leader effectiveness ratings, Millennials had significantly higher effectiveness ratings for ideological leaders than did non-Millennials. Therefore, in addition to having higher preferences for ideological leaders, Millennials also view them as more effective. This may be due, in part, to the fact that ideological leaders focus on correcting and not repeating past mistakes. As well, ideological leaders do not try to persuade followers into doing something; rather, they simply work with those who already share their beliefs and goals. These characteristics could equate to how Millennials conceptualize effectiveness. Regardless of the reasons for this difference in how the generations perceive ideological leaders, however, both generational groups viewed charismatic and servant leaders as being more effective than either ideological and pragmatic leaders. Moreover, there was no significant difference in effectiveness ratings between the servant and charismatic leader for either of the two generational groups – participants from both generational cohorts rated charismatic and servant leaders as being the most effective leaders of the four.

For leader liking ratings, there also seems to be a pattern among participants such that, despite their generational cohort, participants seem to like charismatic and servant leaders more so than ideological and pragmatic leaders. Again, the reasons behind these findings can only be speculated, but it seems only natural that people have more liking towards those

leaders who are friendly or have a trustworthy air about them (i.e., servant and charismatic leaders, respectively; see Table A.1).

Lastly, with respect to familiarity ratings, again Millennials and non-Millennials had higher familiarity ratings for both charismatic and servant leader than they did for ideological and pragmatic leaders. These findings are particularly interesting because they could help to explain the overall effects of preference, effectiveness, and liking – perhaps participants have a higher preference for, effectiveness view of, and liking towards those leaders with whom they are more familiar and/or with whom they have had previous experience as being in leadership positions.

Hypothesis 3 aimed at deciphering the effects of locus control factors on participants' preferences towards specific leader styles. With the exception of H3h, none of the hypotheses were significant. Despite the mostly non-significant findings overall, some interesting effects were found. For example, internal locus of control was found to be significantly predictive of higher servant leader preference. Those who believe that they are in control of outcomes of events prefer servant leaders. This appeal may be due to the servant leader's 'we can change the world and make it better' attitude. In other words, if you believe you can control outcomes, likely you will prefer to work under a leader who also believes that people are in control of their own destiny or outcomes.

Powerful others and chance locus of controls were found to be significantly predictive of higher ideological and pragmatic leader preferences. This can be explained due to the nature of the approach that both of these leaders share. For example, ideological and pragmatic leaders believe that there are situational aspects that may block change and the betterment of outcomes. Therefore, ideological leaders focus on trying to eliminate situational factors that may hinder change in occurring, while pragmatic leaders focus on waiting for the right moment in order to avoid the situational factors that would hinder change to occur. Thus, an individual who has a more external locus of control (i.e., powerful others or chance determine the outcomes of

events) will be more drawn to those leaders who focus on taking into account these situational factors and who aim to either eliminate them or wait for the perfect moment to before acting. Locus of control seems to have a significant effect on participants' preferences for various leaders due to the leaders approach fitting better with their own locus of control.

The information gained from all parts of Hypothesis 3 are valuable to know because they allow researchers to have a better understanding of the relationships between age, locus of control, and the preferences for various leadership types. It is extremely important for researchers and consultants to acknowledge this link between locus of control factors and preferences for these specific leader types. Although much more still needs to be done in order to fully understand these relationships, this study took a step in the right direction of detecting these effects so that future researchers might someday cement these relationships.

4.1.1 Implications

4.1.1.1 Implications for Research

As previously emphasized, the extent of literature on the Millennial generation is thus far both small and inconclusive. It is therefore hoped that the current research will help future studies to gain a better understanding of the latest generation to enter the workforce and what they are wanting out of their leaders. By learning the types of leaders this generation prefers, researchers and applied consultants can begin to gain an understanding into what it is about these specific leaders that is so appealing to newest workforce population. In other words, we can gain some insight into the types of approaches and methods these Millennials prefer their leaders to take and use.

This study showed that there does seem to be some agreement between generational cohorts, in that servant and charismatic leaders were the preferred choice by the majority of participants. Even though the findings revealed no significant differences between generations in terms of the preferences for any of the leadership types except for the ideological leader, this does not negate the possibility of generational differences. As shown in the additional analyses,

other factors may be influencing the relationship between leaders and followers; thus, future research should continue to pursue variables that may demonstrate differences between generations (liking, effectiveness, etc).

It is also believed that this research will help future researchers in their understanding of the four leadership styles currently under investigation (i.e., charismatic, ideological, pragmatic, and servant). The more data collected on these leadership styles, the more comprehensive our profiles of these leaders can become, and hopefully from this, future researchers will be able to continue to study and learn more on these particular leadership styles.

This study also advanced our understanding regarding the notion of a person's control orientations (i.e., their locus of control ratings). Specifically, this study found that internal locus of control did have a positive relationship with high preferences toward servant leaders. The main explanations for this is that servant leaders take the approach that goals can be attained and outcomes controlled or changed due to people coming together and not stopping until the desired outcome is attained. This seems to have more of an internal locus of control approach, which explains why it is that followers with an internal locus of control were found to significantly prefer the servant leader style. Knowing this opens up the doors for more extensive research into why and how exactly these relationships exist. The results of this study provide a justification for adding the aspect of locus of control to the conceptualization of these different leadership styles, which in turn should provide future researchers with a more comprehensive understanding of these leaders.

4.1.1.2 Implications for Practice

Implications of this study are that hiring agencies will have a better understanding of the types of leaders this latest generation will be looking for. Specifically, consulting agencies should be able to gain a better understanding of which leadership styles are more highly coveted among employees, along with some understanding of why younger employees might not have as high a preference towards various leaders compared to older employees. In many

respects, the goal of this study was to help in the endeavor of creating pre-emptive movements within the workplace so that organizations could start adjusting their current and future work environments (i.e., leadership styles or approaches to supervising) to better fit with this newer generation. Organizations are most likely well aware (or at least should be) that their employees are of foremost importance to the success and productivity of their company. Simply put, if employees are not happy because of a lack of congruency between leader style and follower personality, organizational effectiveness will likely suffer.

As for the generational aspect of this research and its implications for practice, the implications are endless. For example, gathering more scientifically-based data related to this newest generational cohort will help decision makers within organizations to better prepare for the subsequent effects of this generation's entrance into the workforce. Decision makers need to be aware of which organizational change, whether managerial or not, are going to cause rifts and negative effects within their workforce. Shifts can already be seen within the workplace as more and more executive training agencies and programs continue to pop up around major cities. Consultants have already recognized the importance of not only training leaders to better fit the workplace, but to also better fit their employees' wants and needs (i.e., person-organizational fit). By gaining better insight into what the Millennial generation wants in their leaders and finding out which leaders they have a preference for, executive training programs can begin to use this information to help train current leaders to adapt to this style and approach of leading. With every new generation of people comes a new set of rules for what is wanted, what is needed, and what is desired. This research is a step in the direction of studying the Millennial generation and finding out exactly what they are looking for in a leader. By doing so, consultants may be able to adapt their training programs, hiring processes, and the organizational environments to better fit this latest generations needs.

4.1.2 Limitations

4.1.2.1 Generations or Stages of Life

The first and what is probably the greatest limitation of this study is the fact that there is no concrete way of knowing whether the findings of this study are actually related to generational differences or stages of life. As was described in depth in the introductory section of this paper, generational cohorts are essentially believed to encapsulate various personality characteristics and attitudes of a set of people born within a certain time parameter, which makes that set of people different from others who were born within other time parameters (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). However, some research has argued that generations do not exist *per se*, but rather life stages are the reason for any differences between people of various ages. Helsper (2010) explained that life stages were made up of conventional junctures in a person's life where everyday routines would become significantly altered due to a shift or a change in a person's role within society. The idea has been argued that all persons go through stages of life such as childhood, young adulthood, employment, marriage, parenthood, mid-life, retirement, etc., which separates them from others who are currently in different stages of life. According to this line of thinking, the findings from this study could be explained by stating that people who are in young adulthood might have higher scores on powerful others and chance locus of controls because they either still live with their parents or have a general feeling of not being able to control things in their life. This, therefore, would lead to them having higher preferences towards ideological leaders and lower preferences towards servant and charismatic leaders than those individuals who are in the stage of parenthood, mid-life, and/or retirement. It could be argued that those individuals in later life stages have higher internal locus of control ratings due to them having a home, a car, a job, and a life that they created and built and, therefore, they feel as though they have the power and control over their life.

Unfortunately, there have been no comprehensive studies thus far to determine which of these two possibilities, generational cohort or life stages, are correct or a better way to

explain age differences. The reason for the lack of these types of studies is due to the complex nature of a study design that would be needed in order to clarify this question. The only true way for testing generational versus life stage differences would be to collect a large and equal sample size of individuals from various age groups and follow them through life, repeatedly having them fill out surveys that would assess the individuals on a variety of personality aspects. By following these participants throughout their life span, researchers would be able to note whether any group changes occurred or whether people born around the same time held on to various consist or basic beliefs such as creative freedom or resourcefulness. This type of longitudinal study and repeated testing and observations would allow researchers to decipher between age-related effects, generational cohort effects, and time-of-measurement effects (Smith, 2009). Age-related effects would be those effects that appear due to development and change via life span. Generational cohort effects would be those that are due to the time period in which participants were born and how they developed through shared historical events. Finally, time-of-measurement effects would be those effects that appear due to a specific time or historical event that takes place during the testing, rather than illustrating development or change in the participant.

4.1.2.2 Population Sample

Another limitation of this study concerns the participants themselves. As was mentioned previously, student vs. non-student differences were not found to be significant. However, due to the variety of participants from various locations, it is natural that limitations within the population sample exist through uncontrollable factors, which could lead to error/noise within the study. One uncontrollable factor could be simply that of location, which could lead to a limitation of testing a multitude of different cultures without having representative sample sizes for any of the cultures. This was unfortunately an unavoidable limitation due to the needed participant size and the lack of local resources and time.

4.1.2.3 Self-Report Surveys

The use of self-reported measures have been known to be subject to error due to the scores being based on the participants' subjectivity or various interpretations of the items (Schwartz, 1999); therefore, this limitation should be taken into consideration. Likewise, the study data were collected using self-reported measures that were completed using an online website.

There are possible limitations due to using an online survey website for the use of collecting survey data, the first of which is that participants taking the online survey might be completing multiple tasks at once while completing the survey (e.g., checking e-mail, watching TV, or checking Facebook). This, of course, could lead to error due to providing ratings while distracted by other activities or things occurring around the participants at the time of completing the survey. Unfortunately, there was no way for the researcher to know whether participants engaged in these distracting behaviors and, therefore, no way to account or control for this potential error.

Secondly, the use of an online survey might have lead to various differences in ratings simply due to participant error. Specifically, older participants might not use the Internet often or might not be used to answering questions online, which could have lead to differences in their ratings.

4.1.2.4 Common Method Bias

This study was based only on data collected from self-report surveys. The results of the proposed hypotheses might have been different if the study had collected information through a variety of methods such as conducting observations, interviews, and/or quasi-experimental designs. By using multiple methods of collecting and gathering data, common method bias would have been eliminated; however, as this was not the case in this study, common method bias is a limitation that should be taken into account.

4.1.2.5 Leader Preference Based On Job Task

Another limitation of this study is that participants' leader preference ratings were based on leader profiles that were provided to participants. Specifically, participants were asked to make their preference ratings based on general descriptions of the leaders, with no information on the specific job tasks that the leader would be overseeing. Knowing the specific tasks or jobs the leader would be asked to oversee might have a significant impact on which of the four leader styles participants would have preferred (see the Future Research section for more on this).

