



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Leadership and Motivation across Generations: Leading, doing, thriving

Plas, Mariëlle van der

Citation

Plas, M. van der. (2022). *Leadership and Motivation across Generations: Leading, doing, thriving*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master thesis in the Leiden University Student Repository](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3484952>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

LEADERSHIP AND MOTIVATION ACROSS GENERATIONS

Leading, doing, thriving



Name:	Mariëlle van der Plas
Student ID:	s2658925
Master's:	MSc. Public Administration: Public Management and Leadership
Department:	Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs
Institution:	Leiden University, the Netherlands
Supervisor:	Dr Kohei Suzuki
Second reader:	Dr Matt Young
Date:	07.06.2022
Word count:	10,011

Acknowledgements

This thesis, *Leadership and Motivation across Generations*, was written for the Master's Public Administration with a specialization in Public Management and Leadership. While writing this thesis, I have received a staggering amount of support and assistance. Therefore, I would like to take a moment to thank those who have supported me during this academic journey.

First, I would like to thank both my study advisor, Mrs den Heijer, and my mother-in-law, Mrs Bemelman, for their invaluable support helping me to make a plan and keep to it. I would not have managed this thesis without any of you. Second, I would like to thank everyone who participated in this study. Completing my thesis would not have been possible without you.

Without question, I would like to thank my friends and family for their moral support during this process. Thank you for your kind words, uplifting pep talks and unbridled confidence. In particular, I am grateful to Mrs van 't Veld for without her I would not have been able to write anything past my theoretical chapter. I would also like to thank Mr Kramers for simultaneously putting up with me and annoying me into being the best I can be.

Specifically, I would like to thank my father, who always encouraged me to dream big and inspired me to start a Master's, and although he is no longer with us, I am eternally grateful I could call him my dad.

Mariëlle van der Plas

Rijnsburg, 07.06.2022

Abstract

The purpose of this small-scale exploratory research is to understand which leadership style (transformational or transactional) different generations find more motivating in the workplace. Previous public management research primarily focuses on how baby boomers and millennials are influenced by leadership. However, new generations such as Gen Z are less studied. Filling this research gap, this thesis explores how preferred leadership styles differ across different generations, including Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z. The purpose of this study is finding out which type of leadership each generation prefers to feel motivated. This thesis aims to contribute to the current research on this topic in order to help understand what motivates the next working generation better and to help promote teamwork and cohesion between generations in the workplace. Following the introduction, this research begins with a theoretical framework based on a literature review and then includes a methodology section, which explains the choice of quantitative data collection in the form of a survey. The survey was handed out to employees at a private organization in the Netherlands and examines if there is a positive or negative correlation or no correlation between motivation and leadership across generations. This research can be regarded as a contribution to developments in theory on leadership and motivation. The results of the thesis show that each generation is affected differently by the different types of leadership. Baby boomers and Gen X are more positively influenced by transactional leadership, and millennials are more positively influenced by transformational leadership. Interestingly, Gen Z prefer both transformational and transactional leadership, with a slight preference for transformational leadership. As this study is a single-case study and a small N-study, it is susceptible to quantitative limitations, and it is more likely that the results are context-dependent. Therefore, low external validity and non-generalizability are the main weaknesses of this research. If this research would be more thoroughly explored and elaborated on in the future, it could add value to existing studies on leadership style and motivation, as it could provide new information on how to manage employees in the future. If managers are given the tools to understand how to lead different generations, they can use these tools to create cohesion between employees and promote effective teamwork. The findings in this research are especially relevant for future research on Gen Z because, currently, there is little knowledge on which types of leadership motivate Gen Z or on how Gen Zers work together with their colleagues from other generations.

Keywords: Transactional leadership, transformational leadership, motivation, baby boomers, millennials, Generation Z, Gen Z, generations

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	1
Abstract	2
Table of contents	3
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Importance.....	5
1.2 Limitations.....	7
1.3 Thesis outline	7
2. Theoretical Framework	8
2.1 Transactional leadership.....	8
2.2 Transformational leadership.....	8
2.3 Motivation in the workplace.....	9
2.4 Motivation across generations.....	10
2.4.1 Baby boomers.....	10
2.4.2 Gen X	11
2.4.3 Millennials.....	11
2.4.4 Gen Z.....	11
3. Methodology	14
3.1 Type of research	14
3.2 Data collection methods and justification	14
3.3 Data analysis methods	16
3.4 Potential biases and limitations	16
3.5 Obstacles	17
4. Empirical Findings	19
4.1 Preconditions and general findings	19
4.2 Exploratory factor analysis.....	20
4.3 Analysis of variance	21
4.4 Hypotheses	22
5. Discussion	24
5.1 Interpretation of the results.....	24
5.1.1 Baby boomers.....	24
5.1.2 Gen X	25
5.1.3 Millennials.....	25
5.1.4 Gen Z.....	26
6. Conclusion.....	27
6.1 Limitations and recommendations	28
References	30

Appendix 1: Survey Items.....	33
Appendix 2: Total Variance Explained	41
Appendix 3: Correlation Matrix Q9	42
Appendix 4: Correlation Matrix.....	43
Appendix 5: Retail Food Statistics	44

1. Introduction

In today's workplaces, four generations of employees work together: baby boomers, Gen X (Xers), millennials and Gen Z (Zers). These generations all have their own norms and values regarding the work they do and the leadership they prefer to follow. Members of each generation grew up in vastly different times, and as a result their needs differ in regard to what type of leadership they find more motivating. For example, baby boomers grew up without digitized technology and therefore struggle with rapidly changing technology (Shatto & Erwin, 2017). Gen X became adults in the fastest technological developments (Pichler, Kohli & Granitz, 2021), millennials grew up in the fastest growing technological world (Pichler, Kohli & Granitz, 2021), and Gen Z was born with the introduction of smartphones and social media (Schroth, 2019), which makes them navigate the digital world intuitively. Table 1 presents an overview of each generation's age and birth year.

Table 1. Age and birth year by generation

Cohort	Birth Year	Age as of December 2021
Baby Boomers	1947-1964	57-74
Generation X	1965-1980	41-56
Millennials	1981-2000	21-40
Generation Z	2001-2020	1-20

Note: Adapted from Understanding the work values of Gen Z by Maloni, Hiatt & Campbell (2019)

Extensive scientific literature has been written about baby boomers and millennials as they are older and more established generations than Gen Z (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012). While Baby boomers prefer transactional leadership, millennials prefer transformational leadership. This different outlook on leadership makes these two interesting to compare (Eversole et al., 2012). Gen X, on the other hand, take the middle ground regarding their outlook on leadership and are sometimes excluded from research.

Currently, Gen Z are the youngest and therefore newest generation. Aged between 1 and 20 years old, older Gen Zers are new to the workplace (Maloni, Hiatt & Campbell, 2019). Therefore, little research has been undertaken on their preferred style of leadership as well as their wishes and needs in the workplace. Since there is minimal literature on this topic that is specifically focused on Gen Z compared to previous generations, this research is a preliminary exploratory study and not a theory-testing study. This exploratory study can be regarded as a contribution to developing theory on leadership and motivation.

1.1 Importance

Previous research on public management focuses primarily on the differences between baby boomers and millennials regarding preference of management style (Schroth, 2019). With a new generation (Gen Z) entering the workplace, drastic changes in the work environment are likely to occur. While some

academics have more recently taken up research that compares Gen Z to previous generations, not enough research is being done to clarify Gen Z's preferences regarding leadership. This makes this study socially and academically relevant for future research.

