

**SECONDARY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD SCHOOL
LEADERSHIP: A GENERATIONAL DIVIDE?**

Kamahl Taylor Russell, BA (Biblical Studies), GradDipEd, LLB

A thesis submitted in total fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Education (Research)

Faculty of Education

Australian Catholic University

Research Services

Locked Bag 4115

Fitzroy, VIC 3065

Australia

July, 2017

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No parts of this thesis have been submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

All research procedures reported in the thesis received the approval of the relevant Ethics/Safety Committees (where required).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'K. J. P. L.', written over a horizontal line.

Signed:

26/7/2017

Dated:

ABSTRACT

There has been a diminishing pool of suitable candidates for school leadership positions in the Australian Catholic education sector. Currently, there are three major generational cohorts of teachers in schools, including Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennials.

Research in corporate and government sectors has found that these cohorts have distinctive traits and characteristics that shape their approach and expectations to the workplace. Significant research has been undertaken into the declining number of teachers willing to undertake middle and senior school leadership roles. But there is limited research into the factors behind this numerical decline. One area to consider is whether generational differences exist amongst teachers, and how they may be influencing school leadership shortages. This multi-generational workforce teaching and leading alongside each other simultaneously is a new challenge for education officials and schools who are facing leadership succession shortages in both the quality and quantity of aspiring candidates. The main focus of this research project is to explore the differing generational perceptions of each cohort in their perceptions towards workplace behaviours, as well as whether their differing attitudes toward traditional school leadership processes are contributing to these leadership succession issues.

This research has sought to identify generational differences in perceptions and expectations of teachers and school leaders towards their workplace and leadership succession culture; and, evaluate the extent to which these differences can provide insight into leadership succession issues faced by the Catholic education sector.

This quantitative, quasi-experimental study has a positivist theoretical framework, and was explored through the lens of Generational Cohort Theory (GCT). It utilised the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi) Instrument to elicit any differences amongst the three generational cohorts. Five subscale variables of *Motivation*, *Work Ethic*, *Professional Feedback*, *Leadership Development Culture*, *School Hierarchy* were framed under the construct of *Workplace Perceptions*; and, four subscale variables of *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*, *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, *Leadership Styles and Expectations*, and *Awareness of, and Catering of Generational Differences* under the construct of *Leadership Perceptions*.

Data analysis was conducted through Kruskal-Wallis H testing, followed by Mann-Whitney T testing to locate and explore identified differences. Mannheim (1972) and Strauss and Howe's GCT (Strauss & Howe, 1991) was chosen as the guiding framework for discussion and analysis as it holds that each generational cohort is shaped by social and historical events that influence their perceptions, traits, expectations and preferences.

The present study identified differences in two subscales of *Motivation* and *School Hierarchy* under the Workplace Perceptions construct; and, three subscales of *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*, *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, and, *Leadership Styles and Expectations* under the Leadership Perceptions construct. These results support previous research from other sectors that the generational cohorts have different motivations, perceptions, preferences, and expectations in their attitudes towards workplace behaviours and leadership culture. Interpretations of the findings also infer that the differences of the generational cohorts can be utilised for both further research, as well

as provide opportunities for school leaders to potentially adapt and change existing recruitment, development and retention strategies for both existing and aspiring leaders.

Keywords: *generation, school leadership, secondary teachers, non-parametric tests, positivism*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with much gratitude that I acknowledge the contribution of those who have assisted me in the process of completing this study.

Thank you firstly to my original principal supervisor, Dr. Deborah Robertson, for her gracious manner, encouragement, and practical guidance in the initial phase of developing this study's conceptual basis.

I also appreciated the work of my co-supervisor Dr. Kristina Love whose insight, feedback, and questioning prompted several major revisions that improved the clarity of the work.

I am also immensely grateful to my final principal supervisor Dr. Kenneth Smith for the generous assistance and guidance with applying the study's central questions toward quantitative analysis, his rigorous attention to detail, and consistent support and patience along the journey in finally achieving the completion of this study.

I am grateful for the assistance and support of a number of my colleagues and family who acted as mentors and critical friends during the various stages of the process. Specifically, I wish to thank the various generations of educational leaders in Australia, the United Kingdom, and Bulgaria who have generously shared their experiences and reflections.

I am also indebted to all of my close friends who have supported me throughout this long journey with understanding and encouragement.

Finally, I am indebted to the privileged opportunity of being a teacher, and the privileged experience of working with students and colleagues alike.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this research project to the memory of my mother, Valerie Jane Howe, who constantly encouraged me to pursue my dreams.

This is also dedicated to the love of my dearest friends, Derek and Jo-Anne Bradshaw, who have come to mean more than family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF SOURCES	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of The Study	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study	10
1.3 Methodological Approach.....	15
1.4 The Context of the Study	16
1.5 Research Questions	17
1.6 Statement of Hypotheses.....	17
1.7 Description of Instrumentation	19
1.8 Significance of the Study	20
1.9 Outline of the study.....	23
1.10 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	24
1.11 Definitions.....	26
CHAPTER 2	28
LITERATURE REVIEW	28
2.1 Introduction.....	28

2.2 Generational Cohort Theory	30
2.3 Defining the Generations	41
2.3.1 Baby Boomers.....	44
2.3.2 Gen-Xers	46
2.3.3 Millennials	49
2.4 Identifying Gaps In Research Of Generational Differences In The Workplace .	52
2.4.1 Motivation.....	55
2.4.2 Work Ethic	57
2.4.3 Professional Feedback & Mentoring	60
2.4.4 Leadership Preferences and Expectations.....	62
2.4.5 Hierarchy.....	63
2.5 Changing Generational Demographics In The Education Sector	65
2.5.1 Demographics of Teachers in Australia.....	67
2.5.2 Demographics of School leaders in Australia.....	71
2.6 Connecting Generational Workplace Differences and Leadership Succession ..	75
2.7 Summary of Literature Review Findings.....	83
CHAPTER 3	87
THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	87
3.1 Introduction.....	87
3.2 Research Questions	87
3.3 Theoretical Framework	89
3.4 Methodology: Post-Positivism.....	90
3.5 Summary	99

CHAPTER 4	100
THE PRESENT STUDY	100
4.1 Introduction	100
4.2 Sampling	100
4.3 Participants	101
4.3.1 Gender	104
4.3.2 Years of Service	104
4.3.3 Have a Leadership Position (POL)	105
4.3.4 Intend to apply for a POL	105
4.4 Instrument and Procedure: Questionnaire	106
4.5 Validity and Reliability	111
4.6 Analysis of Data	116
4.7 Limitations	117
4.8 Ethical Considerations	118
4.9 Summary	121
CHAPTER 5	122
RESULTS	122
5.1 Introduction	122
5.2 Results for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions	124
5.2.1 Descriptive Results of Totals and Subscales by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions	124
5.2.2 Pearson Correlations of Subscales by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions	126

5.2.3 Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney Test Results by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions	128
5.2.3.1 Results for Motivation Subscale.	130
5.2.3.2 Results for School Hierarchy Subscale.....	131
5.2.4 Summary of Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions.....	132
5.3 Results for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions	133
5.3.1 Descriptive Results of Totals and Subscales by Generation for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions	133
5.3.2 Pearson Correlation of Subscales by Generation for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions	135
5.3.3 Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney Test Results of Subscales by Generation for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions	136
5.3.3.1 Results for Intentional Leadership Succession Planning Subscale.....	139
5.3.3.2 Results for Culture of Mentoring Leaders Subscale	140
5.3.3.3 Results for Leadership Styles and Expectations Subscale	140
5.3.4 Summary of Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions.....	141
5.4 Summary	142
CHAPTER 6	144
DISCUSSION	144
6.1 Introduction	144
6.2 Discussion	144
6.3 Discussion of Leadership Perceptions Construct Hypotheses	145
6.3.1 Hypothesis 1 (Subscale – Motivation): Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts	146

6.3.2 Hypothesis 2 (Subscale – Work Ethic): Determinants of Work Ethic are different between Generational Cohorts	147
6.3.3 Hypothesis 3 (Subscale – Professional Feedback): Perceptions towards Professional Feedback are different between Generational Cohorts	148
6.3.4 Hypothesis 4 (Subscale – Leadership Development Culture): Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development are different between Generational Cohorts	149
6.3.5 Hypothesis 5 (Subscale – School Hierarchy): Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational Cohorts	150
6.3.6 Summary of Discussion of Workplace Perceptions Construct Hypotheses	151
6.4 Discussion of Leadership Perceptions Construct Hypotheses	152
6.4.1 Hypothesis 6 (Subscale – Intentional Leadership Succession Planning): A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement, and the generation/age of the individual.....	152
6.4.2 Hypothesis 7 (Subscale – Culture of Mentoring Leaders): A relationship exists between expectations, culture and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational Cohorts.....	154
6.4.3 Hypothesis 8 (Subscale – Leadership Styles and Expectations): A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Styles and Expectations amongst Generational Cohorts	155

6.4.4 Hypothesis 9 (Subscale – Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences): Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences are different between Generational Cohorts.	156
6.4.5 Summary of Discussion of Leadership Perceptions Construct Hypotheses	157
CHAPTER 7	158
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	158
7.1 Introduction	158
7.2 Recommendations for Practice	159
7.2.1 Recommendation 1 – Paradigm Shift for System Leaders and Senior School Leaders toward teacher generational differences and leadership succession	159
7.2.2 Recommendation 2 – Understanding Generational Motivational Factors.....	160
7.2.3 Recommendation 3 – Creating ‘Pipelines’ for Middle and Senior Leadership.....	161
7.2.4 Recommendation 4 – Increased Emphasis on Mentoring Culture.....	162
7.2.5 Recommendation 5 – Alternatives to Existing School Hierarchical Structures	163
7.2.6 Recommendation 6 – Intentional Leadership Recruitment and Retention	164
7.3 Limitations of the Present Study	165
7.4 Recommendations for Future Research	166
7.5 Conclusions.....	167

REFERENCES	170
APPENDIX A	215
Generational Perceptions of School Leadership Questionnaire (GPSLi)	215
APPENDIX B	217
ACU Ethics Approval Form	217
APPENDIX C	219
Catholic Education Office Melbourne (CEOM) Approval Letter	219
APPENDIX D	222
Invitation Letter to Principal	222
APPENDIX E	225
Invitation Letter to Participants.....	225
APPENDIX F	228
Participant Consent Form.....	228
APPENDIX G	230
Correlations for Constructs 1 and 2	230
APPENDIX H	233
Descriptive Results for Constructs 1 and 2	233
APPENDIX I	236
Non-Parametric Results for Generational Percpetions (Construct 1) and Leadership Percpetions (Construct 2).....	236
APPENDIX J	241
Descriptive Results by Variables	241

