One Size Does Not Fit All: Exploring Leadership Inclinations in a Multigenerational Workforce

Rocel A. Apolonio*
Far Eastern University

Anecito C. Jubac Jr.
Far Eastern University

ABSTRACT

As generational diversity becomes the current organizational composition, which poses unique challenges in the business environment, it is imperative for leaders of the organization to understand the values of the multigenerational workforce to propel action. Each generation brings unique perspectives to the workplace and divergences may result in conflicts that, when unresolved, could adversely impact the organization. As such, leadership theories are posited, which help us understand the psychological and social impacts of effective leadership. This study aims to determine if a statistically significant difference exists in the leadership inclination among generations and whether generational cohort is a predictor of leadership inclination. The quantitative dataset lent itself to Cronbach's alpha, which was employed for reliability testing. Each of the dimensions achieved Cronbach alpha values of 0.7 or higher which indicate an acceptable internal test correlation of the items. Three hundred eighty-six (386) multigenerational respondents from various organizations participated and findings of the study reveal that generational cohort does not significantly influence leadership inclination but data suggests that Generation Y and Z may have a slightly stronger preference for modern, inclusive, and ethical leadership compared to Generation X and Baby Boomers. These align with indicators of authentic and participative leadership.

Keywords: Authentic leadership, generational diversity, multigenerational workforce, participative leadership.

1. INTRODUCTION

The current organizational composition is a mutigenerational workforce which consists of the following groups: the Baby Boomers, Gen X, Y, and Z. Organizations are predominantly composed of Millennials who occupy various positions in companies, while the first batch of Gen Zs has entered the mix.

The workforce is changing and evolving, just like the workplace and business. Leaders and managers must guide and lead this workforce in this new context (Schultz, 2010). Each generation contributes distinct viewpoints and ideals to the workplace, and these differences can lead to friction that, if left unaddressed, could have a negative effect on the business. In the same vein, Dominguez (2003) suggested that organizations must learn how to effectively lead this new generational diversity if they want to flourish and remain competitive in the modern workplace. An issue was

presented by Ballone (2007) in view of the challenges in a multi-generational workforce. The author noted that a lack of knowledge of generational differences leads to friction in working relationships, reduces productivity, and raises turnover.   A younger generation that seems distant can annoy more seasoned employees and become disenfranchised with hierarchal structures.

Each generation contributes different strengths to the workplace, but they also have different values, beliefs, and work expectations that they bring to their professions and organizations (Weston, 2006). Due to differing values and perspectives, when combined with the new era of interaction that the modern workplace offers, the possibility for intergenerational conflict is high given the regularity and frequency of interaction in the workplace (Weston, 2006).

While this study is focused on leadership inclinations in a multigenerational workforce in various companies, the dynamics of generational cohorts and leadership inclinations are not limited to organizations in the Philippines.   The leadership theories discussed in this research such as authentic, participative, directive, servant, situational, transformational, and transactional are widely investigated by scholars from different parts of the world, which reflects the universal need for effective leadership.   The findings from the study not only offer knowledge on leadership inclinations when confronted with similar challenges of managing a diverse workforce but can also offer insights to nations and industries as they become integrated into the global economy. Moreover, technological dissemination allows leaders and employees to access information about effective leadership approaches. By adopting effective leadership, organizations can better engage their teams and navigate the complexities of a multigenerational workforce in an interconnected world.

2.   THE MULTIGENERATIONAL WORKFORCE

Leaders in diverse organizational contexts should be aware of the generational variances in order to lead effectively.   In the study of Al-Asfour and Lettau (2014), it was mentioned that organizations which is composed of generational diversity have paved the way for both professionals and scholars to study and analyze leadership in organizations.   Each of these generations has similar values and beliefs, which can influence leadership types and techniques.

Every generation holds particular beliefs and opinions that are specific to the time period in which they were raised.   Further, each generation is greatly influenced by issues related to the economics, science, technology, politics, social development, and other aspects in molding its opinions and the features of their working environment (Williams & Page, 2011).

The Baby Boomers, which are also knows as Boomers, Love Generation, Woodstock Generation were born during 1946-1964, during the increase of births between World War II and 1964 (Williams & Page, 2011). The Boomers value individualization, self-expression, and optimism, (Hawkins, Mothersbaugh, and Best, 2010).   Boomers have defined themselves by their careers in terms of traits, lives, and attitudes, and many of them are workaholics (Koco, 2006).

