

Chapter 7

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership

Ceren Aydogmus
Bilkent University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Today's workforce is more diverse than ever, comprised of five generational cohorts: Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z. As each generation has its own values, beliefs, and expectations, their leadership preferences pose new challenges for organizations. In this chapter, leadership approaches are discussed, and the differences and similarities among preferred generational leadership styles are examined. The purpose of this chapter is to determine an appropriate leadership style that meets the needs of all generations, and globally responsible inter-generational leadership has been suggested as the most effective approach.

INTRODUCTION

For the first time in history, there exists five generations in the workplace: Traditionalists (1900-1946), Baby Boomers (1947-1964), Generation X (1965-1980), Generation Y (1981-1995) and Generation Z (1996-Present) (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005). As the workplace becomes host to more generations, and with more diverse values and characteristics among these cohorts than previously, intergenerational relationships reveal new challenges for leaders and their employees. Each generation reflects a cohort with similar beliefs, attitudes and values, and the generation-specific characteristics are powerful

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-8003-4.ch007

determinants of employees' reactions towards their supervisors (Howell & Shamir, 2005). Differences among the generations influence preferences for leader types (Mansor et al., 2017).

The previous literature points to the conclusion that different generations prefer different leadership styles (Arsenalut, 2004; Sessa et al., 2007; Yu & Miller, 2005). Leadership types differ in several respects, such as the degree of control exercised by employees, managerial influence on organizational transformation and effects on employees' job behavior (Clark, Hartline & Jones, 2009).

The directive leadership style focuses on an authority–compliance relationship between the leader and the employee. In this style, the leader gives employees instructions for their tasks including expectations, how they should be performed, and a completion time line (Athanasaw, 2003). Charismatic leadership, on the other hand, engages employees, and can result in high commitment to the leader's mission and significant personal sacrifices in the interests of the company. While charismatic leader behaviors can have transformational effects on employees (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993), transformational leadership goes a step further by developing employees to higher levels of ability and potential and motivating them to look beyond their own interests towards interests that will benefit the group (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Research studies in leadership style have established charismatic and transformational leadership styles as effective ways of leading (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Tichy & Devanna, 1986), as these methods guide from a humanistic perspective. Supportive leadership also encompasses individualized consideration, and such leaders give importance to meeting employees' needs and creating a positive work environment (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

Recent ethical scandals such as the collapse of Enron and the Worldcom fraud have raised important questions about the role of leadership in shaping ethical conduct. Previous studies on the ethical dimension of leadership have been embedded mainly within the charismatic and transformational domains (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1992; Price, 2003). However, ethical leadership represents a minor component of transformational leadership, which also involves stimulating, inspiring and visionary leader behaviors. Ethical leaders are characterized as principled and honest people who make fair and balanced decisions. They are expected to communicate well with their employees about ethics and set clear ethical standards (Brown & Trevino, 2006).

The global financial crisis of 2007-2008, global climate change, grand policy dilemmas and major demographic shifts draw attention to the concept of intergenerational fairness in the workplace. However, global intergenerational responsibility is absent in the classic leadership perspectives summarized above. Yet, especially since the global financial crisis, there has been increased societal demand for corporate socio-ethical commitment. In this context, intergenerationally responsible leadership is becoming a substantial issue in the twenty-first century. Globally responsible intergenerational leadership, a term coined by Puaschunder (2016), is the concept that corporate leaders have an obligation to acknowledge the job-related and non-job-related needs of all generations in the workplace and aim to accommodate them.

To manage generational differences in the workplace, it is vital to understand intergenerational diversity. The five generations noted above have been raised in different cultures in different times, yet is there a leadership style that speaks to all of them? Defining the future of leadership is vital for academics and organizations alike; hence the purpose of this book chapter is to examine the most effective leadership style for all five generations in the workplace today. This area of investigation is for leaders who guide and motivate the generational groups and for researchers studying differences between these groups. To this end, the following sections first discuss the theoretical background of different leadership approaches and then compare the leadership styles with globally responsible intergenerational leadership. Next, the characteristics and leadership preferences of the five generations are examined. Subsequently, the emergence of globally responsible intergenerational leadership style for these generations is proposed. Finally, future research directions are suggested followed by concluding remarks.

BACKGROUND

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership

The age of globalization has catalyzed the emergence of globally responsible intergenerational leadership. In her study on implementing this leadership style to ensure intergenerational justice in the workplace and intergenerational equity in the corporate world, Puaschunder (2016) notes the following:

With internationalization trends imposing significant challenges regarding sustainability of climate stability, indebtedness and social welfare for an aging Western world population, the need for intergenerationally responsible leadership has leveraged into an international concern.

Through the implementation of intergenerational equity, identified as providing at least a favorable standard of living for future generations, globalization has caused a shift from national issues to international governance of the corporate sector (Puaschunder, 2016). Intergenerational equity appears to be of crucial importance in finding permanent solutions to the multifaceted crises of today's world; as a natural behavioral law, this approach can prevent discrimination against future generations and can guide social and corporate policy actions (Puaschunder, 2016). Intergenerational equity also explores the drivers of globally responsible intergenerational leadership, which involves making societal, sustainable and intergenerationally conscious decisions and collective choices within and outside of organizations (Puaschunder, 2017).

Globally responsible leadership comprises two main aspects: relational and ethical. Within the relational aspect, the focus is on the stakeholder approach; with the ethical aspect, the virtue approach is at the center (Cameron, 2011). Regarding the first aspect, stakeholders are any individual or group that can influence or be influenced by an organization. They can be individuals or groups with legitimate interests in procedural and/or substantive aspects of organizational activity (Donaldson & Preston, 1995), and can be employees, clients, suppliers, shareholders, communities and society as a whole. Stakeholders have significant positive or negative influences on organizations, and vice versa. Like all leaders, twenty-first century leaders should be able to see the big picture, which become visible only through the lenses of the relationships and interactions among the employees, other organizations and society. Thereby, a stakeholder approach must be considered within the relational aspect of leadership (Geller, 2009). Regarding the second aspect of globally responsible intergenerational leadership, such leaders aim to bring a variety of stakeholders together and build enduring relationships by considering the well-being of different generational cohorts and society through a virtues perspective. Virtue ethics requires the leader to consider the situation, environment, other people and society as a whole (Pless, 2007).