This study examines what type of leadership motivates the four different generations previously mentioned and aims to identify in which areas the generations differ from each other and in which areas they are the same. When done correctly, this research could complement and contribute to existing social studies on leadership style and motivation, as it provides insight into how to manage the employees of the future. It could help future research and managers understand what Gen Z need in order to thrive in the workplace and to be motivated and committed employees. More importantly, it could give managers the tools to create cohesion between the different generations so that they can work together successfully. By researching what kind of work values Gen Z have, and how they fit with previous generations, it will be easier to support Gen Z in the workplace and to make sure they can be a benefit to the organization so productivity can be increased (Pichler, Kohli & Granitz, 2021).

The theoretical contribution of this thesis is in line with research from recent years but diverges from it by not only focusing on baby boomers versus millennials but also on Gen Z versus previous generations. This study aims to provide new insights into what drives Gen Z and into how to create an environment in which they are motivated and thriving, side by side with the older generations. Therefore, the research question for this thesis is as follows:

Which leadership styles (transformational or transactional) do baby boomers, Gen X, millennials and Gen Z in the Netherlands prefer in order to feel motivated in the workplace?

Sub-questions:

- How do each of the four generations (baby boomers, Generation X, millennials and Generation Z) differ in terms of their leadership style preference?
- How is transformational leadership related to motivation?
- How is transactional leadership related to motivation?

Hypotheses:

H₁: Baby boomers' motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership.

H₂: Gen X's motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership.

H₃: Millennials' motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership.

H₄: Gen Z's motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership.

H₅: Gen Z's motivation is more influenced by transformational leadership than millennials.

1.2 Limitations

As with all Master's theses, this thesis has time restrictions and a lack of funding. Therefore, it is conducted on a small scale, which could lead to an incorrect display of results. In this research design, the results are likely to be context-dependent. Thus, low external validity and non-generalizability are major weaknesses of this thesis. Further limitations are discussed in the final chapter.

1.3 Thesis outline

After this introduction, the thesis lays out the theoretical framework in Chapter 2, where transformational and transactional leadership are explored and motivation in the workplace and across generations is discussed. Chapter 2 ends with an analysis of the four different generations discussed in this study: baby boomers, Gen X, millennials and Gen Z. Chapter 3, the methodology, specifies the type of research, the data collection methods and the data analysis methods. It concludes with an evaluation and a description of the limitations of the study and the obstacles. Chapter 4 discusses the empirical findings and the results and gives an analysis of the findings. This chapter starts with an explanation of preconditions and general findings, followed by an exploratory factor analysis, an analysis of variance and the interpretations of supported and unsupported hypotheses. Chapter 5 gives an interpretation of the results, followed by the implications of this interpretation and the possible limitations of this study. Chapter 6 contains an overall conclusion and includes recommendations for further research. At the end of this thesis, a reference list and the appendices are included.

2. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, a theoretical base is established for the research. Firstly, the concept of transformational leadership is explained. This is followed by an explanation of the concept of transactional leadership. Motivation in the workplace is then discussed, which includes an exploration and explanation as to why motivation is important and what type of leadership each generation prefers to feel motivated.

Leadership can make or break an organization and when applying the right type of leadership, organizations can become highly profitable (Robbins & Coulter, 2007). There are many definitions of power and leadership. For example, Laswell and Kaplan (2014) state how power is the ability to partake in the decision-making process. Richard Tawney (1931) describes power as the ability of an individual or a group to influence their environment in accordance with their wishes.

James Odumeru (2013) describes a leader as someone who can influence individuals and groups to realize goals. Furthermore, in a quest to distinguish the difference between transactional and transformational leadership, he compares some of the most influential works on leadership (Odumeru, 2013). In this present study, transformational leadership and transactional leadership are examined, and how these specific types of leadership affect motivation across generations is analysed.

2.1 Transactional leadership

Transactional leadership was first mentioned in James MacGregor Burns' research on political leaders in 1978 and has since spread to fields such as organizational psychology and management. Transactional leaders rely on the exchange of monetary incentives for work and loyalty (Burns, 1978).

Odumeru synthesized a list of behaviours for transformational leadership in 2013. He states that transactional leadership is responsive and motivates employees through the use of rewards and punishments, thereby playing into employees' benefit. This leadership style uses the management by exception model. This model refers to a transformational leader attempting to preserve the existing state of affairs and punishing any deviant behaviour (Odumeru, 2013).

Transactional leadership can be compared to McGregor's Theory X. In this theory, he states that employees are lazy. They do as little work as possible and without a proper reward, they would do nothing. Therefore, employees' actions must be steered, controlled and sometimes punished. Transactional leadership, therefore, involves ruling by fear and consequence, where negative behaviour is penalized and employees are extrinsically motivated through rewards (McGregor, 1960).

2.2 Transformational leadership

Burns describes transformational leaders as leaders who focus on intrinsic needs, who focus on the importance of certain results and who not only order their subjects to do tasks but who also participate in tasks themselves and coach their subjects on how to reach certain goals. He explains that

transformational leaders are more active than transactional leaders, as transformational leaders give their employees a goal to believe in and work towards (Burns, 1978).

Odumeru states that a transformational leader is proactive and encourages employees by pointing out higher ideals and moral values. The transformational leader tries to lift organizational culture to a higher level by realizing innovative ideas and encouraging creative and innovate ideas that can be used to resolve challenges (Odumeru, 2013).

McGregor's Theory Y can be compared to Burns' idea of transformational leadership. Theory Y suggests that managers see their employees as self-motivated and managers are focused on encouraging their employees and provide them with the tools they need to surpass normal standards. It can also be claimed that transformational leaders stimulate intrinsic needs of their employees by providing tools and giving free rein to potential. This kind of leader removes environmental obstacles, creates opportunities for their employees and gives support to encourage individual growth (McGregor, 1960).

2.3 Motivation in the workplace

Clark (2003) states that 'Work motivation is the process that initiates and maintains goal-directed performance.' In other words, it is what helps a person to start doing something and to also continue doing it. Motivation fuels plans, inspires enthusiasm and drives people to apply their knowledge and skills. Without it, even the best employees will not manage to do their jobs sufficiently. Furthermore, motivation inspires hard work and pushes people to strive for quality and quantity (Clark, 2003).

Motivation is an important stimulus which inspires productivity and efficiency among employees. It can be inspired by monetary rewards or through recognition and the presentation of a common goal (Kalsoom, Khan & Zubair, 2018). These kinds of tools are inspired by transformational and transactional leaders, who intrinsically or extrinsically motivate their employees (Odumeru, 2013).

According to Amabile (1993), employee motivation has always had an important role in the workplace. Motivated employees are productive, creative and persistent, whereas unmotivated employees do the bare minimum and try to leave the work floor as soon as possible. As a result, motivated employees have a higher standard and deliver a higher quality work than unmotivated employees.

Clark states that every individual is motivated differently. This leads to differences between what works for an individual regarding working independently and working in a team (Clark, 2003). Taking this into account, it does not come as a surprise that different generations are also motivated differently.

Previous public management research studies show that many factors influence motivation besides transformational and transactional leadership, such as servant leadership or ethical leadership (Hameduddin & Engbers, 2021). According to Hameduddin and Engbers', leadership in general was

most commonly used as the independent variable in studies (2021), with the most commonly used construct being transformational and transactional leadership (2021). Therefore, transformational and transactional leadership were chosen for this thesis as the most important factors for motivation.

2.4 Motivation across generations

At the end of 2021, there were four established generations in the workplace. This is the first time there are as many as four different generations together in the workplace, which creates an interesting set of circumstances (Maloni, Hiatt & Campbell, 2019). Salahuddin (2010) explains that, for the first time, organizations are actively researching generational differences. Furthermore, she discusses how these differences may affect different aspects on the work floor. A considerable amount of research has been undertaken since Salahuddin's text in 2010, and according to Colquitt, Lepine and Wesson (2011), managers are confronted with various issues when leading different generations in the workplace. Some of these issues occasionally cause problems among teams, which results in reduced effectiveness.

