

---

# AGE DIFFERENCES IN ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

---

Robert I. Kabacoff, Ph.D.  
Management Research Group

Ronald W. Stoffey, Ph.D.  
Kutztown University

---

In order to investigate possible age differences in organizational leadership behavior, a diverse sample of younger (25-35 years) and older (45-55 years) mid-level North American department and unit managers (n=1,280) matched for industry, job function, and gender were compared on 22 leadership behaviors and 3 effectiveness measures. Outcome measures were assessed using a 360-degree strategy in which each manager was evaluated by self, boss, peers, and direct reports. A second study compared younger (25-35 years) and older (45-55 years) North American division heads and vice presidents (n=254) using identical procedures. In each study, numerous age differences in both leadership behaviors and measures of effectiveness were obtained. Comparisons with previous research and implications for individual and organizational development are discussed.

Each generation entering and working within organizations differs from the previous one in terms of education, values, aspirations, work attitudes, and "world view." The generation born between 1946 and 1964, the so-called "baby boomers" or "new values workers", present a radically different worker profile in comparison to the so called "matures" or pre-boomers" born between 1909 and 1945. In terms of numbers, baby boomers dominate the nation's workforce (Mitchell, 1998). It is estimated that about half (48 percent) of today's workforce is comprised of baby boomers. Pre-boomers make up only 12 percent of the labor force. Various studies depict baby boomers as more educated, independent, and less tolerant of authority and power. They are seen as more vocal in terms of demanding work that is both challenging and personally satisfying, and in general, are reported as having lower levels of organizational allegiance, commitment, and job satisfaction (Bower and Fidler, 1994; Manz and Sims, 1993, Smith and Clurman, 1997).

As this cohort group assumes leadership positions alongside the previous generation of corporate executives, an even newer cohort group of workers and future leaders is entering organizations, presenting yet a different profile in terms of life and work values (Bower and Fidler, 1994; Cufaude, 2000; Losyk, 1997; Jurkiewicz, 2001; Manz and Sims, 1993). The "baby busters", "generation X'ers", or "Millennials", as they are frequently described, are seen as less loyal and committed to organizations, highly "technoliterate", independent and self-absorbed, attention seeking, and more diverse in terms of race than their baby boomer predecessors. They thrive upon a creative and competitive environment, embrace radical change, and are willing to take high risks for high rewards. While GenXers account for only 6 percent of the labor force, this percentage will rise rapidly as they reach adulthood (Mitchell, 1998). Given their swashbuckling image, coupled with the projected decrease in boomers as they begin to retire in the next 10 years, these youthful, bold, and energized GenXers are viewed as the up-and-coming leaders of the corporate world (Wah, 1999). Yet, some recent studies suggest that many GenXers are ill suited to the critical challenges facing companies today and in the future (Wah, 1999).

## Research on Leadership and Age

Studies such as the ones reviewed point to the controversy and recent interest in examining the relationship between leadership and age. Age is one of several traits or attributes within the field of organizational demography along which organizational members are posited to vary (Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Myers, 1998). Other demographic traits include tenure, occupation, gender, and ethnicity (Blau, 1977). The basic premise of demography theory is that demographic attributes, such as age, influence social dynamics which in turn influence various organizational outcomes, such as conflict and turnover, culture, distribution of power, innovation and adaptability, and organizational performance (Pfeffer, 1983).

---

Contact Information: Robert I. Kabacoff, Ph.D. Vice President of Research and Development, Management Research Group, 14 York Street, Suite #301 Portland, Maine, USA 04101, (207) 775-2173, rob.kabacoff@mrg.com.

The study of leadership and age is important for several reasons. First, as Bower and Fidler (1994) note, organizations are not necessarily changing the guard but *mixing it*. As the result of dwindling numbers of new entrants within the workforce and older workers remaining employed longer, multigenerational cohorts will be working side by side in various work and leadership roles (Cufaude and Riemersma, 1999). The mixing of cross-generations is also due to the increase of flattened organizational structures where the boundaries that once separated “senior” staff from “junior” staff are now more fluid (Ernst, 2000). Further, due to the complexity of leading in today’s dynamic and fast paced global economy, leadership is unlikely to be the exclusive domain of a single individual. Top leadership teams comprised of multigenerational members will be the norm (Kakabadse, 1991).

Multigenerational differences in perceptions and interpretations of individual behavior and organizational events, reflecting cohorts’ unique “world view”, create the potential, however, for conflict and misunderstanding. For example, baby boomers may view their preboomer colleagues as too fiscally and socially conservative, or unwilling to innovate and take risks. Likewise, GenXers may view their baby boomer counterparts as workaholic, idealistic, hierarchy-worshipping, and overly influenced by their parents’ depression mentality (Jurkiewicz, 2001). Moreover, the continued presence of high level, older leaders can cause frustration and dissension among GenXers eager for promotion to senior level status (Cufaude and Riemersma, 1999). Conversely, diversity in the organization’s belief structure also has the potential to positively impact creative and comprehensive decision making capabilities and provide the necessary momentum for organizational change and renewal (Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Myers, 1998).

In short, the ability to understand, learn, and effectively leverage multigenerational diversity will be necessary for organizations now and in the future to build and maintain high performance systems. Within this context, Kakabadse et al. argue for adopting a broader view of performance beyond profit-maximizing measures to include such qualitative goals as clear vision, unity of strategic direction, and quality of dialogue.

Second, although several studies support the existence of multigenerational differences within organizations, other studies point to a more homogenous cadre of workers and leaders. A recent study conducted by Randstad North America (2000) found that employees often expressed similar motivations and expectations that spanned all generations and work styles. In a sample of 241 municipal employees, Jurkiewicz (2001) also found greater homogeneity of work-related needs and values between GenXers and baby boomers. Out of fifteen work-related factors ranked by respondents, only three factors were found to be significantly different between the two groups, only one of which was indicated in the literature: GenXers ranked “Freedom from Supervision” significantly higher than baby boomers.

Other studies, however, support the existence of multigenerational differences in organizations. Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Myers (1998) found that age, along with other time related dimensions, had a powerful effect in shaping attitudes and behaviors of senior leaders within the Australian Commonwealth (federal) government. In their study, three leader profiles emerged, similar to the generational categories found in other research. The “Radicals” (age 26 to 35) were described as energetic, committed, and disciplined in terms of effectively promoting follow-through. They were competitive, market driven, and results oriented. In developing others to focus on customers and clients, they adopted an open style of leading, which included encouraging feedback and dialogue throughout the organization. However, despite their open style, they were equally strong-minded leaders who like to be in charge. Their demand for high performance, coupled with lack of patience, resulted in radicals becoming hypercritical, cynical, and punitive. This negativity was seen as potentially inhibiting others from offering suggestions to improve operations and performance. As Kakabadse et al. note, “the irony with radicals is that their drive and enthusiasm can be undermined by their daunting presence, for when faced with problems and challenges, their worst side is raised (p.370).”

The other two leader profiles identified in the study were the “Bureaucrats” and the “Team players.” Bureaucrats (age 46-55) were described as effective communicators, disciplined, service conscious, and committed to their organization and the client. Although people-oriented, like the Radicals they preferred being the boss and in control. Their focus on detail and routine was seen as driven by a need for structure and systems. Bureaucrats often leveraged protocol to their advantage, especially in resisting attempts by others to intervene in what they considered their business.

In comparison to the other two leader profiles, Team Players were older. They were described as being strong people and team oriented leaders who encouraged feedback and openness in communication. Team players tended to be somewhat conservative, less likely to openly criticize past traditions and inadequacies of their organizations, and to have a poor history of driving change. What particularly differentiated

team players from the other two leader profiles were their maturity, their seeing challenges and initiatives through to completion, and their long-term perspective in managing people and systems.

