

A Survey on Perceived Leadership Traits of the Young and Experienced Leaders: Preference of the Young Recruits

Thufathun Nessa Chowdhury*

School of Business, East Delta University, 1267/A Goshaldanga, Agrabad, Chittagong, Bangladesh

*thufathun_nessa@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research had undertaken to identify the preference of the young recruits while choosing the traits for the young and experienced leaders. Besides, the researcher investigated the difference between the expectations and perceptions of the leadership traits for both type of leaders. A targeted sample of 100 respondents working in different manufacturing firms was selected as samples for the study. The researchers chosen these samples just because the recruits had newly joined into the job, pursuing MBA degree during evening time at different public and private university in Chittagong, not yet finished their probation period. The researcher had done this research through two different types of surveys those are, "Survey-1" and "Survey-2". Same type of samples was undertaken for both the surveys. The researcher followed exploratory and conclusive approach (known as inductive and deductive approach) in doing this research.

The results found a list of traits in "Survey -1" that were preferred by the young recruits. The second objective addressed that in both the survey majority response were found from the young recruits. In the third objective, the results of testing hypotheses were set for the study. A significant difference had observed between the expectation and perception of traits when recruits preferred the leaders. This research gave a clear idea that young recruits required different leadership. They preferred the young leaders rather than the experienced leaders. Young leaders required different leadership traits while delivering leadership to the subordinates. So, the management of the organization should assign appropriate leaders for the subordinates based on the age of the recruits. At the same time, young leaders should be trained properly to supervise the young recruits.

Keywords: perceived leadership traits, young leaders, experienced leaders, preferred leadership, young recruits, and experienced recruits.

1. Introduction

Appointments in organizations for the entry level jobs generally recruit the fresher who have completed their undergrads and graduations recently. There were a number of factors which can motivate a recruit and retain them with satisfaction in the workplace. So, the recruits should be provided all their basic necessities while performing their jobs. Maslow (1943) invented five hierarchy of needs related to the basic needs of human beings. In this theory the author identified the relation of these needs (psychological, security, belongingness, esteem and self-actualization needs) with salary, pension plan, friends in work place, job title, job challenge (Moorhead and Griffin, 2005). Herzberg (1968) suggested another theory of development which was initially called dual-structure theory now popularly known as two-factor theory. In this theory "supervision" is a Hygiene Factor which may remove dissatisfaction. But Motivating Factors like "achievement" and "recognition", often cited as causes of satisfaction and motivation, are based on the Hygiene factors (Moorhead and Griffin, 2005). From the above discussion about the influential factors of employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction, it was obvious that proper supervision and motivation were needed to fulfil the higher order needs (Maslow, 1943) of the recruits in every organization.

The leaders, who provide necessary traits according to the requirements of the young recruits, and deliver leadership with proper motivation, would be preferred by the new comers. Effective leaders with preferable traits were required to satisfy the recruits of an organization. Then adequate motivation should be provided by the leader to fulfil the self-actualization need of the recruits through proper training and guidance. Newstrom (2003-2004) concluded that successful leadership can never be guaranteed by the leadership traits. Traits can vary from leader to leader based on age and level of experience. A young leader could be found as more inspiring than an old experienced leader because of differences in leadership traits. This research was undertaken to seek the answers that the researcher addressed throughout the study. The researcher tried to find a conclusion by surveying the preference of young recruits while choosing a young leader or an experienced leader. Also the researcher investigated the difference between the expectation and performance of the traits while delivering

leadership (by the young leader) to find the perceived leadership trait preferred by the young recruits.

2. Objective of the study:

The main objective of this study was to find out the leadership traits preferred by the young recruits with the preference in choosing young or experienced leaders. The other related objectives included the differences between the expectations and perceptions of traits of the preferred leaders.

2.1. *What leadership traits were preferred by the young recruits?*

2.2. *Did the young recruits prefer the young leaders or the experienced leaders?*

2.3. *Do the preferred leadership traits always differ before and after perceiving the leadership by the recruits?*

2.3.1. *Null Hypothesis:*

2.3.1.1. *No significant difference observed between the expectation and perception of traits when young recruits preferred young leaders.*

2.3.1.2. *No significant difference observed between the expectation and perception of traits when young recruits preferred experience leaders.*

2.3.1.3. *No significant difference observed between the expectation and perception of traits when experienced recruits preferred young leaders.*

2.3.1.4. *No significant difference observed between the expectation and perception of traits of experienced recruits preferred experienced leaders.*

3. Literature Review

The study of leadership had undertaken as an interesting research since 20th century. In the early 'Great Man' and 'Trait' theories (Kahn, Hewes and Ali, 2009; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991), it was believed that leaders were born not made. The updated theories revealed later with 'Contingency', 'Situational' and 'Behavioural' approaches where leadership changes with the change in social world. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) identified whether leadership traits were inherited or acquired was not confirmed by the 'Trait' theory. It only affirmed that leaders' and non-leaders' features were different from each other. Kahn, Hewes and Ali (2009) discussed about the argument of developed leadership and inherited leadership and opined that, when the proper support given, any young person can develop the leadership skills.