Then enter the newest generation, Gen Z, into the mix. While millennials and Gen Z have some common traits, Gen Z has a new, unique outlook on the world and have a different understanding of how work should be organized. Their perspective on work is shaped by the circumstances they grew up in, including the technological advancements and societal shifts they have experienced (Schroth, 2019). Additionally, while each generation is shaped by their unique environmental circumstances, it is important not to stereotype people according to the stereotypes attributed to their generation. People who are grouped together in one generation might have grown up in similar circumstances, but this does not mean that they act or think the same (Smola & Sutton, 2002). To give some insight into each generation, the next subsections briefly discuss each generation's outlook on motivation and leadership.

2.4.1 Baby boomers

Baby boomers, born between 1947 and 1964, are currently the oldest working generation. They are the most established of all generations and are at the end of their careers. They grew up in an economically thriving world after the second world war (Hughes & O'Rand, 2005).

According to Yu and Miller (2005) baby boomers like a clear hierarchy, are hard workers and are loyal to their employer. Baby boomers, generally, do not like change, and as they mostly grew up without digitized technology, they are not considered to be tech-savvy. However, they are team players and expect the same of others. They believe in a strict chain of command and expect managers to lead them. They work hard, are optimistic and hold creativity and self-sacrifice in high regard.

In terms of leadership style, baby boomers prefer a formal setting, with clear goals and continual work. They are motivated through monetary rewards and like to be credited for their work (Yu & Miller, 2005), which suggests that baby boomers prefer transactional leadership. These characteristics are in line with McGregor's Theory X and Burns' idea of transactional leadership.

2.4.2 Gen X

Members of Gen X were born between 1965 and 1980, and, as of December 2021, are between 41 and 56 years old. As this generation takes the middle ground between baby boomers and millennials, this generation often feels overlooked. Gen X was the first generation to be exposed to major globalization and digital technology, giving them a global mindset (Swanzen, 2018).

Gen X are the first generation who are notably more entrepreneurial and better at working in teams. Burke claims Gen X do not value hierarchy as much as previous generations and as a result are more flexible regarding set rules and regulations (Burke, 1994).

According to Ferres, Travaglione and Firms, trust and respect are important to members of Gen X. They value a leader who recognizes individuality and can adapt their management style to fit the individual (Ferres, Travaglione and Firms, 2003). Additionally, members of Gen X prefer a leader who is fair and straightforward (Martin, 2015). They take the middle ground regarding Burns' transformational and transactional leadership theories and McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, meaning Gen X prefers a little of both sides of leadership.

2.4.3 Millennials

Millennials are born between 1981 and 2000 and are currently the largest generation in the workforce (CBS, 2022). Millennials grew up in a fast growing technological world and can handle digitized technology well. Because of their upbringing, they are achievement and team oriented and are willing to trade monetary rewards for flexible workhours. They are always looking for new challenges and better conditions and do not stay in the same job as long as baby boomers. Millennials are not afraid to switch jobs when they are ready for a next step in their careers and therefore are sometimes described as 'job-hoppers' (Galdames & Guihen, 2022).

Regarding leadership, millennials value leaders who recognize that their actions have consequences and leaders who are coaching and caring. They prefer to share information and want to be included in the decision-making process (Valenti, 2019).

Furthermore, millennials are not afraid to challenge authority, and they value a leader who is willing to take risks with them. They are motivated by a leader who supports and coaches them and encourages them to be the best they can be. This suggests that millennials prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership. Furthermore, millennials' preferred leadership is in line with McGregor's Theory Y.

2.4.4 Gen Z

When Gen Z fully enter the workplace, there will be some unique challenges ahead for managers. This is due to the fact that Gen Z have considerably less work experience than previous generations, due to

their upbringing in a culture of safety. They started working at a later age than people from older generations. Furthermore, another factor that influenced Gen Z is the introduction of the smartphone and the huge popularity of social media. Through social media, the rise of social justice movements have grown exponentially (Schroth, 2019).

Since Gen Z are a relatively new generation, little has been written about their presence in the workplace in comparison to previous generations regarding preferred leadership style and motivation.

According to Schroth, understanding what drives and motivates Gen Z could help managers merge different generations to create an efficient and successful work environment. Furthermore, even though organizations were not ready for the arrival of millennials in the workplace, there is still time to prepare for Gen Z (Schroth, 2019).

Available information regarding Gen Z suggests individual values to be important (Gabrielova & Buchko, 2021). Al Amiri, Dadkeh and Al Kaabi (2019) suggest transformational leadership seems to be the most compatible with Gen Z. Furthermore, according to Ivanova and Raybinina (2019) Gen Z desires diverse working conditions, in which they can be autonomous and flexible in how they work, for example working from home and working flexible hours. They note that Gen Z, just as previous generations, value seeing tangible results. They prefer leaders who make interpersonal connections and are focused on results and service (Ivanova & Raybinina, 2019).

Looking at previous Gen Z research, it is hypothesized that members of Gen Z prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership because they are closer in age to millennials than to baby boomers. When analysing the preferences of different generations through the years, it can be seen that each new generation shows a higher preference for transformational leadership over transactional leadership.

While research on Gen Z is fairly new, it can be said that Gen Z prefers transformational leadership over transactional leadership. This is in line with McGregor's Theory Y and Burns' notion of transformational leadership.

The following hypotheses were composed based on the available literature:

H₁: Baby boomers' motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership.

H₂: Gen X's motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership.

H₃: Millennials' motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership.

H₄: Gen Z's motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership.

H₅: Gen Z's motivation is influenced more by transformational leadership than millennials' motivation is.

These five hypotheses were inspired by the previous findings that baby boomers prefer transactional leadership, Gen X prefer transactional leadership, millennials prefer transformational leadership and Gen Z prefer transformational leadership.

3. Methodology

In this chapter, the methodology is presented. First, an explanation is given of the type of research that was conducted. Second, the data collection methods used are reviewed, and a justification of why these methods were used is given. Third, the data analysis methods are presented. Fourth, an evaluation is given of any biases that were found in the research. Following this, possible limitations are presented. Chapter 3 ends with a statement that details the obstacles that were faced during the research process.

3.1 Type of research

This study examined which leadership styles baby boomers, millennials and Gen Z prefer in order to feel motivated in the workplace. A particular focus is placed on Gen Z, as not much is known about this generation, both in general as in the workplace. To help create a deeper understanding of this topic, a survey was conducted. The results of the survey created new insights into Gen Z that could be used to help them reach their full potential in the workplace and to help facilitate teamwork across the generations. With an aim of contributing to theoretical developments on leadership and motivation, an exploratory study was conducted.

Using a quantitative research approach, data was collected in the form of a survey. The research focused on the relationship between motivation and leadership style across generations, without pre-set manipulation of the variables. Furthermore, it aimed to examine if there is positive, negative or zero correlation between these variables. While these results cannot be generalized, they can be used as a steppingstone for theory development and to help other researchers expand the topic in the future. It could help form new theories regarding motivation of new generations in the workplace and how to handle new generations in the future.

While this research uses information from previous studies to help create a clearer understanding of baby boomers, Gen X, millennials and Gen Z, nonetheless it is a preliminary exploratory study because little information can be found on Gen Z regarding their preferred type of leadership and the effect this leadership has on motivating Gen Zers. The intention of this research is to create a clearer understanding of the generations in relation to leadership and motivation in the workplace. An exploratory study was needed to collect more information on Gen Z in relation to motivation in the workplace and leadership style.