A third issue highlighting the importance of studying leadership and age is the assumed *impact* of multigenerational differences in leader behavior on individual and organizational outcomes. To date, research examining age and effectiveness of overall performance is inconclusive (Kakabadse and Kakabadse, 1999). Two arguments prevail in the literature. The first argument, based in part on the perspective of ageism, suggests that older leaders are rigid, are less likely to retool and be willing to learn new ways of working, are prone to resist change and innovation, and hence are likely to encumber the organization. The alternative argument is that because of their years of experience and “trial by fire”, older leaders have developed a maturity, wisdom, and “corporate memory” that allows them to anticipate problems, respond to crisis calmly and with confidence, and to effectively develop others to assume leadership through role modeling, coaching, and mentoring relationships.

The present study was conducted to further examine multigenerational differences in leader behavior and its impact on individual performance. Specifically, our research addressed the following questions: (1) do generational cohort groups differ in terms of leader behaviors, and if so, on what behaviors, and (2) are there significant differences in effectiveness rating between generational cohorts? The present study attempted to control for several of the methodological flaws evident in previous research by matching the generational cohorts on gender, industry, and organizational function. In addition, larger sample sizes, multidimensional evaluations of leadership behavior (22 measures) and effectiveness (3 measures), and the use of multiple observer groups (Church, 1995; Tornow, 1993) were employed.

## **Study I – Department and Unit Managers**

### **Method**

#### **Participants**

Participants consisted of 640 younger (age 25-35 years) and 640 older (age 45-55) unit and department managers completing 360-degree evaluations as part of leadership development programs in 282 North American companies. Subjects were selected from 49 US states, 8 Canadian provinces, and a wide range of industries. Demographic characteristics of the 1280 managers are provided in *Tables 1* and *2*.

A total of 1,534 boss evaluations, 4,728 peer evaluations, and 4,940 direct report evaluations were obtained on the 1280 managers. This provided a median of 1 boss, 4 peer, and 4 direct report evaluations for each manager. Observer demographic characteristics are provided in *Table 3*.

#### **Instruments**

##### **Leadership Behaviors**

Each manager completed the Self version of the *Leadership Effectiveness Analysis*<sup>TM</sup> (LEA; Management Research Group, 1992), while bosses, peers, and direct reports completed the Observer version. The LEA is a descriptive, behaviorally oriented instrument, providing scores on 22 dimensions of leadership behavior. The instrument has demonstrated high reliabilities, low inter-scale correlations, and excellent construct and criterion-rated validity in extensive large sample studies (Kabacoff, 1998). For interpretive purposes, raw scores are converted to percentile rank scores through comparisons with a large and representative sample of mid to senior level business managers. In the current investigation, percentile rank scores were based on comparisons with 30,000 LEA 360-degree evaluations completed in North America over the last 5 years. Brief descriptions of the 22 leadership dimensions assessed by the LEA are provided in *Appendix A*.

## Leadership Effectiveness

The Observer version of the LEA also contains 20 graphically anchored rating scales assessing various aspects of leadership effectiveness. Based on both factor analytic studies and rational considerations, these rating scales have been combined to yield 3 broader effectiveness measures: Business Skills, People Skills, and General Effectiveness. The resulting measures have demonstrated high reliabilities and good content and factorial validity (Kabacoff, 1998). Brief descriptions of these scales and their content are provided in *Appendix B*.

## Design and Procedure

Data were obtained by sampling from an extensive archive of 360-degree leadership evaluations maintained by an international human resource development firm. Evaluations were completed in the course of ongoing organizational development projects. A subject pair was selected if a match between an older and younger manager on industry type, functional area, and gender could be found, and if complete 360-degree evaluations were available for both members of the pair. This process yielded 640 such older-younger pairs and a total of 12,482 completed questionnaires (1,280 self and 11,202 observer evaluations). Peers and direct reports completed evaluations anonymously.

## Results

### Leadership Practices

Given the ordinal nature of percentile rank scores, age differences in LEA self-ratings were examined via a series of Wilcoxon independent 2-sample tests with the 22 leadership variables employed as dependent variables and age of manager (25-35 vs. 45-55 years) as the independent variable<sup>1</sup>. The process was repeated for boss, peer, and direct report data. For observer data, median ratings for each scale were employed as the dependent variables with boss, peer, and direct report data analyzed separately. In addition, a Spearman correlation coefficient for each age comparison is provided<sup>2</sup>. The latter is provided to aid in the interpretation of effect size.

#### *Self Ratings*

Significant age group differences were obtained on 14 leadership variables ( $p < .05$ ). Details for self ratings are provided in *Table 4*. These include group median percentile rank scores, Wilcoxon statistics, significance levels, Spearman correlations, and a statement describing the direction of the results.

#### *Observer Ratings*

Significant age group differences ( $p < .05$ ) were obtained on 16 boss-rated leadership variables. Details are provided in *Table 5*. For peer-ratings, 14 significant differences were obtained and are described in *Table 6*. Finally, 13 significant age group differences were obtained for direct report rated leadership behaviors. Results are provided in *Table 7*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Analyses employing raw scores and MANOVAs, rather than percentile rank scores and nonparametric tests yielded similar results. The latter is provided here to aid in the interpretation of findings.

<sup>2</sup> Spearman correlations were indicate the correlations between age group rated (1=older group, 0=younger group) and the ordinal leadership behavior measures (percentile rank scores).

## Summary

The twenty-two leadership scales of the LEA are grouped into 6 functional sets: Creating a Vision, Developing Followership, Implementing the Vision, Following Through, Achieving Results, and Team Playing. Findings for each functional set are summarized below. Results are also summarized in *Table 8*.

*Creating a Vision.* Older managers were rated higher on Conservative than younger managers by self-report and the evaluations of all three observer groups (boss, peers, direct reports). They were rated higher on Technical by boss ratings and self-report. Younger managers were rated higher on Strategic by bosses and higher on Innovative by bosses and peers.

*Developing Followership.* Younger managers were rated higher on Excitement by self-report and all three observer groups. Bosses, peers, and direct reports rated older managers higher on Restraint. Older managers were higher on Persuasive than younger managers by self-report, but not by observer ratings.

*Implementing the Vision.* Younger managers were rated higher on Tactical than older managers (by self, peer, and direct report ratings) and higher on Communication (by bosses). Older managers were described as higher on Delegation by self and peer ratings, and higher on Structuring by peer ratings.

*Achieving Results.* Younger managers were rated higher on Management Focus and Production than older managers by self-report and observer ratings (boss, peers, direct reports). All but direct reports rated younger managers higher on Dominant.

*Team Playing.* Older managers were rated higher than younger managers on Cooperation (by self, boss, and peer ratings), Deference to Authority (by boss and direct report ratings) and Empathy (by boss, peer, and direct report ratings).

*Following Through.* No age group differences were found for this functional area.

## Leadership Effectiveness

Age group differences in observer ratings were examined via separate MANOVAs for each observer group, with the effectiveness measures as dependent variables, and age group of the manager as the independent variable. A significant MANOVA was followed by separate ANOVAs and measures of effect sizes for each dependent variable.