Jago (1982) described leadership as distributed traits among the population. He also expressed leadership as observable actions done by the leaders rather than inherent characteristics in a leader. Ralph Stogdill (1948) had drawn a conclusion after a thorough literature review that "A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits". Stogdill found no universal traits related to effective leadership where some influential factors were active based on the situations. Because leadership traits vary from person to person. Considering the factors depending on the situation, a leader must deliver leadership with required traits and avoid those traits which were not required. Because the sub-ordinate's activities strongly affected by the performance level of the supervisors (Farris, 1966; Lowin, 1968). Kirkpatrick et al. (1991) expressed that traits were the precondition of successful leadership. Leaders who possess these requisite traits were more likely to be successful and leaders must take some actions to perform this required leadership. Lowin, Hrapchak, and Kavanagh (1969) described leadership as effective when it met the demand of the sub-ordinates. So, the preferred leadership traits of the young recruits must be delivered to extract the best performance from the newly joined recruits and ensure retention with satisfaction.

3.1. *Leadership for the Young Recruits*

Kahn, Hewes and Ali (2009) defined youth leadership as "Young people empowered to inspire and mobilise themselves and others towards a common purpose, in response to personal and/or social issues and challenges, to effect positive change". Leaders must understand the attitudes and expectations of the subordinates to manage them effectively. Younger workforce interested about those organization that wanted them to have a life rather than a job. These kinds of subordinates seek more options and freedom for developing career. Different leadership style was required for these subordinates that give prompt feedback (Guthrie 2009). Davenport (1998) did not acknowledge the one best leadership style too. To fulfil subordinates' needs and situation demand,

successful leaders adjust their leadership style. Kahn, Hewes and Ali (2009) opined that without practicing a “followership”, young people can practice leadership. That means a young leader can lead without following someone. The author also added that youth and adult leadership are different from each other. Now, the question is what kind of followers should the leader supervise? The young recruits or the adult recruits? Nichols, Cooper and Quine (2008) found the same in a change makers survey. Among the 100 surveyed people half of the respondents affirmed that youth leadership is different from adult leadership. This study inquired the leadership traits preferred by the young recruits. Ladureau (1976) study noticed a gap between the expected leadership skills from the young recruits and actual skills of young graduates. This study investigated the distinction between the expectation and actual performance of the leadership traits perceived by the young recruits. McCrindle, M., (2013) described the nature of generation as “A metaphor of this is found in any ‘How to Surf’ book: there are many pages on how to pick a wave, catch a wave, and turn on a wave- but not even a sentence on how to create a wave or change a wave. Quite simply because we can’t - God make’s the waves and surfers catch them! And so it is with the generational and cultural waves. We can’t change the learning styles, work patterns, or employment attitudes of an entire generation – but we can position ourselves to understand and so better engage with each new generation”. From this it can be concluded that a new young generation is different by their nature. Leaders should take good care of the new comers and give them the appropriate leadership style with the required traits when they join the organization as new recruits.

3.2. *The Perception of the Sub-ordinate*

Evans (1973) intended to prove that, based on the category of the subordinates the leader behaves differently. A subordinate who is a new comer of an organization may require a young leader with specific traits. Evans also identified the perception of the leaders’ styles that affect the subordinates’ personality characteristics. The young subordinates who joined the organization must have their own liking and preferences. This study identified the preference of the subordinates’ while perceiving leadership traits. It was an observed phenomenon that young leaders used relationship-oriented leadership whereas old leaders were less flexible. Yu & Miller (2005) found substantial difference between the leadership styles preferred by Baby Boomers and Generation X in the Taiwan Manufacturing Industry. These researchers also diagnosed Baby Boomers as more loyal and accepting a “chain of command” leadership style compared to Generation X. Whereas Xers desired freedom and power and perceived authority as unreasonable toughness. Xers preferred the leaders who treat the subordinates like a partner instead of a worker. In short a relationship-oriented leadership style was preferred by the Generation X (Armour 1997; Leung 2000; Levin 2001; Nagle 2001; Tulgan 1996; Yankelovich 2000). So, it can be concluded that like the generation X, flexible leadership with some appropriate traits would be preferred by the young recruits. Evans (1973) study also found the influential personality factors affecting perceived supervisory behaviour that predicts behaviour at a future time. The experience of perceiving leadership traits before and after the delivery of leadership could be measured through a survey from the new recruits. Durand and Nord (1976) opined that with the passage of time, the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate develops. Different subordinates may conceive different behaviours from an effective leader (Vroom, 1964; Rubin and Goldman, 1968). A young leader may be perceived differently by the young and experienced recruits. So, it became an alarming question that, who are the preferred leaders by the young recruits? Again, the effects of personality measurement of the leaders taken at two different times that is time 1 and time 2, would measure the supervisor and subordinate relationship of each member of the organization. The results revealed that perceived supervisory behaviour measured at time1 was more strongly related to measurement done at a future time that is time2 (Durand et al., 1976). And such kind of results may represent the significant differences between the expectations and perceptions of the leadership traits by the young recruits.

3.3. *Trait Analysis*

Northouse (2006) stated that there were some individuals who possessed some inherent and inborn qualities to become a natural leader, was the trait perspective of leadership. Newstrom et al. depicted two leadership traits from early research based on physical (height, body size and shape, personal attractiveness), intellectual (intelligence, ambition and aggressiveness), and personality characteristics (Myer-Briggs Type Indicator personality test). “Foresight” was another important leadership quality necessary for overcoming uncertain situation by setting alternative courses of action (Riaz and Haider, 2010). *Good communication skills and assertiveness* were observed in many leaders (Griffin, 2007). Several researchers examined different leadership traits throughout a number of decades. The findings integrated a summarized traits related to leadership effectiveness as follows; *high energy level and stress tolerance, self-confidence, Internal locus of control*