3.2 Data collection methods and justification

This study began by creating a theoretical framework based on a literature review. Following this, a survey was conducted. The collected data was analysed with the help of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) in SPSS, which was used to help recognize mean value differences by generation. These differences were then used to identify which variables influence motivation among different generations.

The theoretical framework helped create boundaries for the study and contributed to the reliability of the research.

This study was conducted at a private organization, which owns a gas station in the Netherlands. The gas station is located in the province of South Holland and has been operating for 50 years. As of December 2020, it has 64 employees and a family culture. As this company prefers not to have its identity disclosed, a more in-depth understanding of the internal structure cannot be given. The survey created for this study was given to employees at the gas station to fill out. The company that owns the gas station was chosen for this research because a mixture of generations work at this gas station and because the researcher had easy access to the workers as they work there as a side job. Furthermore, an easily accessible organization was chosen due to the limited time frame. The sampling method used was convenience sampling, which involves being reliant on the willingness of organizations and employees to participate. Potential biases caused by this kind of convenience sampling are discussed in subsection 3.4.

The survey was sent out between October 7th and October 28th, 2021. After a week a reminder email was sent. After careful consideration, the questions used in this research were taken from Ismail et al. (2010) research, taking into consideration the questionnaires of Rudd et al. (2009) and Hinkin and Tracey (1999). All these questionnaires are based on the multifactor leadership questionnaire from Avolio and Bass in 1991. The multifactor leadership questionnaire was not directly used, due to the fact that it needs to be purchased. In Table 2 (see subsection 3.3), the survey items for Q9 of the survey have been coded based on Ismail et al. (2010) research, taking into account their coding of these questions. Table 2 strives to make this more visible and readable.

Q9 explicitly measures the transformational and transactional coded items in this survey. The full survey can be found in Appendix 1: Survey Items. The code was used to create the correlation matrix in Appendix 3. Table 2 helps avoid confusion because the survey items were shuffled to make the correlation matrix. In Appendix 4, another correlation matrix can be found for the complete survey. Questions 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 have been included in combination with the mean of all transformational and transactional items of Q9. The variable 'other' was removed to make all questions ordinal.

Due to limited time and resources, this study was conducted on a small scale. In order to increase reliability and validity of the results, further research should go into more depth and be done on a larger scale. This study began with 50 participants, but as some participants did not complete the survey, the final number of respondents was 40 (N=40). As this study is a single-case study and a small N-study, this makes it susceptible to some quantitative limitations. Because of this, the results are more likely to be context-dependent. Therefore, low external validity and non-generalizability are the main weaknesses of this research.

3.3 Data analysis methods

The survey was created with a program called Qualtrics from Leiden University. Once the survey had been completed by the participants, the statistical data analysis was undertaken using the program SPSS.

Table 2. Coded questions Q9 survey

Number	Code
Q 9.1	Instills pride in me (TF)
Q 9.2	Spends time teaching and coaching me (TF)
Q 9.3	States clear expectations (TA)
Q 9.4	Considers moral and ethical consequences (TF)
Q 9.5	Will take action before problems become chronic (TA)
Q 9.6	Views me as an individual with needs, abilities and aspirations (TF)
Q 9.7	Listens to my concerns (TF)
Q 9.8	Tells me precise standards to carry out my work (TA)
Q 9.9	Encourages me to perform to the best of my ability (TF)
Q 9.10	Encourages me to think creatively (TF)
Q 9.11	Works out agreements with me (TA)
Q 9.12	Sets challenging standards (TF)
Q 9.13	Monitors my performance (TA)
Q 9.14	Keeps track of my mistakes (TA)
Q 9.15	Gets me to rethink never-questioned ideas (TF)

Note: TF = Transformational item, TA = Transactional item.

3.4 Potential biases and limitations

Following the use of a survey, some biases should be taken into consideration. Firstly, it is possible that a sampling bias has occurred because convenience sampling was used. A bias may occur as there could be a difference between people who choose to participate and people who do not, with the results of decreased representativeness of characteristics, such as gender. The possibility of this bias occurring was taken into account but as volunteer bias occurs in almost all non-probability sampling methods, the researcher has chosen to take no further action regarding this bias. Secondly, because the data was collected using a survey, the data could be prone to response/survey bias. This bias refers to when participants feel pressure to give socially desirable answers. However, the researcher dealt with this issue by making the survey anonymous. Therefore, the answers cannot be connected to the individual respondents. Thirdly, a sampling bias may have occurred. This bias occurs when the sampling is not completely random. This has been counteracted by only choosing the organization in which to execute the research and not the participants. Lastly, a selection bias may have occurred. This bias is particularly common. As the researcher chose to undertake this study at their place of work, the selection process is not completely random. By using this purposive sampling, this study is not completely random and is

thus not generalizable. Where it does strive to be representative within the organization by selecting as many employees as possible, it is possible that it is only reproducible in specific circumstances.

For example, employees who work at the gas station may not be considered a representation of the wider population in the Netherlands. Therefore, this raises questions such as What if this research was conducted in a bigger or smaller organization?, What if this research was conducted in an organization the researcher had never worked for? and What if this research was conducted in an organization that is younger or older than this particular gas station?

According to Retail Insiders (2021), the category of retail food includes all companies in the Netherlands that sell food, drinks and tobacco, including gas stations. Looking at some of the average of the retail food, it can be said the chosen organization is about average nationwide in this category regarding gender division and employment status (full-time/part-time), as can be seen in Appendix 5. The organization analysed in this study has a higher score regarding the employees' average educational level and a higher percentage of full-timers. As a result, the percentage of part-time employees who work at the gas station is lower than the nationwide average. Currently, 64 employees work in the organization and therefore are part of the 22.7% of the other organizations with 50–499 employees. Although the chosen organization does have some factors in common with the nationwide average, some factors are different. As a result, this study is not average enough to generalize the findings and therefore cannot be reproduced (Retail Insiders, 2020). Furthermore, as the selection pool in this study is very small and has few participants, this severely limits the strength of the conclusions.

Since a fairly small sample size has been used in this study, it is possible that significant relationships between values have been missed. If this was a large N-study, with a larger sample size, more results could be recognized. When further research is done on this topic, the sample size and total population should be increased to verify the results from this study. Additionally, few studies and scholarly papers focus on how leadership affects motivation for Gen Zers. This leaves a gap in accessible knowledge.

3.5 Obstacles

The survey was first sent out on October 7th. A week after sending out the survey, the response rate was still low; therefore, a reminder email was sent to the participants. A week after that, the response rate was still only 35. Therefore, on October 22nd, a second reminder email was sent with a note attached. As an incentive for the remaining potential respondents, a 'stroopwafel' (a Dutch snack made of wafers pressed together with a caramel-type filling) was promised to each participant who sent a screenshot of their completed survey. This incentive prompted more respondents to fill out the survey because by November 28th the number of respondents had increased to 50. The final result was N=40 due to some unfinished surveys. As the sample size was always going to be small, this was deemed an acceptable final result. Of the 50 participants who filled in the survey, one (2%) was excluded because he/she did

not give permission for the usage of the anonymous data in this study. Furthermore, nine (18%) more participants were excluded because they did not complete the survey.

4. Empirical Findings

In this chapter, the empirical findings, results and analysis of said results are discussed. This chapter starts with a general presentation of the preconditions of this survey and gives a summary of the purpose of this study. Then, the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) that was undertaken is described, followed by an ANOVA. This chapter ends by stating the main results, which are connected to the pre-set hypotheses.

