DİFFERENT LEADERSHİP STYLE CHOİCES, DİFFERENT GENERATİONS

MERVE BAKO
Yıldız Technical University
mcizgen@yildiz.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

In the past, a generation covered a larger span of time, having more members. However, today, thanks to the developments in technology and many other factors generations change frequently having less members and covering a few years. What matters now is the workforce itself and how these different generations work together. The current workforce has 3 generations working together while waiting for the fourth one. Soon, it is inevitable that 5 or 6 generations will be working at the same workplace. As a result, it is crucial to understand the type of leadership a generation prefers in business and academic life. The aim of this study was to find out how leadership style choice differs among four generations (Baby Boomers, Generations X, Generation Y, and Generation Z) of academics and prospective academics in Turkey. In the study, 265 participants from different generation rated the leadership attributes that contribute or impede effective leadership. The *Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness* (GLOBE) Project research survey by House et al. (2004) was used to find out the leadership style choice of different generations. The statistical relationships were determined between the generation variable and the 16 primary leadership subscales through MANOVAs and ANOVAs. The results of the tests showed that significant differences exist among the four different generations in 3 of the 16 leadership subscales. These subscales are Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice, Conflict-inducer, and Face saver.

Keywords: Leadership, Generation, Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, Generation Z

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, a leader in the business life should get used to the idea that the workforce consists of at least three different generations (Guzman, Stanton, & Stam, 2008). The current workforce is basically comprised of Baby Boomers, Generation X'ers, and Generation Y'ers. All these generations have their own share of values and preferences that they bring into the workplace (Arsenault, 2004; Lancaster & Stillman, 2009). Morris Massey (as cited in Twenge, 2006) states that "the gut-level value systems are, in fact, dramatically different between the generations." This sentence occurs as a support to validate the necessaity of the research on the values between the generations. It is obvious that "a culture that has been shaped by the values, standards, and policies of one generation isn't necessarily going to be compatible with the next generation that comes through the door." (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009). It is heavily reported by the press, media, and many researchers that there has been an increased conflict between the generations who are working at the same workplace right now and this situation leads to organizational and management problems (Arsenault, 2004). Retention problems, turnover, productivity problems, mobbing, not having a peaceful work environment, not being positive towards the job and the colleagues can be counted among these problems. That's why, it is important to understand how each generation wants to be led and their understanding of an effective leader. The study conducted here aims to find out the leadership style choice of each generation of academics in Turkey and how they want to be led in their workplace.

1.1.Generations

Ryder (1965) defines a generational cohort as a group of individuals who have gone through the same sort of events during the same time period. Similarly, Carlsson and Karlsson (1970) explain cohort as people who take some important steps at the same time like being born at the same time interval, having the first employment and getting married almost at the same time. In the light of these definitions, the categorization of the generational cohorts was made and adapted according to Lancaster & Stillman (2009) and Kotler & Keller (2006):

- Baby Boomers (born between 1946 – 1964)
- Generation X (born between 1965 – 1980)
- Generation Y (born between 1981 – 1994)
- Generation Z (born between 1995 – 2002)

Table 1: Profiling Generational Cohorts

Baby Boomers	Born 1946-1964	Great acquisitors, they are value-and cause-driven despite indulgences and hedonism.
Generation X	Born 1965-1977	Cynical and media-savvy, they are more alienated and individualistic.
Generation Y	Born 1978-1994	Edgy, focused on urban style, they are more idealistic than Generation X.
Millennial	Born 1995-2002	Multicultural, they will be tech-savvy, educated, grow up in affluent society, and have big spending power.

Original Source from *Generation Next* (pp.14-16), by B Tsui, January 15, 2001. *Advertising Age*. Taken from *Marketing Management* (p.252), by P Kotler, and K L Keller, 2006, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Pearson Education Inc., Copyright 2006 by Pearson Education Inc.