orientation, emotional stability and maturity, personal integrity, socialized power motivation, moderately high achievement orientation, low need for affiliation (Yukl, 2011). Current research identified some personality traits, as the most important characteristics for the leaders, were; *high level of personal drive, the desire to lead, personal integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, Business knowledge, charisma, creativity, flexibility and personal warmth* (Newstrom et al., 2003-2004). Griffin and Moorhead (2005) found two sets of traits from early and recent literatures. *Intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, energy, activity, and task relevant knowledge* are reviewed from early decades. Recently *drive, motivation, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, knowledge of the business, and charisma*. A list of traits and characteristics was prepared by Northouse (2006) from the review of different trait approaches done by Stogdill (1948), Mann (1959), Lord, De Vader, and Alliger (1986), and Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991). The authors found *intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity and sociability* as the common traits in the list. To simplify the confusing literature of leadership traits Dugman (1990) and Hough (1992) suggested a Big Five model with specific traits. Surgency (or extraversion), dependability (or conscientiousness), adjustment (neuroticism), intellectance (or openness to experience), and agreeableness, these five categories of traits covers all of the relevant traits which include similar leadership behavior (as cited in Yukl, 2011). Robbins (2005) concluded with seven traits, after reviewing numerous studies and analysis of previous decades from 1960s to 1990s, which were *ambition and energy, the desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, intelligence, high self-monitoring, and job-relevant knowledge*.

Kickul and Neuman (2000) had done a personality and cognitive ability tests and the result represented some traits, such as *extroversion, openness to experience and cognitive ability* for emergent leadership. *Intelligence or cognitive ability, dominance, masculinity, and sociability* were also related to emergent leadership (Lord, DeVader, & Allinger, 1986; Kaess, Witryol, & Nolan, 1961). Stogdill (1948) reached to a conclusion that leaders were differentiated from the followers by five traits. These traits included *intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, level of energy and activity, and task-relevant knowledge*. Whereas Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) identified six traits to differentiate leaders from non-leaders that were *drive, the desire to lead, honesty/integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business*. Drive includes *achievement, motivation, ambition, energy, tenacity, and initiative*; *motivation* signifies the desire to lead self-confidence was related to the emotional stability. Traits like charisma, creativity and flexibility did not possess strong evidence. Mann's (1959) reviewed seven categories of traits and examined *intelligence and cognitive ability* as the best predictor of leadership. DiPietro, Severt, Welsh & Raven (2008) found *hope, organizational commitment, service quality, empathy* etc. to study the similarity between manager and franchisee. Hogan (1994) also emphasized on transformational leadership with *social and interpersonal skills*. The personality traits of these leadership skills included adjustment like *self-confident and able to handle pressure, social impact like outgoing and assertive, and agreeableness like warm and friendly*. Ross and Offermann (1997) also diagnosed *self-confidence* as important personality trait for a supervisor. Van Rensburg and Crous (2000) also identified *need for affiliation* as a trait for a transformational leader. Shin (1998 – 99) investigated the traits that distinguish leadership styles of CEOs between successful and unsuccessful firms. Finding revealed that four representative traits like *initiator attitude, tenacity and summoning spirit, network-building ability, and emphasis on competency* were the traits of CEOs of successful firms. The managers, who followed transformational leadership style, had exposed through *ambition, motivation, assertiveness, need for influence, need for affiliation, responsiveness in interaction, trust and tolerance* (Eeden, Cilliers and Deventer, 2008).

3.3.1. Findings:

Some common traits found from the review of the previous study. Several studies had gone through, written

Table-1: List of traits found in the Literature Review

| Yukl (2011) | Newstrom et al. (2003-2004) | Northouse (2006) | Robbins (2005) | Griffin and Moorhead (2005) | Digman (1990) and Hough (1992) |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Self-confidence | Self-confidence | Self-confidence | Self-confidence | Self-confidence | Self-esteem |
| | Intelligence | Intelligence | Intelligence | | Intelligence |
| | Business knowledge | | Job-relevant knowledge | Knowledge of the business | |
| | Cognitive ability | | | Cognitive ability | |
| Socialized power motivation | | Extroversion, Sociability | | | Extroversion |
| | Ambition | Ambition | | | |
| High energy level | | Energy | | Activity, Energy | Energy and activity level |
| Personal integrity | Personal integrity | Integrity | Honesty and integrity | Honesty and integrity | Personal integrity |
| Socialized power motivation | | | | Motivation | |
| | High level of personal drive | | | Drive | |
| | The desire to lead | | The desire to lead | | |
| | Charisma | | | Charisma | |
| Emotional stability and maturity | | | | | Emotional stability |
| | | | Self-monitoring | | Self-control |
| Achievement orientation | | | | | Need for achievement |
| Stress tolerance, | Creativity, Flexibility, Personal warmth, | Determination, | | | |
| Internal locus of control, | Aggressiveness | Masculinity, | | | Need for power, |
| Low need for affiliation | | Alertness, | | | Dependability , Adjustment, |
| | | Persistence, Initiative, | | | Assertiveness, |
| | | Responsibility, Influence, | | | Agreeableness, |
| | | Conservatism, | | | Open-minded Dependability |
| | | Dominance | | | Need for power |
| | | Extroversion | | | Curious and inquisitive |
| | | Cooperativeness | | | Need for affiliation |
| | | Tolerance | | | |

by different authors (Riaz and Haider, 2010; Kickul and Neuman, 2000; Lord, DeVader, & Allinger, 1986; Kaess, Witryol, & Nolan, 1961; Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959; Lord, De Vader, and Alliger, 1986; and Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991; DiPietro, Severt, Welsh & Raven 2008; Eeden, Cilliers and Deventer 2008; Hogan 1994; Ross and Offermann 1997; Van Rensburg and Crous 2000; Shin, 1998 – 99;) who mentioned different traits in their research, to find the similarities with the traits summarized in the chart. The chart was prepared by reviewing the papers prepared by Northouse (2006); Yukl (2011); Newstrom et al., (2003-2004); Griffin (2007); Moorhead (2005); Robbins (2005); Digman (1990); and Hough (1992).