The Generation X, also called the Baby Busters, the "lost" generation, was born during 1965-1977. This generation is said to have reached adulthood during difficult economic times (Reigner, 2009). Since they grew up at a time of rising divorce and

violence, this generation values family by balancing family, life, and work (Williams & Page, 2011).   In contrast to the Baby Boomers, they do not think that time, effort, and relationships should be sacrificed for advancement.   Multiculturalism and global perspective-taking have become the norm with the emergence of Generation X. They are educated and have experienced personal computers. They are however pessimistic, skeptical, and are very questioning of conventionality (Moore and Carpenter, 2008).

The Generation Y also known as Millennials, Echo Boomers, or the Gen-Wired was born during 1977-1994 (Williams & Page, 2011). They are the offspring of the Baby Boomers and grew up during a period of profound and rapid change, including nearly equal employment opportunities for women, dual-income households as a norm, respect for racial and cultural diversity, heightened social awareness, and the broadened use of computers in home, work, and school (Dietz, 2003).   They have a strong sense of independence and autonomy, are goal-oriented and optimistic, but are also self-absorbed. They have a need for peer acceptance including social networking (Dickey and Sullivan, 2007).

The Generation Z also known as the Baby Bloomers was born after 1994. This generation is said to face global terrorism, school violence, and economic uncertainties (Williams & Page, 2011).   Amanda Slavin (2015) posited that the Gen Z wants to be heard irrespective of their young age.   Aside from being the most creative, imaginative, and lateral-thinking generation, they are used to being inundated with information from various sources.   Technology is their identity (Langford, 2008; Gaidhani, Arora, and Sharma, 2019). Furthermore, Generation Z values authenticity, realness, peer acceptance, and security (Wellner, 2000).   They want to create an impact in the world, are confident, and very optimistic (Gaidhani, Arora, and Sharma, 2019).

3.   LEADERSHIP THEORIES AND APPROACHES

A number of leadership theories and psychology have been posited over the years. There are the popular leadership theories which can help us understand the psychological and social impacts of effective leadership thereby honing us in determining the kind of leader we aim to be.   Some of the most common leadership theories include: the participative theory, situational theory, behavioral (directive) theory, transformational theory, transactional theory, servant leadership theory, and authentic leadership theory.

As defined in the research of Wang, Hou, and Li (2022), the purpose of participative leadership is to effectively increase employees' sense of ownership and actively integrate individual goals into company goals. It is a democratic style of leadership that involves subordinates in organizational decision-making and administration.   The following characteristics describe participative leadership: first, in the process of employee participation in decision-making, leaders and subordinates are on an equal footing and have complete faith in one another, and organizational issues are resolved through democratic consultation. Second, while participatory management generally involves a wide spectrum of employees in decision-making, the final choice is still determined by the top-level decision-makers (Huang, Iun, Liu, and Gong, 2010).

Burns (1978) distinguished transactional leaders from transformational leaders who engage followers, focus on higher order intrinsic needs, and raise awareness about the significance of goals as well as achievement of specific outcomes.   While transactional

leaders exchange tangible rewards for followers' labor and loyalty, transformational leadership happens when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their team members, create awareness and acceptance of the goals and mission of the organization, and inspire team members to look beyond their own self-interest for the benefit of the whole (Bass, 1990).

Behavioral leadership theory emerged after the Trait theory. This theory explains that leadership can be learned, that particular behaviors are what distinguish leaders. The underlying premise of this theory is that a leader who demonstrates the behavior that promote group productivity and group psychosocial development will be successful in any situation (Kovach, 2018).

The interaction between the task behavior (that is, providing instruction, direction, and guidance and the relationship behavior), listening, support, and value can be characterized as the situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). This style offers the benefits of combined strategies that apply consideration to individual   and environmental needs. Situational leadership strategies foster a flexible mindset that acknowledges how quickly circumstances can change and how quickly new requirements might arise. As a result, it makes use of a variety of strategies and modes that are appropriate for various circumstances (Rowitz, 2014).