Globally responsible intergenerational leaders can build and sustain moral and social relationships among an organization's stakeholders based on a sense of justice regarding a wide range of social, political, economic, ecological and human responsibilities. Thereby, intergenerationally responsible leadership

helps guide corporate actions to benefit direct and indirect stakeholders through a positive and proactive ethics lens (Puaschunder, 2016).

Many of the recent global business failures were related to ethical lapses. These situations exposed serious weaknesses in stakeholder relationships around the social responsibilities of business life. Globally responsible intergenerational leadership transcends “good” leadership to focus on the intersection of ethical and effective leadership. Regardless of how effective leaders are, if they lack ethics, they cannot be good leaders (Ciulla, 2004). Globally responsible leadership considers the intergenerational relationships within a leader’s realm and consequently arises at the junction of ethical and relational dimensions from a global perspective.

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership vs. Directive Leadership

A directive leadership style is the traditional approach, where leaders exhibit a high degree of authority when making decisions. This type of leadership is characterized by highly centralized decision making and concentrated power. There is little or no employee control in decision making, and thus a management-dominant influence exists. Directive leadership can be exemplified by telling employees what, when and how activities should be performed (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy 1999). Directive leadership is autocratic, restricting autonomy and self-determination and pushing employees to accept the leader’s ideas instead of pursuing their own (De Cremer, 2006). Directive leaders thus limit their employees’ impact on organizational decisions by showing little respect for their workers’ values and opinions. Directive leaders act in self-centered manner such that they supervise employee activities more closely compared to other leadership styles and make decisions unilaterally. They are not highly concerned about their workers’ personal development. Directive leadership can be effective in decision making situations, such as when a task has a clear structure, or in communicating a concise vision of the organization’s strategic goals and/or when follower commitment is high (Clark, Hartline & Jones, 2009).

Compared to directive leadership, globally responsible intergenerational leadership has a de-centralized perspective, involving employees in decision making processes and considering them part of the organizational team. In addressing the challenges of globalization, this leadership style combines a macro view of society with a micro view of leadership. Globally responsible

intergenerational leaders build trust among their followers and produce social capital in ethical terms in working towards the organization's financial and social goals. Such leaders work to achieve consensus through effective two-way communication. This leadership style goes beyond the traditional internal view of leadership as leader-follower interaction to a broader view of leadership as leader-stakeholder interaction.

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership vs. Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

Unprecedented interdependency of massive global systems, technology improvements and various environmental and social forces has changed the marketplace and workforce over the last two decades. Due to the resulting dynamic work environment, these shifts have necessitated changes in leadership style for many organizations, requiring leaders to become more charismatic and transformational. Through charisma (idealized influence), individualized consideration, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders move their team beyond immediate self-interest for the good of the group (Bass, 1990). Charismatic and inspirational leadership actualize when the leader sets a vision and articulates how it can be reached by motivating employees in a synchronous manner. Workers have a high degree of trust in charismatic leaders, who are able to determine and meet the emotional needs of each follower and thus greatly influence them. Transformational leaders show individualized consideration to their followers by paying close attention to the differences among them. Through intellectually stimulating their followers, transformational leaders help employees overcome difficulties and emphasize rational solutions to organizational challenges. For these reasons, charismatic and transformational leaders are seen as effective in the eyes of their followers (Bass, 1990). However, charismatic and transformational leadership styles are principally conceptualized at the dyadic level. The main focus is on clarifying the leader's direct influence over individuals rather than on group or organizational progressions (Yukl, 1999).

The research on charismatic and transformational leadership does not implicitly consider leadership in the context of stakeholders outside of the organization or society as a whole (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Globally responsible intergenerational leadership, however, incorporates this expanded focus while sharing characteristics such as vision, inspirational motivation,

individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation with charismatic and transformational leadership styles.

Globally responsible intergenerational leadership is less focused on individual leadership characteristics, such as being a charismatic and transformative leader, and emphasizes new responsibilities in the context of stakeholder interaction, such as coordinating and cultivating relationships with broader constituencies (Maak, 2007). Charismatic and transformational leaders spark change in their followers for the instrumental purposes of increasing performance and commitment and achieving organizational objectives. Extending this notion, globally responsible leaders add vision, and motivate stakeholders to engage in objectives at the organizational *and* societal levels, such as contributing to a sustainable future and creating positive social change.

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership vs. Supportive Leadership

Supportive leadership has been recently suggested as a major component of the individualized consideration apparent in transformational leadership, where leaders visibly care about their followers (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). Similar to globally responsible intergenerational leadership, supportive leadership is defined as expressing concern for followers and considering their individual needs, thus creating a positive and psychologically supportive work environment (House, 1996). In an organizational climate of supportive leadership, employees perceive that leaders are encouraging of all employees and promote individual development and empowerment. Trustworthy behavior from management is core to a sense of such perceptions (Whitener et al., 1998). In a supportive organizational environment, leaders' integrity, consistency and concern for employee needs help build a strong organizational climate.

Leaders who are supportive of their followers communicate well. Such leaders are approachable and dependable, and thus aware of challenges faced by their staff (Hart et al., 1996). In this respect, support has been suggested as a key factor in developing improved coping mechanisms; strong social relations in the work environment enhance employee well-being (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999). However, similar to transformational leadership, supportive leadership is also focused on the dyad of a leader-follower relationship, ignoring relationships outside organizational boundaries. As noted above, globally responsible intergenerational leadership provides a feasible link among internal organizational variables, the dynamics of globalization and societal

well-being. Through effective globally responsible leadership practices, organizations can manage the effects of globalization while simultaneously considering society. Globally responsible leaders set up strategies that balance short-term and long-term organizational objectives for a variety of stakeholders and facilitate harmonization between the organization and the global environment.