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Comparison of Mannheim (1972); and Strauss and Howe's (1991) Approaches to Generational Cohort Theory.....	33
Table 2.2	Generational Puzzle at Work.....	42
Table 2.3	Identifying Generational Differences in Australian Culture and Milestones.....	44
Table 2.4	Australia's Generational Population and Workplace Profile.....	67
Table 2.5	Percentage of Secondary Teachers by Age in 2007 and 2013.....	68
Table 2.6	Percentage of Catholic Teachers intending to leave teaching before retirement in 2007 and 2013.....	70
Table 2.7	Summary of key state-based reports on leadership succession in Australia.....	74
Table 3.1	Generational Cohort Theory and Leadership Succession Attributes Model.....	90
Table 3.2	Synthesis of key dimensions of Positivism.....	93
Table 4.1	Generational Perceptions to Teacher-Leadership Instrument (GPSL <i>i</i>) Variables and A Brief Personal Description of Their Measurements.....	102
Table 4.2	Demographic Breakdown of Participants Responding to the GPSL <i>i</i> Questionnaire.....	103
Table 4.3	The Present Study's Research 1 Question, Construct, Hypotheses and the GPSL <i>i</i> Questions.....	109

Table 4.4	The Present Study's Research 2 Question, Construct Hypotheses and GPSLi Questions.....	110
Table 4.5	Details of content validity for the development of the GPSLi.....	116
Table 5.1	Workplace Perceptions Total and Subscales Means and Standard Deviation by Generation.....	125
Table 5.2	Pearson Correlations of the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi) Instrument Subscales by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions.....	127
Table 5.3	Mean Ranking of Generation by Subscales for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions.....	128
Table 5.4	Kruskal-Wallis H-Test and post hoc Mann-Whitney U-Test Results between the Generational Cohorts for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions.....	130
Table 5.5	Summary Results for Research Question 1 Hypotheses.....	133
Table 5.6	Leadership Perceptions Total and Subscales Means and Standard Deviation by Generation.....	134
Table 5.7	Pearson correlations of the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi) Instrument Subscales by Generation for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions.....	136
Table 5.8	Mean Ranking of Generation by Subscales for Construct 2: Leadership Perception.....	137
Table 5.9	Kruskal-Wallis H-Test and Mann-Whitney U-Test Results between the Generational Cohorts for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions.....	138
Table 5.10	Summary Results for Research Question 2 Hypotheses.....	142

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

'the times they are a changing...' (Dylan, 1964)

1.1 Background of The Study

In 1996, the first baby-boomer President, the 50-year-old Bill Clinton faced a re-election campaign against 73-year-old and World War Two veteran challenger Senator Bob Dole, whose epic presidential campaign clash was told by journalist Bob Woodward's *The Choice*. Clinton likened the race to a metaphor of clashing generations within a family. The patriarch had built an institution through decades of hard work and persistent effort. Content, he handed over leadership to his son. The son had boundless purpose, energy and ideas. Due to the shifting needs and attitudes of the community, the institution had required significant changes that required different methods and approaches. While there were some victories, the son also had made some mistakes. Then the patriarch, because of the mistakes the son had made, and that these decisions were made without familiarity to the old, well-established way of doing things, decided he wanted the leadership of the institution back (Woodward, 1996). It is a story of one generation facing off against another, and where a nation was being forced to choose a future with one generation's values and ideals over another.

A shift is occurring in our nation's education system. There is a popular focus upon policy-based issues of NAPLAN testing, teacher performance pay and reviews, standards-based reform, and national curriculum that dominate our public discourse. However, one issue that has not received such public attention is that of increasing

concern over leadership succession within schools (Barker, 2006; Hazarika, 2009; Sugrue, 2014). Younger generations of teachers are unwilling to take up the positions older generations are retiring from (Anderson et al., 2007). Woodward's metaphor highlights the experience faced by Australian school systems - a multi-generational leadership-succession crisis (Fink, 2011; Marks, 2013).

The workforce in Australia is changing. The anecdote above reflects a phenomenon in a shift in power in the workplace, including the education sector. Currently there are four, distinctive generations collectively spanning over 60 years in the labour market, with the oldest currently phasing out through retirement. In contrast to the innate social communitarian outlook of ageing workers, young workers are characterised with a tendency towards self-fulfilment and self-enhancement (Jorgensen, 2004). Differences in outlook and approach have emerged between generations (Lovely & Buffum, 2007; McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2013). While the ageing sector of the workforce has been typified as highly experienced, work-oriented and steady in employment, younger employees are considered as progressively mobile, exhibit less organisational loyalty or organisational dedication (Hannay & Fretwell, 2011), but are entrepreneurial and technologically fluent (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007).

Much research has been undertaken on how these generations are interacting within the corporate sector, government or public service and healthcare providers. These significant differences in outlook and methods to work may result in intergenerational conflict that impacts workplace performance and employee cohesion (Lovely & Buffum, 2007). Organisational employee diversity poses challenges to management culture, styles

and approaches that fail to understand and manage diversity in their workplaces can lead to intergenerational conflict (Bernstein, Alexander, & Alexander, 2008). These also include complex issues concerning recruitment, retention, and early retirement of quality staff (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007, p. 350). Some argue that relational misinterpretations and confused interactions from intergenerational conflict are especially acute in times of poor knowledge transfer between workers (Aiman-Smith, Bergey, Cantwell, & Doran, 2006); reorganisation and downsizing (Bernstein et al., 2008; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Westerman & Yamamura, 2007), where the differing generational cohorts can view each other with suspicion and antipathy as they compete during shrinking jobs markets (Bernstein et al., 2008). Corporate research evidence also suggests that systemic inability to accept and accommodate for generational differences can negatively affect employee productivity (Hannay & Fretwell, 2011), innovation and corporate citizenship (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). This can be directly linked to issues concerning employee retention and turnover. Corporations, government and public sectors are seeking to optimise the traits and skills of all participating generational cohorts, integrating differences in the workplace, educating and improving employees' ability to maximise this diversity for personal and organisational advantage (Zemke et al., 2013). Greater awareness of these issues may lead to creating new organisational cultures that value, and optimise, generational diversity (Tolbize, 2008).

However, limited research has been undertaken on how this sociological shift has influenced the field of educational leadership. This is especially true for Catholic Education in Australia.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2015) has found that the nation's 'education and training' sector holds the largest percentage of workforce participants intending to retire within 10 years.

This is not a problem unique to Australia, as identified in other Western countries worldwide by Hargreaves, Halasz, and Pont (2008), who state, "in many countries, almost half of the current generation of school leaders is due to retire within the next five years, creating significant challenges to leadership recruitment, stability and effective continuity" (p. 71).

In the period between the 1970's to 1980's, Australia's Catholic Education system faced a near-crisis of leadership in schools over the issues of declining numbers of members of religious orders, many of whom had previously taken on leadership and principal roles in schools (Canavan, 2006, p. 2). Therefore, there was a growing need for the Catholic community to change and adapt towards a system more dependent on lay principalship (Belmonte, Cranston, & Limerick, 2006; Canavan, 1999; Catholic Education Office, Sydney, 2001; Hansen, 2000).

While this shortage had consequences for the future leadership of schools in general (McKenzie, Kos, Walker, Hong, & Owen, 2008), development of future leaders in Catholic schools was mutually influenced by the contextual workplace stresses of all principals, and other issues peculiar to the Catholic Church, its education mission and its adaptability to a rapidly transforming educational system (Budge, 1994; Caldwell, 2000a; Canavan, 1999; Hansen, 2000; Hutton, 2002). This created a leadership succession issue where there was a shortage of lay educators adequately prepared for leadership in Catholic schools (Caldwell, 2000b; Rowe, 2000). The Catholic system was also affected

by wider contextual factors of increased government accountability and administrative demands.

Two decades later, history appears to be repeating itself. There is an increasing recognition across the different Catholic education sectors across Australia that in the new century the system is experiencing a new school leadership crisis (d'Arbon, Duignan, & Duncan, 2001; Duncan, 2002; Hutton, 2002). The roles in middle and senior leadership, in terms of expectations and function, have changed due to the changing nature of teaching staff populations and their attitudes to undertaking these roles, as well as other external societal and technological influences (Busher, 2005; Gronn, 2003; Hutton, 2002). Fewer educators in the Catholic system are aspiring to the role of principal (Fink & Brayman, 2006; Rowe, 2000) or other leadership roles (d'Arbon, 2006). Therefore, it is worth exploring the reasons why this shortage exists.

While not exclusively attributable to the Baby Boomer retirement bulge, there are also the contributing factors including attrition of younger teachers who would be middle and senior leaders including principalship as well as a deep hesitation of middle leaders to aspire to more senior positions. Exacerbating the potential shortage of principals is the reluctance of younger and middle management teachers to aspire to leadership positions (Barty, Thomson, Blackmore, & Sachs 2005). In the UK, Fink (2010) discovered a significant 'reluctance' and 'unwillingness' by middle leaders and deputy heads to aspire further in leadership roles. In Australia, approximately only 50% of principals believe that potential candidates considered senior leadership roles desirable (McKenzie et al., 2008). This research built upon earlier findings that detailed middle leaders and younger teachers as not interested in applying for principalship (d'Arbon et al., 2001; Barty et al., 2005; Lacey & Gronn, 2006). Mulford (2008) concluded that, "finding the next

generation to succeed those soon to retire is proving a challenge, not only because of the demographics, but because there are some who do not like the look of the leadership pressures” (p. 5).

Considering extensive research in several countries comparative to Australia’s demographical and cultural polity (Fincham, 2010), Canada (Noonan & Walker, 2008; Winton & Pollock, 2013), the United States (Blandford, 2006), South Africa (Bush, 2011) and the United Kingdom (Arrowsmith, 2007; Bush, 2011; Cowie & Crawford, 2009; Day, 2009), it is instructive to follow Fink’s (2011) suggestion that merely filling the leadership *pipeline* with certified leaders is only the first step to addressing this succession challenge in the wider education system. Other researchers such as Myung, Loeb, and Horng (2011) and Shapiro et al. (2015) also adopt this pipeline analogy in exploring educational leadership succession problems in identifying areas of blockages and impediments.

Broad (2011), Slater (2008), and Fink (2011) recommend that education systems also need to investigate and develop stronger leadership succession culture that attracts and develops a steady stream of high-quality lead educators across all levels of school leadership. Significant observations have been made that an increasing number of younger teachers are leaving the profession because of inter-generational conflicts due to their reluctance to accept their elders’ leadership and management style (Bernstein et al., 2008; Coleman, 2012; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Walker, 2015; Westerman & Yamamura, 2007).

Across the Catholic school system there is a need to develop a strategy to ensure an ongoing supply (quantity) of well-qualified and highly motivated (quality) senior leadership for Catholic schools (d’Arbon et al., 2001; Catholic Education Office

Melbourne, 2005). Existing principals are struggling to find younger generations of teaching staff willing to apply for middle and senior leadership positions (Caldwell, 2000b; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; Neidhart & Carlin, 2011).