4.1.3 Future Research

4.1.3.1 Longitudinal Study

As previously mentioned, there is no way to determine whether the results from this study are due to generational cohorts differences or differences in life stages that shape people's preferences towards the leadership styles. The only way to determine if there are distinct generational cohorts is to conduct a thorough and wide-spread longitudinal study which would follow participants through various decades, while simultaneously adding more participants as the years go on (i.e., more generations are born), and repeatedly observing the participants at least once a year. Researchers would also need to follow these participants for years in order to frequently test and re-test them on their leadership preferences, along with measuring various personality factors to determine whether any differences are due to being a part of a specific generation, or are due to simply growing up and going through the various stages of life.

Because this type of study would require a large amount of time and resources (i.e., funding, researchers, and participants), likely it is because of these reasons that no such study has been carried out. However, this type of research endeavor should eventually be undertaken in order to add more clarity to the generational cohort/life stages question.

4.1.3.2 In-lab Study

It might be worthwhile to conduct a similar study in an in-lab setting. Even more interesting would be to have a video recording of confederates acting as the leader (i.e., a recording for the charismatic, ideological, pragmatic, and servant leaders) and have the participants watch the videos and then make their preference ratings. Many factors would need to be accounted for, such as gender of participant versus gender of leader, apparel of the leader, mannerisms, and wording of the script to name a few. However, despite the difficulties of carrying out this type of study, it would most likely provide researchers with more in-depth and thorough data. Researchers would then have quantitative and qualitative data through surveys and observed behavioral ratings, which would hopefully allow for more clarity in the question of generations' leadership preferences.

4.1.4 Conclusion

Despite of this study's hypotheses not being fully supported, there were numerous important findings from this research. Generational differences for preferences towards servant, pragmatic, and charismatic leaders were not found, leading to the conclusion that perhaps these three leadership types can be viewed as being more or least preferred overall (e.g., servant leaders are the most highly preferred leadership type overall). Likewise, this study also aided in finding significant results for the relationships between locus of control and leadership preferences. Specifically, higher internal locus of control scores were found to be highly related to high preferences for servant leaders, and higher external locus of control (i.e., powerful others and chance) scores were found to be highly related to high preferences for ideological leaders.

Hopefully this study and its findings will encourage future researchers to join in on the quest to discovering whether generational differences in leadership preferences exist and, if so, in what ways. Whether null or significant results are found, all research studies are significant in their contributions to the research and applied psychological communities. It is the belief of this

researcher that the findings of this study will aid in discovering more information about these four leadership types and to continue to build upon their conceptualization.

APPENDIX A

LITERATURE REVIEW TABLES

Table A.1
Comparison of Four Leader Styles

Leader Styles	Defining Traits and Behaviors	General Perspective	Expectations of Followers
Charismatic	Has an air about them that encourages others to trust/follow them; leads through role-modeling/self-sacrificing behaviors; appeals to the masses.	Emphasizes positive, future-oriented goals; believes that people are in charge of their own destiny.	To achieve and maintain individual goals as well as the group's goals for the greater good; to create the world they want for tomorrow.
Ideological	Has good interpersonal relationships with followers; seeks out those who are intrinsically like them; uses emotional appeals to influence.	Emphasizes goals that have been proven effective in the past; believes in attaining goals by correcting for situational factors that would hinder the attainment; believes in a shared leadership environment.	To believe in the same things leader does and therefore to share the same goals; to pay attention to past mistakes by atoning for them.
Pragmatic	Has a high patience in waiting for the right moment; builds lasting institutions; uses logical arguments; deals well with the facts.	Emphasizes the current issues at hand; believes in using global images to influence followers; focuses on situational factors that may prevent a goal from being achieved.	To maintain benefits of their mutual interest by attaining shared goals; to induce change on relevant causes and control unforeseen events.
Servant	Has a serving attitude; focuses on followers needs; leads by example; develops prosocial relationships with each follower; communicates through a friendly, open, and frank manner.	Emphasizes personal integrity; possess a serving mentality; believes in expressing personal views; stays enthusiastic about change; approaches leadership through a friend mentality.	To maintain personal integrity; to express their opinions and points of view; to create a better group and world; to imitate enthusiastic behaviors and challenge the status quo.

Table A.2
Comparison of the Differences Between Five Generations

Generation	Defining Traits and Behaviors	General Perspective
WWIIers: 1909 - 1933	Resourceful; caring; leaders.	Possess a desire for stability and security in both the workplace and at home.
Swinger/Silents: 1934 - 1945	Patient; loyal; caring; hardworking.	Possess a great respect for authority and following the rules.
Baby Boomers: 1940 -1964	Highly independent; creators of their own destinies; caring; high need for security and stability; desire the freedom to be creative.	Possess a great sympathy/empathy towards various social reforms and social injustices; believes they are deserving of all the greater things in life.
Generation X: 1960s – 1975 to 1982	Highly independent, self-reliant, determined, ambitious; aptitude for creating novel solutions when solving intricate problems; individualist, untrusting, cynical.	Possess a great cynicism towards authority and the workplace; desires a good balance between workplace and home life; believes in being creative, independent, and individualistic.
Generation Y / Millennials: 1980s – 2000ish	Highly confident; up-beat disposition; high self-esteem; highly educated-minded; high understanding of the opportunities and problems that lay ahead of them; low need for social approval; values status; high levels of narcissism.	Possess an open and tolerant disposition toward social issues such as race, gender, age, and sexual orientation; believes in volunteerism.

Table A.3
Six Factors Believed to Shape a Generation

	Factor	Millennial Example
Factor 1	"A traumatic or formative event such as a war"	The War on Terrorism
Factor 2	"A dramatic shift in demography that influences the distribution of resources in society"	Dual Income Households
Factor 3	"An interval that connects a generation to success or failure"	The prolonged war in Iraq and throughout the Middle East
Factor 4	"The creation of sacred space that sustains a collective memory"	9/11 Trade Center Tower Memorial
Factor 5	"Mentors or heroes that give impetus and voice by their work"	President Obama
Factor 6	"The work of people who know and support each other"	The increase in patriotism after the 9/11 attacks

Note. Adapted from "Generational Differences in Leader Values and Leadership Behaviors," by W. I. Sessa, R. I. Kabacoff, J. and H. Brown, 2007, *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10(1), p. 49.

APPENDIX B

MILLENNIAL PILOT STUDY MATERIALS

Fill in all demographic information: (Mark correct answer with an "X" where appropriate)

Name (This identification information is required so that research credit can be awarded to you):

Gender:

_____ Male _____ Female

Date of birth (MM/DD/YYYY) _____/_____/_____

Education

_____ GED _____ High School Diploma _____ Some College _____ Bachelors Degree
_____ Masters Degree _____ PhD _____ Other? _____

Race/Ethnicity

Asian (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.)

African American/Black (A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa)

Caucasian/White (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.)

Hispanic/Latino (A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.)

American Indian/Alaska Native (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.)

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.)

Multi-racial or other (A person who has parents from more than one of the broad race categories listed above.)

Have you ever been in a leadership position? (Circle answer choice) Yes No

If yes, please specify the title of this leadership position, as well as the roles you completed as a leader.

Please indicate your average household income:

_____ less than 15,000
_____ between 15,001 and 35,000
_____ between 35,001 and 55,000
_____ between 55,001 and 75,000
_____ between 75,001 and 95,000
_____ between 95,001 and 115,000
_____ between 115,001 and 135,000
_____ between 135,001 and 155,000
_____ 155,001 or more
_____ do not wish to answer

Marital Status:

___ Married ___ Divorced ___ In a relationship ___ Dating ___ Single ___ Widowed

Adopted: ___ Yes ___ No

Siblings: ___ Yes ___ No

If you have siblings, what are their ages? _____

Place of birth: _____
(city) (state) (country)

Citizenship: ___ US ___ Other

If other, please specify country _____

Do you hold dual citizenship? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please specify: _____

If you are a foreign national or hold dual citizenship, how many years have you lived in the United States? _____

Please indicate the primary place where you were raised

(city) (state) (country)

Where do you predominantly call "home"?

(state) (country) (city)

Please complete the section below with respect to your principal caregiver(s) (i.e., mother, father, grandmother, aunt, etc.)

.

Caregiver	Approx.	Political
Religious	year of birth	Affiliation
_____	____/____/____	_____
_____	____/____/____	_____
_____	____/____/____	_____
_____	____/____/____	_____

Questionnaire:

A. List 5 events/changes that have occurred during your lifetime and that have had a significant impact or effect on you. (No more than 250 words.)

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

B. What was it about these 5 events (previously listed above) that made them especially important? Discuss why and/or how they impacted/effected you (NO MORE THAN 250 WORDS PER EVENT).

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Listed below are three main sections: Historical Events, Technological Advancements, and Pop-Culture. Think about which items were most influential to you then rank order your top 10 choices. You will mark “1” for your first choice, “2” for your second choice, etc., all the way to “10” as being the least important and least influential to you.

Historical Events Section: (Rank 1 through 10)

- ___ Iran Contra Deal
- ___ Space Shuttle Challenger explodes
- ___ INF nuclear arms control treaty signed
- ___ The Berlin Wall is pulled down
- ___ 7.1 magnitude earthquake hits San Francisco
- ___ US troops invade Panama
- ___ US soldiers arrive in Saudi Arabia as part of Operation Desert Shield
- ___ Germany united
- ___ Iraq attacks Kurds in Northern Iraq
- ___ Hubble telescope launched
- ___ U.S.S.R. comes to a formal end
- ___ Operation Desert Storm (The Gulf War)
- ___ Clinton is voted into office
- ___ An Islamic terrorist group bombs the World Trade Center
- ___ Oklahoma City bombing (Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building is destroyed)
- ___ Police officers found “Not Guilty” of attack on Rodney King
- ___ Branch Davidian siege in Waco
- ___ Nelson Mandela is elected President of South Africa
- ___ O.J. Simpson trial
- ___ Britain turns over Hong Kong to China
- ___ Clinton/Lewinsky scandal
- ___ Northern Ireland peace
- ___ US Embassies bombed in Kenya and Tanzania
- ___ Kosovo
- ___ President Clinton impeached
- ___ U.S.S. Cole attack
- ___ George Bush Jr. elected president
- ___ September 11th attack, Twin Towers of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon hit by planes.
- ___ US and Great Britain attack Afghanistan
- ___ Anthrax attacks
- ___ Enron bankruptcy

- ___ Space Shuttle Columbia explodes on re-entry
- ___ US invades Iraq
- ___ 9/11 Commission
- ___ Hurricane Katrina
- ___ Barak Obama elected president
- ___ General Motors declares bankruptcy
- ___ Energy conservation efforts
- ___ Cults massive suicide
- ___ Hubble telescope
- ___ Amber Alert
- ___ Mars Rover
- ___ Exxon Valdez oil spill
- ___ Hurricane Andrew
- ___ Y2K
- ___ Columbine school shooting

Technological Advancements Section: (Rank 1 through 10)

- ___ At home desktop computers
- ___ World Wide Web
- ___ Internet
- ___ Cell phones, pagers, text messaging
- ___ The iPhone
- ___ Gameboys, PS2s, X-Box
- ___ Live online video gaming