Table 2: Generation Theoretical Descriptions

Boomers	Much heralded but failing to meet expectations, smug, self-absorbed, intellectually arrogant, socially mature, culturally wise, critical thinkers, spiritual, religious, having an inner fervor, radical, controversial, non-conformist, self-confident, self-indulgent
Gen Xers	Cynical, distrusting, bearing the weight of the world, fearful, lost, wasted, incorrigible, in-your-face, frenetic, shocking, uneducated, shallow, uncivil, mature for their age, pragmatic, apathetic and disengaged politically, independent, self-reliant, fatalistic, mocking, under-achieving
Millennials	Optimists, cooperative, team players, trusting, accepting of authority, rule-followers, smart, civic-minded, special, sheltered, confident, achieving, pressured, conventional

Adapted from *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*, by W Strauss, and N Howe, 19991, New York, Quill/William/Morrow, Copyright 1991 by Quill/William/Morrow.

1.1.1. Baby Boomers

According to Lancaster and Stillman (2009), Baby Boomers were born between the years of 1946–1964 and are the largest population ever born in US and number about eighty million.

1.1.2. Generation X

The Generation Xers who were born between 1965–1980 according to Lancaster and Stillman (2009) and are a smaller group when compared to Boomers but a very influential population with a number of forty-six million. "Generation "X" might well have been called Generation "I" for "invisible" or "L" for "lost." "It's a generation that no one ever really noticed, that didn't exactly register, until recently. Xers grew up in the shadow of the Boomers and, like the middle child, passively resisted anything the elder sibling embraced" (Zemke et al., 2000, p.93).

Contrary to what older generations say or think about them- slackers, cynics, drifters and sullen, contemptous, naive, arrogant, unfocused, materialistic (Tulgan, 1995) and slacker, lazy, grungy, unmotivated, and skeptic (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009) - Thirteeners (Generation X) see themselves "as pragmatic, quick, sharp-eyed, able to step outside themselves to understand the game of life as it really gets played" (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 320).

There is no economic future for Generation X with the rising costs of setting out in life and falling amount of salaries and they learned to survive with money. Besides, "Thirteeners were told to be self-reliant, independent, self-actualizing individuals" (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 321). As a result they started life much earlier than Boomers. This generation has always had to survive in an area that Boomers left behind. This situation caused Generation X'ers to become distrusting and pragmatic (Strauss & Howe,1991), bringing about trust issues among the members of Generation X.

Most of them do not prefer to define themselves by their organizational affiliation, but they put more emphasis on personal growth and happiness. The values that matter for Generation X in the work place are sense of belonging, ability to learn new things, autonomy, entrepreneurship, security, flexibility and short-term rewards (Tulgan, 1995).The loyalty to the organizations they have been working for is quite low, as they witnessed their parents' loyalty was rewarded with downsizings, layoffs, forced turnover, mergers and pension improprieties (Jurkiewicz, 2000).

1.1.3. Generation Y

"The next Baby Boom (seventy-six million in number) has been known as the Echo Boom, Generation Y, the Baby Busters, or Generation Next" (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009, p.27) and they were born between the years 1981 – 1999.

According to Lancaster and Stillman (2009) the Millennials (1981–1999) are a smart, practical, techno-savvy, confident and pragmatic generation. Generation Y is "among the smartest, cleverest, healthiest, most-wanted *Homo sapiens* to have ever walked the face of the earth" (Zemke et al., 2000, p.23).

In their 2000 book "Millennials Rising" Howe and Strauss describe Millennials as "numerous, more affluent, better educated and more ethnically diverse with positive social habits, teamwork, achievement, modesty, and good conduct overwhelming the cynics and pessimists" (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p.4). According to Twenge (2006) Generation Y rarely hides behind the courtesy as a result, they are too direct and blunt. They always try to be open, true and uncomplicated.

PSSJ

Though the whole American nation expects the new generation to be worse than themselves, the quite opposite is true for Generation Y as they are the "corrective" generation. With Generation Y, there are less teen suicide, less teen pregnanacy, less drug abuse, more education, better scores at the tests, more helpful, more socially committed etc. (Howe & Strauss, 2000). They are compliant team players, they respect authority, they are rule followers, they are smart, they believe in future and change, and they welcome established values of home, family life, community, and education (Howe & Strauss, 2000).