4.1 Preconditions and general findings

The purpose of this small-scale exploratory research was to find out which leadership style different generations prefer and how this influences motivation across different generations in the workplace. In particular, this study focuses on how Gen Z's motivation is influenced by leadership and how they are different from or similar to the generations before them, as previous public management research has not placed much focus on these differences. An exploration of these facts could contribute towards understanding the next working generation better, with the purpose of stimulating cohesion and teamwork between different generations.

Of the participants who gave permission to participate in this study (Q1) and gave permission to use the generated data for this research (Q2), the youngest participant is 16 years of age and the oldest 67, with a mean of 38 (Q3). The extensive descriptive statistics can be found in Table 3 below. Looking at the independent variables regarding level of education (Q4), baby boomers are the least educated, millennials are the highest educated and Gen Z are still finishing their secondary education or their Bachelor's degrees. Question five (Q5) shows that this organization employs more women than men (Q5) and employs more part-timers than full-timers (Q6). According to the answers given for question seven (Q7), employees work an average of 8 years for this organization ($M = 8.02$ years, $SD = 7.6$ years), and at 32.5%, millennials represent the largest working group.

According to the answers given for Q10, 21 respondents (52.5%) found it 'somewhat likely' to recommend their company as a good place to work; nine respondents (22.5%) found it 'extremely likely' that they would recommend their company as a good place to work; and only one respondent (2.5%) found it 'extremely unlikely' that they would recommend their company as a good place to work.

The open-ended question, Q11, asked to explain the answer from Q10, as can be seen in Appendix 1. Participants gave various answers, for example, 'It is a nice working environment. Not everything is great but it could be a lot worse' or 'Nice atmosphere. Nice work environment. Nice colleagues.' The answers given to Q11 do not provide additional useful information. In Table 3, the variables of Q3 to Q8 can be found, with the exception of Q7. An interesting finding is that employees who work full-time generally score higher on all transformational and transactional items. A general correlation matrix with the variables of all questions can be found in Appendix 4.

Table 3. Frequencies and percentage descriptive statistics (N=40)

		Frequency	Percent
Age (Q3)	Generation Z	8	20
	Millennials	13	32.5
	Generation X	10	25
	Baby Boomers	9	22.5
Highest level of education (Q 4)	No schooling completed	2	5
	Elementary education	1	2.5
	Secondary education	8	20
	Secondary vocational education	14	35
	Bachelor's	12	30
	Master's	3	7.5
Gender (Q 5)	Women	22	55
	Men	17	42.5
	Other	1	2.5
Employment status (Q 6)	Employed full-time (36+ hours a week)	16	40
	Employed part-time (Less than 36 hours a week)	20	50
	Other	4	10
Satisfied about working for this company (Q 8)	Extremely dissatisfied	1	2,5
	Somewhat dissatisfied	2	5
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	7	17.5
	Somewhat satisfied	17	42.5
	Extremely satisfied	13	32.5

4.2 Exploratory factor analysis

An EFA was performed in order to check if the questions in the survey are internally reliable and to check what the factor structure is. Before the exploratory factor analysis was performed, the assumptions were checked. The input variables were all on scale level; the correlations seemed to be linear; no outliers were detected (outliers on a Likert scale are unlikely); and the correlations between the variables of Q9 were reasonably high as can be seen in Appendix 3: Correlation Matrix Q9.

The EFA was performed to see if certain variables fit within the same category (latent variable/construct). Ideally, this would show two different categories, one for transformational leadership and one for transactional leadership. As seen in Table 4, a total of four different categories can be distinguished.

Table 4. EFA components

	Component 1 (Transformational)	Component 2 (Transactional & Transformational)	Component 3 (Transactional)	Component 4 (Transactional)
Eigenvalue	6.09%	2.16%	1.93%	1.17%
Variance	40.61%	14.37 %	12.88%	7.78%
Matching Questions	Q9.1, Q9.2, Q9.4, Q9.6, Q9.7, Q9.9, Q9.10, Q9.15	Q9.12, Q9.13, Q9.14	Q9.3, Q9.5, Q9.8	Q9.11

Note. The distributions of questions among components comes from the rotated component matrix generated in SPSS.

In particular, the total variance score on the transformational construct is interesting. As seen in Table 4, component 1 includes all transformational coded questions, with the exception of the transformational coded question Q9.12. This means that the transformational construct seems to best measure what it is intended for. Components 2, 3 and 4 all consist of the transactional coded questions. The transactional construct is widespread, with Q9.11 as the odd one out. This question does not fit with any other category, which makes its reliability questionable.

As the EFA was done after finishing the survey, all components were used in this thesis. Table 4 is to show that even though the questions were taken from an already existing study, Ismail et al. (2010), the distribution of questions among components are not evenly divided between transformational and transactional leadership. The questions should have been evenly divided between transformational items (TF) and transactional items (TA), as seen in Table 2 (see subsection 3.3). They are spread among multiple categories, implying the internal reliability and factor structure should be strengthened. This is cause to examine the questions more closely in future research. More on this will be mentioned in 6.1 Limitations and recommendations.

4.3 Analysis of variance

A one-way ANOVA was done to explore the differences in preferred leadership style between baby boomers, millennials and Gen Z. Before running the ANOVA, the assumptions were checked (Laerd Statistics, 2018). One of the assumptions is normality of the dependent variables. All of the dependent variables (baby boomers, Gen X, millennials and Gen Z) seemed to be normally distributed. The normality of the dependent variables was checked by executing a Shapiro Wilk test. All of the dependent variables seemed to be normally distributed for each independent variable ($p > 0.05$), except for the dependent variable 'millennials' on the independent variable 'transformational leadership'.

However, the ANOVA analysis is robust for violating this assumption (Laerd Statistics, 2018); therefore, the millennials were still included in the analysis. However, the results should be interpreted carefully. Furthermore, a Levene's test was executed to determine homogeneity of variance, and homogeneity of variance was established ($p > 0.05$).

As can be seen in Table 5 below, there were no statistically significant differences between the groups for transformational leadership ($p = 0.24$), nor were there statistically significant differences between the groups for transactional leadership ($p = 0.077$). The explanation for this is that the N is small; nevertheless, it is still useful to look at the differences between groups.

Table 5. ANOVA (N=40)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transactional	Between Groups	5,015	3	1,672	2,480	0,077
	Within Groups	24,262	36	0,674		
	Total	29,277	39			
Transformational	Between Groups	4,838	3	1,613	1,450	0,244
	Within Groups	40,036	36	1,112		
	Total	44,874	39			

4.4 Hypotheses

In this subsection, the data collected from the survey analysis is interpreted and linked to the previously formulated hypotheses. This way, whether the hypotheses are supported or dismissed can be checked.

The first hypothesis states that baby boomers are more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership. The results support this hypothesis, but according to the paired sample test, the significance in a two-tailed test is $p = 0.066$, which makes it insignificant. Baby boomer's motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership ($M = 5.19$; $SD = 0.59$ [Table 6]) than by transformational leadership ($M = 4.49$; $SD = 1.05$ [Table 6]).

The second hypothesis states that Gen X are more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership. This hypothesis is supported but insignificant ($p = 0.856$). This means Gen X's motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership ($M = 5.32$; $SD = 0.74$ [Table 6]) than by transformational leadership ($M = 5.27$; $SD = 1.20$ [Table 6]).

The third hypothesis states that millennials' motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership. This hypothesis is also supported. The two-tailed significance test is $p = 0.003$, which makes it significant. This means millennials' motivation is

more positively influenced by transformational leadership ($M = 5.41$; $SD = 1.02$ [Table 6]) than by transactional leadership ($M = 4.78$; $SD = 0.98$ [Table 6]).