The MANOVA for boss ratings was significant (Wilk's  $A=0.91$ ,  $F(3,1276)=40.01$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ) and ANOVAs were significant for all three effectiveness measures. Effect sizes for significant age differences ranged from -0.30 to -0.59. Bosses rated younger managers as more effective than older managers on all three effectiveness measures. The MANOVA for peer ratings was significant (Wilk's  $A=0.93$ ,  $F(3,1219)=32.57$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Peers rated younger managers higher on Business Skills ( $d=-0.15$ ) and Overall Effectiveness ( $d=-0.41$ ). Finally, the MANOVAs for direct report ratings was significant (Wilk's  $A=0.97$ ,  $F(3,1276)=14.82$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Direct reports rated younger managers as more effective than older managers on all three effectiveness measures. Effect sizes ranged from -0.12 for People Skills to -0.32 for Overall Effectiveness. Details are provided in *Table 8*.

## Study II – Division Heads, Vice Presidents, and Senior Vice Presidents

Study I was replicated with a diverse sample of younger and older Division Heads, Vice Presidents and Senior Vice Presidents, using procedures identical to those described above.

### Method

#### Participants

Participants consisted of 127 younger (age 25-35 years) and 127 older (age 45-55) senior executives completing 360-degree evaluations as part of leadership development programs in 124 North American companies. Subjects were selected from 36 US states, 5 Canadian provinces, and a wide range of industries. Demographic characteristics of the 254 senior executives are provided in *Tables 9 and 10*.

A total of 318 boss evaluations, 938 peer evaluations, and 1,092 direct report evaluations were obtained on the 254 senior executives. This provided a median of 1 boss, 4 peer, and 4 direct report evaluations for each manager. Observer demographic characteristics are provided in *Table 11*.

#### Instruments, Design and Procedures

This study mirrored Study I in all respects. Leadership behaviors and leadership effectiveness were evaluated through a 360-degree assessment process using the LEA questionnaires. Evaluations were completed in the course of ongoing organizational development projects. A subject pair was selected if a match between an older and younger senior executive on industry type, functional area, management level and gender could be found, and if complete 360-degree evaluations were available for both members of the pair. This process yielded 254 such older-younger pairs and a total of 2,597 completed questionnaires (254 self and 2,343 observer evaluations). Peers and direct reports completed evaluations anonymously. Results are described below.

### Results

#### *Self Ratings*

Significant age group differences were obtained on 5 leadership variables ( $p < .05$ ). Details for self ratings are provided in *Table 12*.

#### *Observer Ratings*

Significant age group differences were obtained on 11 boss-rated leadership variables ( $p < .05$ ). Details are provided in *Table 13*. For peer ratings, 12 significant differences were obtained and are described in *Table 14*. Finally, 8 significant age group differences were obtained for direct report rated leadership behaviors. Results are provided in *Table 15*.

#### *Summary*

Findings for each functional set are summarized below. Results are also summarized in *Table 18*.

*Creating a Vision.* Older executives were rated higher on Conservative than younger executives by all three observer groups (boss, peers, direct reports). They were rated higher on Technical and Self by boss ratings. Younger executives were rated higher on Innovative than older executives by bosses and peers.

*Developing Followership.* Younger executives were rated higher on Excitement by self-report and all three observer groups. Peers rated older executives as higher on Restraint. Younger executives were higher on Persuasive than younger executives by boss and peer ratings.

*Implementing the Vision.* Younger executives were rated higher on Tactical than older executives (by self, peer, and direct report ratings) and higher on Communication (by direct reports). Older executives were described as higher Delegation by self and direct report ratings. Younger executives rated themselves as higher on Structuring than older executives did. However, bosses rate older executives higher on Structuring than younger executives.

*Achieving Results.* Younger executives were rated higher on Production than older managers by self-report and observer ratings (boss, peers, direct reports). Bosses and peers also rated younger executives higher on Management Focus and Dominant.

*Team Playing.* Peers rated older executives higher than younger executives on Cooperation. Both peers and direct reports rated older executives as higher on Deference to Authority and Empathy.

*Following Through.* Bosses rated younger executives higher on Control.

## **Leadership Effectiveness**

The MANOVA for boss ratings was significant (Wilk's  $A=0.88$ ,  $F(3,250)=11.71$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ) and ANOVAs were significant for all three effectiveness measures. Effect sizes for significant age differences ranged from  $-0.25$  to  $-0.61$ . Bosses rated younger executives as more effective than older executives on all three effectiveness measures. The MANOVA for peer ratings was significant (Wilk's  $A=0.92$ ,  $F(3,241)=6.85$ ,  $p < .0002$ ). Peers rated younger executives higher on Overall Effectiveness ( $d=-0.47$ ). Finally, the MANOVAs for direct report ratings was significant (Wilk's  $A=0.89$ ,  $F(3,250)=9.92$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Direct reports rated younger executives as more effective than older executives on Overall Effectiveness ( $d=-0.51$ ). Details are provided in *Table 16*.

## **Discussion**

In comparing younger and older leaders, numerous differences in both leadership behaviors and ratings of effectiveness were obtained. These differences were also fairly consistent across the organizational levels investigated.

Ratings suggest that compared with younger leaders, older leaders are more likely to study problems in light of past practices in order to ensure predictability, and minimize risk. To a lesser degree, younger leaders feel more comfortable in fast changing environments and are more willing to take risks and consider new approaches. Older leaders are rated higher than younger leaders on maintaining an in-depth knowledge of their field and emphasizing this knowledge to study problems and issues. Bosses saw older department managers as lower on strategic thinking and long-range planning than their younger counterparts.

Compared with older leaders at both mid and senior levels, younger leaders were described as operating with more energy, intensity, and emotional expression and having a greater capacity to energize others. Older leaders were more likely to maintain a calmer, lower-key, understated interpersonal demeanor and to be less emotionally expressive.

Some of the most striking differences are in the area of achieving results. Younger leaders were described as more likely to seek out positions of authority, taking charge and leading the efforts of others. They were described as more likely to push vigorously to achieve results in an assertive and competitive manner than their older counterparts. They were also described as more likely to adopt a strong orientation toward achievement, holding high expectations for themselves and others.

Conversely, older leaders were described as accommodating more to the needs and interest of others and being willing to defer performance on their own objects to assist colleagues with theirs. They were described as demonstrating more of an active concern for other people and their needs by forming close and supportive relationships with others. Finally, older leaders were described as showing loyalty to their organization and respecting the opinions of others in authority to a greater degree than their younger counterparts.

The picture of age differences emerging from these results is consistent with many of the findings obtained in past research. Younger leaders bring an energizing presence, are open to change, and are fo-

cused on attaining results. Their approach may be described as more self-focused and less open to compromise. Older leaders bring a calmer, more considered approach, steeped in the traditions of the organization. Their approach is more in the role of the good corporate citizen. While younger leaders may be focused on self-development in career and abilities, older leaders may be more focused on the development of those workers below them. Their approach is more democratic and “other” oriented.

There are several possible explanations for the age differences observed. First, the two age groups have had different experiences growing up. For example, the younger group may have had more solitary experiences (e.g. latch-key children), and has been socialized with more messages emphasizing individual over group achievement, and the questioning of authority. The younger group has also been raised during a time of greater and accelerating change. Second, these groups became corporate members at different times and under different expectations. When the older group entered the workforce, the expectation was that if they took care of their company, the company would take care of them – the so-called womb to tomb approach. Expectations have clearly changed over time. Today, workers entering the workforce hear the message that there is a place for them only so long as they produce. The implicit contract is time-limited and emphasizes innovative production.

The differences described above refer to leadership behaviors. With regard to effectiveness ratings, all three observer groups rated younger unit managers higher on overall effectiveness than older unit managers. Differences between older and younger unit managers were most pronounced when bosses were completing the ratings. Age group differences on business skills and people skills were less when peers and direct reports were rating the unit managers. Age group differences in overall effectiveness ratings for senior executives were more pronounced than for unit managers. All three observer groups rated younger senior executives more highly. However, rating differences between the older and younger senior executives on both business skills and people skills were attenuated.