It can be said that this generation is the most educated workforce ever and thanks to their parents they have already started building portfolios including hobbies, sports, voluntary activities and various work experience for college admission and business life (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009). However, this situation causes some problems related to job satisfaction. As these people expect a fulfilling job according to their level of education and they are more prone to changing jobs if they are not happy with the current one ("Perception vs. Reality:", n.d.). What Millennials count as reward at work are the things they can cash in now and enjoy boasting about to their peers. What's more, they can be rewarded via "a fun environment, the ability to work in teams

with peers, having bosses they can relate to, and being allowed to participate in work decisions" (Jurkiewicz, 2000, p.87). What's more, Generation Y prefers to be in teams and a leader who consults frequently and gives autonomy to his/her employees would be the best type of leader for Generation Y.(Alch, 2000; Kehrli & Sopp, 2006).

1.1.4. Generation Z

Generation Z is commonly referred to those who were born after 1996 and are the offspring of 1965-1985 born Generation X (Korea Times, November 13, 2007). In their book "The App Generation" Gardner and Davis (2013) called Generation Z as "The App Generation" because they identify them with the new technology – mobile phones, tablets, computers and applications installed on these devices and the social media. They also call this generation digital natives as this generation have been born into a digital world and they cannot think of a world where technological devices they have now do not exist.

According to Levine and Dean (2012), the youth of today focus more on career and behave more pragmatically, besides they concentrate on issues rather than ideologies. Education is regarded as a number of tasks to complete to get the desired job by the youth. As the young generation becomes more pragmatic and career-focused, they move toward being more individualistic and less community-minded. Together with individualim, isolation and more passivity occurs among the members of Generation Z (Gardner & Davis, 2013; Twenge & Foster, 2010).

The youth today are more comfortable and accepting towards people who are different from them. Less kids are ostracized because of being "geek" or they are cool in their relationships with their homosexual friends or there are more interracial dates/marriages among today's young. Altough they are more accepting in those issues, they are less aware of global problems when compared to the previous generations. Their cultural knowledge is generally limited to entertainment figures instead of public figures (Gardner & Davis, 2013).

2. METHODOLOGY

A quantitative research design has been used in this study. The GLOBE questionnaire was added to a website – surveey.com – for its ease of use and the link to the survey was sent to the participants via e-mail. The survey included Likert-type items to collect the data on leadership preference. The data were put together to create numerical scales that are used in analysis that

was run to test the hypotheses. Central tendencies and frequency distribution of responses to the questionnaire items were identified using descriptive statistics. The hypotheses of the study were tested using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Necessary Post Hoc tests applied to see the difference between the generational cohorts. The hypotheses in the following sections were developed to see the differences between Baby Boomers, Generation X'ers, Generation Y'ers and Generation Z'ers in their preference of leadership, if there are any.

2.1. Dependent Variables

The dependent variables are 16 of 21 basic Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership – CLT – subscales of GLOBE study. The reason why the GLOBE questionnaire was preferred for this study is that it has been used by many researchers all over the world and it has proved its validity and reliability through many researches. These 16 subscales were explained with the attributes allocated for each subscale in the leadership effectiveness parts of *GLOBE Alpha survey. Charismatic 1: Visionary:* Foresight, Prepared, Anticipatory, Plans Ahead; *Charismatic 2: Inspirational*: Enthusiastic, Positive, Morale Booster, Motive Arouser; *Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice:* Risk Taker, Self-Sacrificial, Convincing; *Integrity:* Honest, Sincere, Just, Trustworthy; *Decisive:* Willful, Decisive, Logical, Intuitive; *Performance oriented:* Improvement-oriented, Excellence-oriented, Performance-oriented; *Team 1: Collaborative team orientation:* Group-oriented, Collaborative, Loyal, Consultative; *Team 2: Team integrator*: Communicative, Team Builder, Informed, Integrator; *Diplomatic:* Diplomatic, Worldly, Win-Win Problem Solver, Effective Bargainer; *Malevolent:* Hostile, Dishonest, Vindictive, Irritable; *Administratively competent:* Orderly, Administratively Skilled, Organized, Good Administrator; *Self-centered:* Self-centered, Nonparticipative, Loner, Asocial; *Status conscious:* Status-conscious, Class-conscious; *Conflict inducer*: Normative, Secretive, Intragroup Competitor; *Face saver:* Indirect, Avoids Negatives, Evasive; *Procedural:* Ritualistic, Formal, Habitual, Procedural (House et al., p.131).