Exploring the differing attitudes between generations of teachers may lead to identifying the issues and concerns of younger generations of teachers who are reluctant to take up these roles. These different groups, in their daily interaction in the school setting develop conflicts that occur because of different generational work habits (Rance, 2005), ethic differences (Yu & Miller, 2005), attitudes (Bezzina, 2012; Rose, 2005), and beliefs (Frost, 2003). These conflicts can lead to frustration (Harris, 2005) and relational misconceptions (Appelbaum, Serena, & Shapiro, 2004; Boggs & Szabo, 2011). Senior leaders are staying in their positions for longer (Dorman & d'Arbon, 2003a; Marks, 2013). They are bewildered by the demands of younger teachers to be promoted 'before their time'. After only several years in the system younger, aspiring teachers are leaving the profession in droves due to frustration at lack of promotion opportunities, with those remaining feeling 'locked out' (Anderson et al, 2007; Marks, 2013). Many teachers from older generations are also delaying their retirement due to financial concerns (Marks, 2013; Sugrue, 2014), contributing to a phenomenon where leadership vacancies at middle and senior levels have decreased, leading to less opportunity for younger teachers to apply for these positions (Fink, 2011). They are finding more flexible, supportive career pathways in the commercial sector that lead to greater work/life balance; flexibility; remuneration and professional development (González & Tacorante, 2004; Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008). They are reluctant to apply due to overwhelming administrative responsibilities and increased role-expectations externally (parents and authorities) and internally (staff and student oversight) (Fink, 2011; Rowe, 2000; Waite, 2016). They are

also unwilling to conform to traditional leadership cultures (Lovely & Buffum, 2007; Waite, 2010) and management processes of the system they are inheriting developed by older generations that they view as inconsistent – even redundant – with their values, (Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal & Brown, 2007), goals and lifestyles in a changing world (González & Tacorante, 2004; Caldwell, 2000a; Sheahan, 2005). Existing principals therefore are struggling to find younger generations of teaching staff willing to apply or prepared for middle and senior leadership positions (Marks, 2013; Dorman & d'Arbon, 2003a). Educational authorities seeking to improve their schools have identified leadership-transition and succession as a key imperative as they plan, prepare, and transform their systems for the 21st century (Barker, 2006; Fink, 2010; Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2008).

Other factors influencing this issue include:

- **Recent Economic Conditions and Raising of the Retirement Age:** Many older teacher-leaders near retirement (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015) are remaining longer in their positions due to the economic events following the Global Financial Crisis (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014).
- **1990's Graduate Boom:** The dramatic influx of teaching graduates who heeded the teacher-shortage crisis of the late 1990's and early 2000's saw a new population of teachers (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015) with a generationally different attitude to their career practice and professional development attitudes (d'Arbon et al., 2001; Marks, 2013).
- **Growing Administrative Burden of Leadership Roles:** Younger generations of teachers are daunted by the increase over the last decade of the policy-demands agenda of 'accountability' and 'outcomes' (Coates, 2010;

Fink & Brayman, 2006; Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Weldon & Ingvarson, 2016; Witziers, Bosker & Krüger 2003). They are concerned with this increased time spent in administration (Gronn & Lacey, 2004; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; Waite, 2016), inflexible leadership structures (Coates, 2010; Waite, 2010) and less spent on pedagogy and students (Anderson et al, 2007; Haris, 2010; Lavery, 2012).

- **Principal-Building Focus:** Existing leadership succession strategies in all Australian education systems (including State, Catholic and Independent systems) almost exclusively focus on content and access to those considering principalship, rather than middle-senior leadership development (Fink, 2010; Ruwoldt, 2006; Lacey, 2004). This has led to an unpreparedness, capacity and readiness in becoming a senior leader (Haris, 2010; Slater, 2008).

As a Gen-Xer educator who has served in the field of secondary education for eleven years in the Catholic and Public sectors in Australia, the United Kingdom, and Bulgaria, this researcher is interested in researching the issues and culture of leadership succession within schools. The contributing fact that I serve as an experienced middle-level leader wishing to advance into senior school-leadership also prompted me to pursue this study, focusing on certain dynamics of educational leadership. I have had previous roles in religious and youth organisations that have acknowledged and sought to understand the generational differences and developed subsequent meaningful leadership development and effective succession strategies. These public sector experiences however were different from what this researcher has experienced in the educational field.

The present research aims to investigate the extent to which the teaching staff of a Catholic school perceive and understand the issues surrounding inter-generational dynamics of each other; and their approaches to incorporating these dynamics in their leadership development and succession strategies.

As a middle-level leader, this researcher has worked with other stakeholders in several secondary schools and realised that changing attitudes, expectations and practice of leadership in its various forms of activity, styles and interaction have been received with mixed reactions by teachers of all ages and levels of experience and responsibility. I came to realise that this changing nature of the teaching workforce has placed the Catholic School system under a new burden of recruitment, retention and development challenges of particularly younger staff. Teachers who seek to or currently serve as school middle and senior leaders work under increasingly intricate and complex conditions and expectations.

This study seeks to draw data from a selected Catholic school in Melbourne, with the aim of attempting to investigate the extent to which they have identified generational differences, and how those issues influence leadership succession within their school-context. As an investigative case study, this research will also seek to identify areas for further study and potential areas for change in leadership practice across the wider Catholic Education system.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

This quantitative study is quasi-experimental in nature and will use Generational Cohort Theory (Edmunds & Turner, 2005; Mannheim, 1952, 1972; Strauss & Howe, 1991) to explore generational differences and perceptions within a Catholic School's

teaching staff; and how they may potentially influence current school leadership succession issues. A convenient opportunity for this specific research problem is to identify perceptions of stereotyped generational behaviours and characteristics of a Victorian Catholic School's teaching faculty; as well as identifying how these perceptions in differences may impact succession issues such as staff retention; applying for roles; and, leadership style expectations.

Generational Cohort Theory (GCT) presumes that generational groupings are defined by shared events that influence and define the worldview of each individual generation (Coupland, 1991; Mannheim, 1972; Salt, 2004; Strauss & Howe, 1991; Zemke et al., 2013) and that while individuals in each different generation are varied, they nevertheless share particular perceptions, thoughts, values, and behaviours (Becton, Walker & Jones-Farmer, 2014). Furthermore, these values, reactions, and behaviours seemingly differ across generations (Hung, Gu, & Yim, 2007; Twenge & Campbell, 2011). GCT supports research in giving a valid method of analysing the generations (Schofield & Honoré, 2009) exploring how they operate within certain contexts such as the workplace. By investigating the intersection between the past, present and future of inter-generational dynamics and tensions (Becton et al., 2014; Bristow, 2015; Jorgensen, 2003; Twenge & Campbell, 2011) we can discover how school staffrooms experience the interaction between emerging leaders and existing leaders. It is appropriate to explore how GCT can be applied to the school workplace context, its leadership heritage and if there are any linkages between generational differences and current leadership succession issues.

The literature review in Chapter 2 will analyse the development and significance of GCT. Three generations identified in the current literature are studied, including:

Baby Boomers: the generation born between 1945-1964, and currently approaching retirement, the 'Boomers' were born in the decade of economic prosperity after World War 2 (Zemke et al., 2013). Baby Boomers' historically-defining events were Watergate, Vietnam and the counter-cultural, social turmoil of the 1960s and 1970s (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014). In the workplace they are characterised as merit-based and highly motivated in 'career-climbing' (Salt, 2004)

Generation X: the 'slacker' generation, born between 1966-1990, are often characterised as 'cynical', 'unfocussed' or 'uncommitted (Moody, 2007). Their historically-defining events included the collapse of the Berlin Wall (and Communism), AIDS, and the economic recessions of the 1990s (Smola & Sutton, 2002). Their generation was the first to experience divorce on a large scale (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007), and were the first to also be more likely to have several careers across their lifetime (Salt, 2004). This generation is frustrated that their advancement towards leadership and management roles in the workplace is being 'stunted' while the Baby Boomers are working longer than previous generations (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014).

Generation Y (Millennials): Characterised as the 'Net' or 'Now!' generation, this cohort were born around and raised over the year 2000 (Bristow, 2015). Their historically-definitive event was the terror attacks of September 11, 2001. They are portrayed as demanding and unrealistic in their job/career expectations (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). They are the first generation to not know a work without the Internet; and despite their 'addiction' to social media are most likely to describe themselves as 'lonely' (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014).

Further review of literature on each of these so-called generational groupings and their distinctive features are explored in the next chapter. The older ‘Traditionalist’ generation, born in the pre-World War 2 era, has recently retired, and therefore, the study was unable to gain their insight by their participation with the survey instrument.

The need for research in identifying contributory reasons as to why younger teachers are not applying for middle or senior leadership roles is critical (Earley & Weindling, 2012; Fink, 2011; Hazarika, 2009; Shapiro et al., 2015; Thorpe & Melnikova, 2014). The extent of studies into teachers’ motivations or impediments to applying for principalship roles is comprehensive (Addison & Brundrett, 2008). Anecdotal and empirical research focusing on leadership succession issues has focused on the nature (Gronn & Lacey, 2006), task (Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009), and impact (Fink & Brayman, 2006) of school leadership roles and how they have changed in recent years.

Challenges in leadership practice and succession challenges faced by school systems and principals on a daily basis can be as over-whelming as they are challenging (Dorman & d’Arbon, 2003b; Fink, 2011; Gronn & Lacey, 2006; Gurr & Drysdale, 2012). These include issues such as role impact on personal life balance, increasing administrative/bureaucratic responsibilities (d’Arbon et al., 2001; Twenge, 2010), inflexible role expectations (d’Arbon et al., 2001; Canavan, 1999), insufficient role support and mentoring (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Levy-Gazenfrantz, 2015), time commitment (Ferres, Travaglione, & Firms, 2003; Smola & Sutton, 2002), perception of having to sacrifice close relationships with colleagues and students, gender-related concerns (Lewis & Butcher, 2003; Merkes, 2003; Murphy, 2005; Neidhart & Carlin, 2003a), and adequate compensation/remuneration (González & Tacorante, 2004). Another significant factor to be explored in this research is the unwillingness of many

younger potential educational leadership aspirants, to conform to management systems they inherit from older generations that they view conflicts with their values (Boggs & Szabo, 2011), goals (Lacey, 2004; Neidhart & Carlin, 2003b), relevance (Sheahan, 2005) and lifestyles (Caldwell, 2000b; González & Tacorante, 2004; Yu & Miller, 2005).

The three different groups, in their daily interaction in the school setting develop conflicts that occur because of different generational work habits (Frost, 2003), attitudes (Becton et al., 2014; Rance, 2005; Yu & Miller, 2005), and beliefs (Rose, 2005). These common-across-all-sector conflicts can lead to frustration (Harris, 2005), relational misconceptions (Appelbaum et al., 2004; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009), work ethic differences (Sullivan, Forret, Carraher & Mainiero, 2009), morale and motivation issues, staff-retention problems (Frost, 2003; Marks, 2013; OECD, 2016; Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008; Sugrue, 2014; Sujansky, 2002), disenchantment of younger teachers with traditional leadership culture (Fink, 2011; Lovely & Buffum, 2007); and most significantly, leadership succession failings (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Hannay & Fretwell, 2011; Lovely & Buffum, 2007).