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership vs. Ethical Leadership

The contemporary view of management has both an efficiency component and an ethical component. Recent corporate ethics scandals have raised crucial questions about the role of leadership in shaping ethical behaviors in organizations (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005). In the twenty-first century, managers are considered not only responsible for firm success but also for inspiring ethical values in their employees. Thus, organizations have begun to focus on the importance of ethical behavior in leader-follower relationships. Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005) define ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making.”

The increasing attention on managerial ethics has occurred due to severe lapses at all levels in organizations (Blanchard, O'Connor & Ballard, 1997). In this context, there exists a need for an ethical organizational climate that strongly reflects the values of the larger society, rather than solely focusing on the relationships between leaders and followers (Schein, 2010). In globally responsible leadership, leaders consider general standards and hyper norms as well as organizational requirements. This leadership perspective goes beyond positive psychological resources such as transparency, courage and moral capacity. While the purpose of ethical leadership is to achieve and manage high ethical standards in the workforce (Pless & Maak, 2011), globally responsible intergenerational leadership emphasizes the significance of a comprehensive ethical outlook focusing on multi-level, multi-stakeholder outcomes with an emphasis on intergenerational differences.

GENERATIONAL COHORTS AND LEADERSHIP PREFERENCES

A generation is an identifiable group that shares similar beliefs, attitudes, values, preferences and, importantly, ages. Generational cohort theory states that individuals change and mature, as well as develop their values, attitudes and preferences, as a function of their age (Strauss & Howe, 1991). For example, different values around work among various generations in the workplace may influence goals, views and attitudes toward leadership (Sessa et al., 2007). Generational differences have always existed, and the changes that each generation brings to organizations have been studied, realized and factored into organizational life, particularly since 1960s. According to Wyatt (1993), six essential items shape the scope of a generation: (a) a traumatic event, such as war; (b) a dramatic shift in demography, such as urbanization, that affects societal distribution of resources; (c) an interval, such as the Great Depression that connects a generation to failure or success; (d) mentors or heroes, such as Ghandi, who give impetus and voice to societal challenges through their work; (e) an important event, such as Woodstock that sustains a collective memory and (f) the work of prominent individuals on a major societal development, such as Steve Jobs and Bill Gates on technology.

Traditionalists

Traditionalists (1900-1946), sometimes called the Silent Generation, Veterans or Matures, make up the oldest generation alive today. They are characterized as a group who suffered through war and economic depression. They are conservative, disciplined and civic-minded. Traditionalists give importance to traditional family values, work/life balance and are mostly motivated by factors such as money and recognition (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 2008).

Traditionalists will soon retire or are retired. As employees, Traditionalists comprise less than five percent of the total workforce today. They are hard-working, loyal to their organizations and respect authority. They tend to work best with a directive style of leadership in clearly defined formal relationships. Traditionalists prefer to work in hierarchical work environments, with a clear chain of command between managers and employees. The leadership style for Traditionalists should include a structured style that emphasizes delegation (Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000). In this sense, directive leadership might best fit Traditionalist values.

In addition to affecting a generational cohort, empirical evidence shows that traumatic and threatening situations such as war can also affect leadership preferences (Cohen et al., 2005; Pyszczynski, 2004). Terror management theory identifies that individuals who are easily reminded of death or who perceive a deadly threat are most likely to favor directive and charismatic leadership styles (Cohen et al., 2005). Directive leadership focuses on productivity, but this emphasis may not usually result in good morale or an effective level of work in organizations (Somech, 2006). Although directive leadership may be effective in decision making when follower commitment is high and tasks have a clear structure, there are situations where charismatic leadership can be more effective for Traditionalists. Traditionalists' favorite leaders are often cited as Dwight D. Eisenhower, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill (Arsenault, 2004), war heroes and charismatic political leaders who fit this generation's preferred leadership style. Traditionalists also want honesty and loyalty in their leaders; these characteristics positively correlate with this generation's respect for authority and adherence to hierarchical relationships. Hence, leaders of Traditionalists should be open about their values, uphold high standards and ethical procedures and be charismatic (Arsenault, 2004).

Baby Boomers

Baby Boomers (1947-1964), who are also called Gen Bust, Boomers and Digital Immigrants, represent more than 20 percent of the overall workforce. Baby Boomers are hard-working, corporate overachievers, passionate and relationship-oriented (Martin & Tulgan, 2002). Similar to Traditionalists, they prefer stable working environments. They also care about work/life balance and, like their parents, are motivated by factors such as money and recognition.

Baby Boomers have been deeply influenced by events such as the civil rights and women's movements, the Vietnam War, Woodstock, the Kennedy and King assassinations, Watergate, the first walk on the moon and the sexual revolution (Adams, 2000). Caring, honesty and ethics are essential for this cohort as they have witnessed the weaknesses of business, political and religious leaders (Sessa et al., 2007). In terms of leadership style, they look to their managers to lead them towards organizational goals. They desire a consensual and collegial workplace, with teamwork, open communication and responsibility sharing. They need to be encouraged to pursue training opportunities (Yu & Miller, 2005). They want equality in the workplace and like to have leaders who pay attention to their personal needs. Hence, Baby

Boomers prefer supportive leadership, in which supervisors are helpful, approachable and positive, and show concern for employees' well-being. This generation wants leaders who build a team climate and create a facilitative task environment of mutual trust, respect and psychological support (Duquesnoy, 2011). Due to the influence of the social movements they experienced, Baby Boomers also respect passionate leaders such as Ghandi and Martin Luther King (Arsenault, 2004). Therefore, they also gravitate towards charismatic leaders who are spirited, honest, competent and empathetic (Wilson, 2010).