2.2. Independent Variables

2.2.1. Generational Cohorts

Only independent variable that was included in the hypotheses was "generation".

- Baby Boomers (born between 1946 – 1964)
- Generation X (born between 1965 – 1980)
- Generation Y (born between 1981 – 1994)
- Generation Z (born between 1995 – 2002)

The hypotheses of this study were determined to test first, if four generations differ significantly in their leadership preference and styles based on 16 primary leadership subscales of GLOBE study (H1).

- H1: There is a difference in leadership preference and styles between the generations classified as Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z for the 16 GLOBE basic Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership (CLT) subscales (Table 3).

Table 3: Global Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership (CLT) Dimensions

1	Charismatic/Value-Based	H1a	Charismatic 1:Visionary
		H1b	Charismatic 2: Inspirational
		H1c	Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice
		H1d	Integrity
		H1e	Decisive
		H1f	Performance oriented
2	Team Oriented	H1g	Team 1: Collaborative team orientation
		H1h	Team 2: Team integrator
		H1i	Diplomatic
		H1j	Malevolent (reverse scored)
		H1k	Administratively competent
3	Self-Protective	H1l	Self-centered
		H1m	Status conscious
		H1n	Conflict inducer
		H1o	Face saver
		H1p	Procedural

From *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (p.137), by R J House, P J Hanges, M Javidan, P W Dorfman, and V Gupta, 2004, Thousand Oaks, CA Sage Publications, Copyright 2004 by Sage Publications.

MANOVA was used to test the 16 hypotheses of this study. After Tests of Between-Subjects Effects were controlled for any significance, Post Hoc analysis was conducted for the identification of the group comparisons that yield statistically significant values.

3. SAMPLE

For this study, 265 participants from five different universities in İstanbul completed the survey. However, the students who do not plan to become an academician were excluded from the data, leaving us 228 participants. The desired number of participants was 40 for each generation in the beginning of the study – a total of 160. Though the total desired number was reached and exceeded, the number of Baby Boomer participants was 24. But it is still enough to reveal meaningful results in MANOVA tests.

The number of followers that falls into a specific generation category is as follows

- Baby Boomers (born between 1946 – 1964) $n = 24$
- Generation X (born between 1965 – 1980) $n = 46$
- Generation Y (born between 1981 – 1994) $n = 77$
- Generation Z (born between 1995 – 2002) $n = 81$

The participants were between the ages of 18 and 72 ($M = 31{,}26$, $SD = 12{,}832$) while being equally represented in terms of gender.

4. ANALYSES

The descriptive statistics were calculated for the dependent variables and for each of the generations. The constructs that are highly rated (5 and above) by all the generational cohorts are Charismatic 1: Visionary, Charismatic 2: Inspirational, Charismatic 3:Self-sacrifice, Integrity, Decisive, Performance-oriented, Team 1: Collaborative, Team 2: Team integrator, Diplomatic, and Administratively competent. The constructs that were rated low (less than 3) are Malevolent, Self-centered, and Face-saver. By looking at the means of the dependent variables, it is possible to see the differences between the generations before conducting MANOVA and post hoc tests for hypothesis testing. In some constructs such as Charismatic 1: Visionary, Performance-oriented, Team 2 Integrator, Diplomatic, Procedural, Integrity, Decisive, and Status-conscious there are very small differences in the mean rank scores of each generation. To start with, there is a difference in mean rank scores of Generation X and Generation Z in "Charismatic 2: Inspirational, Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice, and Face Saver" constructs. In Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice, and Face Saver constructs Generation Z thinks that these factors contributes highly to effective leadership. Interestingly, for Team 1: Collaborative

construct, while Baby Boomers rate it quite high as contributing to effective leadership, Generation Z rates it lowest.