Added to these factors, in the various Catholic school systems across Australia, research has also focused upon the peculiar requirements and expectations of school middle and senior leaders in cultivating a school's Catholicity and faith dimension in all aspects of its educative purpose and operational practices (Canavan, 2013; Duignan, 2006; Neidhart & Carlin, 2011). This was significant after the shift in the 1970s and 1980s from predominantly religious to lay staffing of senior school positions such as principal (Budge, 1994; Dorman & d'Arbon, 2003b; Lavery, 2012).

However as much as this previous research has explored the beliefs, perceptions and attitudes of teaching staff with an emphasis of the nature of role and system expectations, this current study seeks to explore whether teaching staff see each others' distinctive generational characteristics and how those characteristics are perceived to interact or are a potential impediment to leadership succession. These areas have all contributed to development of this study's survey data-gathering instrument.

The present study has the potential to develop further understanding into how generational differences affect the teaching faculty of a Catholic school; how these differences may be impacting leadership succession issues for that school; opportunities for development of specific strategies that empower school leadership teams to cater for their staff's generational demographics; and finally, utilisation of this knowledge of these perceptions to positively respond to leadership succession issues for the wider target population of the Catholic teaching sector in the Archdiocese of Melbourne.

1.3 Methodological Approach

This quasi-experimental study (Creswell, 2008) using a case study of one school incorporates a survey method for the purpose of quantitative data collection and analysis (Babbie, 1990). A questionnaire has been designed to assess perceptions, attitudes and beliefs of differing generations of teaching staff toward workplace behaviours and leadership succession. Subsequently, data drawn from existing teaching staff relationships may infer a potential connection between generational differences and leadership succession issues within a Catholic School. A quantitative design that is by nature positivist in its paradigm, allows for a formal, deductive problem-solving approach

to this study. For the sake of this study, it will allow for the measurement of testing the hypotheses statements. A positivist approach allows for deeper understanding of what is happening in a situational context, locating patterns that may be present in other situations (Collis & Hussey, 2003). It seeks to objectively (Walsham, 1995) uncover the veracity and nature of these perceptions, beliefs and attitudes via empirical means (Henning, van Rensburg, & Smit, 2004). It also complements social science research through detailed analysis of data collected by survey (Miller & Brewer, 2003; Neuman, 2010).

This study will either verify or contradict the observations from the limited range of previous anecdotal findings on generational differences in a school context. It is necessary to locate statistical differences in the attitudes of the three studied generations and to identify those aspects that characterise those differences in order to verify anecdotal evidence. This will enable objective identification of factors, analysis, and interpretation of how these perceptions shape faculty-behaviour and generational interaction. The present study's quantitative design will empirically test the series of hypotheses stemming from this research problem.

1.4 The Context of the Study

A questionnaire was given to the teaching staff of a Catholic College, in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne. A small group of nuns from the Society of Sisters, Faithful Companions of Jesus, established the school in used in the study in 1889. It is a girls school, providing an Ignatian, faith-based learning setting for 1200 students from Early Years to VCE education. It has a teaching staff of 127; and has a middle and senior management leadership structure. The participating school seeks to encourage and

prioritise a culture of professional development amongst their staff, yet has no specific policies that articulate a focus on its own leadership succession practices. It also has not undertaken any significant development of awareness or training of its leadership staff in the area of generational differences and interactive dynamics.

1.5 Research Questions

This study seeks to examine the impact that perceptions of generational differences are having upon leadership succession in Catholic schools and will be guided by a primary research objective concerning how do generational differences affect leadership succession in a Catholic School?

This research objective is supported by two contributing research questions:

- Research Question 1: *Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership Instrument (GPSLi)?*
- Research Question 2: *Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

1.6 Statement of Hypotheses

It is important to identify if any statistical differences exist among the three generations' attitudes and perceptions regarding motivation, work ethic, approaches to leadership development, professional feedback, and school hierarchy. Answering the first research question was accomplished through testing the first five hypotheses upon inter-

generational attitudes toward one another. This led to the formation of a construct (refer to Chapter 4) called *Workplace Perceptions*:

- H1. Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H2. Determinants of Work Ethic are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H3. Perceptions towards Professional Feedback are different between
Generational Cohorts.
- H4. Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development are different
between Generational Cohorts.
- H5. Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational
Cohorts.

Answering the second research question was accomplished through testing the next four hypotheses upon inter-generational attitudes toward a school's Leadership Succession culture. This led to the formation of a construct (refer to Chapter 4) called *Leadership Perceptions*:

- H6. A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning
Leadership Succession and Advancement and the generation/age of the
individual.
- H7. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning
Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational Cohorts.
- H8. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning
Leadership Styles amongst Generational Cohorts.
- H9. Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences are different
between Generational Cohorts.

1.7 Description of Instrumentation

The quasi-experimental design hypothesises that generational differences exist and are influencing school leadership succession issues. The GPSLi survey instrument (referred to in Appendix A) was used to analyse quantitatively the views of three generations within the school chosen for this study. A questionnaire can elicit a statistical or numerical description of a population's attitudes, trends or perceptions (Creswell, 2008). A questionnaire assesses a quantitative or numeric description of a small, sampled population's trends, attitudes, or opinions for generalising from that sample to a wider population (Babbie, 1990). This approach enabled a systematic investigation in the veracity of the stated hypotheses.

The Likert Scale questionnaire designed for this study contained three sections. It asked voluntary participants how they agreed or disagreed with each item, and how closely they felt each item applied to their colleagues and school leadership. The Likert Scale method was selected because of its ability to discover their perceptions towards the item-questions. The first section consisted of demographic items relating to age, length of service, gender, whether they were in a position of leadership and/or intended to apply for a leadership position in the future. The second section, consisting of 15 questions under the *Workplace Perceptions* construct, was used to gather information on teacher attitudes towards their own and other generations in their workplace. The third section also consisted of 15 questions under the *Leadership Perceptions* construct that were designed to elicit the views of those same teachers on their school's knowledge and management of generational differences; and whether those perceptions contributed to their consideration of undertaking leadership roles.

1.8 Significance of the Study

There is value to building upon existing minimal research into understanding if generational differences contribute to teachers' attitudes and perceptions towards leadership succession. Anecdotal evidence is available for the wider demographic of Australia's teaching profession (see Chapter 2).

Three areas for this study's significance are:

1. Deeper understanding of the generational differences (if any) within the context of a teaching faculty of one Catholic school. Identifying these differences may lead to better understanding by school senior leadership in better understanding the motivation and mindset of their staff. Therefore, research that assesses staff relational dynamics (Rhodes & Brundrett, 2008) that encourage or discourage teaching staff from aspiring to leadership (Gronn & Lacey, 2004) may also help authorities identify factors that include culture and programs that require improvement and redesign for better teaching leadership practice (Gronn & Lacey, 2006; Gurr & Drysdale, 2013; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009; Ribbins, 2008). This can also lead to directly-influential means to improve student outcomes (Dinham, 2007; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Mulford & Silins, 2011; Murphy, 2005; Sammons, Gu, Day, & Ko, 2011). Marks (2013) through quantifiable research that further explores the relationship between what is referred to as the 'generational collide' (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009) and the leadership succession issues faced in the Australian education sector:

If managed adroitly through a combination of both principal retention and principal succession policies, 'generational collide' may be

avoided and replaced with a ‘generational transfer’: retain the old and bring forth the new. (p. 12)

2. Whether these identified generational differences are linked with current leadership succession shortages. With a shrinking number of school leaders directly reflecting an ageing teacher workforce (Duignan & Bezzina, 2006; Marks, 2013; McKenzie et al., 2008) it is critical for education systems to identify and understand the contributing factors to declining numbers of leadership recruitment and retention in schools (Canavan, 2007; Gurr & Drysdale, 2013; McKenzie, Weldon, Rowley, Murphy, & McMillan, 2014; Sugrue, 2014) and whether these factors influence their attitudes, engagement with and/or aspiration towards these roles (Duignan & Bezzina, 2006; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003). The 2014 country background report on school leadership activity from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) advocates that:

...evidence suggests that Australia is experiencing serious leadership supply problems. These problems include the replenishment of role vacancies, the identification of aspirants for vacancies and ‘next generation’ school leaders, and workplace wellbeing issues associated with leadership. (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 47)

The OCED report explicitly states the significant need for more detailed research into these contributing factors, particularly around intrinsic and extrinsic influences:

In general, employers, policymakers and researchers lack clear and detailed knowledge of identifiable and typical teacher and leader

career mobility and progression pathways, along with such key influences on aspirations as sense of self-efficacy, capability and motivation... These difficulties with identifying potential school leaders and their pathways are exacerbated by the relative dearth of research into school leadership roles other than principals. Such roles should be the increasing focus of policy attention and research.

(Anderson et al., 2007, p. 56)

3. Provision of recommendations for the improvement of leadership succession strategies within other Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. By identifying and understand potential generational differences (Smola & Sutton, 2002) and investigate how these differences can more prominently inform the design of leadership culture (Mulford, 2012; Sugrue, 2015) including recruitment, training and development (Duignan & Bezzina, 2006; Hannay & Fretwell, 2011; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2008). Therefore, there is an opportunity to further research the existing teaching workplace and identification of current staff-interaction dynamics (Gurr & Drysdale, 2012; Murphy & Johnson, 2011) may help contribute to nurture new strategies for recruitment (Bush, 2011; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003), building both middle and senior leadership capacity (Broad, 2011), professional development (Normore & Gaetane, 2010) and management (Rhodes, 2012) of existing and future generations of teachers (Gronn & Lacey, 2006; Skilbeck & Connell, 2004) to better improve the rate and quality of educational leadership succession.

1.9 Outline of the study

This chapter introduction outlines and contextualises the problem and identifies the purpose and research questions.

Chapter 2 reviewed a body of literature that discusses:

- Existing research on the definition and impact of Generational Cohort Theory (GCT);
- The perceptions and attitudes amongst differing generational cohorts in the teaching workplace;
- Identifying contributing or discouraging factors from perceived generational differences amongst teachers influencing their decision to aspire towards school leadership roles.

Chapter 3 details the methodology and research design of the project including the theoretical paradigm, methodological framework, data gathering and analysis techniques and approach to ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 details the nature of this present study by describing the instrumentation and process of data analysis.

Chapter 5 presents the results and findings of the study that identifies generational differences in the teaching workplace and how those identified differences may contribute to leadership succession perceptions.

Chapter 6 discusses the results in relation to the findings from the literature review (Chapter 2).

Finally, Chapter 7 elucidates implications, conclusions and recommendations for further research and workplace practice.

1.10 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

A survey method, using quantitative analysis is adopted in this study through the use of a questionnaire designed to elicit attitudes and beliefs such as work ethic; approaches to leadership development; professional feedback; school hierarchy; teamwork; and leadership styles of teaching staff towards each other's generational differences. The purpose is to identify and evaluate the impact these differences toward workplace behaviours and expectations, if any, are having upon the decreasing number of applicants willing to undertake leadership positions within Catholic schools.