There are several possible explanations for differences in effectiveness ratings. The most obvious is the salience of age in various positions. Younger leaders that have achieved the level of division head or vice president are likely to be seen as up and coming stars – particularly by their superiors. Older senior executives may be seen as having climbed the corporate ladder over a normal time frame. Conversely, younger unit managers may be viewed as just starting out, whereas older unit managers may be viewed less positively, given the length of time they have been in their present positions without advancement.

Less obviously, younger leaders tended to display behaviors (excitement, persuasiveness, innovation) that would raise their visibility to others – again particularly with superiors. This dynamic and charismatic approach may make it more likely that they would garner attention and glamour and thus be seen in a positive fashion. Finally, the fact that age differences are stronger for overall effectiveness than for business or people skills suggests that these differences represent more global perceptions and are less tied to specific strengths or weaknesses.

Given that age group differences were found in ratings of both effectiveness and behavior, there is some confounding between the two sources of variance. However, it is unlikely that the differences in leadership behavior obtained between older and younger leaders is due solely, or even primarily to differences in perceived effectiveness. First, the differences in leadership behaviors fit patterns of generational differences reported by other investigators. Second and more importantly, over the past 5 years we have conducted more than a dozen best leadership practice studies using the databases from which the current investigation data was sampled. The pattern of age differences found in the current investigation do not match the differences we typically find between more and less effective leaders in general (see Kabacoff, 1998).

## **Implications**

The challenge facing organizations is to find ways of using and valuing the unique contributions of both younger and older leaders. Organizations need change agents, but also individuals who can help to maintain the corporation’s past learning. They need high achieving individuals who will drive production. At the same time, they need to develop their talent pools through a process of mentoring. During times of crisis, both innovative risk taking and a calm approach that values past wisdom is needed. There is room for both the “Hollywood star” and the “good corporate citizen”.

In today’s organizations, older and younger leaders are likely to be working together in team oriented endeavors. A mutual understanding of the strengths and weaknesses each group brings is crucial to

future success. Conversely, ignoring the value of one approach and emphasizing the other is highly problematic. Excitement and innovation can easily turn to chaos – just as conservatism can turn to entropy.

### Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The current investigation was correlational in nature, and thus limited regarding possible causal connections between developmental experiences and current group differences. In addition, leadership behaviors and leadership effectiveness were measured via rater perceptions rather than more object measures. In addition, raters rated one and only one age group. Therefore, comparisons between groups are implicit rather than explicit. However, the sample size was large and diverse, groups were matched on important and possibly confounding variables and extensive and specific outcome variables were employed. Future research, focusing on the interaction of younger and older leaders within the same organization is needed. Additionally, intervention-outcome studies investigating the impact of age diversity training programs on organizational development and effectiveness would be beneficial.

### References

- Blau, P.M. (1977). *Inequality and heterogeneity*. New York, N.Y.: Free Press.
- Bower C., & Fidler, M (1994). The importance of generational literacy. *Leadership*, p.30-35.
- Church, A. (1995). First-rate multirater feedback. *Training and Development*, 49, 42-43.
- Cufaude, J.B., & Riemersa, M (1999). The future face of the workforce. *Association Management*, 51, p.1-3
- Cufaude, J.B. (2000). Cultivating new leadership. *Association Management*, 52, 73-79.
- Ernst, C.T. (2000). Continuity through conversation: A voice for generation X. *Proceeding from the 82<sup>nd</sup> Conference on Human Issues in Management*, Silver Bay, New York.
- Hedges, L. & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2000). Generation x and the public employee. *Public Personnel Management*, 29, p. 55-81.
- Losyk, R. (1997). Generation x” What they think and what they plan to do. *Futurist*, 39-45.
- Kabacoff, R. (1998). *Leadership Effectiveness Analysis: Technical considerations*. (Available from the Management Research Group, 14-26 York Street, Portland, ME 04101).
- Kakabadse.A., Kakabadse, N., & Myers, A. (1998). Demographics and leadership philosophy: Exploring gender differences. *Journal of Management Development*, 17, 351-388.
- Kakabadse.A., & Kakabadse, N. (1999). *Essence of leadership*. New York; International Thomson Business Press.
- Manz C.C., & Sims, H.P. (1993). Tyrannosaurus rex: The boss as corporate dinosaur. In Gill Robinson Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (1998). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Management Research Group. (1992). *Leadership Effectiveness Analysis*. Portland, ME: Author.
- Manz, C.C., & Grothe, R. (1991). “Is the workforce vanguard to the 21<sup>st</sup> century a quality of work life deficient-prone generation?”. *Journal of Business Research*, 23, 67-82.
- Mitchell, S. (1998). *American generations: Who are they. How they live. What they think*. Ithaca, New York: New Strategist Publications, Inc.
- Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. In L.L. Cumming’s and B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol.5). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tornow, W. (Ed.). (1993). Special issue on 360-degree feedback [Special issue]. *Human Resource Management*, 32 (2-3).
- Wah, L. (1999). Older bosses are best. *Management Review*, 88, p.7.

**Table 1.**  
**Variables Used to Match Older and Younger Mid-Level Executives**

<b>Demographic Variable<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Older</b>		<b>Younger</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Functional Area</b>				
Accounting/Finance	47	7.3	47	7.3
Administration/Operations	179	28	179	28
Customer Service	66	10.3	66	10.3
Data Processing/Systems	28	4.3	28	4.3
Distribution/Fulfillment	9	1.4	9	1.4
HR/Personnel	37	5.8	37	5.8
Manufacturing	30	4.7	30	4.7
Marketing/Sales	115	18	115	18
Technical/Engineering/Research	57	9	57	9
Other	72	11.3	72	11.3
<b>Industry</b>				
Accounting/Banking/Finance	82	12.9	82	12.9
Insurance	115	18	115	18
Health Care/Medical	56	8.8	56	8.8
General Manufacturing	102	16	102	16
Communications/Telecom	65	10.1	65	10.1
Pharmaceuticals/Medical Products	28	4.3	28	4.3
Social Services	10	1.6	10	1.6
Wholesale/Retail Trade	48	7.6	48	7.6
Computer/Office Equipment	18	2.8	18	2.8
Utilities	15	2.4	15	2.4
Business/Info Systems	4	.6	4	.6
Education	5	.8	5	.8
Food Products/Processing	7	1.1	7	1.1
Hospitality/Travel/Tourism	22	3.4	22	3.4
Printing/Publishing/Advertising	9	1.4	9	1.4
Contracting/Construction	6	.9	6	.9
Mining/Oil/Gas/Chemicals	3	.5	3	.5
Real Estate/Land Development	6	.9	6	.9
Research/Scientific Services	1	.2	1	.2
Transportation	1	.2	1	.2
Other	36	5.7	36	5.7
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	443	70	443	70
Female	197	31	197	31

<sup>†</sup>N adds up to 640 and percentages add up to 100% for each age group for each variable.