After analyzing the traits some common traits and other related traits (Table-1) had found which later characterized the young and experienced leaders in the surveys.

3.3.1.1. Most Common Traits

Intelligence, Self-confidence, Honesty and integrity, Job-relevant knowledge, Energy and activity level, Cognitive ability, Ambition, Motivation, Personal drive, Sociability, The desire to lead, Emotional stability and maturity, Self-monitoring and control, Need for achievement, Charisma.

3.3.1.2. Other Traits

Tolerance, Internal locus of control, Dominance, Assertiveness, Aggressiveness, Personal warmth, Flexibility/Adjustment, Determination, Responsibility, Influence, Conservatism, Foresight/Alertness, Persistence, Creativity, Initiative, Open-minded, Dependability, Need for power, Curious and inquisitive, Masculinity.

By using these traits, the researcher prepared the questionnaire for “Survey-1” which was a list of traits to be selected (ticked) for the young and old aged leaders.

4. Methodology of the study

4.1. Purpose: At the beginning of the research, to have a trait survey, the researcher reviewed different related papers to find a set of traits referred by the authentic authors. Because this research had undertaken to identify the preference of the young recruits while choosing traits for the young and experienced leaders. Besides, the researcher investigated the difference between the expectations and perceptions of the leadership traits for both type of leaders.

4.2. Samples: A targeted sample of 100 respondents working in different manufacturing firms was selected as samples for the study. The main characteristic of the employees were that they were the new recruits and not yet completed their probation or just finished their probation period recently. Considering the context of Bangladesh, it was observed that 30 year was the age limit for applying any entry level job. And the probation period was observed as set for maximum two years. So, those who were within 30 years of their age, conceiving probation of at-best two years, were selected as respondents for the survey of this study.

The researcher applied judgment sampling in choosing the samples for the surveys. The students, having their executive MBA degree at different public and private university, were chosen as sample for this study. The researchers chosen these samples just because the recruits had newly joined into the job, pursuing MBA degree during evening time, not yet finished their probation period. The sample size of the first survey was 100 MBA students (recruits of different manufacturing firms) of different private university in Chittagong. The same types of samples were taken for “Survey 2”. In total 87 samples found attending the survey in the second attempt of the researcher.

4.1. Methodology and Strategy: The researcher had done this research through two different types of surveys those are, “Survey-1” and “Survey-2”. Same type of samples had undertaken for both the surveys. A structured questionnaire was set for “Survey-1” based on the reviewed traits found through the exploratory research. Another questionnaire was prepared for “Survey-2” in five point Likert scale. The research choice was mono method that is; data collection through survey only. The time horizon was cross-sectional that is the researcher taken the month of March and the month of May in the year 2014 for the surveys respectively.

4.3. Approach: Though no previous research was found in this area, it was considered as a real research gap to follow an exploratory and conclusive approach suggested by (Zikmund, 2003). The same were prescribed by Saunders (2011) as inductive and deductive approach.

4.4. Data: Different secondary sources were used to gather relevant information about the study. This research reviewed the literature based on desk research that was, browsing through the internet and going through the downloaded articles. Different relevant books had also reviewed by the researcher. For collecting the primary data, the researcher used questionnaire for survey. The students of evening MBA program, who were the newly joined recruits of the organizations, had participated in the survey. A structured questionnaire was used to get their preferable traits for the young and experienced leaders. They also provided information about their expectations and perceptions while perceiving the leadership traits of the young and experienced leaders.

Summarizing the surveyed information, the researcher analyzed the results by testing the null hypotheses then concluded the study with necessary recommendations.

5. Research Findings

5.1. Results of “Survey-1”

Table-2: Age of the Recruits

| Preference of the Recruits | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Type of Recruits | Young Leader | Experienced Leader | Total recruits |
| Young Recruits | 71 | 23 | 94 |
| Experienced Recruits | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Total Preference | 74 | 26 | 100 |
| Preference of the Young Recruits (%) | 76% | 24% | |

5.1.1. *Age of the Recruits*: The recruits, who were not having their professional experience more than two years, had selected as sample for the survey. Though their experience was not more than two years, their age had varied from one respondent to another respondent. 86% of the respondents were under 32 years. 8% of them were aged from 32 to 35 years not having experience over two years. Only 6% of the recruits were more than 35 years old and only two of them had probation over two years.

Table-3: Probation Period of the Recruits

| Age of the Leaders Determined by the Recruits | | |
|---|--------------|-----|
| Young Leader | 30-40 | 40% |
| | less than 30 | 7% |
| Experienced Leader | 50-65 | 30% |
| | 40-50 | 24% |

5.1.2. *Probation Period*: The total number of the recruits, who were having their probation not more than two years, was 98 and that was the majority. Rest two respondents were having probation more than two years.

Table-4: Preferred Leaders by the Young Recruits

| Type of Recruits | Age of the Recruits | Number of Recruits | % |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----|
| Young Recruits | Not more than 32 | 86 | 94% |
| | 32-35 | 8 | |
| Experienced Recruits | More than 35 | 6 | 6% |

5.1.3. *Preference of the Recruits*: Out of 100 respondents, 71 young recruits preferred the young leaders. 23 young recruits preferred experienced leaders. Only three experienced recruits preferred young leader and rest three of them chosen experienced leaders.