In the process of exploring connections among variables, where this study's identified hypotheses are tested, quantitative design is the most common method of logical method selected by researchers (Creswell, 2003; Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). Quantitative studies in their essence, if designed appropriately, allow for strong validity and reliability of the study's hypotheses. However, it is important to be aware of potential limitations (Burns, 2000), in order to enhance design-strengths and minimise design-weaknesses, which specific to this study can include:

- ruling out and/or controlling the variables surrounding the complexity of the human experience (for this study, the intergenerational interaction of teachers in the school workplace dynamic)
- the reality that not all people respond in the same manner; their unique ability to make meaning from their experiences and construct interpretations (Crotty, 1998)
- 'banal and trivial findings' (Burns, 2000)
- inflexibility of design (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009)

- subjectivity of the researcher (Borg, 1987; Morris & Van der Veer Martens, 2008)

This particular study, taking place in one school, looks at the attitudes of its workplace colleagues. While there are four generations in the current workforce, according to the literature, this study only documents attitudes of three generational cohorts: Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y/Millennials. The school did not have a significant enough number of teaching staff from the Traditional/Silent Generation to provide any relevant and valid information. Another limitation is that the study is taken within the context of one school. Further research would need to be taken for further generalisation.

1.11 Definitions

Generations	A generation is a group of people who share a time and space in history that lends them a collective persona
Baby Boomers	Generation born in the period – 1945-1964
Gen-Xers	Generation born in the period – 1965-1984
Millennials	Generation born in the period – 1985-2000
Traditionalists	Generation born in the period – pre 1945
Senior Leaders	Includes principals, deputy principals, Religious Education Coordinators – and any other positions eligible for senior leadership/executive team
Middle Leaders	Includes Year Level Coordinators, Learning/Curriculum Coordinators, Faculty Heads & Assistants
Positions of Leadership (POL)	A position within the school's leadership structure requiring extra leadership responsibility usually in the areas of wellbeing and curriculum
Generational Perceptions of School Leadership	Survey instrument utilised for the purpose of establishing the perceptions and attitudes of teachers toward teacher-leadership

Instrument

(GPSLi)

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

"I see no hope for the future of our people if they are dependent on frivolous youth of today, for certainly all youth are reckless beyond words... When I was young, we were taught to be discreet and respectful of elders, but the present youth are exceedingly wise [disrespectful] and impatient of restraint." (Hesiod, circa 8th century BC)

2.1 Introduction

The focus of this research is to identify any possible connection between the perceptions of differing generations toward the teaching workplace; and how these perceptive differences between generations may be impacting the leadership succession culture of a school's teaching faculty.

Leadership succession is a significant issue faced by Catholic Education in Australia factors contributing to leadership aspiration and retention issues faced from authorities (Bezzina, 2012; Canavan, 2013; d'Arbon, 2006; Fink, 2011; Fink & Brayman, 2006). Fink and Brayman (2006) describe leadership succession within an educational context as a process whereby "plans connect the identification, recruitment, preparation, placement, induction, and ongoing in-service education of leaders." (p. 65)

For over twenty years, researchers in Australia and overseas have conducted studies to identify factors that are contributing reasons why teachers choose to take up leadership roles within their schools (Canavan, 2007; Gronn, 2003a; Marks, 2013; McKenzie, Weldon, Rowley, Murphy, & McMillan, 2014; Neidhart & Carlin, 2003b; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009).

This review of literature seeks to explore research and findings of these issues concerning the problem of leadership succession currently experienced by Catholic schools, and this study's over-arching question as to whether generational differences are a contributing reason for teachers not applying for middle or senior-leadership roles.

Therefore, literature has been reviewed with the following aims in mind:

- To identify and define the key attitudinal, demographic and cultural distinctives to the generations currently in the teaching workplace,
- To ground the relevance of the research in a Catholic school,
- To provide guidance and insight into potential inter-generational issues that could be relevant to issues of leadership succession.
- To identify how those generations view successional topics of Motivation; Work Ethic; Feedback and Mentoring; School Hierarchy; and, Leadership Succession.

Subsequently, this approach will provide the foundation for the development of the study's theoretical framework and approach. For the first aim, literature was considered relating to GCT, followed by understanding the attitudinal distinctives of each generation in the teaching workplace – Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennials, as defined in Chapter one. The structure of this review is as follows:

1. Generational Cohort Theory,
2. Defining the generations,
3. Identifying gaps in research of generational differences in the workplace,
4. Changing generational demographics in the education sector, and
5. Connecting generational workplace differences and leadership succession in Catholic Education.

Discussion then seeks to determine whether it is valid to incorporate generational cohort differences when considering leadership succession problems faced by Catholic Education in Australia.

2.2 Generational Cohort Theory

Research examining the differing generations in our Western society, and their specific characteristics has been undertaken by researchers from differing experts of scholarship ranging from historical, economic, political, psychological, sociological, anthropological and statistical perspectives.

This section of the literature review reflects that plurality of discussion. GCT can catalyse new opportunities for researchers in practically applicable fields (Steele & Acuff, 2012) such as:

- economic market analysis;
- employment and workplace relations;
- leadership development;
- social and contextual analysis.

Major themes, traits and socially identifying features have been explored in attempts to differentiate one generation from another. In this section, a review of major generational theories is attempted for the purpose of better understanding the identifying features of each generation, including values, attitudes towards work, motivation and advancement.

By first investigating these historical and social differences it is intended to provide a deeper foundational understanding when investigating any potential conflict in motivations and values between the generations; and ultimately whether any inter-

generational clashes in a multi-generational school workplace is contributing towards Australian Catholic Education's problems with leadership-shortages and succession-planning.

GCT can give educational researchers a framework within which to analyse the generations (Schofield & Honoré, 2009; Stone-Johnson, 2011) for the purpose of exploring how they operate within certain contexts such as the workplace. It is appropriate to explore how GCT can be applied to the school workplace context, and if there are any linkages with a school's practice of leadership succession planning (Barker, 2006).

While providing guidance, the differing GCT in and of itself – regardless of its coherence or validity – will not necessarily restrict this opportunity to uncover any new areas for inquiry. But it can provide for objective and critical analysis of existing work on this question.

GCT is based upon the notion that each generation shares events that define and influence cohort groupings of people (Coupland, 1991; Salt, 2004; Strauss & Howe, 1991; Zemke et al., 2013), and that while each generation consists of diverse individuals, they still share perceptions, values, and behaviours because they collectively experience those shared events. This study is based on the supposition that GCT can be used as a tool to understand and explain how shared life experience of culture and historic events can form the attitudes, behaviours, mindset and worldview of generations of people born within a timeframe (Strauss & Howe, 1991). As a response, these cohorts have an affinity to the same values, reactions, and behaviours, which are distinct from other generations not their own (Hung, Gu, & Yim, 2007; Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Gasset (1947) believes that the concept of “generation” is the most important concept of history, and believes it can provide sociological insight; inform mission, motivation and aspiration; and able to be utilised as an instrumental method of historical investigation.

For the purpose of this study, focus is made upon how understanding each generation’s differences can lead to better leadership succession (including role-replenishment, recruitment, management and retention) and multi-generational empowerment within the school workforce (Salopek, 2006). For inter-generational cohesion in the workplace, it is essential that each generation understand its own defining characteristics (Legas & Sims, 2011), recognising the realities and myths of their own perceptions of each other alongside those of the other generations (Lester, Standifer, Schultz, & Windsor, 2012). McCrindle and Wolfinger (2014) believe the key to successfully navigating generational differences within the workplace context involves comprehension of each generation’s distinctive traits, attitudes, shifts and social changes. Relational links between different generational cohort approaches to the workplace can be discovered to better improve communication, increased levels of workplace participation and collaboration, and transferral of knowledge and experience from older to younger generations (Salopek, 2006). Strategies to decrease issues of inter-generational conflict can be developed (Legas & Sims, 2011; Lyons & Kuron, 2013).

It is therefore beneficial to explore two key contributions to GCT, first in the 1920’s by sociologist Karl Mannheim in *The Problem of Generations* (1972) followed in the 1990’s by the work *Generations* (Strauss & Howe, 1991) by historian William Strauss; and economist and demographer Neil Howe (refer to Table 2.1). This researcher believes that Mannheim’s contribution is significant as he laid down the historical and

social foundation for GCT; and the work of Strauss and Howe has provided this sociological construct with supporting empirical data, analysis, and observations.

Table 2.1

Comparison of Mannheim (1972); and Strauss and Howe's (1991) Approaches to Generational Cohort Theory

Karl Mannheim (1972)	William Strauss and Neil Howe (1991)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sociological point of view • Critical of the positivist-formulation (too mechanistic and externalised) • Emphasises social location and classes factors as dominant variables affecting generational traits, behaviours and approaches • Historical and generational changes must factor alongside biological factors that personify each generation (Pilcher, 1994) • Social changes develops distinct generational consciousness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused on generational cycles of US history (applicable to other Western societies such as UK and Australia) • “recurring dynamics of generational behaviour and how and when it results in social change” (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 8) • Patterns of change are recurrent • Each generational cycle is length of human life (80-90 years) • Criticism: Some assumptions are not reliably verifiable, too reliant on qualitative and not quantitative data (Twenge, 2010)

In what is referred to as the seminal work on generational theory, Mannheim (1972) states that a generational ‘cohort’ consists of a grouping of people within the same age-range, from a similar culture, and who have collectively shared key social, life or historical events (Mannheim, 1972; Meredith, Schewe, Hiam, & Karlovich, 2002). Mannheim (1972) believes that “simple generational separation performed on the basis of so many calendar years did not furnish a sound foundation for the analysis of social process and change.” (p. 21)

Mannheim (1972) postulates an exacting theory of generations and seeks clarity when socially categorising each generation’s unique *location* and *actuality* as a cohort.

This method was developed to guard against stereotyping and opinion (Pilcher, 1994). His concept and method has informed a large amount of research that identifies generational locationally defined as socio-economic, political and cultural influences (Burnett, 2016) that inform the shared formative experiences (actuality) of each generational cohort (Appelbaum, Serena & Shapiro, 2004; Yu & Miller, 2005; Zemke et al., 2013). By developing this approach, where the generational cohorts identify with each through shared experience, Mannheim (1972) proposed that it is possible to posit and apply generational contentions within organisational and behavioural contexts. This will assist this study's focus on the exploration of generations and their attitudes and perceptions toward school leadership succession.

When it comes to defining each generational cohort, many researchers follow the lead of Strauss and Howe (2000) who developed a descriptive 'taxonomy' of generations. Their research provided an inductive process of historical examination that has informed modern efforts to describe and classify the differing generations through the lens of historical and cultural events. Strauss and Howe (1991) are persuaded by Mannheim's thesis regarding the influence of social and historical events shaping a cohort. Both of these theories speak to the concept that specific generations have socially and historically identifiable traits and characteristics.

However, whereas Mannheim's broad approach provides a foundation for general sociological study, Strauss and Howe's interpretation is more workable in comprehending the specific commonalities and differences between generations (Strauss & Howe, 2000). There are several social and anthropological factors that shape, define, realign and shift a generation's traits and characteristics. These factors also include life events (Kupperschmidt, 2000) and shared experiences (Mannheim, 1972) such as a

natural disaster, or war (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998); or social movements such as Feminism or Industrialisation effect (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014) and can differentiate one generational cohort from another (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998). These factors are defining in their cause and impact on a generation's attitudes and expectations (Inglehart & Norris, 2003).