Generation X

Generation X (1965-1980) is also called Gen Xers, the MTV Generation, Xers and the Baby Busters. By 2019, they are expected to number 65.8 million in the US workforce. Gen Xers have been affected by AIDS, the Challenger incident, globalization and the fall of communism (Arsenault, 2004). They grew up with great diversity, rapid change and financial and societal insecurity, which resulted in prioritizing individualism over collectivism (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998). Gen Xers are more independent, self-sufficient and self-motivated than Traditionalists and Baby Boomers. They are primarily loyal to themselves and expect the workplace to meet their needs rather than striving to meet workplace requirements. They seek emotional security and prefer informality in a workplace. Gen Xers value positive work relationships, growth opportunities and work/life balance more highly than previous generations (Adams, 2000). They consider working hard as an indication of an employee's worth and want to be promoted quickly (Smola & Sutton, 2002). This MTV Generation prefers flexible hours, whereas Traditionalists and Baby Boomers want regularly scheduled hours. Gen Xers do not particularly respect authority and are comfortable with change (Rodriguez, Green & Ree, 2003).

Rather than being loyal to their managers, Gen Xers are loyal to their profession, thus look for opportunities to develop their working skills. Overall, they give importance to personal satisfaction and do not want their jobs to negatively affect their personal life. Consequently, money and recognition are not strong enticements for this generation, as they primarily seek self-achievement. Gen Xers are well educated, technically savvy and eager to upgrade their knowledge and skills in their jobs (Howe & Strauss, 2007). On the other hand, some Gen Xers have a chameleon personality, which makes them quite difficult to predict and understand. As Gen Xers are very frustrated with the current political system and skeptical about their future,

they desire to live in an environment of social investment, economic populism and family-friendly morality (Halstead, 1999).

Although Gen Xers are easy to recruit, they are harder to retain because they seek flexibility and autonomy, with more emphasis on the former. They prefer leaders who provide mentoring and skills training and want to be trusted and respected for the work they perform. They generally dislike authority, seeking egalitarian relationships in the workplace. Ambition, trustworthiness, competence, honesty, fairness, straightforwardness, team-building, engagement and support are the preferred leader characteristics for this generation (Sessa et al., 2007). Hence, transformational leadership, which encompasses all of these values, may be the most desirable leadership style for Gen Xers. They like exciting leaders, who make them feel like change agents (Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000). They also desire optimistic leaders, who show individualized consideration, listen to, encourage and support them, recognize their talents, give feedback and inspire them and challenge and motivate them. These characteristics are embodied in transformational leaders, who must also be ethical, as honesty is vital for Gen Xers.

Generation Y

Generation Y (1981-1995) is also known as the Millennials, Echo Boomers, the Internet Generation, Gen Y, the iGeneration and the Nexters. They will represent about 50 percent of the global workforce by 2020 (PwC Global Survey Report, 2011). Generation Y is more technically savvy, individualistic and better educated than any previous generation. They are idealistic multi-taskers, comfortable with change and content with being a member of the global village. They value diversity, and indeed, ethnic and racial diversity are quite high in this generation.

Millennials like to complete work tasks in their own way, placing importance on self-determination and flexibility, and they seek immediate feedback from their managers (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Their emotional intelligence levels positively influence their job satisfaction (Aydognmus, 2016). Millennials appreciate challenge and skill development and prefer to balance work with personal and family time. Even though Millennials consider work important, they lack loyalty towards their organization. They are the most demanding of all the generations and tend to leave their jobs when they are not satisfied rather than work to resolve issues. They are optimistic, self-confident and

achievement oriented, which leads to pro-activeness and flexibility of mind (Zemke, Raines & Filipczak, 2000).

While the mentality of Gen Xers reflects modesty and moderate behavior, the mentality of Millennials reflects personal identity and self-will (Bontekoning, 2011). Millennials give great importance to learning as they want to demonstrate the best performance, and they view family as a key to happiness. They seek collaboration and social awareness more than previous generations. Corporate social responsibility is a key influencer for this generation, yet financial remuneration is the most important driver (Martin, 2005).

Millennials prefer leaders who provide mentorship through teaching and opportunities for growth. Leaders for this generation might consider the work *and* life needs of Millennials, as this cohort, unlike previous generations, does not want to sacrifice personal pursuits for professional success (Dulin, 2008). They believe in collective action and have a will to get the things changed. Within diverse leadership styles, supportive and transformational leadership approaches have been suggested as the most preferred styles for Millennials (Duquesnoy, 2011; Mansor et al., 2017). Similar to the Baby Boomers and Gen Xers, leader concern about followers' preferences and needs are very important for Millennials. Furthermore, the mutual trust that is associated with openness and honesty between a supervisor and the employee is essential for this generational cohort.

Millennials want to have autonomy and responsibility in their work while having leaders who support and encourage them to participate in organizational decisions. They prefer a supportive leadership style to guide them in the early stages of their careers and look for leaders who display higher moral standards and influence their followers to do the right thing.

Additionally, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and individual consideration through a transformational style are especially valuable for Millennials. They want leaders who encourage them to develop personally and pursue self-actualization and ideals by providing them the freedom to try new things as well as stimulating them to be more creative. In return, Millennials will use these skills to achieve high performance in the organization. Millennials expect leaders to set visionary, challenging goals to attract and encourage employees. Applying a transformational leadership style towards Millennials can influence them to become more engaged and loyal to the organization (Mansor et al., 2017).

Generation Z

Finally, Generation Z (1996-Present), also known as the Post-Millennials, Founders, Neo-Digital Natives or the Homeland Generation, is the most recent generation to enter the workforce. The most distinctive characteristics of Generation Z are freedom, individualism, and addiction to technology (Berkup, 2014). Members of this generation see themselves as the founders of a new society, with greater acceptance of different religions, races and sexualities. Rather than breaking down the rules of society like the previous generation did, Generation Z aims to create a new society with new rules.

Generation Z makes up approximately one quarter of the US population. This youngest generation looks for organizations to *create* jobs within their community. Similar to Generation Y, technology plays a central role for members of this generation. As they have grown up in a global recession and been plugged into technology from birth, they are mostly entering emerging knowledge worker organizations and positions (Lanier, 2017).