**Table 2.**  
**Additional Demographic Characteristics of Mid-Level Executives**

Demographic Variable <sup>†</sup>	Older		Younger	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
African American	15	2.3	11	1.7
Am Indian or Alaskan Native	7	1.1	7	1.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	10	1.6	25	4
Hispanic	15	2.3	15	2.3
Caucasian	573	90	564	88
Missing	20	3.1	18	2.8
<b>Number of Subordinates</b>				
1 - 9	414	65	402	63
10 - 19	128	20	144	23
20 - 29	33	5.2	23	3.6
30 - 39	11	1.7	16	2.5
40+	36	5.6	39	6.1
Missing	18	2.8	16	2.5
<b>Education</b>				
Grades 9-12	50	7.8	25	3.9
Tech/Vocational	34	5.3	18	2.8
2 Years College	106	16.6	83	13
4 Years College	251	39.2	340	53.1
Graduate School	192	30	168	26.3
Missing	7	1.1	6	.1

<sup>†</sup>N adds up to 640 and percentages add up to 100% for each gender for each variable.

**Table 3.**  
**Demographic Characteristics of Observers of Mid-Level Executives**

Characteristics <sup>†</sup>	Bosses (N=1,534)		Peers (N=4,728)		Direct Reports (N=4,940)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	1146	74.7	2980	63	2363	47.8
Female	308	20.1	1527	32.3	2300	46.6
Missing	80	5.2	221	4.7	277	5.6
<b>Age</b>						
<= 29 Years	14	39	240	5.1	890	18
30 – 39 Years	350	22.8	1604	33.9	1779	36
40 – 49 Years	631	41.1	1778	37.6	1248	25.3
50 – 59 Years	387	25.2	695	14.7	508	10.3
60+ Years	47	3	82	1.7	71	1.4
Missing	105	6.8	329	7	444	9
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	26	1.7	95	2	181	3.7
Am Indian or Alaskan Native	12	.8	62	1.3	81	1.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	25	1.6	135	2.9	197	4
Hispanic	16	1	75	1.6	115	2.3
Caucasian	1312	85.5	3951	83.6	3906	79.1
Missing	143	9.3	410	8.7	460	9.3
<b>Time Known Person Rated</b>						
< 1 Year	404	26.3	1078	22.8	1765	35.7
1 – 4 Years	488	31.8	1645	34.8	1637	33.1
5 – 10 Years	467	30.4	1463	30.9	1104	22.4
11 – 15 Years	104	6.8	281	5.9	252	5.1
16+ Years	71	4.6	260	5.5	182	6.7
Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Education</b>						
Grades 1 – 8	0	0	0	0	3	0
Grades 9 – 12	45	2.9	284	6	681	13.8
Tech/Vocational	26	1.7	188	4	381	7.7
2 Years College	137	8.9	560	11.8	907	18.4
4 Years College	572	37.3	1915	40.5	1878	38
Grad School	556	36.3	1265	26.7	684	13.9
Missing	198	12.9	516	10.9	406	8.2

<sup>†</sup> Percentages add up to 100% for each variable within each observer group.

**Table 4.**  
**Mid-Level Executives – Self-Report Ratings of Leadership Practices**

<b>Leadership Practice</b>	<b>Older Median (n=640)</b>	<b>Younger Median (n=640)</b>	<b>Wilcoxon Statistic</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>Results</b>
Conservative	80	75	382784.5	0.000	0.12	Older > Younger
Innovative	60	60	419916.5	0.130	-0.04	
Technical	65	60	386376.5	0.000	0.10	Older > Younger
Self	45	40	393638.5	0.014	0.07	Older > Younger
Strategic	50	50	420595.5	0.106	-0.05	
Persuasive	40	35	388741.5	0.001	0.09	Older > Younger
Outgoing	50	60	447338.5	0.000	-0.16	Younger > Older
Excitement	30	50	460436.0	0.000	-0.21	Younger > Older
Restraint	65	65	410180.0	0.969	-0.00	
Structure	60	53	395156.0	0.025	0.06	Older > Younger
Tactical	60	65	432394.5	0.001	-0.10	Younger > Older
Communication	50	50	416141.5	0.346	-0.03	
Delegation	60	55	382055.0	0.000	0.12	Older > Younger
Control	45	45	412900.0	0.652	-0.01	
Feedback	55	60	413315.5	0.607	-0.01	
Management Focus	60	65	428470.0	0.005	-0.08	Younger > Older
Dominant	50	55	428500.0	0.005	-0.08	Younger > Older
Production	45	60	452738.5	0.000	-0.18	Younger > Older
Cooperation	70	65	382126.5	0.000	0.12	Older > Younger
Consensual	40	40	397864.0	0.068	0.05	
Deference to Authority	75	70	395366.0	0.027	0.06	Older > Younger
Empathy	50	50	402648.0	0.271	0.03	

**Table 5.**  
**Mid-Level Executives - Boss Ratings of Leadership Practices by Age Rated**

Leadership Practice	Group Rated		Wilcoxon Statistic	p	r <sub>s</sub>	Results
	Older (n=640) Median	Younger (n=640) Median				
Conservative	80	60	356941.0	0.000	0.22	Older > Younger
Innovative	45	60	451943.0	0.000	-0.18	Younger > Older
Technical	64	55	395550.0	0.030	0.06	Older > Younger
Self	55	50	399769.5	0.124	0.04	
Strategic	45	55	430258.0	0.002	-0.09	Younger > Older
Persuasive	45	50	424685.0	0.025	-0.06	Younger > Older
Outgoing	50	48	407350.0	0.697	0.01	
Excitement	45	55	456282.0	0.000	-0.20	Younger > Older
Restraint	67	60	392409.5	0.008	0.07	Older > Younger
Structure	60	55	396456.0	0.042	0.06	Older > Younger
Tactical	65	65	414063.0	0.530	-0.02	
Communication	40	49	438612.5	0.000	-0.12	Younger > Older
Delegation	60	60	401312.5	0.192	0.04	
Control	50	55	424593.5	0.026	-0.06	Younger > Older
Feedback	51	50	409631.5	0.965	0.00	
Management Focus	45	60	448371.0	0.000	-0.16	Younger > Older
Dominant	50	55	431275.5	0.001	-0.09	Younger > Older
Production	54	70	470978.0	0.000	-0.26	Younger > Older
Cooperation	60	55	387774.0	0.001	0.09	Older > Younger
Consensual	50	50	410595.5	0.919	-0.00	
Deference to Authority	60	50	383555.5	0.000	0.11	Older > Younger
Empathy	60	53	387805.5	0.001	0.09	Older > Younger

**Table 6.**  
**Mid-Level Executives - Peer Ratings of Leadership Practices by Age Rated**

Leadership Practice	Group Rated		Wilcoxon Statistic	p	r <sub>s</sub>	Results
	Older (n=640) Median	Younger (n=640) Median				
Conservative	68	55	451336.0	0.000	0.29	Older > Younger
Innovative	51	57	354437.5	0.000	-0.15	Younger > Older
Technical	57	53	403789.0	0.008	0.08	Older > Younger
Self	55	51	396777.5	0.119	0.04	
Strategic	52	52	387963.0	0.865	0.00	
Persuasive	50	53	381303.0	0.379	-0.02	
Outgoing	50	50	380811.0	0.338	-0.03	
Excitement	44	58	338290.0	0.000	-0.22	Younger > Older
Restraint	66	60	409489.5	0.000	0.10	Older > Younger
Structure	59	55	405281.5	0.004	0.08	Older > Younger
Tactical	63	66	369016.5	0.005	-0.08	Younger > Older
Communication	48	50	379935.0	0.273	-0.03	
Delegation	63	60	403877.0	0.007	0.08	Older > Younger
Control	48	50	375032.0	0.062	-0.05	
Feedback	50	50	386065.0	0.897	-0.00	
Management Focus	48	57	350741.0	0.000	-0.16	Younger > Older
Dominant	48	53	366905.5	0.002	-0.09	Younger > Older
Production	52	65	324229.5	0.000	-0.28	Younger > Older
Cooperation	58	55	406656.0	0.002	0.09	Older > Younger
Consensual	48	48	397562.0	0.092	0.05	
Deference to Authority	51	48	402140.0	0.016	0.07	Older > Younger
Empathy	53	48	408524.0	0.001	0.10	Older > Younger