Rogler (2002) explained the concept of a generational cohort as the “classification of persons of more or less the same age by attributing to them characteristics thought to be prevalent in their period.” (p. 1014). As each of the generations find themselves bound in an intricate dynamic of perceptions, conventional-thinking, feelings, and aspirations; he believes this formation process of these collective identities develop in the following ways:

- Historical/cultural events and shifts challenge the existing status quo/social order and facilitate the emergence of a new generational identity (Giancola, 2006)
- These events have a deep impact on the ‘coming-of-age’ group – due to the tendency of pre-adults to psychologically develop their value systems (Zemke et al., 2013).
- The previous or older generational groupings have already codified their value systems and functioned within them in life (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014).
- There is a shared mutuality of experience amongst the peers of the generational grouping that continues through adulthood (Macky, Gardner, & Forsyth, 2008).

From a different perspective, Teh (2002) identifies three major categories of influences to the formation of generational identity: biological, sociological and cultural.

A biological approach simply references a measure of years between a parent and child (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014, p. 17). Zemke et al. (2013) state twenty years as the measure for a generational cohort. Mackay (1997) implies that the biological approach is influenced by sociological and cultural factors, and reduces this figure to 15 years. He does this based on his conclusion that this is the result of the exponential explosion of technology, and the transformative nature of culture towards the later twentieth century (Mackay, 1997). Teh (2002) suggests that the reason this approach is popular is for its ease and convenience to determine and demographically categorise a cohort for age-based studies of populations (Smola & Sutton, 2002). O’Rand and Krecker (1990) in advocating for understanding cohort differences through the concept of life-cycle, observed that changing circumstances and needs over a person’s lifespan leads to a maturing process that is constantly changing. Ultimately, finding a specific figure to define the span of a generational cohort is inexact (Teh, 2002). Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, & Brown (2007) argue that it is impractical to strictly define a generational cohort by biological means as it limits the input and influences of each generation as it evolves. Cole, Smith, and Lucas (2002) also note this approach’s weakness of negating other obvious factors such as gender and culture. Some research findings have found that what have been labelled as generational differences are in fact instead attitudes and behaviours resulting from age-related differences (Gentry, Griggs, Deal, Mondore, & Cox, 2011; Macky et al., 2008; Yang & Jolly, 2008) or perceptions derived exclusively from the historical and social context the study took place within (Kowske, Rasch, & Wiley, 2010).

The second, sociological approach focuses on the surrounding familial situation in which people grow up. People define themselves in accordance to their “ranking” within

their family unit and the generational hierarchy within their own family or communal hierarchy (Getz, 2015). This is further supported by sociologists who identify major social changes taking place each 30 years (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014; Salt, 2004).

The third approach advocated by Teh (2002) is the cultural perspective. This approach affirms the concept that each generational cohort is defined and shaped by gender (Favero & Heath, 2012; Inglehart & Baker, 2001), education, religion and socio-political movements (Meredith, et al., 2002); technology (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014, p. 20); and significant events and shared experience (Appelbaum et al., 2004; Salt, 2004; Zemke et al., 2013). These events and shared responses shape how a generation views the world and their place within it (Yu & Miller, 2005).

Segmenting cohorts can be used by researchers to better understand how generations share their experiences, and cultivate their own intrinsic values and attitudes towards life (Murphy, Gordon, & Mullen, 2004). In the commercial world, marketers studying demographics believe that these shared identities can not only be located to understand generational preferences and stimuli around work and lifestyle choices (Portolese Dias, 2003); relationships and sexuality; and technology needs (Dlodlo & Dhurup, 2013; Yang & Jolly, 2008), but can also be specifically targeted for influencing consumer behaviour (Bristow, Brosdahl, & Carpenter, 2012; Hachtmann, 2012). In a study that empirically measured the cultural distinctiveness that developed within generations and their formative pre-adult years from both the United States and China (Egri & Ralston, 2004), a significant contribution was identified of these formative factors upon the development of a generation's beliefs, values and attitudes. These attitudes and beliefs can in turn influence behaviour and motivations both personally (Inglehart & Norris, 2003), and in the workplace (Kupperschmidt, 2000). For example a

generation that spends its formative pre-adult years during wartime conflict or economic depression will develop a survivalist mindset, a strong work ethic, respect for authority, strong sense of worth of material possessions, and logical rationality (Smola & Sutton, 2002; Yu & Miller, 2005).

Kasser and Ryan (1996) believe that each generation matures during a time of socio-economic ease, take on values centred upon personal identity, egalitarianism, and tolerance (Murphy et al., 2004; Myers, 2000). These groups of people experience shared events, which they transfer into their attitudes and values when making decisions in their adult personal and professional lives (Myers, 2000). These attitudinal traits would fit with Mannheim's theory that each cohort share a collective sense of identity and shared consciousness (Mannheim, 1972; Murphy & Johnson, 2011). The beliefs and attitudes formed in these pre-adult years also continue into their later years (Cogin, 2012; Hachtmann, 2008; Rhodes, 1983; Yu & Miller, 2005). In the workplace, Murphy et al. (2004) found "significant instrumental" and "terminal value differences" spanning generational cohorts and advocated employers to look for incentives that extended beyond traditional motivators of salary and position, and to instead consider family-friendly forms of employee arrangements. Appelbaum et al. (2004) also noted a shift in generational motivators and values such as confidence and meaning changing due to environmental influences, particularly with younger generations. This includes sensitivity to issues concerning inclusion, belonging and justice (Kasser & Ryan, 1996; Myers, 2000).

However, there are critical limitations to the literature on GCT that must also be considered. A large amount of studies available are either anecdotal or pre-dominantly grounded upon the experiences of researchers themselves considering the generational

stereotypes (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2005; Hicks & Hicks, 1999; Sheahan, 2005). At the risk of only cultivating social conjecture, this body of literature therefore loses a certain amount of validity. This epistemic problem can lead to what Moore and Stilgoe (2009, pp. 654-658) call “constructions” of “nonexpert actors”.

It must be acknowledged that despite this defining approach, some have differed on exact dating of each major cohort. While empirical studies have identified key generational distinctives, attitudes and attributes; this evolving body of research provide findings with differing results when specific hypotheses are tested for validity. For example, Macky et al. (2008) identified the methodological conflict between understanding generational stereotypes peculiar to a cohort, and other considerations such as age or time period (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007, p. 350; Ryder, 1965).

Also, a large number of studies are cross-sectional in nature (Jobe, 2014; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Wong, Gardiner, Lang, & Coulon, 2008), and some have called for in-depth longitudinal studies which are rare, as are studies that reflect the evolving nature of those generational cohorts over the extent of that cohort’s entire lifetime (Becton, Walker, & Jones-Farmer, 2014). One other critical observation of generational differences is that by focussing solely on historical events or years of birth does not effectively discuss the scope of how different societal culture influence life experiences (Murphy et al., 2004). In their cross-sectional study, Murphy et al. (2004) studied Baby Boomer pilots from both the USA and Japan after the formative experience of World War 2, and found both generational differences and similarities. Both Cole et al. (2002) and Meredith et al. (2002) warn against ignoring people’s individual complexity and over-generalisation when defining each generational cohort, with the simple observation that not all people within that cohort grouping completely conform to the behaviours and

attitudes typically ascribed and associated to that generation. In response, this study seeks to examine how work values define and shape generational differences for the benefit of understanding how those formed values influence teachers with their decisions, motivations and choices.

Another challenge lies in Mannheim's (1972) notion that generational cohorts are located within a socio-historical context. Therefore, a significant challenge remains in the need for more qualitative, longitudinal studies (Gentry et al., 2011) to further examine generational dynamics across multiple cultures (Deal, Stawiski, Graves, Gentry, Ruderman, & Weber, 2012). This is imperative in order to generalise GCT across differing globalised contexts (Edmunds & Turner, 2005). Twenge and Campbell (2011) use a cross-temporal meta-analysis to test for periodically-traceable trends. Such data that is sequentially gathered from cohorts longitudinally across would allow for better evidence of how these cohorts interact over a large period of time, allowing for age-related changes.

Therefore, while acknowledging that GCT as presented by Mannheim (1972), and Strauss and Howe (1991), can provide no complete understanding of each generation's differences (Burnett, 2016), there are key elements that this study can incorporate to provide some solutions to workplace inter-generational cohesion within the school context. When people are working within a particular environment such as a workplace, their ability to bond or conflict becomes a major dynamic that shapes the culture and effectiveness of that organisation. Both similarities and differences become distinct and obvious.

2.3 Defining the Generations

A generational grouping share common birth years, similar historical and cultural events, and possess a collective identity (Zemke et al., 2013; Salt, 2004). Society tends to stereotype generational cohorts by allotting a set of generalised descriptors that suggest a generation's beliefs, attitudes and behaviours (Becton et al., 2014; Zemke et al., 2013; Twenge, 2010; Zemke et al., 2013). Each generation is defined by its experiences and collective feelings, not merely their date of birth (Zemke et al., 2013). Their values, personality and historic worldviews are shaped by their era, influenced and moulded by their times (Bernstein, Alexander, & Alexander, 2008; McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014). They experience the dynamic of collectively, during their formative years, going through the same trends and events of their era. There is the observation in some literature concerning each cohort's time of formative beginning and subsequent end phases alongside the previous or ensuing generational cohorts.

Definition and dating of each generation currently in the workplace is not universally accepted by all researchers. Also of significance is that while a generation may span a period of 80-90 years in age, it is their phase in their lifetime in which they have the most significant historical and cultural interaction and shaping (Zemke et al., 2013). There are however commonly-accepted assignment of each cohort, freely adopted in popular literature (Salt, 2004; Strauss & Howe, 2000; Twenge, 2010):

1. Baby Boomers are dated as being born between 1945 and the mid-1960s
2. Gen-Xers are dated as being born between the 1970s and mid-1980s
3. Millennials are dated as being born from the 1990s to the year 2000

Pilcher (1994) states that delineating the birth years of the generations are not critical, believing that each cohort's characteristics and experiences distinguish each grouping distinctively.