Managers can better understand Generation Z if they recognize that this group does not desire or value traditional policies, norms or institutions. Generation Z is innovative, entrepreneurial and wants flexibility and autonomy. Finding the right match in a job is imperative for these Post-Millennials; they are independent and dislike authority. Growing up with constant threats of terrorism and through the recent global financial crisis and its fallout has influenced their values of work security and stability. Post-Millennials want to make a difference, but surviving in a stable job environment is more important for them. They are self-confident and want to guarantee their future. Post-Millennials feel that work is important, but happiness at work is the most important. They can easily quit their jobs if this criterion is not met (Ozkan & Solmaz, 2015). Post-Millennials look for managers with vision, as, like Millennials, they have a complex set of beliefs, needs, wants, motivations and ideologies. Post-Millennials differ from Millennials, however, in that they have grown up in more uncertain economic, financial and environmental times (Montana & Petit, 2008). They seek workplaces with a strong company culture and want honest leaders who do not hide information. In this sense, ethical leadership might be the most preferred style for Generation Z, which believes that leader attitudes and work ethic have the largest impact on determining business growth or decline.

Transformational leadership may also fit well with Generation Z employees. A recent study in Brazil, Germany, Turkey, Canada, China, India, South Africa,

Sweden, the UK and the US showed that Post-Millennials want strategic managers who inspire them and communicate rationally (Schawbel, 2014).

An effective leader for this youngest generation is ambitious, broad minded, caring, competent and cooperative. Post-Millennials want leaders to show them individualized consideration, value their opinions and listen to their ideas. Due to their background, Post-Millennials are more career-minded and realistic than previous generations. As Post-Millennials have witnessed how much Millennials have struggled in the recession, the former are entering the workplace better prepared and more equipped to succeed (Schawbel, 2013).

Post-Millennials have more of an entrepreneurial spirit than Millennials, and they prefer communication over tools such as instant messaging and video conferencing. Millennials primarily communicate by text or voice, while Post-Millennials use video or movies (Takahashi, 2011). Post-Millennials are mostly motivated by opportunities for career advancement, and thus want be mentored in a job environment where they can advance quickly. Autonomy and self-determination are quite important for this generational cohort, and they seek a work setting where they can be independent, competitive and even territorial. Their desire to work for an international company is higher than previous generations. They also look for leaders who embrace big ideas and give importance to socially responsible issues.

Regarding these five different generations in the workplace, two major questions arise for management: “Are we ready to create a common effective leadership style that meets all five generations’ needs?” and “What is a leader’s role in establishing intergenerational justice?” Globally responsible intergenerational leadership can help answer these questions. This leadership style is effective at the individual, organizational and systemic levels in an increasingly connected world, and can thus meet the needs of intergenerational relationships in the workplace.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Emergence of Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership for all Generational Cohorts

Peter Drucker (2009) expressed the following about effective leaders: “Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things.” Globally responsible intergenerational leaders do the right things for the right

reasons. Intergenerationally responsible leadership is likely to be the most effective style in considering five generations in the workplace. Managers who adopt globally responsible leadership among generations take active roles in encouraging trust, accountability and appropriate moral decision making within and outside the organization. They assist their followers by coaching them to effectively tackle problems and challenges. They engage in corporate activities by supporting and developing programs, and creating organizational policies and codes of conduct to increase moral awareness. Directive, supportive, charismatic, transformational and ethical leadership styles act on the individual level only in considering intra-organizational contextual factors. Differently, globally responsible intergenerational leadership addresses factors from the cultural context as well. Such leaders generate a new social perception of leadership behavior, where the leader is a relationship coordinator and works toward change and transformation across and beyond the organization (Pless & Maak, 2011). Hence, it is plausible to deduce that globally responsible intergenerational leadership may comprise the most effective leadership practices for the five generations in the workplace now and the generations to come.

Responsible leadership can be characterized by accountability and dependability, freedom of action and empowerment, ability or inclination to act in an appropriate fashion, and is grounded in stakeholder theory (Cameron, 2011) (These four facets are explained in detail below). *Globally* responsible intergenerational leadership, which covers the aforementioned characteristics that will be explained in detail below, goes a step further by considering different generations in the workplace.

1. **Accountability and Dependability:** A clear sense of roles and responsibilities builds accountability. Responsibility is synonymous with accountability and dependability in the sense of being accountable for performance and being dependable in achieving promised performance. Charismatic and transformational leaders articulate a strong vision to their followers by displaying accountable and dependable behaviors (Bass, 1990). Furthermore, as long as leaders continue to support and guide their employees, accountability encourages confidence and personal development. In this context, both accountability and dependability can be assessed as leadership characteristics that reinforce the effectiveness of supportive, charismatic and transformational leadership styles.
2. **Freedom of Action and Empowerment:** Leaders are accountable and dependable when they can act freely and feel empowered to perform

(Spreitzer, De Janasz & Quinn, 1999). In turn, they ensure freedom of speech in their organizations. Globally responsible leaders promote active citizenship within and outside the organization, create incentives to encourage respectful collaboration and coach and reinforce their followers. They support their employees in various aspects of their lives and display care for their interests and needs. Such leaders are driven by a value-based vision of the future.

In the workplace, empowerment can be identified as a process where employees are provided the required autonomy and authority that allow them to exercise control over workplace decisions (Conger & Kanungo 1988). Empowerment is one of the characteristics of transformational leadership, such that transformational leadership behaviors enhance employee empowerment at the individual level (Aydognmus et al., 2018). Empowered employees are self-motivated and believe in their abilities to manage their tasks and perform them successfully. They feel free to make decisions and execute actions and tasks. They also feel able to affect the organization by expressing their opinions (Spreitzer, 1995).

Support is an aspect of empowerment. In the presence of supportive leadership, psychologically empowered employees will exhibit greater organizational commitment, which is identified as employee intention to stay within the organization with high willingness, alongside strong efforts on behalf of the organization to retain him or her (Chaudhry & Shah, 2011). Supportive leaders encourage their followers during decision making processes, and charismatic and transformational leaders go a step further by authorizing employees to solve problems and make decisions in the organization through a strong sense of shared commitment and mutual values. Charismatic leadership has three essential components: empowerment, vision and empathy. Followers' desire for power is enhanced by a charismatic leader's empowerment practices (Choi, 2006).