Luthans and Avolio (2003) highlight a more authentic leadership development approach, which has gained increased relevance and attention in modern times. They defined authentic leadership as a process that integrates positive psychological strengths and a developed organizational context. This integration leads to increased self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors among leaders and their team members, thereby allowing for positive self-development.

The authentic leader is described by Luthans and Avolio (2003) as confident, resilient, transparent, moral/ethical, future-oriented, and inspires teams to become leaders. It acknowledges the importance of being authentic and true in one's interaction with others (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). The article of Avolio, Gardner, Luthans, May, and Walumbwa (2004), stated that the core idea of authentic leadership is enhanced self-awareness and self-regulation which promote the development of authenticity in their followers. Consequently, this authenticity in followers enhances their well-being and leads to genuine performance. Ilies, R., Morgeson, F., and Nahrgang, J.D., (2005) identified the four core elements of authenticity which complemented the works of authentic leadership concept authors. These include self-awareness, unbiased processing, authentic behavior, and relational authenticity. Moreso, Luthans and Avolio (2003) provided that it is the deep sense of self and their stance on important issues and beliefs which are conveyed not just by words but through actions.

Greenleaf (1977), popularized servant leadership and this has become a subject of interest in organizational leadership. He mentioned that the foremost desire of a leader is to serve. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then, conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power to drive or to acquire material possession (p. 13).

Leaders who want to serve first are very distinct from those who want to lead first Greenleaf (1977). In 2019, Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, van Dierendonck, and Liden described servant leadership as holistic such that it encompasses a number of dimensions which include emotional, ethical, and spiritual. They also described three features

linked to the definition, first, motive. This focus on others illustrates the leader's determination and belief that true leadership requires veering away from a self-centered approach. Second, mode, which recognizes that every follower is unique, who possesses distinct needs, interests, desires, goals, strengths, and limitations. Finally, mindset, which puts emphasis on developing followers by upholding a sense of concern for the broader community and a dedication to being accountable for their well-being. Servant leaders are motivated by a strong sense of higher purpose or a deep personal conviction to serve and create a positive impact on others (Eva, et.al, 2019).

An overlap exists between servant leadership and transformational leadership. Servant leadership prioritizes addressing the psychological needs of followers as an end in itself, while transformational leadership considers these needs secondary to achieving the organization's objectives (van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, De Windt, & Alkema, 2014).

4. BRIDGING THE GENERATIONAL GAP

In order to effectively manage diversity, managers must take a number of actions to change beliefs and attitudes and promote effective management of diversity. According to Jones and George (2009), securing senior management support for broadening awareness on diversity, enhancing communication with the diverse workforce, encouraging flexibility, adopting a transparent evaluation system must be cultivated to effectively utilize a diverse workforce.

In the same vein, opening a discussion forum for all employees, especially those from younger generations could be advantageous for employers as well. These young generation are eager to participate, take the initiative, and contribute (Solaja and Ogunola, 2016). In addition, Hatfield (2002) mentioned that bridging the multigenerational gap include providing team sessions and regular meetings to reconcile different perspectives; and suggested that differences should be recognized for a straightforward approach in managing, motivating, or rewarding employees (Hatfield, 2002).

An awareness of the dynamics that exist in a multigenerational workplace can help managers to successfully design and formulate human resource initiatives. A manager's organizational commitment can lead to fulfilment and job satisfaction (Sukirman, Muhyi, Raharja & Tahir, 2024) as this indicates a strong sense of responsibility and investment in their role as leaders of the organization. On the other hand, organizational justice, in the context of formal-transactional relationships is linked to job satisfaction, with indicators such as freedom of expression among employees and the accordance of work procedures with ethical and moral standards (Sunarta, Tjahjono, Muafi & Prajogo, 2023) which are similar to the indicators of authentic and transformational leadership, respectively. Understanding effective leadership will not only yield results but can harmonize work relationships.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research utilized primary data collected through an online survey of three hundred eighty-six (386) respondents belonging to the four generations – Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z – working in ten (10) companies in the

National Capital Region (NCR).   The companies were randomly selected to represent a number of industries, and the survey targeted employees across different generational cohorts utilizing random sampling to ensure a diverse representation of participants. The sample size was computed based on the region's workforce population which is eight million (PSA, 2023) to ensure adequate representation.   All participants consented to the study.