The three major generational groups identified for this study as 'Boomers', 'Gen-Xers' and 'Millennials' (See Tables 2.2 and 2.3):

Table 2.2

Generational Puzzle at Work

	Baby Boomers	Gen-Xers	Millennials (aka Gen Y, GeNext)
Birth Years	1945-1964	1965-1984	1985-2000
Influencers	Booming birth-rate; economic prosperity; Vietnam; Watergate; anti-protest & human rights movements; sex, drugs, rock 'n' roll; suburbia; dual incomes	Collapse of Berlin Wall & Communism, Sesame Street & MTV; personal computers; children of divorce; AIDS; crack cocaine; loss of 'world' safety	Expansion of technology & the media; drugs & gangs; pervasive violence; widening chasm between haves & have-nots; unprecedented immigration growth
View of institutions	Want to put their stamp on institutions	Are sceptical of institutions, hierarchies	Judge institutions on their own merit, prefer organic models
Defining Work Motivation	Making a difference	Building a career	Work that has meaning
Traits	Idealistic & optimistic; highly competitive; overwhelming need to succeed; question authority; the 'sandwich generation' with elder-care concerns; responding to healthcare issues, divorce, death of parent, kids in college; may be turning inward; have difficulty admitting something is wrong; don't like to ask for help; at risk for burnout; experienced; team-workers; skilled at mentoring	Eclectic; resourceful; comfortable with change; self-reliant; adaptable; sceptical about relationships & distrust institutions; high divorce rate; info-highway pioneers; entrepreneurial & independent; innovative; full of energy; fun at work; the generation that 'got rid of the box'	Aka 'The Digital Generation'; globally concerned; integrated; cyber literate; media & technology savvy; expect 24-hour info; realistic; probably have too much stuff to sort through; acknowledge diversity & expect others to do so; environmentally conscious; will try anything
Negative Stereotypes	Materialistic; work hard not smart; sold out their ideals; heavily in debt; not loyal	Haven't paid their dues; too young for management; say what they think; slackers; aggressive; annoying; loud; MTV generation	Unaware of lack of skills; require excessive affirmation;
Values	Who am I? Where did my	Be my own boss; team	High value on education;

	passion go? Is it too late to get it back? Seek organisations with integrity; politically correct; eager to put their own stamp on things; good pay; community involvement	environment contrasted with entrepreneurial spirit; advancement opportunity	high value on life style balance; work is not the most important thing; stepping stone for future opportunities; high tech, innovative; diverse workforce; Be my own boss
Recruitment, engagement, management, & retention	Be aware of Boomers' competitive nature; acknowledge their contributions; focus on how they can make an impact; offer continued training opportunities, especially life skills & balance	Respect their scepticism; establish your credentials; show you have a sense of humour; let them know you like them; talk about how training applies to their careers, not just their jobs	Don't assume they are all at the same level in training; expect to do more remedial training; teach in shorter modules, testing often & making it fun; help them visualise how the training applies to their jobs; understand they learn best by collaborating
The workplace as an institution	43% say they lack mentoring opportunities & 30% say that contributes to job dissatisfaction; 75% say time off would be the greatest reward; 35% think a one- company career is good; prone to workplace burnout	30% have left a job due to lack of training opportunities; 80% of Gen-Xer men put time with family above challenging work or a higher salary; only 17% think a one-company career is good	Globally aware, cyber literate, techno-savvy; personal safety is #1 workplace issue; they expect diversity
Improving feedback & communication	'Once a year, formal & documented.' Initiate weekly informal talks & formally document them;	'So how am I doing?' Give feedback all the time & to the point: be available; allow freedom to keep them learning & focused on career paths; immediate & regular feedback; tell it like it is (Gen-Xers have a well-tuned BS-ometer)	'I want it with the push of a button. Let's all talk about it.' Initiate the connection; consider electronic connections & newsletter; make it visual; allow them an active role in creating their own education & work plans
Performance rewards	Money, title, recognition; recognise them as the first 'sandwiched' generation caring for children as well as parents; provide time off with pay; provide life skills & balance training; provide second-career avenues	Gen-Xers have shaken up the rewards system; sceptical about jobs & organisations; prefer time with family & outside interests; provide opportunities for development of personal & professional life	Provide work that has meaning

Note. Reprinted from 'When Generations Collide', by L. Lancaster, (2004), *Management Forum Series*, pgs 2-4. Copyright (2004) by Executive Forum.

Table 2.3

Identifying Generational Differences in Australian Culture and Milestones

	Baby Boomers	Gen-Xers	Millennials
Political/ Global Events	The Dismissal, Vietnam, Boat People, Land Rights	Gulf War, Port Arthur Massacre, Mabo Decision, Republic Debate	September 11, 2001, 'Sorry' Apology (2007)
Financial Milestones	Post-War Reconstruction & Boom	Globalisation, 90's Recession, Retrenchments & High Interest Rates	Dot-Com Bubble Burst, Asian Financial Crisis (1998), Great Recession (2008)
Political Figures	JFK, Nixon, Whitlam, Fraser	Thatcher & Reagan, Hawke & Keating	Howard, Rudd, Bush 2, Obama
Family Unit	Divorced Blended Families	Single Parents/De Facto	Casual Relationships
TV Shows	Murder She Wrote, Dallas, Dynasty	Married with Children, Simpsons & Friends	'Reality' Shows, Underbelly
Relocation for Work?	Move to another state	Move overseas for periods of time for adventure	Move permanently overseas (global citizens)
Attitude to material goods	Materialistic, consumerists. Purchase on credit what they want, not need	Reclaim/reuse/recycle household items	Cashed-up, Technological & Entertainment-based goods
Entertainment?	Television	Internet	Mobile phone apps & gaming
Technology	Television & Video	CD/DVD Player	Internet, Live Streaming, File-Sharing
Housing	¼ acre block, Double-story, 4-5 Bedroom, 2 Bathroom, double garage house	Small block, unit/townhouse	Flat/apartment
Number of Jobs in Lifetime	3-5 similar-skilled careers	5-10 different-skilled careers	Multi-skilled, multi-careered

2.3.1 Baby Boomers

For Baby Boomers, birth years are identified as the group born between the period of 1945 and 1964 – the post-war generation (Boggs & Szabo, 2011, Hannay & Fretwell, 2011). They are called 'Boomers' because of the post-war birth boom during this period (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2014; Salt, 2004; Foot & Stoffman, 2000). Their values are described as 'idealistic', 'optimistic' and 'highly competitive' (Stillman & Lancaster, 2014b). Their generational identity was profoundly impacted by the Vietnam War, Watergate (Stillman & Lancaster, 2014b), the Kennedy brothers and King

assassinations, the Whitlam Dismissal, and the Sexual/Feminist Revolutions (Salt, 2004). Baby Boomers were the first generation, especially after the economic hardships of the first half of the 20th century, to be raised by their parents for their own pleasure, rather than economic constrictions.

Baby Boomers are characterised as “cherished” and indulged (Strauss & Howe, 2000, p. 266), they were raised to be merit-based, independent and to believe they could define their own destinies (Zemke et al., 2013). Formative values were based on the principles of merit and hard work rather than privilege (Hannay & Fretwell, 2011; Sheen, 2000). They began to reject respect or loyalty towards establishment institutions as the mushrooming access to media exposed the foibles and fallibility of religious (Zemke et al. 2013), political (Strauss & Howe, 2000, p. 141), and corporate leaders (Salt, 2004). Protesting against power in their youth, they are now retiring from these very positions of corporate and political power (Hannay & Fretwell, 2011; Murphy, 2006). Status, material success and traditional values returned in the Baby Boomers’ workplace (Bernstein et al., 2008) once they became entrenched in the workplace. Due to the demographically large size of the post-war generation, especially in labour-force terms, they competed for the enormous increase in material resources and career opportunities (Stillman & Lancaster, 2014a).

Strauss and Howe (2000) emphasised their image as ‘workaholics’, and attribute this to their merit-based work ethic. Boomers’ positive work ethic and abilities include set roles, structured responsibilities; and are highly ambitious and workaholic (Hyman, 2005; Bunting 2004; Sheen, 2000). That is, they seek meaning and identity-definition upon what they achieve in their careers. After the initial rebellion of their formative years, as they asserted themselves in the workplace (Lester et al. 2012) they became more

achievement-oriented (career advancement, salary, role perks) and respectful of authority (Strauss & Howe, 2000) in their place of employment (O'Bannon, 2001). In Gravett and Throckmorton's (2007) descriptive study containing 2500 people, 45% prioritised salary and status over advancement (38%), and recognition for their ability (33%).

Baby Boomers also became more loyal to their social and work organisations (Twenge & Campbell, 2011) and renowned for their diligence in their work responsibilities (Yu & Miller, 2005). With increasing wealth and lifestyle-enjoyment, they came to enjoy their own career-destinies (Bernstein et al., 2008). There is also empirical evidence that they are stronger in these characteristics than younger generations; as well as having an innate desire to prove their worth and ability to their parents' generation (Meriac, Woehr, & Banister, 2010). Because of this sense of achievement and what they have achieved, they also have characteristics that suggest feeling threatened by and deep reluctance towards changes within the workplace (Lester et al. 2012; Twenge, 2010). They also enjoy and demand wide access to a flourishing standard of living. Due to their immense numbers (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2006), their generational presence has had a profound influence on social and economic policy. They represent a significantly large portion of today's workforce on the verge of retirement (ABS, 2015). In popular literature, they are perceived by Gen-Xers and Millennials as poor in technological proficiency (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Twenge, 2010).

2.3.2 Gen-Xers

Gen-Xers, born between 1965 and 1985 (Boggs & Szabo, 2011), inherited the social and economic turmoil created by the Boomers leading them to steer their way

through chaotic economic times including recession and unemployment (Foot & Stoffman, 2000). Their defining moment was the fall of Communism (Hicks & Hicks, 1999; Burke, 1994). Gen-Xers grew up with multiple recessions and financial uncertainty; family and societal insecurity (Kupperschmidt, 2000); and diminishing traditions (Ferres, Travaglione, & Firms, 2003; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

In Australia, the age-bracket for Gen-Xers being between 1965 and 1980 inclusive is clear and distinctive (ABS, 2006). For example, the number of births in 1965 were 223,000, reaching a high of approximately 268,700 in 1972 (ABS, 2006). This is in sharp contrast to the birthrate in 2005, where approximately 254,000 were recorded (ABS, 2006).

They have been influenced by either or both being the first generation of their divorcing and/or single parents. With Boomers as working-parents, Gen-Xers are also known as 'latch-key kids' who looked after themselves during their parents working hours (Strauss & Howe, 2000). They are also the first generational cohort to experience both parents in the workforce (Becton et al., 2014; Watson, 2013). They have been recognised in the media as having grown up as children who spent a significant part of their day unsupervised (Fox, 2011), and subsequently receiving less care and attention to the same level of input their parents would have received with one grandparent at home, while the other was the main breadwinner for the family. Because of this, they are generally characterised as radically individualistic and self-reliant (Tulgan, 2003; Watson, 2013).

This contributes to their underlying distrust of corporations who laid off their parents during periods of recession and economic rationalism which in turn feeds their lack of employer-loyalty (Burnett, 2016). This also contributes to their popular image as

distrusting as they commenced their time in the workplace highly educated, but amidst massive corporate 'down-sizing' and 'economic rationalism' (Tang, Cunningham, Frauman, Ivy, & Perry, 2012). When it comes to job mobility and vocational longevity, Gen-Xers have no problem leaving an employer for more challenging work, better salary and conditions (Bernstein et al., 2008). This lessening sense of loyalty to their employer comes from growing up during economic instability where such commitment was not necessarily rewarded with job security (Loomis, 2000). Influenced by their parents' experience of heavy lay-offs, they have far less sense of employer loyalty (Hyman, 2005; Bunting 2004; Salt, 2004). This also feeds their strong suspicion of globalisation (Slaughter & Swagel, 2004). They are highly committed to balancing their work and vocational pathway closely aligned alongside their personal lives (Eisner, 2011); financially independent (Kamenetz, 2006; Tulgan, 2003); and entrepreneurial risk-takers (De Meuse, Bergmann & Lester, 2001). They seek greater focus on work and family life balance in their vocational pathway choices (Grandey, Cordeiro, & Crouter, 2005; Sahibzada, 2005; Semler, 2003; Valenti, 2001; Voydanoff, 2005; Winslow, 2005).