- ___ Wii
- ___ VHS
- ___ DVD
- ___ Cassette tapes
- ___ CD
- ___ MP3
- ___ Flopi-disks
- ___ CD-ROM
- ___ Flash Drives
- ___ E-books
- ___ Digital cable
- ___ Typewriter
- ___ Printer
- ___ E-mail
- ___ Instant Messenger
- ___ Video chatting
- ___ Webcam
- ___ Online dating
- ___ Facebook
- ___ Myspace
- ___ Xanga
- ___ Webblogs
- ___ Digital Video Camera
- ___ Digital Camera
- ___ Hybrid Cars
- ___ Electronic Cars
- ___ GPS
- ___ Online search engines
- ___ Online radio
- ___ iPods
- ___ MP3 Players
- ___ Laser printing
- ___ Satellite TV/Radio
- ___ 3D Movies
- ___ HDTV
- ___ DNA testing (Biometric information storage of fingerprints, retinal scans, etc.)
- ___ Cloning
- ___ Compact fluorescent light bulbs (Energy conservation)
- ___ Low-flow toilets/showerheads (Water conservation)
- ___ Sprinkler systems
- ___ Use of robots in factory/manufacturing companies
- ___ Laser keyboards (projection)
- ___ Online banking
- ___ Online shopping
- ___ Hubble telescope
- ___ Unmanned spacecrafts

- ___ Fiber optics
- ___ Batteries
- ___ Remote controls
- ___ Wireless Internet
- ___ Wireless headsets for phones
- ___ Car phones
- ___ Baby monitors
- ___ Global finance production, manufacturing, communication
- ___ Beta-tapes
- ___ VCR
- ___ DVD Player
- ___ Tape Player
- ___ CD Player
- ___ Boombox
- ___ PDAs
- ___ LCD screens
- ___ Solar power: homes, buildings, traffic lights, cars, etc.
- ___ Traffic camera distributed tickets
- ___ OnStar (GPS)

Pop-culture Section: (Rank 1 through10)

People:

- ___ Michael Jordan
- ___ Barry Sanders
- ___ Britney Spears
- ___ Tiger Woods
- ___ Oprah Winfrey

Fashion:

- ___ Converse All-Stars
- ___ Air Force Ones
- ___ Kimora Lee
- ___ Russel Simons
- ___ Rocawear
- ___ Coach
- ___ Jordan
- ___ Louis Vuitton
- ___ Skinny jeans
- ___ AVON
- ___ Mary Kay

Trends:

___ "There's an app for that"

Cartoons:

___ Looney/Tiny Toons
___ Anime
___ Ninja Turtles
___ Nickelodeon
___ Superhero Shows
___ Southpark
___ Simpsons
___ G.I. Joes

Toys:

___ Popples
___ Pound puppies
___ Carebears
___ Matchbox cars
___ Barbies
___ G.I. Joes
___ Power Rangers
___ Digi/Giga Pets/Tomagachi
___ American Girl Dolls
___ Board Games (Twister, Candy Land,
Monopoly, Grape Escape, Mousetrap, etc.)
___ Mortal Combat
___ Tetris
___ Zelda
___ Cabbage Patch Kids
___ Glow Worms
___ Baseball Cards
___ Nurf Guns
___ Super Soakers
___ Transformers

Television Shows:

___ Sex and the City
___ Baywatch
___ America's Funniest Home Videos
___ WWF (wrestling shows)
___ Barney
___ G.I. Joes
___ Full House
___ Friends
___ Saturday Night Live
___ Fresh Prince of Bel-Air
___ American Idol
___ Reality TV Shows
___ Simpsons
___ Sci-Fi TV Shows (Star Trek, X-files, etc.)
___ Power Rangers
___ Sesame Street

Music:

___ R&B
___ Hip-hop
___ Techno
___ Alternative
___ Slow Rock
___ Punk Rock
___ Country
___ John Williams
___ Jimmy Buffet
___ Madonna
___ Boy Bands
___ Britney Spears
___ Green Day
___ All American Rejects
___ Blondie
___ Ozzy Osbourne
___ Aerosmith
___ KISS
___ Whitney Houston
___ Queen
___ Michael Jackson
___ Vanilla Ice
___ MC Hammer
___ The Ramones

Movies

___ Harry Potter
___ Lord of the Rings
___ Star Wars
___ American Pie
___ Saw
___ Scream
___ Spoof Movies
___ Back to the Future
___ Indiana Jones
___ Jaws
___ Superman
___ Close Encounters of the Third Kind
___ E.T.
___ Jurassic Park
___ Alien
___ Breakfast Club (Brat Pack films)
___ Princess Bride
___ Terminator
___ Saving Private Ryan
___ Forrest Gump
___ Titanic
___ Austin Powers
___ Braveheart
___ Disney Movies

- _____ Home Alone
- _____ Dirty Dancing
- _____ Gremlins
- _____ Willow
- _____ The Dark Crystal
- _____ Never Ending Story

- C. From each of the 3 sections above, list your top 2 choices. Then explain why they were important to you and how they impacted you (NO MORE THAN 250 WORDS EACH).**

Historical Events Section:

1.

2.

Technology Advancements Section:

1.

2.

Pop-culture Section:

1.

2.

- D. If you had to describe your generation in *10 words or less*, what would you say?**

Big Five Inventory – 44 item version

- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree a little
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree a little
- 5 = agree strongly

I see myself as someone who...

1. Is talkative
2. Tends to find fault with others
3. Does a thorough job
4. Is depressed, blue
5. Is original, comes up with new ideas
6. Is reserved
7. Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. Can be somewhat careless
9. Is relaxed, handles stress well
10. Is curious about many different things
11. Is full of energy
12. Starts quarrels with others
13. Is a reliable worker
14. Can be tense
15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker
16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. Has a forgiving nature
18. Tends to be disorganized
19. Worries a lot
20. Has an active imagination
21. Tends to be quiet
22. Is generally trusting
23. Tends to be lazy
24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
25. Is inventive
26. Has an assertive personality
27. Can be cold and aloof
28. Perseveres until the task is finished
29. Can be moody
30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
33. Does things efficiently
34. Remains calm in tense situations
35. Prefers work that is routine
36. Is outgoing, sociable

37. Is sometimes rude to others
38. Makes plans and follows through with them
39. Gets nervous easily
40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas
41. Has few artistic interests
42. Likes to cooperate with others
43. Is easily distracted
44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

Sense of Self Scale (SOSS)

Listed below are questions for the section. **Please provide a response for every question.**

1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Slightly Disagree, 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 – Slightly Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree

1. I wish I were more consistent in my feelings.
2. It's hard for me to figure out my own personality, interests, and opinions.
3. I often confuse my own thoughts and feelings with those of others.
4. I often think how fragile my existence is.
5. I have a pretty good sense of what my long-term goals are in life.
6. I sometimes wonder if people can actually see me.
7. Other people's thoughts and feelings seem to carry greater weight than my own.
8. I have a clear and definite sense of who I am and what I'm all about.
9. My opinions and values can change almost as quickly as my moods.
10. It bothers me that my personality doesn't seem to be well defined.
11. I'm not sure that I can understand or put much trust in my thoughts and feelings.
12. I find it difficult to distinguish my beliefs and perspectives from other people's beliefs and perspectives.
13. Who am I? is a question that I ask myself a lot.
14. I need other people to help me understand what I think or how I feel.
15. My beliefs and values can change from day to day.
16. I tend to be very sure of myself and stick to my own preferences even when the group I am with expresses different preferences.

Optimism- Revised Life Orientation Test
Scheier, Carver, Bridges (1994)

For the following questions, rate you level of agreement:

- 1= Strongly disagree
- 2= Slightly disagree
- 3= Neither agree nor disagree
- 4= Slightly agree
- 5= Strongly agree

- 1) In uncertain times, I usually expect the best.
- 2) It's easy for me to relax.
- 3) If something can go wrong for me, it will.
- 4) I'm always optimistic about my future.
- 5) I enjoy my friends a lot.
- 6) It's important for me to keep busy.
- 7) I hardly ever expect things to go my way.
- 8) I don't get upset too easily.
- 9) I rarely count on good things happening to me.
- 10) Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.

Self-Monitoring Scale

Please answer true or false for each item, as they may apply to you.

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
2. In different situations and with different people, I often act like a very different person.
3. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).
4. I guess I put on a show to impress and entertain people.
5. In a group of people, I am rarely the center of attention.
6. I am not always the person I appear to be.
7. At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
8. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.
9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
10. I would probably make a good actor/actress.
11. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have no information.
12. I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should.
13. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
14. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
15. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.
16. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
17. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people in different situations.
18. I have considered being an entertainer.

APPENDIX C

MILLENNIAL PILOT STUDY RESULTS

Table C.1
Correlation Matrix for Personality Factors of Millennial Participants

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
1. Openness	186	2.84	0.32	1		
2. Conscientiousness	186	3.00	0.33	0.02	1	
3. Extroversion	186	2.87	0.32	-0.008	-0.037	1
4. Agreeableness	186	2.96	0.35	-0.03	.183*	-0.037
5. Neuroticism	186	3.30	0.29	0.017	0.055	-0.043
6. Internal LOC	186	5.05	0.82	0.087	0.025	-0.019
7. Chance LOC	186	3.20	0.96	0.01	0.107	0.025
8. Powerful Others LOC	186	3.00	1.08	0.044	0.14	-0.119
9. Sense of Self	186	2.65	0.58	-0.055	.289**	0.004
10. Optimism	186	3.68	0.64	0.024	-.236**	-0.137

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed). ** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

Table C.1 - continued

	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Openness						
2. Conscientiousness						
3. Extroversion						
4. Agreeableness	1					
5. Neuroticism	0.064	1				
6. Internal LOC	-0.032	0.107	1			
7. Chance LOC	-0.087	-.149*	-0.041	1		
8. Powerful Others LOC	.208**	0.006	-0.001	.663**	1	
9. Sense of Self	.273**	-0.024	-.155*	.457**	.488**	1
10. Optimism	-.195**	0.072	.219**	-.363**	-.343*	-.435**

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed). ** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

APPENDIX D

TOMORROW'S LEADERSHIP SURVEY MATERIALS

Demographic Information

Please select the answer choice that best applies to you.

Gender: Female Male

Year of birth: In or after 1980 Before 1980

Date of Birth (MM/DD/YYYY): _____

How old are you (in years)? _____

Race (Please select the answer choice that best applies to you):

- a- White/Caucasian
- b- Black/African-American
- c- Hispanic/Latin
- d- Asian
- e- Other (please specify): _____

Please indicate your current enrollment status:

- a- Freshman
- b- Sophomore
- c- Junior
- d- Senior
- e- Graduate/ Advanced Degree Student
- f- Not currently enrolled in school

On average, I work...

- a) less than 5 hours a week
- b) more than 5 but less than 15 hours a week
- c) more than 15 but less than 25 hours a week

- d) more than 25 but less than 35 hours a week
- e) more than 35 but less than 45 hours a week
- f) more than 45 hours a week
- g) Not currently employed

I currently work...

- a) one job at one company
- b) two different jobs at different companies
- c) three different jobs at different companies
- d) four or more different jobs at different companies
- e) Not currently employed

Please indicate the industry in which you are primarily employed.

- a- Restaurant/Retail
- b- Sales/Marketing
- c- Technical/Manufacturing/Engineering
- d- Medical/Healthcare
- e- Education/Government/Non-Profit
- f- Financial/Legal
- g- Consulting/Professional
- h- Other
- i- Not currently employed

I consider my current employment to be...

- a- Full time and temporary
- b- Full time and permanent

- c- Part time and permanent
- d- Part time and temporary
- e-Not Currently employed

I consider my current employment...