Similarly, for Malevolent construct, while Boomers think it inhibits effective leadership by providing the lowest score, Generation Z provides a higher score for this construct. Other construct that reveals a noticeable difference between Boomers and Generation Z are Self-centered. This result shows that while the negative attributes are definitely negative for Baby Boomers, they are tolerable for Generation Z.

Conflict-inducer construct was rated highest by Generation Z while it is rated lowest by Generation Y.

5. RESULTS

There is a difference in leadership preference and styles between the generations classified as Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z for the 16 GLOBE basic Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership (CLT) subscales (H1a-H1p).

To test Hypothesis 1 (H1a-H1p) a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate generational differences in leadership attributes. 16 dependent variables were used as mentioned before. The independent variable was generation.

There was a statistically significant difference between the generations, in the MANOVA test (see Table 4), when the test of Pillai's Trace was checked, it is observed that the Pillai's Trace value is ,442 and the Sig. value is ,001 and when the Sig. value is less than ,05, it can be concluded that there is a difference among different generations and the H1 was accepted. The reason why the test of Pillai's Trace was used is that it is more robust and it is used in cases where some of the assumptions were violated, in this case, it is normality.

The value provided in the "Partial Eta Squared" column tells us the importance of generation on the leadership attribute constructs. The value in this case is ,147 which means it explains 15% of the variance leadership attributes constructs.

*Table **Error! No text of specified style in document.**: Multivariate Tests*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	,997	2859,252[b]	21,000	204,000	,000	,997
	Wilks' Lambda	,003	2859,252[b]	21,000	204,000	,000	,997
	Hotelling's Trace	294,335	2859,252[b]	21,000	204,000	,000	,997
	Roy's Largest Root	294,335	2859,252[b]	21,000	204,000	,000	,997
v163	Pillai's Trace	,442	1,694	63,000	618,000	,001	,147
	Wilks' Lambda	,613	1,724	63,000	609,778	,001	,151
	Hotelling's Trace	,545	1,754	63,000	608,000	,001	,154
	Roy's Largest Root	,321	3,148[c]	21,000	206,000	,000	,243

a. Design: Intercept + v163

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Now that our data have a significant value as a result of MANOVA test, we can go further to investigate the relationship between all the dependent variables when controlling for the independent variable: generation by conducting an additional univariate analysis (ANOVA). According to Table 5, three of the dependent variables are significant at .05 alpha level. These variables are Charismatic3: Self-sacrifice, Conflict-inducer, and Face-saver. In this study, there was a significant difference between the generations in these three dependent variables. It is important to note here; the multivariate and univariate values are different from each other. When the multivariate values are checked, it is observed that there is a difference between the generations. However, when the univariate values (see table 5) are checked, separately for each dependent variable, it is seen that only 3 of 16 variables have a significant value.

Table 5: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

v163	Charismatic1:Visionary	,466	3	,155	,640	,590	,008
	Charismatic2:Inspirational	3,017	3	1,006	2,164	,093	,028
	Charismatic3:Self-sacrifice	7,822	3	2,607	3,146	,026	,040
	Integrity	,906	3	,302	,545	,652	,007
	Decisive	2,101	3	,700	2,286	,080	,030
	Performance oriented	,298	3	,099	,146	,932	,002
	Team1:Collaborative	1,850	3	,617	1,020	,385	,013
	Team2:Team integrator	,289	3	,096	,266	,850	,004
	Diplomatic	,121	3	,040	,087	,967	,001
	Malevolent (R)	6,140	3	2,047	2,167	,093	,028
	Administratively competent	1,704	3	,568	1,529	,208	,020
	Self-centered	6,216	3	2,072	1,935	,125	,025
	Status-conscious	1,383	3	,461	,247	,864	,003
	Conflict-inducer	18,803	3	6,268	4,919	,002	,062
	Face-saver	18,627	3	6,209	4,711	,003	,059
	Procedural	1,043	3	,348	,307	,820	,004