**Table 7.**  
**Mid-Level Executives - Direct Report Ratings of Leadership Practices by Age Rated**

Leadership Practice	Group Rated		Wilcoxon Statistic	p	r <sub>s</sub>	Results
	Older (n=640) Median	Younger (n=640) Median				
Conservative	66	54	349952.5	0.000	0.25	Older > Younger
Innovative	52	58	431369.5	0.001	-0.09	Younger > Older
Technical	58	57	400161.0	0.140	0.04	
Self	54	52	397964.5	0.071	0.05	
Strategic	55	53	398623.0	0.088	0.05	
Persuasive	41	43	415346.0	0.412	-0.02	
Outgoing	49	53	425306.5	0.020	-0.07	Younger > Older
Excitement	43	56	467493.0	0.000	-0.24	Younger > Older
Restraint	66	62	392815.5	0.010	0.07	Older > Younger
Structure	57	55	395632.5	0.031	0.06	Older > Younger
Tactical	62	65	432490.0	0.001	-0.10	Younger > Older
Communication	53	55	422128.5	0.065	-0.05	
Delegation	65	63	395491.5	0.029	0.06	Older > Younger
Control	48	49	412476.5	0.699	-0.01	
Feedback	50	51	418944.0	0.172	-0.04	
Management Focus	47	50	427113.0	0.009	-0.07	Younger > Older
Dominant	47	49	423079.0	0.047	-0.06	Younger > Older
Production	52	63	461545.0	0.000	-0.22	Younger > Older
Cooperation	65	65	402561.5	0.266	0.03	
Consensual	54	53	405829.0	0.536	0.02	
Deference to Authority	52	48	392232.0	0.007	0.07	Older > Younger
Empathy	55	51	386767.5	0.000	0.10	Older > Younger

**Table 8.**  
**Leadership Effectiveness Ratings By Observer Group and Age Rated for Mid-Level Executives**

Effectiveness Rating	Observer Group	Age of Executive Rated				F	p	Effect Size
		Older (n=640)		Younger (n=640)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Business Skills	Boss	30.19	4.71	31.76	4.48	37.28	<.0001	-0.34
	Peers	31.52	3.67	32.03	3.34	6.48	.011	-0.15
	Direct Reports	32.78	3.65	33.28	3.31	6.37	.012	-0.14
People Skills	Boss	50.74	7.86	52.99	6.99	29.46	<.0001	-0.30
	Peer	50.78	6.63	51.11	6.38	0.77	.38	-0.05
	Direct Reports	51.01	7.32	51.85	6.86	4.52	.034	-0.12
Overall	Boss	14.62	3.02	16.33	2.80	108.98	<.0001	-0.59
	Peers	15.03	2.23	15.89	1.95	51.41	<.0001	-0.41
	Direct Reports	15.53	2.38	16.24	2.03	32.65	<.0001	-0.32

**Table 9.**  
**Variables Used to Match Older and Younger Senior Executives**

<b>Demographic Variable<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Older</b>		<b>Younger</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Management Level</b>				
Senior/Executive Vice President	16	12.6	16	12.67
Division Head/Vice President	111	87.4	111	87.4
<b>Functional Area</b>				
Accounting/Finance	17	13.4	17	13.4
Administration/Operations	45	35.4	45	35.4
Customer Service	1	.8	1	.8
Data Processing/Systems	5	4	5	4
Distribution/Fulfillment	1	.8	1	.8
HR/Personnel	4	3.2	4	3.2
Manufacturing	1	.8	1	.8
Marketing/Sales	35	28	35	28
Technical/Engineering/Research	5	4	5	4
Other	13	10	13	10
<b>Industry</b>				
Accounting/Banking/Finance	31	24.4	31	24.4
Insurance	25	20	25	20
Health Care/Medical	18	14.2	18	14.2
General Manufacturing	6	4.7	6	4.7
Communications/Telecom	4	3.2	4	3.2
Pharmaceuticals/Medical Products	6	4.8	6	4.8
Social Services	1	.8	1	.8
Wholesale/Retail Trade	8	6.3	8	6.3
Computer/Office Equipment	1	.8	1	.8
Business/Info Systems	8	6.3	8	6.3
Consulting	1	.8	1	.8
Education	1	.8	1	.8
Hospitality/Travel/Tourism	6	4.7	6	4.7
Printing/Publishing/Advertising	2	1.6	2	1.6
Real Estate/Land Development	1	.8	1	.8
Other	8	6.3	8	6.3
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	99	78	99	78
Female	28	22	28	22

<sup>†</sup>N adds up to 640 and percentages add up to 100% for each age group for each variable.

**Table 10.**  
**Additional Demographic Characteristics of Senior Executives**

Demographic Variable <sup>†</sup>	Older		Younger	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
African American	3	2.4	4	3.2
Am Indian or Alaskan Native	2	1.6	0	0
Caucasian	118	93	121	95.3
Missing	4	3.2	2	1.6
<b>Number of Subordinates</b>				
1 - 9	82	64.6	79	62.2
10 - 19	32	25.2	23	18.1
20 - 29	3	2.4	4	3.2
30 - 39	1	.8	4	3.2
40+	5	3.9	13	10.2
Missing	4	3.2	4	3.2
<b>Education</b>				
Grades 9-12	9	7.1	3	2.4
2 Years College	11	8.7	9	7.1
4 Years College	46	36.2	78	61.4
Graduate School	61	48	37	29.1

<sup>†</sup>N adds up to 640 and percentages add up to 100% for each gender for each variable.

**Table 11.**  
**Demographic Characteristics of Observers of Senior Executives**

Characteristics <sup>†</sup>	Bosses (N=318)		Peers (N=938)		Direct Reports (N=1,092)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	257	80.8	629	67	558	51.1
Female	38	12	255	27.2	477	43.7
Missing	23	7.2	54	5.8	57	5.2
<b>Age</b>						
<= 29 Years	0	0	33	3.5	143	13.1
30 – 39 Years	47	14.8	275	29.3	394	36.1
40 – 49 Years	145	45.6	363	38.7	309	28.3
50 – 59 Years	89	28	181	19.3	147	13.5
60+ Years	11	3.46	18	1.9	16	1.5
Missing	26	8.2	68	7.3	83	7.6
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	1	.3	10	1.1	26	2.4
Am Indian or Alaskan Native	3	.9	9	1	11	1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	.3	15	1.6	26	2.4
Hispanic	3	1	10	1.1	16	1.5
Caucasian	279	87.7	799	85.2	932	85.4
Missing	31	9.8	95	10.1	81	7.4
<b>Time Known Person Rated</b>						
< 1 Year	70	22	242	25.8	308	28.2
1 – 4 Years	93	29.3	307	32.7	386	35.4
5 – 10 Years	109	34.3	279	29.7	296	27.1
11 – 15 Years	29	9.1	71	7.6	63	5.8
16+ Years	17	5.4	39	4.2	39	3.6
<b>Education</b>						
Grades 1 – 8	0	0	2	.2	0	0
Grades 9 – 12	4	1.3	28	3	97	8.9
Tech/Vocational	2	.6	20	2.1	47	4.3
2 Years College	22	6.9	93	9.9	179	16.4
4 Years College	118	37.1	337	35.9	450	41.2
Grad School	126	39.6	333	35.5	229	21
Missing	46	14.5	125	13.3	90	8.2

<sup>†</sup> Percentages add up to 100% for each variable within each observer group.