Table-5: Age of the Leaders Determined by the Recruits

| Probation | No of Respondents |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Not More than 2 years | 98 |
| More than 2 Years | 2 |

5.1.4. *Age of the Leaders*: The recruits determined the age of the young and experienced leaders. 47% of the recruits written the age for the young leader forty or less than forty. 54% of the recruits determined the age for the experienced leaders forty above.

The survey results shown 74 recruits preferred young leaders whereas 71 recruits were young recruits and 3 of

them were experienced recruits. 26 recruits preferred experienced leaders whereas 23 were young recruits and rest of them were experienced recruits. The recruits put tick mark of the preferred traits for the leaders. The total number of ticks for a particular trait was numbered and converted into percentage. The results were arranged according to the rank order from highest percentage to lowest percentage and up to a fixed percentage of the ranked traits were kept for preparing the questionnaire for further survey. The minimum percentage for accepting the traits were decided based on the judgment of the researcher. In case of common traits up to 40% shows the maximum response for the respective traits. But for the other traits, response rate was poor and the researcher considered the favorable traits at best 35%. Some traits were eliminated based on response rate displayed beside the selected traits for the second survey.

The questionnaire of survey 2 was rearranged based on the rank ordered selected traits. Some traits, considered as less important, were eliminated because of the poor percentage of recruits given tick for those traits.

Table-6: Preferred Leadership Traits by the Young Recruits

| Preference of the Young Recruits | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Number of Recruits = 74+26 | | | | |
| Preference of Young Leaders | | 74 | | |
| Preference of Experienced Leaders | | 26 | | |
| Most Common Leadership Traits | Young Leaders Trait | Percentage | Old Leaders Trait | Percentage |
| Intelligence | 67 | 93% | 51 | 71% |
| Self-confidence | 66 | 92% | 43 | 60% |
| Honesty and integrity | 61 | 85% | 45 | 63% |
| Job-relevant knowledge | 52 | 72% | 40 | 56% |
| Energy and activity level | 51 | 71% | 18 | 25% |
| Cognitive ability | 46 | 64% | 31 | 43% |
| Ambition | 57 | 79% | 25 | 35% |
| Motivation | 46 | 64% | 40 | 56% |
| Personal drive | 57 | 79% | 28 | 39% |
| Sociability | 39 | 54% | 39 | 54% |
| The desire to lead | 43 | 60% | 32 | 44% |
| Emotional stability and maturity | 30 | 42% | 38 | 53% |
| Self-monitoring and control | 43 | 60% | 40 | 56% |
| Need for achievement | 41 | 57% | 13 | 18% |
| Charisma | 29 | 40% | 18 | 25% |
| Other Traits | | | | |
| Tolerance | 18 | 25% | 42 | 58% |
| Internal locus of control | 30 | 42% | 34 | 47% |
| Dominance | 16 | 22% | 30 | 42% |
| Assertiveness | 20 | 28% | 24 | 33% |
| Aggressiveness | 35 | 49% | 23 | 32% |
| Personal warmth | 30 | 42% | 27 | 38% |
| Flexibility/ Adjustment | 34 | 47% | 27 | 38% |
| Determination | 33 | 46% | 23 | 32% |
| Responsibility | 38 | 53% | 45 | 63% |
| Influence | 28 | 39% | 28 | 39% |
| Conservatism | 12 | 17% | 26 | 36% |
| Foresight/ Alertness | 21 | 29% | 30 | 42% |
| Persistence | 15 | 21% | 20 | 28% |
| Creativity | 46 | 64% | 16 | 22% |
| Initiative | 29 | 40% | 21 | 29% |
| Open-minded | 35 | 49% | 23 | 32% |
| Dependability | 6 | 8% | 25 | 35% |
| Need for power | 15 | 21% | 27 | 38% |
| Curious and inquisitive | 19 | 26% | 12 | 17% |
| Masculinity | 9 | 13% | 9 | 13% |

So

two

separate trait charts were accommodated in the questionnaire for the young leaders and experienced leader separately for the recruits. The recruits only scaled the chart according to the five point Likert scale assigned for the preferred leaders.

Table-7: Percentage of the Number of Recruits who Preferred the Young and Experienced Leaders' Traits

| Number of Recruits = 74 | | Number of Recruits = 26 | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | | Recruits Prefer Experienced Leaders | |
| Most Common Leadership Traits | Young Leaders Trait Percentage | Most Common Leadership Traits | Old Leaders Trait Percentage |
| Intelligence | 93% | Intelligence | 71% |
| Self-confidence | 92% | Honesty and integrity | 63% |
| Honesty and integrity | 85% | Self-confidence | 60% |
| Ambition | 79% | Self-monitoring and control | 56% |
| Personal drive | 79% | Job-relevant knowledge | 56% |
| Job-relevant knowledge | 72% | Motivation | 56% |
| Energy and activity level | 71% | Sociability | 54% |
| Cognitive ability | 64% | Emotional stability and maturity | 53% |
| Motivation | 64% | The desire to lead | 44% |
| Self-monitoring and control | 60% | Cognitive ability | 43% |
| The desire to lead | 60% | Personal drive | 39% |
| Need for achievement | 57% | Ambition | 35% |
| Sociability | 54% | Other Traits | |
| Emotional stability and maturity | 42% | Responsibility | 63% |
| Charisma | 40% | Tolerance | 58% |
| Other Traits | | Internal locus of control | 47% |
| Creativity | 64% | Dominance | 42% |
| Responsibility | 53% | Foresight/ Alertness | 42% |
| Open-minded | 49% | Influence | 39% |
| Aggressiveness | 49% | Personal warmth | 38% |
| Flexibility/ Adjustment | 47% | Flexibility/ Adjustment | 38% |
| Determination | 46% | Need for power | 38% |
| Personal warmth | 42% | Conservatism | 36% |
| Internal locus of control | 42% | Dependability | 35% |
| Initiative | 40% | | |
| Influence | 39% | | |