est. 2018

Multivariate tests of this data yielded significant results, giving us the authority to investigate further. Tests of between subjects' effects showed which dependent variables differed in terms of generation. Post Hoc tests of MANOVA further show us between which generations these dependent variables are significantly different. There is a difference between Generation X and Generation Z in Charismatic3: Self-sacrifice subscale with a sig. value of ,015 at ,05 confidence interval. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation X with a mean difference of ,51. In the light of this evidence, H1c was accepted. There is a difference between Generation X and Generation Z in Conflict-inducer subscale with a sig. value of ,031 at ,05 confidence interval. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation X with a mean difference of ,56. In the same subscale - Conflict-inducer – there is also a difference

between Generation Y and Generation Z with a sig. value of ,001 at ,05 confidence interval. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation Y with a mean difference of ,65. In the light of this evidence, H1n was accepted. There is a difference between Generation X and Generation Z in Face-saver subscale with a sig. value of ,009 at ,05 confidence interval. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation X with a mean difference of ,67. In the same subscale – Face-saver – there is also a difference between Generation Y and Generation Z with a sig. value of ,024 at ,05 confidence interval. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation Y with a mean difference of ,52. In the light of this evidence, H1o was accepted. The rest of the hypothesis (H1a, H1b, H1d, H1e, H1f, H1g, H1h, H1i, H1j, H1k, H1l, H1m, H1p) were rejected as the test of between-subjects effects did not reveal any significant values for these leadership subscales (dependent variables).

As a result of multivariate analyses, univariate analyses, and post-hoc tests, 3 of 16 subscales yielded significant results. The subscales, the items that comprise these subscales and the differences between the generations are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of the Results

The Subscales that Yielded Significant Results	**The Items that Comprise the Subscales**	**Differences between the Generations**	
		High	**Low**
Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice	Risk-taker	Generation Z	Generation X
	Self-Sacrificial		
	Convincing		
Conflict Inducer	Normative	Generation Z Generation Z	Generation X Generation Y
	Secretive		
	Intra-group competitor		
Face Saver	Indirect	Generation Z Generation Z	Generation X Generation Y
	Avoids negatives		
	Evasive		

6. DISCUSSION

There is a difference between Generation X and Generation Z in Charismatic3: Self-sacrifice subscale. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation X. We see that for Generation Z, attributes of risk-taking, self-sacrificing, and being convincing contributes to effective leadership while these attributes do not mean much to Generation X. The reason why Generation X rated these items lower may be they are self-reliant (Strauss & Howe, 1991) and they do not require their leaders take any risks or sacrifice themselves because they do not care and their loyalty to the organization is quite low (Tulgan, 1995). On the other hand, Generation Z requires these attributes in a leader because they are more career-oriented and individualistic (Levine & Dean, 2012) and they might like the idea that a leader should be risk taking and self-sacrificing and convincing to help them with their career advancement. The comments that were made for Generation Z are not sufficient as the literature is not through on this topic and Generation Z has not experienced the business life yet (Bako, 2016).

Furthermore, there is a difference between Generation X and Generation Z in Conflict-inducer subscale. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation X. In the same subscale - Conflict-inducer – there is also a difference between Generation Y and Generation Z. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation Y. We see that for Generation Z, attributes of being normative, secretive, and intragroup competitor contributes to effective leadership while Generation X and Y think that these attributes impede effective leadership. Generation Z rated these leadership attributes higher because they are accepting towards all kinds of people (Gardner & Davis, 2013) and if their manager abides by the rules and keeps secrets from them, they are cool with that and they accept this situation as it is. Generation Y rated these attributes lower because according to Alch (2000), Generation Y prefers collaborative leaders so a secretive leader is not an effective one for Generation Y. Moreover, as Generation Y prefers genuine connections and more autonomy at work (Kehrli & Sopp, 2006), a normative leader would not be preferred and as team work is preferred by Generation Y (Howe & Strauss, 2000) an intragroup competitor type of leader would not be rated high. For Generation X, flexibility matters at the work place (Tulgan, 1995) so a normative leader is not preferred. Moreover, as Generation X is a symbol of skepticism (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009), they retain this behavior at the workplace, too, plus they prefer leaders who are honest and fair (Arsenault, 2004). As a result, a secretive leader would not be preferred by them.