Supportive, charismatic and transformational leaders make their followers feel better about their jobs through giving them more control over their work. Conversely, directive leadership does not subscribe to employee empowerment. As a result, employees often cannot adapt to their leader's vision as they are excluded from decision making. According to Conger (1989), "Leadership is the art of empowering others." Two vital elements for empowerment are employee involvement and autonomy.

3. **Ability or Inclination to Act in an Appropriate Fashion:** Intergenerationally responsible leaders use sustainable values as their moral compass, provide fair and equal employment opportunities among diverse generations in the workplace and ensure that ethical standards are respected within the organization. This characteristic of globally responsible leaders stems from ethical leadership.

As measured by the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership, ethical aspect is associated with honesty, interactional fairness, trust in the leader and socially charismatic behavior. Ethical extent of leadership is related with stimulating, inspiring and visionary leader behaviors that generate charismatic and transformational leadership styles (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005). Charismatic and transformational leaders can inspire their followers by giving importance to values through moral principles (Bass, 1985) as long as the leaders are using their own power for good (House & Aditya, 1997); that is, they are motivated by altruism rather than egoism (Howell & Avolio, 1992). In this respect, the distinction of socialized (ethical) versus personalized (unethical) charismatic leaders, as well as authentic versus pseudo-transformational leaders, has been questioned in the literature (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1992). The above-noted research suggests that charismatic and transformational leadership styles are not always aligned with ethical leadership; personalized charismatic and pseudo-transformational leaders can be inconsiderate and abusive (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005). Such leadership styles do not embody ethical leadership, which focuses on nurturing, care and concern for one's team. Thereby, global leadership effectiveness is associated with socialized charismatic and authentic transformational leadership rather than personalized charismatic and pseudo-transformational styles. Ethical leaders may use both charismatic and transformational leadership styles to influence their followers' behavior, but there is only a partial overlap between these two styles (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005).

4. **Grounded in Stakeholder Theory:** Globally responsible leaders create value for organizational stakeholders by considering the well-being of society as a whole. They achieve this aim, in part, by maintaining a network of close stakeholder connections. As noted earlier, none of the aforementioned leadership styles includes a comprehensive approach that considers stakeholders and the broader society; they concentrate only on dyadic relationships between the leader and individual stakeholders. In

contrast, stakeholder theory identifies an organization as an assemblage of cooperative and competitive interests having intrinsic value (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Stakeholder theory has two main facets: (a) developing the stakeholder concept into organizational and business planning and (b) considering corporate social responsibility (CSR) in stakeholder management (Freeman, 2010). Organizational and business planning that does not stem from stakeholder theory concentrate on evaluating and developing decisions by groups a firm feels are necessary for organizational sustainability; in this categorization, stakeholders are recognized mainly as customers, owners, suppliers and public groups. The CSR categorization extends the organizational planning aspect to involve external impacts on the company by making ethical decisions and contributing to economic development for society as a whole, not just for the groups perceived to be most connected to the company. Such CSR decisions improve the quality of life for employees, the community, the country, and indeed the world (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2009). With a CSR perspective, organizations can affect positive employee behavior and attitudes, differentiate themselves positively from their competitors, create a comparative advantage by integrating non-economic issues into their business model and build a better reputation (Brammer, Millington & Rayton, 2007; Fombrun & Shanley 1990; Porter & Kramer 2006). Globally responsible intergenerational leadership symbolizes effective integration of leadership and CSR.

Meeting the needs of five different generations in the workplace at the same time is challenging. Traditionalists mostly prefer directive or charismatic leadership, while Baby Boomers seek to work with supportive or charismatic leaders. Transformational leadership is the most preferred style for Gen Xers, whereas Millennials like supportive or transformational leaders. Generation Z prefers mainly transformational leaders. Ethical values are important for all five generations, and Millennials and Generation Z place special emphasis on corporate responsibility. However, none of these leadership styles considers social and natural environment effects on company decision making or connects leadership practices to outcomes of sustainable value creation and social change for the benefit of all stakeholders. Globally responsible leadership, on the other hand, builds social insight into leadership, where leaders coordinate relationships across and beyond the organization. Globally responsible intergenerational leadership combines all the effective leadership characteristics of the above leadership styles by considering generational

differences, future generations, and society as a whole. Globally responsible intergenerational leaders act as change agents with a visionary perspective in an ethical manner, care about the generational differences of diverse beliefs, values and attitudes, give voice to their followers and coach their team in establishing intergenerational justice in the workplace.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Globally responsible intergenerational leadership is an important area of research; however the field is far from complete. Globally responsible intergenerational leadership should be better positioned within the wider stream of leadership theory and research. The brief overview in this book chapter offers a starting point for comparing globally responsible intergenerational leadership with other leadership perspectives. This chapter offers directions for further research, thereby contributing to clarifying the effects of the different leadership styles on intergenerational relationships.

There is great benefit in investigating, both conceptually and empirically, globally responsible intergenerational leadership mindsets. Research in this field can expose the complexity of globally responsible intergenerational leadership, as well as its quality, effectiveness, and the level of intergenerational relationships between leaders and followers. As research seeks to refine globally responsible intergenerational leadership, it would be helpful to develop scales and constructs for testing. Future research could build and refine such an instrument (perhaps calling it the Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leadership Scale (GRILS)) to measure the construct, estimate its psychometric properties, and provide evidence of the theory's validity. Research could also be conducted to enhance the understanding of how companies as a whole, like leaders, can encourage socially responsible behavior for diverse generations.