5.2. Results of "Survey-2":

Table-8: Number of Recruits Preferred the Young and Experienced Leaders

| Number of Recruits | |
|--|-----------|
| Young Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | 50 |
| Experienced Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | 4 |
| Young Recruits Prefer Experience Leaders | 26 |
| Experienced Recruits Prefer Experience Leaders | 7 |
| Total | 87 |

In the “Survey-2”, 50 young recruits preferred the young leaders. 4 experienced recruits preferred the young leaders. 26 of the young recruits preferred the experienced leaders and 7 of the experienced recruits preferred the experienced leaders. The results of “Survey-2” had shown the difference between expectations and perceptions of the recruits about the leadership traits of young and experienced leaders.

Table-9: Calculation of Test Statistics When Young Recruits Preferred the Young Leaders

| Young Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Respondents | P/O | E | O-E | (O-E) ² | (O-E) ² /E |
| R1 | 85 | 102 | -17 | 289 | 3 |
| R2 | 90 | 106 | -16 | 256 | 2 |
| R3 | 99 | 108 | -9 | 81 | 1 |
| R4 | 95 | 116 | -21 | 441 | 4 |
| R5 | 78 | 102 | -24 | 576 | 6 |
| R6 | 86 | 102 | -16 | 256 | 3 |
| R7 | 71 | 89 | -18 | 324 | 4 |
| R8 | 82 | 102 | -20 | 400 | 4 |
| R9 | 91 | 106 | -15 | 225 | 2 |
| R10 | 89 | 108 | -19 | 361 | 3 |
| R11 | 106 | 105 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| R12 | 84 | 110 | -26 | 676 | 6 |
| R13 | 95 | 104 | -9 | 81 | 1 |
| R14 | 73 | 88 | -15 | 225 | 3 |
| R15 | 101 | 104 | -3 | 9 | 0 |
| R16 | 108 | 83 | 25 | 625 | 8 |
| R17 | 73 | 92 | -19 | 361 | 4 |
| R18 | 111 | 117 | -6 | 36 | 0 |
| R19 | 53 | 87 | -34 | 1156 | 13 |
| R20 | 98 | 79 | 19 | 361 | 5 |
| R21 | 111 | 100 | 11 | 121 | 1 |
| R22 | 114 | 113 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| R23 | 42 | 50 | -8 | 64 | 1 |
| R24 | 109 | 105 | 4 | 16 | 0 |
| R25 | 57 | 53 | 4 | 16 | 0 |
| R26 | 105 | 85 | 20 | 400 | 5 |
| R27 | 93 | 104 | -11 | 121 | 1 |
| R28 | 98 | 106 | -8 | 64 | 1 |
| R29 | 0 | 110 | -110 | 12100 | 110 |
| R30 | 111 | 98 | 13 | 169 | 2 |
| R31 | 107 | 108 | -1 | 1 | 0 |
| R32 | 83 | 103 | -20 | 400 | 4 |
| R33 | 65 | 60 | 5 | 25 | 0 |
| R34 | 106 | 114 | -8 | 64 | 1 |
| R35 | 105 | 108 | -3 | 9 | 0 |
| R36 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R37 | 85 | 84 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| R38 | 64 | 125 | -61 | 3721 | 30 |
| R39 | 81 | 97 | -16 | 256 | 3 |
| R40 | 83 | 107 | -24 | 576 | 5 |
| R41 | 64 | 45 | 19 | 361 | 8 |
| R42 | 125 | 115 | 10 | 100 | 1 |
| R43 | 95 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R44 | 108 | 94 | 14 | 196 | 2 |
| R45 | 106 | 104 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| R46 | 109 | 94 | 15 | 225 | 2 |
| R47 | 89 | 107 | -18 | 324 | 3 |
| R48 | 93 | 114 | -21 | 441 | 4 |
| R49 | 97 | 93 | 4 | 16 | 0 |
| R50 | 96 | 91 | 5 | 25 | 0 |
| SUM{(O-E)²/E} | | | | | 255 |

Table-10: Calculation of Test Statistics When Young Recruits Preferred the Experienced Leaders

| Young Recruits Prefer Experienced Leaders | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Respondents | P/O | E | O-E | (O-E) ² | (O-E) ² /E |
| R1 | 77 | 88 | -11 | 121 | 1 |
| R2 | 76 | 84 | -8 | 64 | 1 |
| R3 | 65 | 88 | -23 | 529 | 6 |
| R4 | 75 | 90 | -15 | 225 | 3 |
| R5 | 89 | 102 | -13 | 169 | 2 |
| R6 | 89 | 114 | -25 | 625 | 5 |
| R7 | 98 | 108 | -10 | 100 | 1 |
| R8 | 86 | 109 | -23 | 529 | 5 |
| R9 | 77 | 96 | -19 | 361 | 4 |
| R10 | 96 | 110 | -14 | 196 | 2 |
| R11 | 92 | 98 | -6 | 36 | 0 |
| R12 | 112 | 99 | 13 | 169 | 2 |
| R13 | 102 | 106 | -4 | 16 | 0 |
| R14 | 96 | 85 | 11 | 121 | 1 |
| R15 | 0 | 88 | -88 | 7744 | 88 |
| R16 | 0 | 97 | -97 | 9409 | 97 |
| R17 | 99 | 102 | -3 | 9 | 0 |
| R18 | 99 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R19 | 74 | 80 | -6 | 36 | 0 |
| R20 | 76 | 99 | -23 | 529 | 5 |
| R21 | 61 | 120 | -59 | 3481 | 29 |
| R22 | 95 | 93 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| R23 | 98 | 87 | 11 | 121 | 1 |
| R24 | 50 | 55 | -5 | 25 | 0 |
| R25 | 73 | 91 | -18 | 324 | 4 |
| R26 | 114 | 84 | 30 | 900 | 11 |
| SUM{(O-E)²/E} | | | | | 269 |