There is a difference between Generation X and Generation Z in Face-saver subscale. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation X. In the same subscale – Face-saver – there is also a difference between Generation Y and Generation Z. Generation Z rated the items in this subscale higher than Generation Y. We see that for Generation Z, attributes of being indirect and evasive and avoiding negatives contributes to effective leadership while Generation X and Y think that these attributes impede effective leadership. The reason why Generation Z rated these items higher can be explained through their growing passivity (Gardner & Davis, 2013) and isolation (Twenge & Foster, 2010). Being indirect, evasive and avoiding negatives are behaviors that result from being passive and isolated so Generation Z might regard a leader as effective when they share some similar behaviors. Generation Y rated these items low as they do not feel the need to hide behind the courtesy, they are too direct and blunt. They need to be open, true and uncomplicated (Twenge, 2006). As a result, an indirect and evasive leader is not preferred by Generation Y. Generation X is described as distrusting and pragmatic by Strauss & Howe (1991) and while Generation X is distrusting by default, a leader's qualifications of being indirect and evasive does not contribute much to Generation X's trust issues. Moreover, according to Arsenault (2004), Generation X prefers straightforward leaders, so evasive leaders would not be preferred by Generation X.

7. CONCLUSION

The problem that different generations are actually different from each other and this situation may cause serious problems in a workplace has not got the attention it deserves, especially in Turkey. As this study proved, there are differences between the generations in their leadership preferences. Although each generation agrees on most of the leadership subscales (13 of 16), they disagree in 3 of them and this situation may cause problems in the workplace. It is hoped that this study paves the path for other researchers to study on the differences of generations and the preferred leadership style.

REFERENCES

Alch, M. (2000). Get ready for the net generation. *Training & Development, 54*(2), 32-35.

Arsenault, P. (2004). Validating generational differences. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*(2), 124 – 141.

Bako, M. (2016). *The leadership style preferences of academics from different generations: Baby boomers, generaton X, generation Y and generation Z*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/giris.jsp

Carlsson, G., & Karlsson, K. (1970). Age, cohorts and the generation of generations. *American Sociological Review*, *35*(4), 710-718.

Gardner, H., & Davis, K. (2013). *The app generation.* London: Yale University Press.

Guzman, I. R., Stanton, J. M., & Stam, K. R. (2008, February). The occupational culture of IS/IT personnel with organizations. *DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 39(1), 33-51.

Han, J. (2007, November 13). Marketers brace for generation Z customers. *Korea Times*. Retrieved from http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2007/11/123_13651.html Accessed 24/07/2018.

Hansen, R. S. (no date). Perception vs. reality: 10 truths about the generation Y workforce. Retrieved from http://www.quintcareers.com/Gen-Y_workforce.html. Accessed 01/08/2018.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA Sage Publications.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millannials rising: The next great generation.* New York: Vintage Books.

Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2000). Generation X and the public employee. *Public Personnel Management*, *29*(1), 55-74.

Kehrli, S., & Sopp, T. (2006). Managing generation Y. *HR Magazine*, *51*(5), 113-119.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2005). *Marketing management.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lancaster, L. C., Stillman, D. (2009). *When generations collide* [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Levine, A., & Dean, D. R. (2012). *Generation on a tightrope: A portrait of today's college student.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ryder, N. B. (1965). The Cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, *30*(6), 843-861.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069.* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Tulgan, B. (1995). *Managing generation X : How to bring out the best in young talent.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled- and more miserable than ever before.* New York: Free Press.

Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students 1982-2009. *Social Pyschological and Personality Science, 1*(1), *99*-106.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, boomers, Xers, and nexters in your workplace.* New York: AMACOM.

PSSJ

est. 2018