- a- A stepping stone to permanent employment with the same company
- b- A stepping stone to permanent employment with a different company but in the same field
- c- A stepping stone to permanent employment with a different company and a different field
- d- To already be my permanent employment
- e- A stepping stone to temporary employment with a different company but in the same field
- f- A stepping stone to temporary employment with a different company and a different field
- e) Not Currently employed

I am paid...

- a- hourly plus tips
- b- hourly
- c- salary plus commission
- d- salary
- e) Not Currently employed

I would classify the type of my job as:

- a- skilled or unskilled labor
- b- professional, technical, or sales
- c- clerical
- d- managerial
- e) not currently employed

Section 1: LOC Scale

Please read each item carefully and choose the answer choice that best applies to you. Below is a rating scale, which shows what the ratings represent.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Not True | | | | | | Very True |
1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 2. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 3. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 4. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 5. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 6. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 7. When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 8. Even if I were a good leader, I would not be made a leader unless I play up to those in positions of power.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 9. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 10. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 11. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 12. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------
 13. People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of powerful other people.

Not True – 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 – Very True
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

14. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
15. Getting what I want means I have to please those people above me.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
16. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
17. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't have many friends.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
18. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
19. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
20. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
21. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
23. My life is determined by my own actions.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True
24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.
 Not True – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very True

Section 2: BIDR

Instructions: Using the scale below as a guide, select the rating that best applies to you to indicate how much you agree with it:

1 – Not True 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Very true

1. My first impression of people usually turns out to be right.
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
4. I have not always been honest with myself.
5. I always know why I like things.
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
11. I never regret my decisions.
12. I sometimes lose out of things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
15. I am a completely rational person.
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
17. I am very confident of my judgments.
18. I have sometimes doubted my abilities as a lover.
19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.
21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
22. I never cover up my mistakes.

23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
24. I never swear.
25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.
28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
30. I always declare everything at customs.
31. When I was young, I sometimes stole things.
32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
39. I have some pretty awful habits.
40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Section 3: Matching Leaders

Below are four descriptions of various leadership styles. Please carefully read each description and select which of the answer choices (i.e., leader synopses) most resembles the leader description. **Select your answer by circling the answer choice.**

1. I very much like to focus on setting future-oriented goals both for myself and for my followers. Setting goals are important to me because they emphasize to followers the importance of continuing to strive towards what you want and to not stop until you have attained it. In achieving goals, I believe that there will be moments of personal sacrifice, whether it is a sacrifice of time, energy, knowledge, or even powerful emotions. But I also believe that this self-sacrifice is one way to bring people together as a unit/group. I strive to always lead by example so as to encourage others to follow in my footsteps. I pride myself on a being role model; therefore, my own self-sacrificing behavior helps to encourage and influence other people to commit towards the achieving goals and outcomes. Additionally, it is my opinion that both group goals and individual goals should be extremely important to everyone. I am a firm believer in working together to accomplish goals. Not only can this have an effect on the achievement of what we want for ourselves but it can also greatly impact us as a group and even the world around us.

I believe that I am a very good communicator and motivator because I like to emphasize all of the many positive possibilities of what this world could be like in the future. I believe that it is important for people to look to the future and assess what they want out of it and what they wish to accomplish in it. I constantly encourage people to go after what they want and believe that people are creators of their own destinies. I continually encourage others to create the life that they wish to live.

Additionally, I have been told that I have a very charismatic personality, and I do use this as an advantage when leading others. Overall, my goal as a leader is to bring people together by giving them a sense of meaning and identity that promotes good social interactions with one another.

Which of the descriptions below most accurately reflects the behavior of the leader? Circle the letter beside your answer choice:

- A. Has a high patience in waiting for the right moment; uses logical arguments when attempting to motivate others; deals well with the facts; emphasizes the current issues at hand; believes in using images to influence and motivate followers; focuses on situational factors that may prevent a goal from being achieved.
- B. Has an air about them that encourages others to trust/follow them; leads through role-modeling/self-sacrificing behaviors; motivational speaker; appeals to the masses; gives followers a sense of meaning/identity that promotes good social interactions; emphasizes positive, future-oriented goals; believes that people are in charge of their own destinies.
- C. Has a strong focus on the followers needs; leads by example; acts in positive ways; develops prosocial relationships with each follower; shows great enthusiasm towards change initiatives; communicates through a friendly, open, and frank manner; emphasizes personal integrity; possess a serving mentality; believes in expressing personal views; stays enthusiastic about change; approaches leadership through a friend mentality.
- D. Has good interpersonal relationships with followers; seeks out those who are intrinsically like them; focuses on the negative consequences of past mistakes; emphasizes goals that have been proven effective based on past experiences; believes in attaining goals through the elimination of situational factors that would hinder the attainment of goals; believes in a shared leadership environment.
- E. None of the above.
- F. Not sure.
- G. Not applicable (i.e., I do not wish to answer this question).

2. I like to emphasize those goals that I already know are capable of being achieved, whether knowing this through my own personal experiences or from the experiences of those around me. I believe that achieving goals are due in large part to external situational factors (like the economy for example) that are out of my control; therefore, I do not believe in wasting time on goals that, due to outside forces, might be beyond our reach. In my opinion, sometimes it doesn't matter how hard you work towards something, some situations simply lend themselves to not being able to achieve a goal. However, whenever possible, I tend to strongly focus my attention and the attention of others on removing those external problems that can be removed which might hinder the achievement of either the group's and/or the individual's goals.

I have a tendency to surround myself with people who are intrinsically like me and who already share the same goals as me. Because I prefer to work with individuals who share the same goals and values as me, I tend to promote more of an open and shared leadership environment because I feel confident that those who follow me will think and act like I would. Basically, I feel that the responsibilities of a leader should be shared between followers and leaders. By doing this, each member of the group is able to have a great impact in taking action to change problematic situations. By focusing on creating the 'right' situation first, successfully achieving goals becomes easier to do, at least in my opinion.

As far as my communication style, I usually rely on making emotional pleas to help bring together my followers. Instead of trying to motivate the masses, I like to gather together similar individuals who already share my goals. However, I do believe that maintaining good interpersonal relationship with my followers (being friends with them) is key to my success as a leader. I frequently communicate the importance of fixing past mistakes by reminding people of the negative outcomes of those mistakes, and then discussing what could and should have been done to improve the outcome. In this manner, I don't advocate for the invention of new goals, but rather I communicate the need to atone for past mistakes in order to make a better world for tomorrow.

Which of the descriptions below most accurately reflects the behavior of the leader? Circle the letter beside your answer choice:

- A. Has a high patience in waiting for the right moment; uses logical arguments when attempting to motivate others; deals well with the facts; emphasizes the current issues at hand; believes in using images to influence and motivate followers; focuses on situational factors that may prevent a goal from being achieved.
- B. Has an air about them that encourages others to trust/follow them; leads through role-modeling/self-sacrificing behaviors; motivational speaker; appeals to the masses; gives followers a sense of meaning/identity that promotes good social interactions; emphasizes positive, future-oriented goals; believes that people are in charge of their own destinies.
- C. Has a strong focus on the followers needs; leads by example; acts in positive ways; develops prosocial relationships with each follower; shows great enthusiasm towards change initiatives; communicates through a friendly, open, and frank manner; emphasizes personal integrity; possess a serving mentality; believes in expressing personal views; stays enthusiastic about change; approaches leadership through a friend mentality.
- D. Has good interpersonal relationships with followers; seeks out those who are intrinsically like them; focuses on the negative consequences of past mistakes; emphasizes goals that have been proven effective based on past experiences; believes in attaining goals through the elimination of situational factors that would hinder the attainment of goals; believes in a shared leadership environment.
- E. None of the above.
- F. Not sure.
- G. Not applicable (i.e., I do not wish to answer this question).

3. As a leader, I believe that goals should be attempted only when the perfect situation calls for it. I am a firm believer in 'waiting for the right moment'. Because of this, I like to focus on situational issues (for example, the fall of the economy), which might have been the cause of a problem, rather than on the specific problem itself. In analyzing a problem, I look at the situation to figure out why it happened and then try to find a way to fix the problem that is a result of the situation. Once I have the solution, then I wait for the exact opportune moment that would provide the greatest impact on me achieving the goal or outcome. Because I focus so strongly on situational-based factors, I like to use global images to impact my followers because I think this is one of the best ways to motivate them. A real-life example of using global images was when the government used images of the burning Twin Towers in New York after the planes had hit them in order to motivate the public to back the need to retaliate and start a war against terrorism. Although this is an extreme example, it still illustrates the effectiveness of this type of motivator in achieving desired outcomes.

I prefer to focus on reaching current, present-day goals, rather than looking towards the future. I suppose one could say that my leadership style is very here-and-now, step-by-step, and methodical. I see things as being caused by both people and situational factors; therefore, I view actions as being things we can change and fix, as long as we wait for the right conditions in which to act.

As for my communication style, I prefer to use logical/rational arguments when attempting to motivate or gain backing from my followers. I try to realistically analyze situations for what they are and then I relay that information back to my followers in an understandable way. In other words, I like sticking to the facts. I have to admit, I do tend to focus most of my attention on those individuals who are in the upper echelons (very smart, very wealthy, etc.) because I think they can benefit my cause. It has been my experience that these types of individuals are keenly aware of and involved in current events and therefore they can help me to take control over important and unforeseen situations. My commitment to my followers is one of mutual interest rather than personal interest. Because of this, when trying to persuade others I generally use rational influence tactics (i.e., communicating the facts), rather than resorting to emotional appeals or scare tactics.

Which of the descriptions below most accurately reflects the behavior of the leader? Circle the letter beside your answer choice:

- A. Has a high patience in waiting for the right moment; uses logical arguments when attempting to motivate others; deals well with the facts; emphasizes the current issues at hand; believes in using images to influence and motivate followers; focuses on situational factors that may prevent a goal from being achieved.
- B. Has an air about them that encourages others to trust/follow them; leads through role-modeling/self-sacrificing behaviors; motivational speaker; appeals to the masses; gives followers a sense of meaning/identity that promotes good social interactions; emphasizes positive, future-oriented goals; believes that people are in charge of their own destinies.
- C. Has a strong focus on the followers needs; leads by example; acts in positive ways; develops prosocial relationships with each follower; shows great enthusiasm towards change initiatives; communicates through a friendly, open, and frank manner; emphasizes personal integrity; possess a serving mentality; believes in expressing personal views; stays enthusiastic about change; approaches leadership through a friend mentality.
- D. Has good interpersonal relationships with followers; seeks out those who are intrinsically like them; focuses on the negative consequences of past mistakes; emphasizes goals that have been proven effective based on past experiences; believes in attaining goals through the elimination of situational factors that would hinder the attainment of goals; believes in a shared leadership environment.
- E. None of the above.
- F. Not sure.
- G. Not applicable (i.e., I do not wish to answer this question).

4. As a leader, I focus on serving those around me whether they are followers, customers, clients, or members of the community. I am a firm believer in maintaining one's personal integrity and I try to lead in that way. I tend to focus on the individual follower's needs because I believe that it leads to building a greater trust between my followers and me, and vice-versa. I try to develop positive relationships with each of my followers in order to promote highly committed followers. I have a 'lead-by-example' sort of mentality when it comes to being a leader. I feel that if I act in a certain way, then my followers will copy my behaviors. Because of this, I tend to try and show great enthusiasm towards change initiatives that I put into action.