Survey questions which are measurement indicators of various leadership approaches were formulated based on theories posited by leadership authors.   The questionnaires were distributed for pretesting and the quantitative dataset lent itself to Cronbach's alpha, which was employed for internal consistency and reliability testing. In certain literature, Cronbach's alpha between 0.65 and 0.70 is considered minimally acceptable. Items with less than 0.30 might have to be dropped, as these items might not correlate very well in the overall scale (Field, 2005).

Based on the results, each of the dimensions achieved Cronbach alpha values of 0.7 or higher which indicate an acceptable internal test correlation of the items, suggesting a high level of consistency.

Since this study aims to determine the leadership inclination of the multigenerational workforce, a descriptive-comparative-correlational research design was adopted.   Descriptive measures such as mean and standard deviation were used to measure inclination responses which were represented by a 7-point Likert scale.   For the comparative-correlational research design, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized to compare generational groups while multiple regression determined whether generational cohort is a significant predictor of leadership inclination.

6.   RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Descriptive data particularly, mean and standard deviation are reflected in the following tabular presentations.

Table 1. Summary of Respondent Demographics by Gender and Generational Cohort

Demographics	Category	N=386 F	%
Gender	Male	188	48.70
	Female	198	51.30
Generational Cohort	Baby Boomer	42	10.88
	Generation X	110	28.50
	Generation Y	165	42.75
	Generation Z	69	17.88

Total sample size was three hundred eighty-six (386) respondents, with a gender distribution of 48.70% male and 51.30% female.   The generational breakdown included 10.88% Baby Boomers, 28.5% Generation X, 42.75% Generation Y, and 17.88% Generation Z.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of leadership inclinations by generational cohort

Latent Variable	Baby Boomers		Gen X		Gen Y		Gen Z	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Transformational Leadership	5.90	1.34	5.89	1.21	6.16	1.12	6.04	1.17
Transactional Leadership	5.22	1.44	5.21	1.42	5.39	1.34	6.08	1.39
Authentic Leadership	5.70	1.29	5.76	1.28	6.16	0.97	6.18	1.03
Directive Leadership	5.84	1.19	5.71	1.23	5.97	1.08	5.92	1.26
Servant Leadership	5.65	1.37	5.74	1.24	6.14	1.04	6.00	1.20
Situational Leadership	5.70	1.19	5.96	1.11	6.12	1.04	6.01	1.20
Participative Leadership	5.81	1.25	5.97	1.19	6.29	0.96	6.21	1.11

Each generation exhibits unique inclinations toward different leadership styles, with younger generations (Gen Y and Gen Z) showing a stronger preference for transformational, authentic, servant, and participative leadership.

Table 3.1. Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses on Leadership Indicators by Generation

Latent variable	Indicators	Baby Boomers		Gen X		Gen Y		Gen Z	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
TFL	I appreciate leaders who are not self-serving and act for the greater good.	5.68	1.52	5.65	1.46	5.71	1.53	5.38	1.47
	I look up to leaders who consider the moral and ethical consequences of their actions and decisions.	6.05	1.34	5.97	1.25	6.30	1.04	6.36	1.06
	It excites me when the leader talks optimistically about the vision of the future.	6.05	1.21	5.93	1.08	6.10	1.10	5.88	1.37
	I appreciate leaders who reflects on assumptions or challenges status quo to ascertain validity.	5.88	1.19	5.86	1.07	6.26	0.95	6.07	1.20
	I respect leaders who help others discover their potentials and build on their assets.	5.83	1.41	6.06	1.17	6.41	0.98	6.52	0.77
TSL	Leaders should clarify what we can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.	5.59	1.41	5.66	1.32	6.10	1.03	6.18	1.19
	I think a leader should keep track of all mistakes.	5.00	1.70	5.15	1.54	5.05	1.58	6.14	1.61
	Leaders who rely on standard forms of reward and punishment to control followers work for me.	4.83	1.32	4.41	1.57	4.64	1.63	6.19	1.56