The fourth hypothesis states that Gen Z's motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership. This hypothesis is supported but insignificant ($p = 0.131$). This means that Gen Z's motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership ($M = 5.08$; $SD = 0.90$ [Table 6]) than by transactional leadership ($M = 4.35$; $SD = 0.84$ [Table 6]).

The fifth and last hypothesis states that Gen Z's ($M = 5.08$; $SD = 0.90$ [Table 6]) motivation is influenced more by transformational leadership than millennials' ($M = 5.41$; $SD = 1.02$ [Table 6]). This hypothesis is not supported.

Table 6. Descriptives Q9

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Transactional	Generation Z	8	4,3542	0,84721	0,29953	3,6459	5,0624	3,17	6,00
	Millennials	13	4,7821	0,98221	0,27242	4,1885	5,3756	2,33	6,00
	Generation X	10	5,3167	0,73891	0,23366	4,7881	5,8453	4,50	7,00
	Baby Boomers	9	5,1852	0,58597	0,19532	4,7348	5,6356	4,17	6,17
	Total	40	4,9208	0,86643	0,13699	4,6437	5,1979	2,33	7,00
Transformational	Generation Z	8	5,0833	0,90414	0,31966	4,3275	5,8392	3,78	6,00
	Millennials	13	5,4103	1,02478	0,28422	4,7910	6,0295	3,00	6,33
	Generation X	10	5,2667	1,19693	0,37850	4,4104	6,1229	2,78	7,00
	Baby Boomers	9	4,4938	1,04985	0,34995	3,6868	5,3008	3,00	5,78
	Total	40	5,1028	1,07266	0,16960	4,7597	5,4458	2,78	7,00

5. Discussion

In this chapter, the most interesting results stemming from this research are discussed. Before delving into this discussion, the research question and the sub-questions are repeated. After that, the results are discussed in the order of the hypotheses.

Research question:

Which leadership styles (transformational or transactional) do baby boomers, millennials and Gen Z in the Netherlands prefer in order to feel motivated in the workplace?

Sub-questions:

- How do each of the four generations differ in terms of their leadership style preference?
- How is transformational leadership related to motivation?
- How is transactional leadership related to motivation?

As can be seen in the previous chapter, this research supports the theory that baby boomers prefer transactional leadership to feel motivated and that millennials and Gen Z both prefer transformational leadership. Thus, the results of this research support H₁, H₂, H₃ and H₄. Only H₅, ‘Gen Z’s motivation is more influenced by transformational leadership than millennials’, was not supported. In general, this research found that employees who work full-time score higher on all transformational and transactional survey items. This could be due to the higher involvement of those employees in the organization, which could explain their more outspoken opinions.

5.1 Interpretation of the results

On the basis of the hypotheses, the results are discussed and interpreted.

5.1.1 Baby boomers

H₁: Baby boomers’ motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership.

The results based on this hypothesis build on previous studies, as mentioned in the theoretical chapter. The results show that the oldest working generation, the baby boomers, indeed prefer transactional leadership. In line with previous studies, the results of the survey show that baby boomers prefer a steady work environment; they do not like change, and they like working in a hierarchical environment (Swanzen, 2018). Furthermore, baby boomers score high on transactional inspired statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager states clear expectations’, ‘I like it when my manager tells me precise standards to carry out my work’ and ‘I like it when my manager monitors my performance.’ Having high scores on these transactional inspired statements show that baby boomers

prefer clear goals and continual work (Yu & Miller, 2005). Therefore, it is no surprise that they score low on statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager spends time teaching and coaching me’ and ‘I like it when my manager sets challenging standards’, which are transformational statements. An interesting finding is that fewer baby boomers than expected filled in the survey. This could be due to the fact that baby boomers are the least tech-savvy generation, as they did not grow up with digital technology (Swanzen, 2018). It could also be due to the fact that there were fewer baby boomers working at the organization than expected; because of the heavy work, it can be difficult for baby boomers to work in this industry past retirement.

5.1.2 Gen X

H₂: Gen X’s motivation is more positively influenced by transactional leadership than by transformational leadership.

This study shows that Gen X indeed prefer transactional leadership, but only slightly. The results show that Gen X score high on transactional statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager will take action before problems become chronic’ and ‘I like it when my manager states clear expectations.’ The first statement is in line with Burke’s (1994) research. The second is in line with Martin’s theory (2005), in which he states that Gen X thrive under leaders who are straightforward and clear when stating expectations. However, Gen X also score high on the transformational statement ‘I like it when my manager listens to my concerns’, which is in line with Ferres, Travaglione and Firms’ research (2003). In addition, Gen X score low on transformational statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager sets challenging standards’ and ‘I like it when my manager gets me to rethink never-questioned ideas.’ Furthermore, they score low on the transactional inspired statement ‘I like it when my manager keeps track of my mistakes.’

5.1.3 Millennials

H₃: Millennials’ motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership.

Like the other hypotheses, this hypothesis is in line with previous studies. The survey results show that millennials score high on transformational inspired statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager sets challenging standards’, ‘I like it when my manager views me as an individual with needs, abilities and aspirations’ and ‘I like it when my manager gets me to rethink never-questioned ideas.’ This is in line with the assumptions that millennials are highly achievement oriented, that they love to accept new challenges and are not afraid to go look for them with new employers (Galdames & Guihen, 2022) and that they like to be included in the decision-making process (Valenti, 2019). In contrast, millennials score low on transactional inspired statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager monitors my performance’, ‘I like it when my manager tells me precise standards to carry out my work’ and ‘I

like it when my manager keeps track of my mistakes.’ The results show that millennials had the highest response rate from all of the questioned generations. This is not surprising, as millennials are currently the biggest generation in the workspace (CBS, 2022).

5.1.4 Gen Z

H₄: Gen Z’s motivation is more positively influenced by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership.

According to the survey, Gen Z score high on transformational inspired statements, such as ‘I like it when my manager instills pride in me’, ‘I like it when my manager considers moral and ethical consequences’, ‘I like it when my manager views me as an individual with needs, abilities and aspirations’ and ‘I like it when my manager encourages me to perform to the best of my abilities.’ These statements are all inspired by transformational leadership, which supports H₄. Interestingly, Gen Z also score high on statements such as ‘I like it when my manager states clear expectations’ and ‘I like it when my manager monitors my performance’, which are all transactional inspired statements. This means that *H₅, ‘Gen Z’s motivation is influenced more by transformational leadership than millennials’ motivation is*, is not supported. The reason for the high transformational and transactional scores could be that Gen Z are still at the beginning of their career and therefore appreciate room to explore on their own but also guidance when needed. In short, according to the survey, Gen Z prefer a little of both leadership styles.

6. Conclusion

In the last couple of years, much has been written about leadership and motivation in the workplace, particularly with a focus on baby boomers and millennials and what they prefer in terms of leadership style. Since baby boomers and millennials have different needs and a different outlook on leadership, it is interesting to compare these two generations.

Gen Z, the newest working generation, have begun entering the workplace. Their arrival has led to managers facing challenges they have not encountered before. Due to growing up in a culture of safety, this newest generation has considerably less work experience than the generations before them. Another factor that makes them unique to other generations is the fact that they were brought up alongside the rise of social media and social justice movements. Not so long ago, when millennials entered the workplace, managers were vastly underprepared to successfully unify this new generation with the existing workforce. Due to the generations' different outlook on leadership and work, the collaboration of these generations did not always run smoothly. One of the biggest tasks managers face in the workplace is merging the generations to create a successful work environment. With the arrival of Gen Z in the workplace, managers are faced with this challenge yet again.