I constantly encourage my followers to challenge the status quo by doing better and being better than they were before, so that they may have a greater impact on things. It is an important philosophy of mine to encourage people to convey and express their differing views in an open and free manner because, in my book, there are no right or wrong opinions. I want my followers to feel comfortable enough with each other and with me to be able to fully express their thoughts and opinions. By first meeting the needs of the followers, I believe that the needs of the group will likely be met simply due to the followers feeling a sense of commitment and obligation towards both the group and the goals/missions.

My general communication style is that of a friend. I try and approach my followers with the attitude of an equal, but also as someone who is there to listen and see to any of their needs. In my experience, followers seem to warm to me faster and develop a stronger sense of commitment to me as a leader, and to the group as a whole, when I communicate through a friendly, open, and frank manner. Rather than preach to people or bark out orders, I like to develop an interpersonal relationship (e.g., become friends) with each and every one of my followers, which then allows me to simply talk to my followers about what needs to be done, rather than having to give big speeches.

Which of the descriptions below most accurately reflects the behavior of the leader? Circle the letter beside your answer choice:

- A. Has a high patience in waiting for the right moment; uses logical arguments when attempting to motivate others; deals well with the facts; emphasizes the current issues at hand; believes in using images to influence and motivate followers; focuses on situational factors that may prevent a goal from being achieved.
- B. Has an air about them that encourages others to trust/follow them; leads through role-modeling/self-sacrificing behaviors; motivational speaker; appeals to the masses; gives followers a sense of meaning/identity that promotes good social interactions; emphasizes positive, future-oriented goals; believes that people are in charge of their own destinies.
- C. Has a strong focus on the followers needs; leads by example; acts in positive ways; develops prosocial relationships with each follower; shows great enthusiasm towards change initiatives; communicates through a friendly, open, and frank manner; emphasizes personal integrity; possess a serving mentality; believes in expressing personal views; stays enthusiastic about change; approaches leadership through a friend mentality.
- D. Has good interpersonal relationships with followers; seeks out those who are intrinsically like them; focuses on the negative consequences of past mistakes; emphasizes goals that have been proven effective based on past experiences; believes in attaining goals through the elimination of situational factors that would hinder the attainment of goals; believes in a shared leadership environment.
- E. None of the above.
- F. Not sure.
- G. Not applicable (i.e., I do not wish to answer this question).

Section 4: Leader A, B, C, or D (depending on the randomization) Profile
(Charismatic Leadership)

In a brief summary, please explain yourself as a leader and the approach you take towards leading others. Also, describe your communication skills and any other skills that will help us to assess you as a leader:

I very much like to focus on setting future-oriented goals both for myself and for my followers. Setting goals are important to me because they emphasize to followers the importance of continuing to strive towards what you want and to not stop until you have attained it. In achieving goals, I believe that there will be moments of personal sacrifice, whether it is a sacrifice of time, energy, knowledge, or even powerful emotions. But I also believe that this self-sacrifice is one way to bring people together as a unit/group. I strive to always lead by example so as to encourage others to follow in my footsteps. I pride myself on a being role model; therefore, my own self-sacrificing behavior helps to encourage and influence other people to commit towards the achieving goals and outcomes. Additionally, it is my opinion that both group goals and individual goals should be extremely important to everyone. I am a firm believer in working together to accomplish goals. Not only can this have an effect on the achievement of what we want for ourselves but it can also greatly impact us as a group and even the world around us.

I believe that I am a very good communicator and motivator because I like to emphasize all of the many positive possibilities of what this world could be like in the future. I believe that it is important for people to look to the future and assess what they want out of it and what they wish to accomplish in it. I constantly encourage people to go after what they want and believe that people are creators of their own destinies. I continually encourage others to create the life that they wish to live.

Additionally, I have been told that I have a very charismatic personality, and I do use this as an advantage when leading others. Overall, my goal as a leader is to bring people together by giving them a sense of meaning and identity that promotes good social interactions with one another.

Please read through the below situation and explain in a brief and concise manner how you would handle it as a leader.

Situation: Some of your followers disagree with your proposed actions or the direction in which you are trying to lead the group. As a leader, how would you handle this issue?

I would call for a group meeting in which I would explain to the group the great importance of my proposed actions. I would do this by pointing out the many positive outcomes of achieving these goals if they were to take my directions and begin to follow my instructions. I would explain that in order to achieve our long-term goals, sacrifices are going to have to be made by everyone involved. I would also point out that this is the only way that our goals can be reached. I would make sure to act as a role model so that others might begin to follow my lead. Hopefully by doing this, I would reassure any followers that may have been questioning my actions, and then the group as a whole would become more committed to the direction we are heading in.

Leader A:

Please rate the leader on these next items. Read each item carefully and then rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 – Strongly Disagree

2

3

4

5

6 – Strongly Agree

7 – Not Applicable / Decline to Answer

1. This leader would be an effective leader in a work environment.
2. This leader would do a good job.
3. I would like to work with this leader.
4. This leader would help to further a group/organization.
5. This leader would appeal to followers of and around my age.
6. I would get along with this leader.
7. I would be friends with this leader.
8. I have worked with a leader such as this before.
9. I know a leader such as this.
10. If you yourself were or are currently a leader, would you consider yourself to share this same approach in leadership style? If you are not a leader, please select the Not Applicable.

YES

NO

N/A

11. If you just answered "YES" to the past questions, please rate how strongly you would identify with this leader (i.e., 1- I do not strongly identify with this leader, 6- I do strongly identify with this leader).

Leader A, B, C, or D (depending on the randomization) Profile
(Ideological Leadership)

In a brief summary, please explain yourself as a leader and the approach you take towards leading others. Also describe your communication skills and any other skills that will help us to ascertain you as a leader:

I like to emphasize those goals that I already know are capable of being achieved, whether knowing this through my own personal experiences or from the experiences of those around me. I believe that achieving goals are due in large part to external situational factors (like the economy for example) that are out of my control; therefore, I do not believe in wasting time on goals that, due to outside forces, might be beyond our reach. In my opinion, sometimes it doesn't matter how hard you work towards something, some situations simply lend themselves to not being able to achieve a goal. However, whenever possible, I tend to strongly focus my attention and the attention of others on removing those external problems that can be removed which might hinder the achievement of either the group's and/or the individual's goals.

I have a tendency to surround myself with people who are intrinsically like me and who already share the same goals as me. Because I prefer to work with individuals who share the same goals and values as me, I tend to promote more of an open and shared leadership environment because I feel confident that those who follow me will think and act like I would. Basically, I feel that the responsibilities of a leader should be shared between followers and leaders. By doing this, each member of the group is able to have a great impact in taking action to change problematic situations. By focusing on creating the 'right' situation first, successfully achieving goals becomes easier to do, at least in my opinion.

As far as my communication style, I usually rely on making emotional pleas to help bring together my followers. Instead of trying to motivate the masses, I like to gather together similar individuals who already share my goals. However, I do believe that maintaining good interpersonal relationship with my followers (being friends with them) is key to my success as a leader. I frequently communicate the importance of fixing past mistakes by reminding people of the negative outcomes of those mistakes, and then discussing what could and should have been done to improve the outcome. In this manner, I don't advocate for the invention of new goals, but rather I communicate the need to atone for past mistakes in order to make a better world for tomorrow.

Please read through the below situations and explain in a brief and concise manner how you would handle it as a leader.

Situation: Some of your followers disagree with your proposed actions or the direction in which you are trying to lead the group. As a leader, how would you handle this issue?

I would handle this situation by meeting with the followers in question and re-emphasize to them the negative outcomes that will happen from not doing as I have instructed. I would try to illustrate to them the past mistakes that have been made by others who didn't take these actions and then attempt to get them to re-commit to the group direction. I would also explain to them that without taking these actions, the perfect situation would be missed, our goal would not be achieved, and then we would be making the exact same mistakes as those before us.

Leader B:

Please rate the leader on these next items. Read each item carefully and then rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 – Strongly Disagree

2

3

4

5

6 – Strongly Agree

7 – Not Applicable / Decline to Answer

1. This leader would be an effective leader in a work environment.
2. This leader would do a good job.
3. I would like to work with this leader.
4. This leader would help to further a group/organization.
5. This leader would appeal to followers of and around my age.
6. I would get along with this leader.
7. I would be friends with this leader.
8. I have worked with a leader such as this before.
9. I know a leader such as this.
10. If you yourself were or are currently a leader, would you consider yourself to share this same approach in leadership style? If you are not a leader, please circle the Not Applicable.

YES

NO

N/A

11. If you just answered "YES" to the past questions, please rate how strongly you would identify with this leader (i.e., 1- I do not strongly identify with this leader, 6- I do strongly identify with this leader).

Leader A, B, C, or D (depending on the randomization) Profile
(Pragmatic Leadership)

In a brief summary, please explain yourself as a leader and the approach you take towards leading other. Also describe your communication skills and any other skills that will help us to ascertain you as a leader:

As a leader, I believe that goals should be attempted only when the perfect situation calls for it. I am a firm believer in 'waiting for the right moment'. Because of this, I like to focus on situational issues (for example, the fall of the economy), which might have been the cause of a problem, rather than on the specific problem itself. In analyzing a problem, I look at the situation to figure out why it happened and then try to find a way to fix the problem that is a result of the situation. Once I have the solution, then I wait for the exact opportune moment that would provide the greatest impact on me achieving the goal or outcome. Because I focus so strongly on situational-based factors, I like to use global images to impact my followers because I think this is one of the best ways to motivate them. A real-life example of using global images was when the government used images of the burning Twin Towers in New York after the planes had hit them in order to motivate the public to back the need to retaliate and start a war against terrorism. Although this is an extreme example, it still illustrates the effectiveness of this type of motivator in achieving desired outcomes.

I prefer to focus on reaching current, present-day goals, rather than looking towards the future. I suppose one could say that my leadership style is very here-and-now, step-by-step, and methodical. I see things as being caused by both people and situational factors; therefore, I view actions as being things we can change and fix, as long as we wait for the right conditions in which to act.

As for my communication style, I prefer to use logical/rational arguments when attempting to motivate or gain backing from my followers. I try to realistically analyze situations for what they are and then I relay that information back to my followers in an understandable way. In other words, I like sticking to the facts. I have to admit, I do tend to focus most of my attention on those individuals who are in the upper echelons (very smart, very wealthy, etc.) because I think they can benefit my cause. It has been my experience that these types of individuals are keenly aware of and involved in current events and therefore they can help me to take control over important and unforeseen situations. My commitment to my followers is one of mutual interest rather than personal interest. Because of this, when trying to persuade others I generally use rational influence tactics (i.e., communicating the facts), rather than resorting to emotional appeals or scare tactics.

Please read through the below situations and explain in a brief and concise manner how you would handle it as a leader.

Situation: Some of your followers disagree with your proposed actions or the direction in which you are trying to lead the group. As a leader, how would you handle this issue?

As stated above, I stick to the facts; therefore, if I had followers who were questioning my instructions or tactics, I would simply restate the facts of the situation. I would explain to them again that I have thoroughly analyzed the situation and have found that if we don't act now, our goal would not be achieved and negative outcomes will occur. I would stick to: (a) relaying the facts of the situation, (b) explaining why I am taking the direction that I am, and (c) describing how by following my instructions, they too will benefit. My beliefs should be their beliefs because, after all, we are both after the same thing. I am simply providing the avenue for us to achieve those shared goals.