	I think a leader should motivate followers by setting goals and promising rewards for desired performance.	5.46	1.33	5.61	1.26	5.78	1.13	6.21	1.21
AUTH	I like leaders who are genuine and can share his/her feeling with others.	5.10	1.32	5.15	1.45	5.56	1.22	6.17	1.08
	I appreciate leaders who listen to ideas of those who disagree with him/her.	5.93	1.09	5.70	1.30	6.27	0.88	6.17	0.92
	I respect leaders who seek input and feedback to improve interactions with others.	5.95	1.19	5.94	1.18	6.30	0.90	6.18	1.09
	I respect leaders who know how to admit their mistakes and are accountable.	5.78	1.51	6.13	1.23	6.47	0.86	6.18	0.91
	I respect leaders who demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with actions.	5.76	1.34	5.89	1.25	6.21	0.97	6.17	1.12

Table 3.2. Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses on Leadership Indicators by Generation

Latent variable	Indicators	Baby Boomers		Gen X		Gen Y		Gen Z	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
DIR1	A leader should set standards of performance for group members.	5.85	1.30	5.83	1.13	6.12	1.04	5.86	1.31
DIR2	I think a leader should behave in a predictable manner toward group members.	5.44	1.15	5.02	1.48	5.24	1.38	5.49	1.41
DIR3	A leader should encourage group members to do high-quality work.	5.98	1.20	6.06	1.12	6.31	0.93	6.12	1.25
DIR4	A leader should define role responsibilities for each group member.	6.07	1.11	5.94	1.18	6.22	1.00	6.20	1.06
SRV1	I appreciate leaders who understand the value of contributing to the community.	5.98	1.32	5.85	1.23	6.18	1.08	6.22	1.13
SRV2	I respect leaders who care more about the team's success than his/her own.	5.76	1.38	5.83	1.18	6.22	0.96	5.94	1.33
SRV3	I appreciate leaders who take time to talk to others on a personal level.	5.51	1.48	5.61	1.33	5.98	1.14	5.83	1.27
SRV4	I appreciate leaders who can recognize when others are feeling down without asking them.	5.39	1.36	5.65	1.21	6.10	1.11	6.07	1.09
SRV5	I think leaders should provide others with work experiences that enable them to develop new skills.	5.61	1.32	5.75	1.23	6.22	0.89	5.94	1.18
SIT1	A leader should be flexible according to group	5.56	1.29	5.91	1.13	6.05	1.06	5.97	1.17

	requirements.								
SIT2	A leader should look at different angles when addressing issues or solving problems.	5.85	1.07	6.10	1.12	6.33	0.97	6.25	1.15
SIT3	A leader behaves or responds according to situations.	5.56	1.08	5.91	1.12	5.98	1.10	5.78	1.39
SIT4	A leader should have innovative ideas when faced with bad situations.	5.68	1.30	6.01	1.07	6.18	1.02	5.90	1.23
SIT5	A leader should discuss objectives and provide instructions about plans and goals.	5.83	1.23	5.85	1.09	6.05	1.06	6.13	1.09
PRT1	I appreciate leaders who give subordinates a share in decision-making.	5.61	1.30	5.75	1.26	6.27	0.96	6.25	1.03
PRT2	I think leaders should keep subordinates informed of the future situation, good or bad, under all circumstances.	5.68	1.16	5.88	1.24	6.17	0.95	6.14	1.18
PRT3	I like leaders who train, counsels, and develops subordinates.	5.85	1.22	6.15	1.12	6.42	0.89	6.19	1.16
PRT4	Leaders should be willing to make changes in ways of doing things.	5.76	1.25	5.90	1.17	6.10	1.04	6.06	1.13
PRT5	Leaders should ensure coordination and effective communication with subordinates.	6.15	1.30	6.15	1.18	6.46	0.98	6.42	1.06

The analysis of mean scores across diverse leadership styles among various generational cohorts reveals distinct inclinations within each group. Baby Boomers manifest a significant inclination towards directive leadership, as reflected by the mean score of 5.96. These are indicative of a preference for clearly defined standards and role delineations. Similarly, Generation X exhibits an inclination towards directive leadership, evidenced by their mean score of 5.94. Conversely, Millennials (Generation Y) and Generation Z lean towards participative leadership, exhibiting the highest mean scores across all generations at 6.19 and 6.14, respectively. This inclination underscores their interest in inclusive decision-making processes and collaborative environments. Furthermore, Millennials display a heightened appreciation for transformational and authentic leadership, with mean scores of 6.06 and 6.23, respectively, underscoring their emphasis on visionary leadership and genuine interpersonal connections. Generation Z exhibits a distinct preference for authentic leadership, as indicated by their mean score of 6.26, signifying their valuation of leaders who demonstrate authenticity and transparency in their actions.