Table-11: Calculation of Test Statistics When Experienced Recruits Preferred the Young Leaders

| Experienced Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Respondents | P/O | E | O-E | (O-E) ² | (O-E) ² /E |
| R1 | 110 | 87 | 23 | 529 | 6 |
| R2 | 111 | 101 | 10 | 100 | 1 |
| R3 | 92 | 99 | -7 | 49 | 0 |
| R4 | 0 | 97 | -97 | 9409 | 97 |
| SUM{(O-E)²/E} | | | | | 105 |

Table-12: Calculation of Test Statistics When Experienced Recruits Preferred the Experienced Leaders

| Experienced Recruits Prefer Experienced Leaders | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Respondents | P/O | E | O-E | (O-E) ² | (O-E) ² /E |
| R1 | 0 | 96 | -96 | 9216 | 96 |
| R2 | 44 | 83 | -39 | 1521 | 18 |
| R3 | 69 | 76 | -7 | 49 | 1 |
| R4 | 106 | 81 | 25 | 625 | 8 |
| R5 | 75 | 109 | -34 | 1156 | 11 |
| R6 | 0 | 99 | -99 | 9801 | 99 |
| R7 | 96 | 104 | -8 | 64 | 1 |
| SUM{(O-E)²/E} | | | | | 233 |

Going through the calculations, the researcher came to know that there was significant difference between the expectation and perception of leadership traits of the young and experienced leaders.

Table-13: Estimation of Table Value and Calculated Value When Recruits Preferred the Leaders

| Preference of The Recruits | Degree of Freedom | Level of Significance | Table value | Calculated Value | Decisions |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------|
| Young Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | 49 | 0.05 | 66.339 | 255 | REJECTED |
| Experienced Recruits Prefer Young Leaders | 3 | 0.05 | 7.815 | 269 | REJECTED |
| Young Recruits Prefer Experience Leaders | 25 | 0.05 | 37.652 | 233 | REJECTED |
| Experienced Recruits Prefer Experience Leaders | 6 | 0.05 | 12.592 | 105 | REJECTED |

To test the difference mathematically, the researcher found that all the null hypotheses were rejected because the table values were less than the calculated values. The researcher used Chi-square tests to test the hypothesis. To calculate the t-value, the researcher used the following formula (Gupta and Gupta, 2008),

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Where, O = Observed frequency and E = Expected frequency

In this research “ O ” stands for the values assigned to the perception of the leadership traits and “ E ” stands for the assigned value of the expectation of leadership traits. These values evaluated the difference between the perception of leadership traits before and after the delivery of leadership. Applying the formula, the calculated values were found to compare with table value to test the hypotheses.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation: The researcher reached to a conclusion that all the leadership traits perceived by the recruits were differentiated while expected before leadership and observed after leadership. In both surveys, majority of the young recruits preferred the young leaders. In survey-1, 71% of the leaders preferred the young recruits whereas 57% of the young recruits preferred the young leaders in “Survey-2”. According to the chronology of the objectives the conclusions had drawn by the researcher. The question in the objective one that is “What leadership traits were preferred by the young recruits?” was answered through the trait list found in “Survey -1”. The second question addressed in the second objective as “Did the young recruits prefer the young leaders or the experienced leaders?” was answered in both the survey by finding majority response from the young recruits. The third objective was represented with a question that was “Do the preferred leadership traits always differ before and after perceiving the leadership by the recruits?” The answer was given by testing hypotheses included under that question. A significant difference had observed between the expectation and perception of traits when young recruits preferred young leaders, when young recruits preferred experience leaders, when young recruits preferred experience leaders, and when experienced recruits preferred experience leaders. It proved that the leadership traits always differ before and after the perception of leadership by the recruits.

This research gave a clear idea that young recruits required different leadership. They preferred the young leaders rather than the experienced leaders. Young leaders required different leadership traits while delivering leadership to the subordinates. So, the management of the organization should assign appropriate leaders for the subordinates based on the age of the recruits. Besides an investigation would be needed to identify the proper leadership style along with the traits that suits the new recruits of the organization.

7. References

- Armour, S., (1997), ‘Xers mark the workplace new attitude in managing’, *USA Today Information Network*.
 Davenport, T.H., & Prusak, L., (1998), *Working Knowledge: How Organisations Manage What They Know*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