Leader C:

Please rate the leader on these next items. Read each item carefully and then rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 – Strongly Disagree

2

3

4

5

6 – Strongly Agree

7 – Not Applicable / Decline to Answer

1. This leader would be an effective leader in a work environment.
2. This leader would do a good job.
3. I would like to work with this leader.
4. This leader would help to further a group/organization.
5. This leader would appeal to followers of and around my age.
6. I would get along with this leader.
7. I would be friends with this leader.
8. I have worked with a leader such as this before.
9. I know a leader such as this.
10. If you yourself were or are currently a leader, would you consider yourself to share this same approach in leadership style? If you are not a leader, please circle the Not Applicable.

YES

NO

N/A

11. If you just answered "YES" to the past questions, please rate how strongly you would identify with this leader (i.e., 1- I do not strongly identify with this leader, 6- I do strongly identify with this leader).

Leader A, B, C, or D (depending on the randomization) Profile
(Servant Leadership)

In a brief summary, please explain yourself as a leader and the approach you take towards leading others. Also describe your communication skills and any other skills that will help us to ascertain you as a leader:

As a leader, I focus on serving those around me whether they are followers, customers, clients, or members of the community. I am a firm believer in maintaining one's personal integrity and I try to lead in that way. I tend to focus on the individual follower's needs because I believe that it leads to building a greater trust between my followers and me, and vice versa. I try to develop positive relationships with each of my followers in order to promote highly committed followers. I have a 'lead-by-example' sort of mentality when it comes to being a leader. I feel that if I act in a certain way, then my followers will copy my behaviors. Because of this, I tend to try and show great enthusiasm towards change initiatives that I put into action.

I constantly encourage my followers to challenge the status quo by doing better and being better than they were before, so that they may have a greater impact on things. It is an important philosophy of mine to encourage people to convey and express their differing views in an open and free manner because, in my book, there are no right or wrong opinions. I want my followers to feel comfortable enough with each other and with me to be able to fully express their thoughts and opinions. By first meeting the needs of the followers, I believe that the needs of the group will likely be met simply due to the followers feeling a sense of commitment and obligation towards both the group and the goals/missions.

My general communication style is that of a friend. I try and approach my followers with the attitude of an equal, but also as someone who is there to listen and see to any of their needs. In my experience, followers seem to warm to me faster and develop a stronger sense of commitment to me as a leader, and to the group as a whole, when I communicate through a friendly, open, and frank manner. My motto as a leader is to serve my followers; this tends to guide much of my communication style. Rather than preach to people or bark out orders, I like to develop an interpersonal relationship (e.g., become friends) with each and every one of my followers, which then allows me to simply talk to my followers about what needs to be done, rather than having to give big speeches.

Please read through the below situations and explain in a brief and concise manner how you would handle it as a leader.

Situation: Some of your followers disagree with your proposed actions or the direction in which you are trying to lead the group. As a leader, how would you handle this issue?

Firstly, I would hope that these followers would have come to me when they first had an issue with the direction in which I was taking the group, so that we could have talked it out and found a better solution. Either way, I would call for an open discussion session in which I would encourage the followers to express their issues or concerns about the direction we were heading in. I would listen to their concerns and alternative options, and then as a group we would all come to an agreement as to what actions to take. I am not opposed to compromising if it is for the better of the group.

Leader D:

Please rate the leader on these next items. Read each item carefully and then rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 – Strongly Disagree

2

3

4

5

6 – Strongly Agree

7 – Not Applicable / Decline to Answer

1. This leader would be an effective leader in a work environment.
2. This leader would do a good job.
3. I would like to work with this leader.
4. This leader would help to further a group/organization.
5. This leader would appeal to followers of and around my age.
6. I would get along with this leader.
7. I would be friends with this leader.
8. I have worked with a leader such as this before.
9. I know a leader such as this.
10. If you yourself were or are currently a leader, would you consider yourself to share this same approach in leadership style? If you are not a leader, please circle the Not Applicable.

YES

NO

N/A

11. If you just answered "YES" to the past questions, please rate how strongly you would identify with this leader (i.e., 1- I do not strongly identify with this leader, 6- I do strongly identify with this leader).

Section 5: Overall Ratings:

In these next questions/items, please check the box associated with the specific leadership candidate of your choosing. If you need to or would like to read through a short synopsis of each leader's profiles again, you may do so scrolling to the bottom of the page. Please note which leaders' profile you are reading (i.e., Leader A, B, C, or D).

Leader A Leader B Leader C Leader D

1. Of the four leadership profiles, which leader would you **most** prefer to work with? _____
Why?

2. Of the four leadership profiles, which leader would you **most** like to be friends with?
_____ Why?

3. Of the four leadership profiles, which leader would you **least** prefer to work with?
_____ Why?

4. In the following, please give a ranking as to which leadership profile leader you **would prefer** to have (i.e., 1 – your first leadership choice, 2 – your second leadership choice, 3 – your third leadership choice, and 4 – your last leadership choice). Do so by marking an 'X' in the appropriate column.

	1	2	3	4
a. Leader A				
b. Leader B				
c. Leader C				
d. Leader D				

5. Please select your proposed gender of the four leaders. To be more precise, while reading the leader profiles did you have an opinion of whether these leaders were male or female? Please answer the below items with your opinion of the gender of each leader.

Leader A:

Female	Male	I couldn't tell the gender.	Not sure.	Not applicable.
Leader B: Female	Male	I couldn't tell the gender.	Not sure.	Not applicable.
Leader C: Female	Male	I couldn't tell the gender.	Not sure.	Not applicable.
Leader D: Female	Male	I couldn't tell the gender.	Not sure.	Not applicable.

Synopses:

Leader A: Has an air about them that encourages others to trust/follow them; leads through role-modeling/self-sacrificing behaviors; motivational speaker; appeals to the masses; gives followers a sense of meaning/identity that promotes good social interactions; emphasizes positive, future-oriented goals; believes that people are in charge of their own destinies.

Leader B: Has good interpersonal relationships with followers; seeks out those who are intrinsically like them; focuses on the negative consequences of past mistakes; emphasizes goals that have been proven effective based on past experiences; believes in attaining goals through the elimination of situational factors that would hinder the attainment of goals; believes in a shared leadership environment.

Leader C: Has a high patience in waiting for the right moment; uses logical arguments when attempting to motivate others; deals well with the facts; emphasizes the current issues at hand; believes in using images to influence and motivate followers; focuses on situational factors that may prevent a goal from being achieved.

Leader D: Has a strong focus on the followers needs; leads by example; acts in positive ways; develops prosocial relationships with each follower; shows great enthusiasm towards change initiatives; communicates through a friendly, open, and frank manner; emphasizes personal integrity; possess a serving mentality; believes in expressing personal views; stays enthusiastic about change; approaches leadership through a friend mentality.

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL TOMORROW'S LEADERSHIP SURVEY MATERIALS

INFORMED CONSENT

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR NAME:

Alysia A. Bransford

TITLE OF PROJECT:

Tomorrow's Leadership

INTRODUCTION

You are being asked to participate in an online survey research study. Your participation is voluntary. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

REQUIREMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

To be eligible to participate in this study, you must be 18 years or older (or have parental consent) and be able to read and understand English.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this research study is to help gain a better understanding of the preferences persons have towards various leadership style. The study seeks to gain information as to the type of leader current individuals will have a higher preference for.

DURATION: This study will last 30 minutes.

PROCEDURES: During this study, you will be instructed to review a brief set of instructions, read through four leader profiles, and answer survey questions.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES: Once you have completed reviewing this form and consenting to participate, you will be asked to complete the online survey in good faith with conscientious answers. Sona credit will be allocated within one week of survey completion.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS: You understand that you will receive no direct benefit other than:

- Knowledge that participation in this study will aid efforts in the understanding of leadership preferences
- A copy of any publications resulting from the current study if requested

COMPENSATION: For student participants, 1/2 point (i.e., 0.5 points) of Sona credit is available for participants. For those participants who are not students, or are not enrolled in classes which offer the extra credit points, participants will not receive any other form of compensation.

POSSIBLE RISKS/DISCOMFORTS: There are no known risks associated with participating in this research study; however, should you feel uncomfortable you have the option to quit at any time with no consequence.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES/TREATMENTS: You may participate in other studies available on Sona, or complete the requirements for the paper reports (available through Sona) if desired.

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE STUDY: Participation in this study is completely voluntary and will not affect any grade or status in any program or class. If, in good faith, you decide to withdraw from further participation in this study, there will be no penalties.

Furthermore, please note that you are not required to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering during the course of this study. If any questions are not clear, please ask for clarification from the researchers.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: We expect up to 500 participants to enroll in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your identity will be kept confidential. Your confidentiality during the study will be ensured by assigning you a coded identification number during the data collection process. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in a locked file, with only Alysia A. Bransford having access to this information. Your name will not be directly associated with any data. The confidentiality of the information related to your participation in this research will be ensured by maintaining records only coded by identification numbers. Copies of electronic data will be kept under lock and key, and will only be viewed by lab researchers. Individual data will be aggregated to the group level, thus individual responses will not be published nor presented. Data will be maintained for 3 years after study procedures are complete. Moreover, only select research assistants with the lab will have access to any of the data. If the results of this research are published or presented at scientific meetings, your identity will not be disclosed.

If in the unlikely event it becomes necessary for the Institutional Review Board to review your research records, then The University of Texas at Arlington will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by law. Your research records will not be released without your consent unless required by law or a court order. The data resulting from your participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. In these cases, the data will contain no identifying information that could associate you with it, or with your participation in any study.

CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS: You are encouraged to contact us with any questions or concerns that you might have. **Furthermore, we will gladly provide you with an in-person debriefing regarding this form, the program or the research if you desire.**

Alysia A. Bransford
alysia.bransford@mavs.uta.edu

Dr. Nicolette Lopez
(817) 272-5480 (office)
nlopez@uta.edu

Questions about this research or your rights as a research subject may be directed to Alysia Bransford at alysia.bransford@mavs.uta.edu, or Dr. Nicolette Lopez at (817) 272-5480, or nlopez@uta.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you can contact the UT Arlington IRB Chairperson, telephone (817) 272-3723.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Participation in this research experiment is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or quit at any time without any form of consequences.

By clicking yes below, you confirm that you have read this document and that you agree to participate in this study. If your e-mail address is provided by you, you will be e-mailed a copy of this informed consent document. You have been and will continue to be given the chance to ask

questions and to discuss your participation with the investigators.

By clicking yes below you understand your rights as a participant, you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, and you are 18 years or older or have obtained parental consent for research participation.

If you are under 18 years old, by clicking yes below you verify that you have parental consent forms for the 2010-2011 academic school year on file with the psychology department of the University of Texas at Arlington.

I have read through and give my **consent** to participate in this online survey study.

Yes

No

Instructions for the Tomorrow's Leadership Survey Study

We would like to take this time to thank you for your support and participation in this study. You are being asked to participate in order to help researchers determine which of the four leaders people would prefer to work within an organization. We ask that you carefully read through all of the materials provided to you, and rate the survey items with care and truthful answers. In some cases, it might be helpful to pay close attention to key terms of the leadership styles, as well as paying special attention to each leader style (e.g., Leader A, Leader D, etc.).

Please take this time to read through your informed consent forms. Once you have read through the form and agreed to its terms, choose to consent to participating in the online survey.