CONCLUSION

This chapter contributes to the leadership literature by providing a conceptual framework to show that globally responsible intergenerational leadership is the most appropriate style for the existing five (and future) generations in the workplace. Considering the values of diverse generations, globally responsible intergenerational leaders influence organizational processes and outcomes through psychological and knowledge-based pathways (Doh & Quigley,

2014). At the micro level, globally responsible intergenerational leaders consider their followers the most essential stakeholders in the organization by emphasizing intergenerational justice in the workplace. At the group level, such leaders aim to maintain psychological safety and learning, which is associated with increased group performance. At the organizational level, they work to create an open and diverse organizational culture by sharing and spreading knowledge with internal and external stakeholders alike. At the societal level, they apply a stakeholder approach by considering CSR. Finally, at the global level, they aim to meet all the aforementioned activities via an international concern.

Consequently, globally responsible intergenerational leadership is the most meaningful and effective leadership style for the preferences, values, beliefs, behaviors and attitudes of Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, Millennials and Generation Z alike, providing intergenerational justice in the workplace through a global CSR perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Adams, S. J. (2000). Generation X: How understanding this population leads to better safety programs. *Professional Safety*, 45, 26–29.
- Arsenault, P. M. (2004). Validating generational differences: A legitimate diversity and leadership issue. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 124–141. doi:10.1108/01437730410521813
- Athanasaw, D. L. (2003). Leadership styles as perceived by career senior service executives. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 26(10-11), 1205–1234. doi:10.1081/PAD-120019927
- Aydogmus, C. (2016). How to satisfy Millennials? The roles of personality and emotional intelligence. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(4), 1342–1358.

- Aydogmus, C., Camgoz, S. M., Ergeneli, A., & Ekmekci, O. T. (2018). Perceptions of transformational leadership and job satisfaction: The roles of personality traits and psychological empowerment. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(1), 81–107. doi:10.1017/jmo.2016.59
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–218. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8
- Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with Generations X and Y in Generation Z period: Management of different generations in business life. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 218–229.
- Beutell, N. J., & Wittig-Berman, U. (2008). Work-family conflict and work-family synergy for generation X, baby boomers, and matures: Generational differences, predictors, and satisfaction outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(5), 507–523. doi:10.1108/02683940810884513
- Blanchard, K. H., O'Connor, M. J., & Ballard, J. (1997). *Managing by values*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Bontekoning, A. C. (2011). The Evolutionary Power of New Generations: Generations as Key Players in the Evolution of Social Systems. *Psychological Research*, 1(4), 287–301.
- Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(10), 1701–1719. doi:10.1080/09585190701570866
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Cameron, K. (2011). Responsible Leadership as Virtuous Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(1), 25–35. doi:10.1007/10551-011-1023-6

Chaudhry, M. A., & Shah, N. (2011). Impact of supportive leadership and organizational learning culture as a moderator on the relationship of psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 5(1), 39–50.

Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(1), 24–43. doi:10.1177/10717919070130010501

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Ethics and leadership effectiveness. *The Nature of Leadership*, 302–327.

Clark, R. A., Hartline, M. D., & Jones, K. C. (2009). The effects of leadership style on hotel employees' commitment to service quality. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 50(2), 209–231. doi:10.1177/1938965508315371

Cohen, F., Ogilvie, D. M., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2005). American roulette: The effect of reminders of death on support for George W. Bush in the 2004 presidential election. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP)*, 5(1), 177–187. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2005.00063.x

Conger, J. A. (1989). Leadership: The art of empowering others. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 3(1), 17–24.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471–482. doi:10.5465/amr.1988.4306983

De Cremer, D. (2006). Affective and motivational consequences of leader self-sacrifice: The moderating effect of autocratic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(1), 79–93. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.10.005

Doh, J. P., & Quigley, N. R. (2014). Responsible leadership and stakeholder management: Influence pathways and organizational outcomes. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(3), 255–274. doi:10.5465/amp.2014.0013

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65–91. doi:10.5465/amr.1995.9503271992

Drucker, P. F. (2009). *The Essential Drucker*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Dulin, L. (2008). Leadership preferences of generation Y cohort, A Mixed-Methods Investigation. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(1), 43–59. doi:10.1002/jls.20045

Duquesnoy, D. (2011). *Generations, leadership style and employee performance* (Master thesis). Tilburg University.

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77(2), 85–129. doi:10.1006/obhd.1998.2813 PMID:10069942

Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3(2), 233–258.

Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139192675

Geller, K. D. (2009). Transformative Learning Dynamics for Developing Relational Leaders. *Innovations in Transformative Learning*, 341, 177–200.

Halstead, T. (1999). A politics for generation X. *Atlantic Monthly*, 284(2), 33–41.

Hart, P. M., Griffin, M. A., Wearing, A. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1996). *QPASS: Manual for the Queensland public agency staff survey*. Brisbane: Public Sector Management Commission.

House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323–353. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90024-7

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409–473. doi:10.1177/014920639702300306

Howe, N., & Strauss, B. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next generation*. New York: Vintage Books.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). The next 20 years. *Harvard Business Review*, 85, 41–52. PMID:17642125

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 6, 43–54.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 96–112. doi:10.5465/amr.2005.15281435

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1999). *Leadership* (3rd ed.). Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Brown, R. G. (1998). GenXers vs boomers vs Matures: Generational comparisons of public employee motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 18(4), 18–37. doi:10.1177/0734371X9801800403

Lanier, K. (2017). 5 things HR professionals need to know about Generation Z: Thought leaders share their views on the HR profession and its direction for the future. *Strategic HR Review*, 16(6), 288–290. doi:10.1108/SHR-08-2017-0051

Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2009). Corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 1–7. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00277.x

Maak, T. (2007). Responsible leadership, stakeholder engagement and the emergence of social capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4), 329–343. doi:10.1007/10551-007-9510-5

Mansor, Z. D., Mun, C. P., Farhana, B. N., & Tarmizi, W. A. N. W. M. (2017). Influence of Transformation Leadership Style on Employee Engagement among Millennials. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 11(1), 161–165.

Martin, C. A. (2005). From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about Generation Y. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 37(1), 39–44. doi:10.1108/00197850510699965

Martin, C. A., & Tulgan, B. (2002). *Managing the generation mix: From collision to collaboration*. Human Resource Development.