To help create a successful work environment in which all generations work together successfully, it is important to try to understand Gen Z and their needs in more depth. Currently, the research on Gen Z is ongoing and more data must be collected to make a well-informed statement about Gen Z. This exploratory study is intended as a stepping stone for future social leadership studies and should be regarded as a contribution to developing theories regarding the influence leadership has on motivation across generations.

This present research found that baby boomers and Gen X prefer transactional leadership and that millennials prefer transformational leadership, which is in line with the previous determined theoretical base in Chapter 2 of this research. Therefore, these results are not surprising. As can be seen in subsection 5.1.3, Gen Z prefer both transformational and transactional leadership. Following the findings in this research, it can be concluded that Gen Z's preference for leadership lies somewhere between transformational and transactional leadership. This result was a surprise as it was expected that Gen Z would have a greater preference for transformational leadership than millennials. It stands to reason that Gen Z are still learning, sometimes in an internship, as the oldest Gen Zers are 20 years old. In hindsight, it is not surprising that Gen Z prefer both transformational leadership and transactional leadership. They like the coaching leadership style transformational leadership offers, but because they are still learning and doing internships, they also like the clear directions they get from transactional leadership.

As this research was limited by time and had only a small pool of participants, these results cannot be generalized. Therefore, it would be useful to replicate this research. Recommendations for future research can be found in the next paragraph.

6.1 Limitations and recommendations

In hindsight, this organization was not the best choice for this research due to unbalanced generational groups and the small sample size, which meant that the results of this study cannot be generalized. The reliability of this research is further impeded by the lack of experience of the researcher in quantitative research compared to experienced researchers.

In this research, only the correlation between the dependent and independent variable was explored, forgoing any possibly existing mechanisms. Because of this, this study has a low validity and reliability. To increase validity and reliability, the sample size must be bigger and better distributed among the generations.

Another important point to mention is that the survey items for transformational leadership were good and measured what they were meant to, the transactional construct was more widespread. Further research should consider how to make the questions more coherent with each other to make them fall in the same construct of transformational and transactional items. When this is done correctly, it could help create research with higher internal reliability and a stronger factor structure.

Finally, this study was limited by the minimal available literature on Gen Z in the workplace. There are few studies and scholarly papers which focus on how different leadership styles motivate Gen Z in the workplace. This leaves a gap in accessible knowledge and makes it more likely that the results would be misinterpreted. Future research should be run multiple times to check for inconsistencies.

Further studies should also take into account that this research was primarily conducted for academic purposes and has a low validity and reliability. As stated in the methodology chapter, because this is a small N-study, it is possible that significant relationships between variables were missed. As organizational culture and other organizational factors were not taken into account, it is highly possible that this research cannot be reproduced outside of the Netherlands, as variables such as culture and customs can have an influence on research outcomes. Therefore, a future researcher should take into account that this study was conducted in the Netherlands and that it may not be reproducible in other countries, as culture and customs have to be taken into account. This should be considered so that future results can be generalized and reproduced in more than one country.

Additionally, it would be interesting to extend this research to managers and how they manage the new generation on the work floor. And in a couple of years, when Gen Z are managers themselves, research should be undertaken on their management styles. In general, it would be useful to expand this research to a larger sample to strengthen the results, using a wide variety of study populations so the results are more reliable and can be generalized. It would be interesting to test the same sample

population in a few years' time to see their development regarding preference for leadership and motivation. This new research could be a valuable source of information regarding adaptability, higher productivity and motivation and how to handle these factors in relation to new generations, to help incorporate them into the current workforce. In conclusion, while this research has a low validity and reliability, it could be a stepping stone for future research.

References

- Al Amiri, N., Daradkeh, F., & Al Kaabi, A. (2019). Leadership styles and competence among generation Z Emirati nursing students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 18(9), 23-45.
- Amabile, T.M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 3(3), p. 185-201.
- Burke, R.J. (1994). Generation-X: Measures, sex and age differences. *Psychological Reports*, 74 (2), 555-663.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cahill, T. F., & Sedrak, M. (2012). Leading a multigenerational workforce: Strategies for attracting and retaining millennials. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 29(1), 3-15.
- CBS. (2022). *Arbeidsdeelname; Kerncijfers*.
<https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/82309NED/table?dl=50026>.
- Clark, R.E. (2003). Fostering the work motivation of individuals and teams. *Performance Improvement*, 42(3), p. 21-29.
- Colquitt, J.A., Lepine, J., & Wesson, M.J. (2011). *Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Eversole, B.A.W., Venneberg, D.L., & Crowder, C.L. (2012). Creating a Flexible Organizational Culture to Attract and Retain Talented Workers Across Generations. *Advances in Developing Human resources*, 14(1), p. 607-624. doi: 10.1177 /1523422312455612.
- Ferres, N., Travaglione, A., & Firms, I. (2003). Attitudinal differences between generation-x and older employees. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 6(3), 320-333.
- Gabrielova, K., & Buchko, A. A. (2021). Here comes Generation Z: Millennials as managers. *Business Horizons*, 64(4), 489-499.
- Galdames, S., & Guihen, L. (2022). Millennials and leadership: a systematic literature review. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 33(1-2), 146-162.
- Hameduddin, T., & Engbers, T. (2021, January). Leadership and Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Synthesis. *International Public Management Journal*,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2021.1884150>.
- Hinkin, T.R., & Tracey, J.B. (1999) The Relevance of Charisma for transformational leadership in stable organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 12 No. 2, 1999, p. 105-119.
- Hughes, M.E., & Angela, M.O. (2004). *The lives and times of the baby boomers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Human Resources Management International Digest. (2019, September 26). The Next Generation: The

- differing role of employee development in creating organizational commitment in Generation Xers and Millennials. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, Vol. 27 No. 7. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HRMID-06-2019-0174>.
- Ismail, A., Mohamad, M.H., Mohamed, M.A., Rafiuddin, N.M. & Zhen, K.W.P. (2010). Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles as a predictor of individual outcomes. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, Vol. XVII (2010), No. 6(547), p. 89-104.
- Ivanova, O.E., & Ryabinina, E.V. (2019). Assessing work values of Generation Z representatives and their impact on a person's organizational behaviour. *Revista Espacios*, 40 (18).
- Kalsoom, Z., Khan, M. A., & Zubair, D. S. S. (2018). Impact of transactional leadership and transformational leadership on employee performance: A case of FMCG industry of Pakistan. *Industrial engineering letters*, 8(3), 23-30.
- Laerd Statistics. (2018). One-way Anova. <https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/one-way-anova-statistical-guide-3.php>.
- Lasswell, H.D. & Kaplan, A. (2014). *Power and society: A Framework for Political Inquiry*. Transaction Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315127156>.
- Maloni, M., Hiatt, M. S., & Campbell, S. (2019). Understanding the work values of Gen Z business students. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 17(3), 100320.
- Martin, J. (2015). Transformational and transactional leadership: An exploration of gender, experience, and institution type. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 15(2), 331-351.
- McGregor, D.M. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Odumeru, J.A. (2013). Transformational vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, Vol. 2 Issue 2.
- Pichler, S., Kohli, C., & Granitz, N. (2021). DITTO for Gen Z: A framework for leveraging the uniqueness of the new generation. *Business Horizons*, 64(5), 599-610.
- Retail Insiders. (2020). *Arbeidsmarkt rapportage Retail Food*. <https://www.retailinsiders.nl/docs/ab6b7da4-2c64-43f3-932f-2798dd28e4b3.pdf>.
- Robbins, S.P., & Coulter, M. (2007) *Management* (9th ed.). London: Prentice- Hall.
- Rudd, H., Kent, T., Blair, C.A. & Schuele, U.(2009). Leader behavior Inventory: A Test of Measure Equivalence in Germany and the United States. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 5 (2009), Iss. 1, p. 22-36.
- Salahuddin, M.M. (2010). Generational differences impact on leadership style and organizational Success. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 5(2), 1-6.
- Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace? *California Management Review*, 1(14). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841006>.
- Shatto, B., & Erwin, K. (2017). Teaching Millennials and Generation Z: Bridging the generational divide. *Creative Nursing*, 23(1), 24–28. doi:10.1891/1078-4535.23.1.24.