Table 4 presents the ANOVA results for leadership inclinations among generational cohorts. Results showed that while transformational (p-value =.106) and transactional (p-value = .439) leadership exhibited no statistically significant differences, authentic leadership (p-value = < .001) and participative leadership (p-value = .005) displayed significant variations among generational cohorts, indicating varying inclinations across age groups. Directive leadership (p-value =.163) and situational leadership (p-value

= .052) did not exhibit significant differences. These findings suggest that while authentic and participative leadership may be influenced by generational differences, other leadership styles may not vary significantly across different age groups.

Table 4. ANOVA Results for Leadership Inclinations Among Generational Cohorts

Leadership	Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
TFL	Between Groups	5.45	3	1.82	2.05	0.106
	Within Groups	337.56	382	0.88		
	Total	343.01	385			
TSL	Between Groups	2.99	3	1.00	0.90	0.439
	Within Groups	420.98	382	1.10		
	Total	423.96	385			
AUTH	Between Groups	18.04	3	6.01	7.82	0.000
	Within Groups	293.61	382	0.77		
	Total	311.64	385			
DIR	Between Groups	4.01	3	1.34	1.72	0.163
	Within Groups	297.35	382	0.78		
	Total	301.36	385			
SIT	Between Groups	6.37	3	2.12	2.59	0.052
	Within Groups	312.59	382	0.82		
	Total	318.96	385			
PRT	Between Groups	11.63	3	3.88	4.34	0.005
	Within Groups	341.62	382	0.89		
	Total	353.25	385			

Table 5. Regression Results for Leadership Inclinations by Generations

Predictor	TFL	TSL	AUTH	BHV	SRV	SIT	PRT
Intercept	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
Gen Z	0.432	0.438	0.002	0.629	0.065	0.085	0.032
Gen Y	0.114	0.342	0.003	0.450	0.004	0.008	0.004
Gen X	0.986	0.947	0.712	0.452	0.620	0.119	0.358

The table shows specific leadership styles that resonate with each generation. Generation Z shows significant preference for authentic and participative leadership while Generation Y leans toward authentic, servant, situational, and participative leadership.   Generation X shows no significant preference for any leadership style.

7.   CONCLUSIONS

The results highlighted distinct generational preferences in leadership styles and underscored the importance of adapting leadership approaches to match the values and expectations of each group for effective organizational growth.

To lead each group effectively, leaders need to understand the four generations currently in the workforce: Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y and Z.

The leadership inclinations among employees differ across generations. The new generation of workforce – the Generation Z leans towards authentic and participative leadership. Some considerations include seeking input and looking at the perspective of other people to understand situations, admitting mistakes, and holding one's self accountable. The results reinforce the findings in existing literature, which delve into the methods and reasons why authentic leaders can have a positive influence on the well-being of their followers (Ilies et. al, 2005). The millennials, who currently comprise majority of the workforce population is also inclined to authentic and participative as well as servant and situational leadership. Significant indicators relate to appreciation for leaders who give subordinates a share in decision-making, who train, counsels, and develops subordinates. This corresponds to the literature of Akpoviroro et. al (2018) which asserts that a participative leadership approach fosters a positive relationship with employee productivity and motivation, thereby boosting worker morale.

The authentic and participative leadership inclination indicates a shift in how organizations can effectively manage a multigenerational workforce. Leadership that values input, collaboration, and authenticity become paramount now that the younger generations are becoming influential. The findings of the research suggest broader implications for other nations and industries, especially with similar collectivist orientations. In a diverse and interconnected workforce, leaders who embody authenticity and encourage participation are likely to create a culture of collaboration and creativity.

8.   RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the foregoing, insights into the leadership inclinations within each generational cohort highlight areas of strength and potential areas for development in leadership practices tailored to different age groups.

Organizations should develop tailored leadership development programs that cater to the specific inclinations of different generational cohorts. These programs should incorporate elements of participative leadership and authentic leadership, to resonate with the values and expectations of Millennials and Generation Z.