**Table 12.**  
**Senior Executives – Self-Report Ratings of Leadership Practices**

<b>Leadership Practice</b>	<b>Older Median (n=127)</b>	<b>Younger Median (n=127)</b>	<b>Wilcoxon Statistic</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>r<sub>s</sub></b>	<b>Results</b>
Conservative	75	65	15613.0	0.321	0.06	
Innovative	65	55	15531.0	0.258	0.07	
Technical	50	55	16128.5	0.913	0.01	
Self	40	35	16128.5	0.913	0.01	
Strategic	55	65	17157.5	0.099	-0.10	
Persuasive	55	45	15054.0	0.052	0.12	
Outgoing	45	55	16919.0	0.214	-0.08	
Excitement	45	60	18371.0	0.000	-0.23	Younger > Older
Restraint	60	60	16304.5	0.849	-0.01	
Structure	40	50	17471.0	0.029	-0.14	Younger > Older
Tactical	55	65	17780.0	0.007	-0.17	Younger > Older
Communication	50	45	16126.0	0.910	0.01	
Delegation	70	60	14397.5	0.002	0.19	Older > Younger
Control	50	60	17083.0	0.128	-0.10	
Feedback	60	60	16274.5	0.889	-0.01	
Management Focus	75	75	17072.5	0.132	-0.09	
Dominant	65	65	16829.5	0.276	-0.07	
Production	60	75	18214.0	0.001	-0.22	Younger > Older
Cooperation	55	50	15326.0	0.138	0.09	
Consensual	40	35	15502.0	0.237	0.07	
Deference to Authority	65	60	15572.0	0.288	0.07	
Empathy	45	45	15619.0	0.327	0.06	

**Table 13.**  
**Senior Executives - Boss Ratings of Leadership Practices by Age Rated**

Leadership Practice	Group Rated		Wilcoxon Statistic	p	r <sub>s</sub>	Results
	Older (n=127) Median	Younger (n=127) Median				
Conservative	80	50	13396.0	0.000	0.30	Older > Younger
Innovative	50	65	17528.5	0.022	-0.14	Younger > Older
Technical	65	53	14989.5	0.040	0.13	Older > Younger
Self	60	55	14863.0	0.023	0.14	Older > Younger
Strategic	55	55	15903.0	0.621	0.03	
Persuasive	50	65	17465.0	0.030	-0.14	Younger > Older
Outgoing	50	42	15674.5	0.376	0.06	
Excitement	50	68	19345.5	0.000	-0.34	Younger > Older
Restraint	60	55	15167.0	0.080	0.11	
Structure	50	41	14894.0	0.026	0.14	Older > Younger
Tactical	60	65	16699.0	0.387	-0.05	
Communication	40	44	16480.5	0.623	-0.03	
Delegation	63	60	15259.0	0.111	0.10	
Control	50	62	17914.0	0.003	-0.19	Younger > Older
Feedback	50	55	16347.0	0.792	-0.02	
Management Focus	55	70	17781.5	0.007	-0.17	Younger > Older
Dominant	50	60	17343.5	0.049	-0.12	Younger > Older
Production	55	85	20033.5	0.000	-0.41	Younger > Older
Cooperation	55	45	15232.0	0.101	0.10	
Consensual	48	50	15922.5	0.645	0.03	
Deference to Authority	42	35	15632.0	0.338	0.06	
Empathy	55	45	15281.5	0.119	0.10	

**Table 14.**  
**Senior Executives – Peer Ratings of Leadership Practices by Age Rated**

Leadership Practice	Group Rated		Wilcoxon Statistic	p	r <sub>s</sub>	Results
	Older (n=127) Median	Younger (n=127) Median				
Conservative	65	50	13036.5	0.000	0.27	Older > Younger
Innovative	52	60	17028.5	0.005	-0.18	Younger > Older
Technical	54	49	14727.0	0.208	0.08	
Self	58	58	15549.5	0.844	-0.01	
Strategic	57	55	15072.0	0.518	0.04	
Persuasive	50	64	17489.5	0.000	-0.23	Younger > Older
Outgoing	52	51	15760.0	0.569	-0.04	
Excitement	46	61	17978.0	0.000	-0.29	Younger > Older
Restraint	65	51	13917.5	0.007	0.17	Older > Younger
Structure	50	46	14636.0	0.156	0.09	
Tactical	59	67	17113.0	0.003	-0.19	Younger > Older
Communication	46	46	15690.0	0.656	-0.03	
Delegation	65	60	14539.5	0.112	0.10	
Control	46	50	16197.0	0.179	-0.09	
Feedback	50	54	16035.0	0.291	-0.07	
Management Focus	49	67	17869.0	0.000	-0.27	Younger > Older
Dominant	51	60	17004.5	0.006	-0.18	Younger > Older
Production	52	73	18552.5	0.000	-0.35	Younger > Older
Cooperation	56	48	13772.0	0.003	0.19	Older > Younger
Consensual	49	43	14521.5	0.105	0.10	
Deference to Authority	47	37	13941.5	0.008	0.17	Older > Younger
Empathy	52	42	13823.5	0.004	0.18	Older > Younger

**Table 15.**  
**Senior Executives - Direct Report Ratings of Leadership Practices by Age Rated**

Leadership Practice	Group Rated		Wilcoxon Statistic	p	r <sub>s</sub>	Results
	Older (n=127) Median	Younger (n=127) Median				
Conservative	58	55	14995.0	0.041	0.13	Older > Younger
Innovative	58	59	16686.5	0.399	-0.05	
Technical	54	57	16788.5	0.309	-0.06	
Self	54	54	15814.0	0.518	0.04	
Strategic	56	58	16260.5	0.908	-0.01	
Persuasive	52	56	16400.5	0.723	-0.02	
Outgoing	52	52	16294.0	0.863	-0.01	
Excitement	47	65	18460.0	0.000	-0.24	Younger > Older
Restraint	63	62	16074.5	0.841	0.01	
Structure	49	45	16084.5	0.854	0.01	
Tactical	58	63	18073.0	0.001	-0.20	Younger > Older
Communication	48	58	17987.5	0.002	-0.19	Younger > Older
Delegation	68	63	14232.0	0.001	0.21	Older > Younger
Control	48	52	16782.0	0.314	-0.06	
Feedback	50	50	16439.0	0.674	-0.03	
Management Focus	55	60	17171.0	0.095	-0.11	
Dominant	49	55	17178.0	0.092	-0.11	
Production	59	70	18715.5	0.000	-0.27	Younger > Older
Cooperation	61	58	15809.5	0.513	0.04	
Consensual	51	45	15117.5	0.066	0.12	
Deference to Authority	42	35	15026.5	0.046	0.13	Older > Younger
Empathy	55	50	14886.0	0.026	0.14	Older > Younger

**Table 16.**  
**Leadership Effectiveness Ratings By Observer Group and Age Rated for Senior Executives**

Effectiveness Rating	Observer Group	Age of Executive Rated				F	p	Effect Size
		Older (n=127)		Younger (n=127)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Business Skills	Boss	31.40	4.92	32.65	4.76	4.19	.042	-0.26
	Peers	32.08	3.56	32.95	3.77	3.48	.063	-0.24
	Direct Reports	34.00	3.14	34.77	2.76	4.26	.040	-0.26
People Skills	Boss	51.22	8.28	53.19	7.18	4.08	.044	-0.25
	Peer	51.11	6.62	52.06	6.36	1.31	.254	-0.15
	Direct Reports	51.76	7.13	52.31	6.50	0.41	.524	-0.08
Overall	Boss	14.66	3.08	16.52	3.06	23.48	<.0001	-0.61
	Peers	15.07	2.57	16.21	2.29	13.26	.0003	-0.47
	Direct Reports	15.86	2.56	16.99	1.81	16.42	<.0001	-0.51