- Smola, K.W. & Sutton, C.D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363–382.
- Swanzen, R. (2018). FACING THE GENERATION CHASM: THE PARENTING AND TEACHING OF GENERATIONS Y AND Z. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, 9(2), 125-150. <https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs92201818216>.
- Tawney, R.H. (1931). Equality. New Delhi: *Gyan Books Pvt. Ltd.*
- Valenti, A. (2019). Leadership preferences of the millennial generation. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 19(1), 75-84.
- Yu, H. & Miller, P. (2005). Leadership style: The X Generation and Baby Boomers compared in different cultural contexts. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510575570>.

Thesis definitive

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q0 Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you very much for your interest in participating in this study. You can participate in this study if you work at least 16 hours a week. After reading this introduction, you can make the decision to participate in this study. This research is being conducted by a master's student from Leiden University.

If you have any questions about this introduction or this study, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher. My name and contact information can be found at the bottom of this letter. The aim of this research is to find out how motivation is influenced by leadership style across generations.

There are no right or wrong answers, but for the sake of this research it is important that you choose the answer that best suits you. Completing this questionnaire will take approximately 5 minutes. Your data will be treated anonymously and confidentially and participation in this study is voluntary. You decide whether you want to participate and you always have the option to stop during the survey without giving a reason.

You can only take this survey once, but you can edit your response until the survey is closed.

Miss M.L. van der Plas, email-address: mariellevanderplas@hotmail.com

If you have read the above information and wish to participate in the study, you consent to the usage of the generated data for research purposes.

This survey will start off with a few general questions.

Q1 1. I agree to participate in the research study. I understand the purpose and nature of this study and I am participating voluntarily. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without any penalty or consequences

- Yes, I agree to participate (1)
- No, I don't agree to participate (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Q1 = No, I don't agree to participate

Q2 2. I grant permission for the anonymous data generated from this interview to be used in the researcher's publications on this topic

- Yes, I grant permission (1)
- No, I don't grant permission (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Q2 = No, I don't grant permission

Page Break



Q3 3. What is your age?

Q4 4. What is the highest level of education that you received or are currently following?

- No schooling completed (1)
 - Elementary education (basisonderwijs) (2)
 - Secondary education (middelbare school) (3)
 - Secondary vocational education (MBO) (4)
 - Bachelor (HBO/WO) (5)
 - Master (HBO/WO) (6)
 - Doctoraal/ PhD (7)
 - Other (8) _____
-

Q5 5. What is your gender?

- Female (1)
 - Male (2)
 - Other (3) _____
-

Q6 6. What is your current employment status?

- Employed full-time (36+ hours a week) (1)
- Employed part-time (Less than 36 hours a week) (2)
- Other (4) _____

Skip To: End of Survey If Q6 =

Page Break



Q7 7. How many years have you been working for this organization?

Q8 8. How satisfied are you working for this company?

- Extremely dissatisfied (1)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat satisfied (4)
- Extremely satisfied (5)

Page Break

Q9 9. I feel motivated when my manager:	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Instills pride in me (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Spends time teaching and coaching me (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
States clear expectations (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Considers moral and ethical consequences (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Will take action before problems become chronic (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Views me as an individual with needs, abilities and aspirations (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Listens to my concerns (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Tells me precise standards to carry out my work (8)

Encourages me to perform to the best of my abilities (9)

Encourages me to think creatively (10)

Works out agreements with me (11)

Sets challenging standards (12)

Monitors my performance (13)

Keeps track of my mistakes (14)

Gets me to rethink never-questioned ideas (15)

Q10 10. Would you recommend your company as a good place to work?

- Extremely unlikely (1)
- Somewhat unlikely (2)
- Neither likely nor unlikely (3)
- Somewhat likely (4)
- Extremely likely (5)

Q11 11. Please explain your answer from the previous question.

Thank you for participating!

I really value your feedback. This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your

participation! This questionnaire was about leadership and how leadership influences motivation across generations.

End of Block: Default Question Block

Appendix 2: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings
	Total	% of Variance	% of Variance
1. Transformational	6,091	40,607	33,356
2. Transformational/Transactional	2,155	14,370	15,641
3. Transactional	1,931	12,875	14,868
4. Transactional	1,167	7,778	11,765

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Appendix 3: Correlation Matrix Q9

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
1. Pride (Q9.1)	1														
2. Teaching and coaching (Q9.2)	,484**	1													
3. Moral an ethnical (Q9.4)	,449**	0,261	1												
4. Individuality (Q9.6)	,746**	,623**	,640**	1											
5. Listens to concerns (Q9.7)	,656**	,600**	,464**	,812**	1										
6. Encouraging to perform (Q9.9)	,555**	,589**	,614**	,726**	,647**	1									
7. Thinking creatively (Q9.10)	,678**	,701**	,565**	,843**	,673**	,657**	1								
8. challenging standards (Q9.12)	,405**	0,143	0,214	0,301	0,201	0,284	0,246	1							
9. Rethink (Q9.15)	,532**	0,194	,471**	,529**	,456**	,425**	,469**	,461**	1						
10. Clear expectations (Q9.3)	0,222	,499**	0,091	,319*	,357*	,517**	0,218	-0,079	0,016	1					
11. Taking action (Q9.5)	0,302	,316*	,351*	,380*	,330*	,537**	0,276	-0,109	0,005	,583**	1				
12. Precise standards (Q9.8)	0,115	0,012	0,084	0,065	0,043	0,054	-0,121	0,162	0,128	,403**	0,217	1			
13. Making agreements (Q9.11)	,466**	,380*	0,307	,562**	,472**	,330*	,371*	,420**	0,063	0,256	0,311	,585**	1		
14. Monitoring performance (Q9.13)	,417**	0,266	-0,003	0,176	0,231	,333*	0,062	,401*	,332*	,319*	0,048	,337*	0,221	1	
15. Supervising mistakes (Q9.14)	,357*	0,119	-0,001	0,071	0,085	0,186	0,049	,428**	,390*	-0,021	0,146	0,179	0,151	,605**	1

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix 4: Correlation Matrix

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Age	1,00							
2. Level of education	-0,11	1,00						
3. Gender*	0,39	-0,03	1,00					
4. Employment status**	-0,37	0,20	-0,36	1,00				
5. Years of working for this organization	0,74	-0,01	0,49	-0,32	1,00			
6. Satisfaction for working for this company	0,17	0,03	-0,05	0,13	0,03	1,00		
7. Mean Transformational items (H1-H3, H4)	-0,26	0,20	-0,44	0,01	-0,33	-0,10	1,00	
8. Mean Transactional items (H1- H3)	0,33	-0,15	-0,10	-0,48	0,10	-0,15	0,42	1,00

* 1=male; 2=female

** 1=fulltime 2=parttime

Appendix 5: Retail Food Statistics

Gender	Survey results	Retail Food
Male	42,5%	44,2%
Female	55%	55,7%
Other	2,5%	x

Education	Survey Results	Retail Food
No Schooling	5%	x
Elementary education	2,5%	23%
Secondary education	20%	38,9%
Secondary vocational education	35%	33,4%
Bachelor/Master/PhD	37,5%	4,7%

Employment	Survey Results	Retail Food
Fulltime	40%	30,1%
Parttime	50%	69,9%
Other	10%	x