Inclusive decision-making processes within the organization should be adopted to accommodate the preferences of Millennials and Generation Z. This can be implemented through cross-functional team activities, brainstorming sessions, and regular feedback mechanisms which foster collaboration. Senior leaders may also promote a sense of belongingness at work to younger generations. In so doing, the younger generations would feel they are accepted even if they may somehow have different perspectives that make them different from others. They need to be encouraged to learn and grow; not to be afraid of the consequences for asking questions or the repercussions of making mistakes.

In addition, leaders should be encouraged to demonstrate authenticity in their

actions and communications, which is particularly valued by Millennials and Generation Z. Regular communication and feedback sessions can help bridge any gaps in understanding or expectations between different generations and foster a culture of trust and mutual respect. By recognizing the need to bridge the generation gap in the workplace, leaders need to develop a culture of respect, diversity, equity and inclusion in a multigenerational workforce.

Future researchers should investigate other variables such as cultural and industrial contexts to further validate the findings of the study, particularly in nations facing such shifts due to technological advancements and globalization.

APPENDIX

Cronbach's alpha on transformational leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
tfl1	30	+	0.732	0.519	1.049	0.861
tfl2	30	+	0.842	0.739	0.963	0.785
tfl3	30	+	0.808	0.674	0.978	0.803
tfl4	30	+	0.921	0.869	0.891	0.752
tfl5	30	+	0.655	0.532	1.284	0.841
Test scale					1.033	0.842

Cronbach's alpha on transactional leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
tsl1	30	+	0.727	0.518	1.151	0.696
tsl2	30	+	0.808	0.613	0.913	0.639
tsl3	30	+	0.855	0.670	0.752	0.601
tsl4	30	+	0.591	0.372	1.484	0.764
Test scale					1.075	0.744

Cronbach's alpha on authentic leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
auth1	30	+	0.564	0.320	1.038	0.874
auth2	30	+	0.767	0.666	0.906	0.783

auth3	30	+	0.867	0.772	0.711	0.738
auth4	30	+	0.865	0.766	0.702	0.739
auth5	30	+	0.801	0.648	0.751	0.776
Test scale					0.821	0.821

Cronbach's alpha on directive leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
bhv1	30	+	0.745	0.586	1.307	0.818
bhv2	30	+	0.784	0.636	1.227	0.804
bhv3	30	+	0.721	0.548	1.339	0.829
bhv4	30	+	0.815	0.695	1.206	0.787
bhv5	30	+	0.838	0.744	1.222	0.778
Test scale					1.260	0.836

Cronbach's alpha on servant leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
srv1	30	+	0.891	0.823	1.155	0.787
srv2	30	+	0.755	0.598	1.298	0.845
srv3	30	+	0.783	0.637	1.249	0.834
srv4	30	+	0.869	0.782	1.151	0.795
srv5	30	+	0.693	0.531	1.429	0.858
Test scale					1.256	0.855

Cronbach's alpha on situational leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
sit1	30	+	0.901	0.838	1.573	0.861
sit2	30	+	0.888	0.819	1.611	0.866
sit3	30	+	0.717	0.559	1.891	0.922
sit4	30	+	0.914	0.850	1.480	0.857
sit5	30	+	0.823	0.736	1.807	0.885

Test scale					1.672	0.901

Cronbach's alpha on participative leadership

Item	Obs	Sign	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Average interitem covariance	alpha
prt1	30	+	0.884	0.828	1.761	0.917
prt2	30	+	0.876	0.800	1.647	0.920
prt3	30	+	0.872	0.793	1.644	0.922
prt4	30	+	0.923	0.871	1.541	0.906
prt5	30	+	0.888	0.822	1.640	0.916
Test scale					1.647	0.932

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

[1] Al-Asfour and Lettau. (2014). *Strategies for leadership styles for multi-generational workforce.* Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 11(2), 58-69.

[2] Akpoviroro, K.S., Bolarinwa, K. I., and Owotutu, S.O. (2018). *Effect of participative leadership style on employee's productivity.* Journal of Economic Behavior 8(1), 47-60.

[3] Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W.L. (2005). *Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership.* The Leadership Quarterly 16 315–338; doi:10.1016.

[4] Aviolo, B.J., Gardner, W.L., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2007). *Authentic Leadership Questionnaire.* Mind Garden Inc.