Debriefing Form

This research was conducted as part of a study that aimed at looking at the leadership preference differences between generational cohorts. Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX F

TOMORROW'S LEADERSHIP SURVEY RESULTS TABLES

Table F.1
Leadership Preference Item Aggregation

Rating Item	Preference	Effectiveness	Liking	Familiarity
1. This leader would be an effective leader in a work environment.		X		
2. This leader would do a good job.	X	X		
3. I would like to work with this leader.	X		X	
4. This leader would help to further a group/organization.		X		
5. This leader would appeal to followers of and around my age.	X		X	
6. I would get along with this leader.	X		X	
7. I would be friends with this leader.	X		X	
8. I have worked with a leader such as this before.				X
9. I know a leader such as this.				X
10. If you yourself were or are currently a leader, would you consider yourself to share this same approach in leadership style? If you are not a leader, please circle the Not Applicable.				X
11. If you just answered "YES" to the past questions, please rate how strongly you would identify with this leader (i.e., 1- I do not strongly identify with this leader, 6- I do strongly identify with this leader).				X

Note. "X" represents what each item is rating for.

Table F.2
Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables Between Generations

Variable	<u>Millennial</u>			<u>Non-Millennial</u>		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	126	20.49	2.97	126	45.17	9.75
Internal LOC	126	5.09	0.83	126	5.40	0.73
Chance LOC	126	3.21	1.03	126	2.67	0.90
Powerful Others LOC	126	3.22	1.09	126	2.92	1.04
Charismatic Preference	126	4.11	0.57	126	4.10	0.68
Charismatic Effectiveness	126	4.27	0.61	126	4.22	0.67
Charismatic Liking	126	4.06	0.61	126	4.06	0.74
Charismatic Familiarity	126	3.88	0.63	126	4.12	0.58
Ideological Preference	126	3.54	0.72	126	3.26	0.76
Ideological Effectiveness	126	3.63	0.75	126	3.22	0.89
Ideological Liking	126	3.48	0.76	126	3.24	0.77
Ideological Familiarity	126	3.53	0.72	126	3.68	0.62
Pragmatic Preference	126	3.44	0.67	126	3.39	0.81
Pragmatic Effectiveness	126	3.64	0.80	126	3.48	0.93
Pragmatic Liking	126	3.4	0.71	126	3.36	0.84
Pragmatic Familiarity	126	3.59	0.62	126	3.66	0.63
Servant Preference	126	4.27	0.52	126	4.37	0.48
Servant Effectiveness	126	4.22	0.6	126	4.34	0.66
Servant Liking	126	4.26	0.54	126	4.37	0.48
Servant Familiarity	126	4.08	0.61	126	4.20	0.56
Social Desirability	126	161.15	22.85	126	171.12	25.22

Table F.3
Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables Overall

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Total		95% <i>CI</i>	
				<i>SE</i>	<i>Skewness</i>	lower	upper
Age	252	32.83	14.31	0.90	0.15	31.06	34.61
Internal LOC	252	5.25	0.90	0.05	-0.66	5.15	5.35
Chance LOC	252	2.94	1.00	0.06	0.33	2.81	3.06
Powerful Others LOC	252	3.07	1.07	0.07	0.23	2.94	3.20
Charismatic Preference	252	4.10	0.63	0.04	-0.63	4.03	4.18
Charismatic Effectiveness	252	4.24	0.64	0.04	-1.05	4.16	4.32
Charismatic Liking	252	4.06	0.68	0.04	-0.61	3.97	4.14
Charismatic Familiarity	252	4.00	0.61	0.04	-0.66	3.92	4.08
Ideological Preference	252	3.40	0.75	0.05	0.27	3.30	3.49
Ideological Effectiveness	252	3.43	0.85	0.05	0.03	3.32	3.53
Ideological Liking	252	3.36	0.77	0.05	0.31	3.26	3.45
Ideological Familiarity	252	3.60	0.67	0.04	-0.42	3.52	3.69
Pragmatic Preference	252	3.42	0.74	0.05	0.01	3.33	3.51
Pragmatic Effectiveness	252	3.56	0.87	0.05	-0.09	3.45	3.67
Pragmatic Liking	252	3.38	0.78	0.05	-0.02	3.29	3.48
Pragmatic Familiarity	252	3.62	0.62	0.04	-0.28	3.55	3.70
Servant Preference	252	4.32	0.50	0.03	-1.23	4.26	4.38
Servant Effectiveness	252	4.28	0.63	0.04	-1.22	4.20	4.36
Servant Liking	252	4.32	0.51	0.03	-1.20	4.25	4.38
Servant Familiarity	252	4.14	0.58	0.04	-1.06	4.07	4.21
Social Desirability	252	166.14	24.53	1.55	0.23	163.09	169.18

Table F.4
Correlation Matrix for All Variables

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
1. Age	252	32.83	14.31	1		
2. Internal LOC	252	5.25	0.80	0.13*	1	
3. Chance LOC	252	2.94	1.00	-0.27**	-0.1	1
4. Powerful Others LOC	252	3.07	1.07	-0.13*	-0.04	0.71**
5. Charismatic Preference	252	4.10	0.63	-0.11	0.05	0.02
6. Charismatic Effectiveness	252	4.24	0.64	-0.13*	0.08	0.01
7. Charismatic Liking	252	4.06	0.68	-0.10	0.04	0.010
8. Charismatic Familiarity	252	4.00	0.61	0.12	0.07	-0.07
9. Ideological Preference	252	3.40	0.75	-0.14*	-0.09	0.13
10. Ideological Effectiveness	252	3.43	0.85	-0.17**	-0.13	0.17**
11. Ideological Liking	252	3.36	0.77	-0.12	-0.07	0.11
12. Ideological Familiarity	252	3.60	0.67	0.08	0.08	0.02
13. Pragmatic Preference	252	3.42	0.74	-0.09	0.09	0.09
14. Pragmatic Effectiveness	252	3.56	0.87	-0.11	0.06	0.13*
15. Pragmatic Liking	252	3.38	0.78	-0.08	0.08	0.06
16. Pragmatic Familiarity	252	3.62	0.62	-0.03	0.20**	0.02
17. Servant Preference	252	4.32	0.50	0.05	0.18**	0.02
18. Servant Effectiveness	252	4.28	0.63	0.08	0.04	0.06
19. Servant Liking	252	4.32	0.51	0.05	0.18**	0.002
20. Servant Familiarity	252	4.14	0.58	0.13	0.01	0.04
21. Social Desirability	252	166.14	24.53	0.17**	0.22**	-0.32**

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table F.4 - continued

	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Age						
2. Internal LOC						
3. Chance LOC						
4. Powerful Others LOC	1					
5. Charismatic Preference	-0.01	1				
6. Charismatic Effectiveness	-0.02	0.76**	1			
7. Charismatic Liking	-0.01	0.98**	0.66**	1		
8. Charismatic Familiarity	-0.07	0.42**	0.37**	0.42**	1	
9. Ideological Preference	0.10	0.08	0.01	0.07	-0.12*	1
10. Ideological Effectiveness	0.14*	-0.01	-0.06	-0.01	-0.15*	0.78**
11. Ideological Liking	0.08	0.10	0.02	0.09	-0.10	0.98**
12. Ideological Familiarity	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.09	0.47**
13. Pragmatic Preference	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.09	0.01
14. Pragmatic Effectiveness	0.15*	0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.05	0.03
15. Pragmatic Liking	0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.09	-0.002
16. Pragmatic Familiarity	0.08	-0.04	-0.08	-0.03	0.07	-0.07
17. Servant Preference	-0.02	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.14*	0.004
18. Servant Effectiveness	-0.002	0.07	0.13*	0.06	0.12	0.01
19. Servant Liking	-0.02	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.13*	0.000
20. Servant Familiarity	0.14*	-0.09	-0.04	-0.10	-0.11	0.07
21. Social Desirability	-0.30**	0.08	0.02	0.10	0.14*	-0.12

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table F.4 - continued

	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age						
2. Internal LOC						
3. Chance LOC						
4. Powerful Others LOC						
5. Charismatic Preference						
6. Charismatic Effectiveness						
7. Charismatic Liking						
8. Charismatic Familiarity						
9. Ideological Preference						
10. Ideological Effectiveness	1					
11. Ideological Liking	0.65**	1				
12. Ideological Familiarity	0.34**	0.48**	1			
13. Pragmatic Preference	0.06	-0.003	0.05	1		
14. Pragmatic Effectiveness	0.11	-0.004	0.02	0.80**	1	
15. Pragmatic Liking	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.98**	0.68**	1
16. Pragmatic Familiarity	-0.03	-0.08	0.09	0.51**	0.37**	0.50**
17. Servant Preference	-0.02	0.001	0.07	-0.04	0.03	-0.06
18. Servant Effectiveness	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.05	-0.004
19. Servant Liking	-0.01	0.00	0.10	-0.05	0.03	-0.07
20. Servant Familiarity	0.03	0.08	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01
21. Social Desirability	-0.15*	-0.10	-0.07	0.05	-0.01	0.05

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table F.4 - continued

	16	17	18	19	20
1. Age					
2. Internal LOC					
3. Chance LOC					
4. Powerful Others LOC					
5. Charismatic Preference					
6. Charismatic Effectiveness					
7. Charismatic Liking					
8. Charismatic Familiarity					
9. Ideological Preference					
10. Ideological Effectiveness					
11. Ideological Liking					
12. Ideological Familiarity					
13. Pragmatic Preference					
14. Pragmatic Effectiveness					
15. Pragmatic Liking					
16. Pragmatic Familiarity	1				
17. Servant Preference	-0.02	1			
18. Servant Effectiveness	-0.01	0.75**	1		
19. Servant Liking	-0.01	0.98**	0.63**	1	
20. Servant Familiarity	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.03	1
21. Social Desirability	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.02	-0.08

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table F.5
Leadership Profile Manipulation Check Frequencies

Leader Profile	Answer Choice	Frequency	Percent (%)
Charismatic Leader	Charismatic	166	65.9%
	Ideological	7	2.8%
	Pragmatic	8	3.2%
	Servant	61	24.2%
	None of the above	6	2.4%
	Not sure	4	1.6%
Ideological Leader	Charismatic	14	5.6%
	Ideological	180	71.7%
	Pragmatic	14	5.6%
	Servant	26	10.4%
	None of the above	9	3.6%
	Not sure	8	3.2%
Pragmatic Leader	Charismatic	10	4.0%
	Ideological	7	2.8%
	Pragmatic	202	80.2%
	Servant	15	6.0%
	None of the above	5	2.0%
	Not sure	13	5.2%
Servant Leader	Charismatic	38	15.1%
	Ideological	31	12.3%
	Pragmatic	10	4.0%
	Servant	161	63.9%
	None of the above	3	1.2%
	Not sure	9	3.6%

Table F.6
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3a: Ideological Leaders

		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1				
	Constant	3.99	0.32	
	Social_Desirability	-0.004	0.002	-0.12
Step 2				
	Constant	3.85	0.34	
	Social_Desirability	-0.002	0.002	-0.08
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.11
	Centered_Powerful_Others	0.04	0.05	0.06
Step 3				
	Constant	3.86	0.34	
	Social_Desirability	-0.002	0.002	-0.08
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.11
	Centered_Powerful_Others	0.03	0.05	0.04
	Centered_Age X Centered_Powerful_Others	0.002	0.003	0.04

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.01$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.001$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.7
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3c: Ideological Leader

		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1				
	Constant	3.99	0.32	
	Social_Desirability	-0.004	0.002	-0.12
Step 2				
	Constant	3.82	0.34	
	Social_Desirability	-0.002	0.002	-0.07
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.10
	Centered_Chance	0.06	0.05	0.08
Step 3				
	Constant	3.82	0.34	
	Social_Desirability	-0.002	0.002	-0.07
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.004	-0.10
	Centered_Chance	0.06	0.06	0.09
	Centered_Age X Centered_Chance	-0.001	0.004	-0.01