- DiPietro, R. B., & Severt, D. E., & Welsh, D. H. B., & Raven, P. V., (2008), Franchisee Leadership Traits vs. Manager Leadership Traits an Exploratory Study Comparing Hope, Leadership, Commitment and Service Quality Delivery. *Int Entrep Manag J* 4, 63–78.
- Durand, D. E., and Nord, W. R., (1976), Perceived Leader Behavior as a Function of Personality Characteristics of Supervisors and Subordinates, *Academy of Management Journal* 19(3), 427-438.
- Edelman, A., Gill, P., Comerford, K., Larson, M., and Hare, R., (2004), Youth Development and Youth Leadership: A Background Paper, *Washington DC: National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth*, 11.
- Eeden, R. V., Cilliers, F., & Deventer, V. V., (2008), Leadership styles and associated personality traits: Support for the Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership, *South African Journal of Psychology* 38 (2), 253-267.
- Evans, M. G., (1973), A Leader's Ability To Differentiate The Subordinate's Perception Of The Leader And The Subordinate's Performance, *Personnel Psychology* 26, 385-395.
- Farris, George F., (1966), A Causal Analysis of Scientific Performance, *Doctoral Dissertation*, University of Michigan.
- Griffin, R. W., (2007), Management, Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston New York.
- Griffin, R. W., Moorhead G., (2005), Organizational Behavior, Biztantra, New Delhi.
- Gupta, S.P., Gupta, M.P., (2000), Business Statistics, Sultan Chad and Sons, New Delhi. India.
- Guthrie, L., (2009), The Next Generation of Workers, The Ken Blanchard Companies.
- Herzberg, F., (1968), "One More Time: How do you Motivate the Employee?", *Harvard Business Review* January-February, 53-62.
- Hogan, R., (1994), Trouble at the Top: Causes and Consequences of Managerial Incompetence. *Consulting Psychology Journal* 46, 9-15.
- Jago, A. G., (1982), Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research. *Management Science* 28(3), 315-336.
- Kaess, W.H., Witryol, S.L., & Nolan, R.E., (1961). Reliability, Sex Differences, and Validity in the Leader Discussion Group. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 45, 345–350.
- Kahn L., Hewes, S., and Ali, R., (2009), Taking the Lead: Youth Leadership in Theory and Practice. The Youth of Today. Young Foundation.
- Kickul, J., and Neuman, G., (2000), Emergent Leadership Behaviors: The Function Of Personality and Cognitive Ability in Determining Teamwork Performance and KSAS. *Journal Of Business and Psychology* 15(1), 27-51.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., and Locke, E. A., (1991), Leadership: Do Traits Matter?, *The Executive* 5(2), 48-60.
- R.M., Stogdill, (1948), Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature, *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Ladureau, A., Talking to Young Leaders – A Study of Implicit Leadership Theories Among HR, *EDHEC MASTER THESIS*, Business Management – Intercontinental Track, EDHEC Business School.
- Leung, J., Mertens B., Jordan T., Nakada G., Irwin J., (2000), 'Brave new material world?', *Asian business* 36(1), 16-17.
- Levin, M. (2001), 'Bridging the generation gap', *Association management* 53(1), 92-97.
- Lord, R.G., DeVader, C.L., & Allinger, G.M., (1986), A Meta-analysis of the Relation between Personality Traits and Leadership: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71, 403–410.
- Lowin, A., Hrapchak, W. J., and Kavanagh, M. J., (1969), Consideration and Initiating Structure: An Experimental Investigation of Leadership Traits, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 14(2), 238-253
- Lowin, A., (1968), Participative decision making: a model, literature critique, and prescriptions for research, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 3, 68-106.
- Mann, R.D., (1959), A review of the Relationship between Personality and Performance in Small Groups. *Psychological Bulletin* 56, 241–270.
- Maslow, A. H., (1943), A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review* 50, 370-396.
- McCrinkle, M., (2013), New Generations at Work: Attracting, Recruiting, Retraining & Training Generation Y. *Social Researcher*, MA, BSc. (Psychology), QPMR www.mccrinkle.com.au
- Moorhead, G., and Griffin, R.W., (2005), Organizational Behavior, Biztantra, New Delhi.
- Nagle, T., (2001), Coaching Generation X (Online), Available: <http://www.coachingandmentoring.com>, (May 31, 2001).
- Newstrom, J. W., & Davis, K., (2003-2004), Organizational Behavior; Human Behavior at Work. Tata McGrawHill: New Delhi.

- Northouse, P. G., (2006). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Response Books: New Delhi.
- Nichols, A., Cooper, H., and Quine, C., (2008), A National Institute for Youth Leadership?, A Feasibility Study by Changemakers for the Department for Children, *Schools and Families*.
- Riaz, A., Haider, M. H., (2010), Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction, *Peer-reviewed & Open access journal* 1(1), 29-38.
- Robbins, P. R., (2005), *Organizational Behavior*, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Ross, S. M., & Offermann, L. R., (1997), Transformational leaders: Measurement of Personality Attributes and Work Group Performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 23, 1078-1086.
- Rubin, I., and Goldman, M., (1968), An Open System Model of Leadership Performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 3, 143-156.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A., (2011), *Research Methods for Business Students*, New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Private Limited.
- Shin, Y. K., (1998 – 99), The Traits and Leadership Styles of CEOs in Korean Companies, *Int. Studies of Mgt. & Org.* 28(4), 40-48.
- Stogdill, R.M., (1948), Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the Literature. *Journal of Psychology* 25, 35–71.
- Vroom, V. H., (1964), *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Yankelovich, 2000, *Generational Marketing*, Harperbusiness, New York.
- Yu, HC., & Miller, P., (2005), Leadership Style - The X Generation and Baby Boomers Compared in Different Cultural Contexts, *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 26(1), 35-50.
- Yulk, G. A., (2011), *Leadership in Organizations*, Pearson: New Delhi.
- Tulgan, B., (1996), *Managing Generation X: How to Bring Out The Best in Young Talent*, Capstone Publishing Limited, Oxford.
- Zikmund, W. G., (2003), “*Business Research Methods*”, Cengage Learning India Private Limited. Patparganj, India.