[5] Ballone, C. (2007). *Consulting your clients to leverage the multi-generational workforce.* Journal of Practical Consulting, 2 Iss. 1, 9-15.

[6] Bass, B.M. 1990. *From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision.* Organizational Dynamics, 18(4): 19-31.

[7] Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York. Harper & Row.

[8] Dietz, J. (2003). *Defining Markets, Defining Moments: America's 7 Generational Cohorts, Their Shared Experiences, and Why Businesses Should Care.* The Journal of Consumer Marketing, 20(2/3), 172-174.

[9] Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., Dierendonck, D.V., & Liden, R. (2019). *Servant Leadership: A systematic review and call for future research.* The Leadership

Quarterly, 30 (1), 111-132; doi.org/10.1016.

[10] Field, A.P. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, UK: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

[11] Gaidhani, S., Arora, L., and Sharma, B. (2019). *Understanding the attitude of Generation Z towards workplace.* International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering, 9 (1), 2804-2812.

[12] Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Paulist Press.

[13] Gursoy, Maier, and Chi. (2008). *Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce.* International Journal of Hospitality, 27(3), 448-458; doi:10.1016.

[14] Hatfield, S.L. (2002). *Understanding the four generations to enhance workplace management.* AFP Exchange, 22 (4), 72-4.

[15] Hawkins, D.I., Mothersbaugh, D.L., and Best, R.J. (2010), Consumer Behavior, 11th ed., Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

[16] Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). Management of Organizational Behavior (5th Ed.). Prentice Hall, 169-201.

[17] Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A., and Gong, Y. (2010). *Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust?* The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates. J. Organ. Behav. 31, 122–143; doi: 10.1002.

[18] Ilies, R., Morgeson, F., and Nahrgang, J.D. (2005).   *Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes.*   The Leadership Quarterly, 16, 373-394.

[19] Koco, L. (2006). *Use Generational Marketing to Reach Boomers, Younger Clients.* National Underwriter Life & Health, 110(20), 26-27.

[20] Kovach. M. (2018). *An examination of leadership theories in business and sport achievement contexts.* The Journal of Values-Based Leadership, 16(1), 1-17; doi: 10.22453.

[21] Langford, P. (2008). *Gen Y or Boomer, They Think the Same.* The Advertiser, 1, 36.

[22] Moore, M., and Carpenter, J.M. (2008). *Intergenerational Perceptions of Market Cues among US Apparel Consumers.* Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management, 12(3), 323-337.

[23] Philippine Statistics Authority. (2023). Labor Force Survey. Philippine Statistics Authority. Retrieved from https://psa.gov.ph.

[24] Regnier, P. (2009). *Oh, to Be Young Again (for Real)* Money. 38(9), 124.

[25] Reinke, S. J. (2004). *Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership.* Global Virtue Ethics Review, 3, 30-57.

[26] Rowitz, L. (2014). *Public health leadership: Putting principles into practice.* Jones and Bartlett Learning, 17-24.

[27] Solaja, O. and Ogunola, A. (2016). *Leadership style and multigenerational workforce: A call for workplace agility in Nigerian public organizations.* International Journal of African and Asian Studies, 21, 46-56.

[28] Sukirman, E., Muhyi, H.A., Raharja, S.J., and Tahir, R. (2024). *Impacts of managers' professional commitment and organizational commitment on job satisfaction.* Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 13 (1), 184-202.

[29] Sunarta, S., Tjahjono, H.K., Muafi, M., and Pragojo, W. (2023). *Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction: Psychological contract breach as situational determinants.* Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 13 (1), 262-274.

[30] Thompson, J. (2012). *Transformational leadership can improve workforce competencies.* Nursing management, 18 (10), 21-4; doi:10.7748.

[31] van Dierendonck D., Stam, D. Boersma, P., de Windt, N., and Alkema, J. (2014). *Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes.* The Leadership Quarterly, 25 (3), 544562. https://doi.org/10.1016.

[32] Wellner, A.S. (2000). *Generation Z.* American Demographics, 22(9), 60-65.

[33] Wang, Q., Hou, H., and Li, Z. (2022). *Participative leadership: A literature review and prospects for future research.* Journal Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 1-12; doi: 10.3389.

[34] Williams and Page. (2011). *Marketing to the generations.* Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business, 3 (1), 37-53.