- Montana, P. J., & Petit, F. (2008). Motivating Generation X and Y on the job and preparing Z. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 2(2), 139–148.
- Oblinger, D., & Oblinger, J. (2005). *Educating the Net Gen*. Washington, DC: Educause.
- Ozkan, M., & Solmaz, B. (2015). The changing face of the employees—Generation Z and their perceptions of work (A Study Applied to University Students). *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 476–483. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00876-X
- Pless, N. M. (2007). Understanding responsible leadership: Role identity and motivational drivers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4), 437–456. doi:10.1007/10551-007-9518-x
- Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2011). Responsible leadership: Pathways to the future. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(1), 3–13. doi:10.1007/10551-011-1114-4
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78–92. PMID:17183795
- Price, T. L. (2003). The ethics of authentic transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 67–81. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00187-X
- Puaschunder, J. (2016). Global responsible intergenerational leadership: The quest of an integration of intergenerational equity in corporate social responsibility (CSR) models. *Annals in Social Responsibility*, 2(1), 113–123. doi:10.1108/ASR-10-2015-0016
- Puaschunder, J. M. (2017). *Global Responsible Intergenerational Leadership*. Vernon Press.
- PwC (2011). *Millennials at work reshaping the workplace*. PwC Global Survey Report.
- Pyszczynski, T. (2004). What are we so afraid of?: A Terror Management Theory perspective on the politics of fear. *Social Research*, 71(4), 827–848.
- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 329–354. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

- Rodriguez, R. O., Green, M. T., & Ree, M. J. (2003). Leading Generation X: Do the old rules apply? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 67–75. doi:10.1177/107179190300900406
- Schawbel, D. (2013). *Promote yourself: The new rules for career success*. Macmillan.
- Schawbel, D. (2014). Gen Y and Gen Z global workplace expectations study. *Millennial Branding News Release*, 12.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.
- Sessa, V. 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. doi:10.1080/10887150709336612
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594. doi:10.1287/orsc.4.4.577
- Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 363–382. doi:10.1002/job.147
- Somech, A. (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 132–157. doi:10.1177/0149206305277799
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442–1465.
- Spreitzer, G. M., De Janasz, S. C., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Empowered to lead: The role of psychological empowerment in leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(4), 511–526. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199907)20:4<511::AID-JOB900>3.0.CO;2-L
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York, NY: William Morrow & Company.
- Takahashi, T. (2011). Japanese youth and mobile media. *Deconstructing Digital Natives*, 67–82.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Waldman, D. A., & Galvin, B. M. (2008). Alternative perspectives of responsible leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37(4), 327–341. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2008.07.001

Whitener, E., Brodt, S., Korsgaard, M., & Werner, J. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behaviour. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 453–486.

Wilson, M. (2010). *Developing tomorrow's leaders today: Insights from corporate India*. Singapore: Wiley & Sons (Asia) Pte. Ltd.

Wyatt, D. (1993). *Out of the sixties: Storytelling and the Vietnam generation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yu, H. C., & Miller, P. (2005). Leadership style: The X Generation and Baby Boomers compared in different cultural contexts. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 35–50. doi:10.1108/01437730510575570

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285–305. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2

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

ADDITIONAL READING

Bordas, J. (2015). Leadership by the many the power of Latino inclusion. *Leader to Leader*, 2015(75), 56–63. doi:10.1002/ltl.20167

Edwards, M., Biloslavo, R., Kwaymullina, B., & Kwaymullina, A. (2013). Big picture wisdom: Metatheorising ancient, scientific and indigenous wisdom perspectives for global environmental leadership. *Journal of Spirituality, Leadership and Management*, 7(1), 13.

Ehnert, I., & Claes, M. T. (2014). Global leadership for sustainable development. *Global leadership practices*, 149-168.

Ferreira, G. M., Puaschunder, J. M., De Brito, M. G. P., Perali, F., Bussi, D., Chen, L. L., & Williams, R. (2018). *Intergenerational Responsibility in the 21st Century*. Vernon Press Titles in Economics.

Kafka, B., Seghezzi, D., Villaronga, B., Blome, C., & Althoff, K. (2014). Leadership for global responsibility: values and key competencies for a profound shift towards sustainability. In *Intergenerational learning and transformative leadership for sustainable futures* (pp. 187–196). Wageningen Academic Publishers. doi:10.3920/978-90-8686-802-5_13

Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), 139–157. doi:10.1002/job.1913

Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Stevens, M. J., Maznevski, M. L., & Stahl, G. K. (Eds.). (2017). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315232904

Puaschunder, J. M., & Schwarz, G. (2012). *The future is now: How joint decision making curbs hyperbolic discounting but blurs social responsibility in the intergenerational equity public policy domain*. 1-35.

Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(1), 1–16. doi:10.1007/10551-011-0952-4

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Corporate Social Responsibility: An organization's sense of economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibility towards the society and environment in which it operates.

Effective Leader: A leader who does the things for the greater good; creates an ethical, trusting, and open organizational climate; gives importance to the wellbeing of the organization and its stakeholders; as well as to society and social and natural laws. Such a leader also engages with today's generations and builds the next generation and thus shapes the future.

Generation: People born within the same time period in a society, sharing similar behaviors, attitudes, likes, beliefs, values, and preferences.

Globally Responsible Intergenerational Leader: A leader who works for the greater good by combining a micro level of personal interaction with a macro perspective of CSR, emphasizing intergenerational justice and intergenerational equity in the corporate world.

Intergenerational Equity: A belief that Earth's social, cultural and natural environments do not belong to any single generation but are to be managed and conserved in safety and trust for the wellbeing of future generations.

Intergenerational Fairness: A belief that diverse generations should be treated fairly by their organization. This sense of fairness should be shared across different genders and age groups.

Responsible Leader: An accountable and dependable leader who works for the greater good by making sustainable business decisions that benefit an organization's stakeholders.