**Table 17.**  
**Summary of Age Differences in Leadership Practices for Mid-Level Executives**  
**Observed by Bosses, Peers, and Direct Reports**

Leadership Practice	Rater Group			
	Self	Boss	Peers	Direct Reports
<b>Creating a Vision</b>				
Conservative	■	■	■	■
Innovative		+	+	
Technical	■		■	
Self				
Strategic		+		
<b>Developing Followership</b>				
Persuasive	■			
Outgoing	+			
Excitement	+	+	+	+
Restraint		■	■	■
<b>Implementing the Vision</b>				
Structuring			■	
Tactical	+		+	+
Communication		+		
Delegation	■		■	
<b>Following Through</b>				
Control				
Feedback				
<b>Achieving Results</b>				
Management Focus	+	+	+	+
Dominant	+	+	+	
Production	+	+	+	+
<b>Team Playing</b>				
Cooperation	■	■	■	
Consensual				
Deference to Authority		■		■
Empathy		■	■	■

Key: ■ Older > Younger  
 + Younger > Older

**Table 18.**  
**Summary of Age Differences in Leadership Practices for Senior Executives**  
**Observed by Bosses, Peers, and Direct Reports**

Leadership Practice	Rater Group			
	Self	Boss	Peers	Direct Reports
<b>Creating a Vision</b>				
Conservative		■	■	■
Innovative		+	+	
Technical		■		
Self		■		
Strategic				
<b>Developing Followership</b>				
Persuasive		+	+	
Outgoing				
Excitement	+	+	+	+
Restraint			■	
<b>Implementing the Vision</b>				
Structuring	+	■		
Tactical	+		+	+
Communication				+
Delegation	■			■
<b>Following Through</b>				
Control		+		
Feedback				
<b>Achieving Results</b>				
Management Focus		+	+	
Dominant		+	+	
Production	+	+	+	+
<b>Team Playing</b>				
Cooperation			■	
Consensual				
Deference to Authority			■	■
Empathy			■	■

Key: ■ Older > Younger  
 + Younger > Older

## Appendix A. Variables Measured by the Leadership Effectiveness Analysis

### CREATING A VISION

**Conservative:** Studying problems in light of past practices to ensure predictability, reinforce the status quo and minimize risk.

**Innovative:** Feeling comfortable in fast changing environments; being willing to take risks and to consider new and untested approaches.

**Technical:** Acquiring and maintaining in-depth knowledge in your field or area of focus; using your expertise and specialized knowledge to study issues and draw conclusions.

**Self :** Emphasizing the importance of making decisions independently; looking to yourself as the prime vehicle for decision-making.

**Strategic:** Taking a long-range, broad approach to problem solving and decision making through objective analysis, thinking ahead, and planning.

### DEVELOPING FOLLOWERSHIP

**Persuasive:** Building commitment by convincing others and winning them over to your point of view.

**Outgoing:** Acting in an extroverted, friendly and informal manner; showing a capacity to quickly establish free and easy interpersonal relationships.

**Excitement:** Operating with a good deal of energy, intensity, and emotional expression; having a capacity for keeping others enthusiastic and involved.

**Restraint:** Maintaining a low-key, understated and quiet interpersonal demeanor by working to control your emotional expression.

### IMPLEMENTING THE VISION

**Structuring:** Adopting a systematic and organized approach; preferring to work in a precise, methodical manner; developing and utilizing guidelines and procedures.

**Tactical:** Emphasizing the production of immediate results by focusing on short-range, hands-on, practical strategies.

**Communication:** Stating clearly what you want and expect from others; clearly expressing your

thoughts and ideas; maintaining a precise and constant flow of information.

**Delegation:** Enlisting the talents of others to help meet objectives by giving them important activities and sufficient autonomy to exercise their own judgment.

### FOLLOWING THROUGH

**Control:** Adopting an approach in which you take nothing for granted, set deadlines for certain actions and are persistent in monitoring the progress of activities to ensure that they are completed on schedule.

**Feedback:** Letting others know in a straightforward manner what you think of them, how well they have performed and if they have met your needs and expectations.

### ACHIEVING RESULTS

**Management Focus:** Seeking to exert influence by being in positions of authority, taking charge, and leading and directing the efforts of others.

**Dominant:** Pushing vigorously to achieve results through an approach which is forceful, assertive and competitive.

**Production:** Adopting a strong orientation toward achievement; holding high expectations for yourself and others; pushing yourself and others to achieve at high levels.

### TEAM PLAYING

**Cooperation:** Accommodating the needs and interests of others by being willing to defer performance on your own objectives in order to assist colleagues with theirs.

**Consensual:** Valuing the ideas and opinions of others and collecting their input as part of your decision-making process.

**Authority:** Showing loyalty to the organization; respecting the opinions of people in authority, and using them as resources for information, direction and decisions.

**Empathy:** Demonstrating an active concern for people and their needs by forming close and supportive relationships with others.

## Appendix B. Effectiveness Rating Scales

Each rating scale is presented as a an anchored rating scale from 1 (low) to 7 (high). Business Skills, People Skills, and Overall Effectiveness scales are formed through simple summation.

### Business Skills

**Business "smarts"** (i.e., has an instinct for making money, exploits business opportunities, is wily in business dealings).

**Financial understanding** (i.e., understands and can deal with financial issues such as budgeting, accounting, costs, P&L statements).

**Ability to see the big picture perspective** (i.e., has a strategic orientation, sees interconnections between his/her own and company's objectives, anticipates problems).

**Capacity for effective thinking** (i.e., learns rapidly, deals well with concepts, quickly gets to the heart of an issue, is incisive, etc.).

**Ability to make effective decisions.**

**Insight into how to use organizational resources** (i.e., is able to build alliances, is sophisticated about organizational dynamics, has many contacts).

### People Skills

**Sensitivity to other people's feelings** (i.e., shows concern, has insight, is helpful, avoids hurting others' feelings).

**Likableness** (i.e., easy, friendly, quick to smile, good-hearted).

**Willingness to listen** (i.e., understands quickly, acknowledges communication, goes out of his/her way to get others' views).

**Ability to work with diverse people** (i.e., people from different backgrounds, cultures, belief systems and/or life styles).

**Capacity to contribute to team performance** (i.e., is willing and able to act as a team player, complements the efforts of others).

**Ability to develop people** (i.e., allows room for mistakes, stimulates growth, challenges positively, delegates authority).

**Ability to get things done through people** (i.e., charges effectively, sets high standards, organizes efforts well).

**Effectiveness as an advocate for his/her people** (i.e., defends his/her people appropriately, sells their views to management, protects his/her people from arbitrary decisions).

**Capacity to get people enthusiastic and involved** (i.e., gets people on his/her side, is persuasive and inspiring).

**Credibility and ability to inspire confidence with peers and subordinates** (i.e. is trusted and respected, delivers on promises).

### Overall

**Overall effectiveness as a leader/manager** (i.e., total level of performance against expectations, total impact in role).

**Future potential** (i.e., has the ability to go beyond present level versus being topped out, is likely to be a major resource to the organization).

**Credibility with management - ability to inspire confidence with superiors** (i.e., communicates well, delivers on promises, thinks in similar ways).

---

Paper presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, California, April 2001.