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.01$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.000$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.8
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3b: Pragmatic Leader

		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1				
	Constant	3.17	0.32	
	Social_Desirability	0.002	0.002	0.05
Step 2				
	Constant	3.01	0.33	
	Social_Desirability	0.003	0.002	0.09
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.10
	Centered_Powerful_Others	0.06	0.05	0.08
Step 3				
	Constant	3.01	0.34	
	Social_Desirability	0.003	0.002	0.09
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.10
	Centered_Powerful_Others	0.06	0.05	0.09
	Centered_Age X Centered_Powerful_Others	-0.001	0.003	-0.02

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = -0.001$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.000$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.9
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3d: Pragmatic Leader

		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1				
	Constant	3.17	0.32	
	Social_Desirability	0.002	0.002	0.05
Step 2				
	Constant	3.00	0.33	
	Social_Desirability	0.003	0.002	0.10
	Centered_Age	-0.004	0.003	-0.08
	Centered_Powerful_Others	0.07	0.05	0.10
Step 3				
	Constant	2.95	0.34	
	Social_Desirability	0.003	0.002	0.10
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.004	-0.11
	Centered_Powerful_Others	0.10	0.06	0.13
	Centered_Age X Centered_Powerful_Others	-0.004	0.004	-0.09

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = -0.001$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.10
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3e: Charismatic Leader

		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1				
	Constant	3.76	0.27	
	Social_Desirability	0.002	0.002	0.08
Step 2				
	Constant	3.75	0.28	
	Social_Desirability	0.002	0.002	0.09
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.13
	Centered_Internal	0.03	0.05	0.04
Step 3				
	Constant	3.74	0.28	
	Social_Desirability	0.002	0.002	0.09
	Centered_Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.13
	Centered_Internal	0.02	0.06	0.03
	Centered_Age X Centered_Internal	0.002	0.004	0.03

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.003$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.001$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.11
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3g: Charismatic Leader

	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1			
Constant	3.76	0.27	
Social_Desirability	0.002	0.002	0.08
Step 2			
Constant	3.79	0.36	
Social_Desirability	0.003	0.002	0.11
Age	-0.005	0.003	-0.12
Powerful_Others	-0.004	0.05	-0.01
Chance	0.01	0.06	0.02
Step 3			
Constant	3.66	0.42	
Social_Desirability	0.003	0.002	0.10
Age	-0.01	0.003	-0.12
Powerful_Others	-0.01	0.05	-0.01
Chance	0.02	0.06	0.03
Internal	0.03	0.05	0.04

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.003$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.002$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.12
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3f: Servant Leader

		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1				
	Constant	4.24	0.22	
	Social_Desirability	0.000	0.001	0.02
Step 2				
	Constant	4.38	0.22	
	Social_Desirability	-0.001	0.001	-0.03
	Centered_Age	0.001	0.002	0.03
	Centered_Internal	0.13	0.04	0.20
Step 3				
	Constant	4.39	0.22	
	Social_Desirability	-0.001	0.001	-0.03
	Centered_Age	0.001	0.002	0.03
	Centered_Internal	0.13	0.05	0.21
	Centered_Age X Centered_Internal	-0.001	0.003	-0.03

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = -0.003$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.04$ ($p < 0.01$); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.001$ (*n.s.*).

Table F.13
Results of the Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 3h: Servant Leader

	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β
Step 1			
Constant	4.24	0.22	
Social_Desirability	0.000	0.001	0.02
Step 2			
Constant	4.15	0.29	
Social_Desirability	0.000	0.001	0.02
Age	0.003	0.002	0.06
Powerful_Others	-0.03	0.04	-0.07
Chance	0.04	0.05	0.09
Step 3			
Constant	3.65	0.33	
Social_Desirability	0.000	0.001	-0.02
Age	0.001	0.002	0.04
Powerful_Others	-0.04	0.04	-0.09
Chance	0.05	0.05	0.10
Internal	0.13	0.04	0.20

Note. Adjusted $R^2 = -0.003$ (*n.s.*); Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$ (*n.s.*); Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.04$ ($p < 0.01$).

Table F.14
Leader Preference Ranking Frequencies

Leader	Preference Ranking	Frequency	Percent (%)
Charismatic	1st	83	32.9%
	2nd	89	35.3%
	3rd	39	15.5%
	4th	41	16.3%
Ideological	1st	33	13.1%
	2nd	52	20.6%
	3rd	91	36.1%
	4th	76	30.2%
Pragmatic	1st	37	14.7%
	2nd	48	19.0%
	3rd	87	34.5%
	4th	80	31.7%
Servant	1st	99	39.3%
	2nd	63	25.0%
	3rd	35	13.9%
	4th	55	21.8%

Note. N = 252.

Table F.15
Leader Gender Frequencies

Leader	Answer Choices	Frequency	Percent (%)
Charismatic	Decline to answer	4	1.6%
	Female	52	20.6%
	I couldn't tell the gender	96	38.1%
	Male	72	28.6%
	Not applicable	12	4.8%
	Not sure	16	6.3%
Ideological	Decline to answer	4	1.6%
	Female	59	23.4%
	I couldn't tell the gender	96	38.1%
	Male	61	24.2%
	Not applicable	12	4.8%
	Not sure	20	7.9%
Pragmatic	Decline to answer	4	1.6%
	Female	39	15.5%
	I couldn't tell the gender	83	32.9%
	Male	95	37.7%
	Not applicable	10	4.0%
	Not sure	21	8.3%
Servant	Decline to answer	5	2.0%
	Female	89	35.3%
	I couldn't tell the gender	80	31.7%
	Male	44	17.5%
	Not applicable	12	4.8%
	Not sure	22	8.7%

Note. N = 252.

Table F.16
Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Preference Differences Between Race

Race	Leader Preference	n	M	SE	95% CI	
					Lower	upper
White/Caucasian	Charismatic	143	4.10	.06	3.99	4.22
	Ideological	143	3.32	.06	3.19	3.45
	Pragmatic	143	3.34	.07	3.21	3.47
	Servant	143	4.35	.04	4.27	4.44
Black/African-American	Charismatic	39	4.03	.10	3.83	4.23
	Ideological	39	3.43	.12	3.18	3.68
	Pragmatic	39	3.51	.11	3.29	3.72
	Servant	39	4.17	.08	4.01	4.33
Hispanic/Latin	Charismatic	36	4.14	.10	3.96	4.33
	Ideological	36	3.68	.10	3.47	3.89
	Pragmatic	36	3.48	.10	3.27	3.69
	Servant	36	4.40	.06	4.29	4.52
Asian	Charismatic	23	4.15	.08	3.98	4.32
	Ideological	23	3.25	.13	2.97	3.53
	Pragmatic	23	3.59	.15	3.27	3.91
	Servant	23	4.28	.13	4.00	4.55
Other	Charismatic	10	4.00	.18	3.59	4.41
	Ideological	10	3.72	.32	3.01	4.44
	Pragmatic	10	3.76	.18	3.35	4.18
	Servant	10	4.22	.19	3.80	4.64

REFERENCES

- Anthony, M. 2006. Overview and summary: The multigenerational workforce: Boomers and Xers and Nets, oh my!. *OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing* 11(2), Overview and Summary. Available: www.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANA/Marketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/Volume112006/No2/May06/tpc30ntr16071.aspx
- Appelbaum, S. H., Serena, M., & Shapiro, B. T. (2004). Generation X and the Boomers: Organizational myths and literary realities. *Management Research News*, 27(11/12), 1.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25-33.
- Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F., & May, D.R. (2004), Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors, *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), pp. 801-16.
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychological Association*, 65(3), 157-170.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.) *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Block, P. (1981). *Flawless consulting: A guide to getting your expertise used*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Busch, P., Venkitachalam, K., & Richards, D. (2008). Generational differences in soft knowledge situations: Status, need for recognition, workplace commitment and idealism. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 15(1), 45-58.

- Cennamo, L., & Gardner D. (2008) Generational differences in work values, outcomes, and person-organisation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891-906.
- Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 27-43.
- Cooke, R. A., & Szumal, J. L. (1993). Measuring normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations in organizations: The reliability and validity of the Organizational Culture Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 72, 1299-1330.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 216-224.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice towards female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Erickson, T. (2008). *Plugged in: Generation Y thriving at work*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Fein, E. C., Tziner, A., & Vasiliu, C. (2010). Age cohort effects, gender, and Romanian leadership preferences. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(4), 364-376.
- Forsyth, D. R., Heiney, M. M., & Wright, S. S. (1997). Biases in appraisals of women leaders. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1(1), 98-103.
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39: 98-103.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (25th anniversary ed.). New York: Paulist Press.
- Helsper, E. J. (2010). Gendered Internet use across generations and life stages. *Communication Research*, 37(3), 352-374.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). Attitudes, values, and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies*, 19, 477-492.

- Holtz, B. C. & Harold, C. M. (2008). When your boss says no! The effects of leadership style and trust on employee reactions to managerial explanations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*, 777-802.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 321-338.
- Howell, D. C. (2010). *Statistical methods for psychology* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2006). Addressing multigenerational conflict: Mutual respect and carefronting as strategy. *OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 11*(2), Manuscript 3. Available: www.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/ANA/Marketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/Volume112006/No2May06/tpc30_316075.aspx
- Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41*(3), 397-404.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 196-177.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multi-level consequences for leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 311-338.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Mumford, M. D., Antes, A. L., Caughron, J. J., & Friedrich, T. L. (2008). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 144-160.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Paulhus, D.L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-59). New York: Academic Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). Assessing organizational culture: The case for multiple methods. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 153-192). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuman H., & Scott, J. (1989). Generations and collective memories. *American Psychological Review*, 54(3), 359-381.
- Schwartz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54(2), 93-105.
- Sessa, W. I., Kabacoff, R. I., Deal, J., & Brown, H. (2007). Generational differences in leader values and leadership behaviors. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10(1), 47-74.
- Smith, J. (2009, March 14). *MCUAAAR methods workshop*. Retrieved from <http://mcuaaar.wayne.edu/mmcdoc/researchonchangeovertime.pdf>.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2007). A systems model of leadership: WICS. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 34-42.
- Tulgan, B. (1995). *Managing Generation X: How to bring out the best in young talent*. Santa Monica, CA: Merritt Publishing. Ulrich, B. (2001).
- Tulgan B., & Martin, C. A. (2000). *Managing Generation Y: Global citizens born in the late seventies and early eighties*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press, Inc. (2001).
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, S. M. (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 862-877.
- 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*, March 1, 2010.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh, PA:

University of Pittsburgh Press.

Weber, M. (1921). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. New York: Free Press.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Alysia A. Bransford was born and raised in Fort Worth, Texas. Ms. Bransford received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from The University of Oklahoma. She went on to attend The University of Texas at Arlington where she worked to expand her knowledge in the field of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Working directly under Dr. Nicolette Lopez, she completed her thesis which aimed at assessing for potential generational differences in individuals' preferences for various leadership styles. Ms. Bransford received a Master of Science degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from UTA in May of 2011. Currently, Ms. Bransford is in the process of moving to the East coast in pursuit of a career that will allow her to help better organizations' selection practices. Eventually, Ms. Bransford plans to return to her hometown of Fort Worth, Texas and to use her applied I/O knowledge and experience to give back to her community by striving to create better leaders and better selection practices.