In relational terms, due to the jump in increase of divorce rates by their parents, a significant proportion of Gen-Xers were raised by only one parent (Lyons, Duxbury & Higgins, 2005), and this cohort thus relies heavily on small enclaves of friends for emotional support (Ferres et al, 2003; Frank, Finnegan, & Taylor, 2004; Sahibzada, 2005) rather than the traditional family-unit model. They work well in teams, crave mentors and rely on constant feedback (Bunting, 2004; Burke, 1994). There is also the suggestion that this experience contributes to their desire for flexible work-family arrangements in their desire for increased work-life balance (Tulgan, 2003).

They are considerably more technologically savvy than Baby Boomers (Kupperschmidt, 2000) and are also more change-adaptable (Stillman & Lancaster, 2014b; Watson, 2013). However, they resent and are deeply cynical towards poor change-management (Twenge, 2010). Due to their skepticism, they are results-oriented, requiring information and facts; rather than blindly trusting an authority figure's word (Burnett, 2016; Francis-Smith, 2004). Unlike Baby Boomers who can function on a yearly review or Millennials who require daily affirmation, Gen-Xers require constructive, concrete feedback that is periodically regular and consistent (Becton et al., 2014; Taylor & Keeter, 2010; Twenge, 2010). Egri and Ralston (2004) empirically found that this generation highly elevates adaptability to self-motivational change values including self-direction and stimulation, but lesser importance to self-advancement values such as power, careerism and hedonism than do Baby Boomers.

2.3.3 Millennials

There has been much debate and disagreement about the label for the latest generational cohort to enter the workplace. They have been referred to in popular and academic research as the "Millennials" (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007), "Nexters" (Strauss & Howe, 2000), the "Generation-Yers" (Boggs & Szabo, 2011;), or the "Net Generation" (Hannay & Fretwell, 2011; Tapscott, 1998). Born circa 1990 (Sessa et al., 2007), they are still having their traits and behaviours characterised, but they have been initially described as desperate for affirmation (Hill, 2002) and wanting instant gratification (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014; Hannay & Fretwell, 2011).

Their defining moment is the millennial year of 2000, and their 'Pearl Harbour' moment took place on September 11, 2001 with the destruction of the World Trade

Center (Boggs & Szabo, 2011; Murphy et al., 2004). The forces of globalisation, technological development and multiculturalism have had the impact on Millennials where they are now the most ethnically diverse of the three generations (Strauss & Howe, 2000, p. 4), and this is thought to contribute to their inclusiveness and adaptability towards change (Murphy, 2006; Twenge & Campbell, 2011). Millennials embody traits that are not previously identified with previous generations (Burnett, 2016; Tulgan, 2009) including being manifestly self-confident and self-aware (Foster, Campbell, & Twenge, 2003). Strauss and Howe (2000) define Millennials as the “largest, healthiest, and most cared-for” generation (p.76).

More than any other generation in the workplace, they have received more attention from their parents (Hannay & Fretwell, 2011; Sullivan, Forret, Carraher, & Mainiero, 2009; Tulgan, 2009), as well as growing up in an over-protective environment deriving from societal and legal requirements for child protection and occupational health and safety (Strauss & Howe, 2000). Education has contributed strongly to their development and formation (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012; Watson, 2013). Millennials were educated in a learning culture that prioritised teamwork and collaborative tasks with their peers (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012; Zemke et al., 2013). Near-universal adoption of school uniforms in Western schools for the purpose of enhancing values and team-orientation has also been linked to workplace preferences (Strauss & Howe, 2000; Twenge & Campbell, 2011). Pastoral care and support for students, based on wellbeing extending to awarding students certificates and recognition of even the basic of behaviours and tasks which were in previous generations, assumed as normal (Tulgan, 2009). This has also been linked to their stereotype as being hungry for extrinsic motivators such as fast

advancement, which is considered as ambitious and unearned by both Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers (Bernstein et al., 2008; Strauss & Howe, 1991).

High-tech savvy, they are engaged and active in social networking, and have had access to the Internet since childhood (Sayers, 2007; Strauss & Howe, 2000). They are the first generation in history to have ‘high-tech’ technology so heavily integrated into their developmental lives (Burnett, 2016); growing up in their formative years with gaming, mobile phones, near-universal access to personal computers and Automatic Telling Machines (Salt, 2004; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014). Almost every piece of technology they have is ‘smart’. Also known as the ‘Net’ generation, they have never experienced a world without the Internet (Strauss & Howe, 2000), and because of their near-constant exposure and access to all forms of media and information their level of awareness of world events and forces is unprecedented (Wilson & Gerber, 2008). This over-exposure has led to them feeling pressured in ways unlike previous generations (Strauss & Howe, 2000). However, this affinity with technology is instructive in understanding how Millennials’ process their worldview (Wilson & Gerber, 2008), as well as developing their ability and skill in being flexible, adaptable, collaborative and problem-solving (Burnett, 2016; McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2014).

Millennials commonly accept and endorse racial and ethnic diversity, including active embracing of multiculturalism (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007; Winslow, 2005). Aspirational, while acknowledging the world has ‘old problems’, including ‘boom/bust’ economic cycles, they look for opportunities to succeed both materially and in wellbeing (Kamenetz, 2006; Wolburg & Pokrywczynski, 2001). Like the Gen-Xers, they distrust hierarchical institutions and structured processes (Frank et al., 2004), preferring instead

organic relationships and accept leadership by their seniors based on mandate (Hirsh & Sheldrake, 2000), rather than authority of title or position (Smola & Sutton, 2002; Caldwell, 2000a; Sheahan, 2005). Rather than being driven by remuneration (Staff & Schulenberg, 2010) they seek meaningful team-based work (Strauss & Howe, 2000), and see life-long learning as an essential key to happiness and empowerment (Karp, Fuller, & Sirias, 2002; Sheahan, 2005).

In the workplace they have been characterised as multi-taskers (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010), and highly value collaborative teamwork (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012) that reflects their formative education experience (Raines & Arnsperger, 2009). They are reluctant to take up key leadership and management roles due to the expectation they undertake their duties in the same manner and approach as the previous generations (González & Tacorante, 2004). These key attributes are essential to understand their manner and motivation in the workplace (Lester et al., 2012; Karp et al., 2002; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Patel, 2005).

Understanding the perceptions, beliefs and attitudes of this generation, currently increasing in demographics and participation in the teaching profession are therefore essential in preparing for future school leadership succession planning.

2.4 Identifying Gaps In Research Of Generational Differences In The Workplace

This next section of the literature review will examine findings on the existence and nature of generational differences within the workplace context. Specifically, this review focussed on how those generational differences – real or perceived – were identified through the specific workplace traits of Motivation, Work Ethic, Professional Feedback, Hierarchy, and Leadership Succession.

As previously noted, the entirety of generational cohort and difference literature has been a mix of anecdotal and empirical sociological research. This realm of literature has been predominantly based in commentary within the commercial and organisational behaviour spheres, and may have contributed to an evolving bias and stereotyping of the concept of generational differences in the workplace. However, growing empirical research has been able to identify testable knowledge, as well as the location of verifiable gaps and misunderstandings (De Meuse & Mlodzik, 2010; Haeberle, Herzberg, & Hobbs, 2009).

Significantly, most peer-reviewed research that has been undertaken for the purpose of understanding organisational behaviour within commercial, public sector and government organisations for the purpose of understanding and responding to human resource harmony, workplace conflict, management, and leadership development. Cahill and Sedrak (2012) postulated that inter-generational dynamics can have both positive and negative impact upon the workplace (Ahmad & Ibrahim, 2015), as well as finding that this tension-dynamic may be the result of perceptions and expectations between people working alongside each other. These expectations are formed by people from different backgrounds, who directly and indirectly expect behaviour and attitudes that is typical of their own cohort-groupings (Strauss & Howe, 2000).

Generational cohort studies conducted in workplace environments have been able to identify and investigate the nature of interactive differences, including: collective memory (Arsenault, 2004; Eyerman & Turner, 1998; Schuman & Scott, 1989); intergenerational relationship tensions (Del Campo, 2010; Teh, 2002); recruitment and retention processes (Carpenter & de Charon, 2014; Salt, 2007); vocational needs (Sayers, 2007); and, work expectations and values (Smola & Sutton 2002). Smola and Sutton

(2002) state “work values are more influenced by generational experiences than by age and maturation” (Smola & Sutton, 2002, p. 379).

Salt (2007) found that there were significant misunderstandings and workplace frustration in perceptions and interaction between Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennials. He was able to link these tensions with issues concerning turnover and retention of Millennial workers.

Of course, misunderstandings and disagreement take place in any form of relational or organisational interaction, however generational differences can significantly affect the effectiveness, dynamic and retention of participating members, including employees (Del Campo, 2010; Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). Fox (2011) believes that the defining characteristics and traits of each generation can spur tension, misunderstanding and angst within the workplace. These distinctives can influence communication behaviours and the role these play with decision-making and management styles (Haeberle et al., 2009). For example, older generations follow the stereotype that Millennials are spoilt, demand constant attention and demonstrate poor work ethic, and that this stereotyped perception directly influences their daily interaction and management decisions (Day, 2009; Fox, 2011). Conversely, in another example, Millennials are more likely to feel that their Gen-Xer or Baby Boomer supervisor does not care about their success if they do not receive feedback and input on a near-daily basis (Fox, 2011; Zemke et al., 2013).

Du (2011) goes further and states that these real and perceived attitudes and behaviours are enhanced and polarised when there is increased competition (such as opportunities for advancement or the threat of down-sizing) for resources and benefits within that organisation (Park, Twenge, & Greenfield, 2014). Not all literature has found

that there are only differences between the generations, but there are more similarities of traits and motivators than each generation have of each other (Cogin, 2012; Jorgensen, 2003). Managers and leaders are able to best leverage this phenomenon for their organisation by identifying and understanding the strength and weaknesses of these traits and tendencies for workplace harmony and effectiveness (Burch & Strawderman, 2014).

Because this study seeks to measure differences of perceptions between the generations in the areas of Motivation, Work Ethic, Feedback, Leadership Preferences and Expectations, and Hierarchy, it was important to investigate each area in a detailed exploration of literature.

2.4.1 Motivation

Literature reveals distinctive observations on the workplace value of individual and group motivation, and that many popular assumptions about each generational cohort have been effectively challenged (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012; Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, & Lance, 2010; Wong et al., 2008). Much empirical research has noted contradictions that have occurred with efforts measuring intrinsic values with motivation (Haeberle et al., 2009; Howe & Nadler, 2012; Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). Some stereotypes have been found true, for example, in the areas of job satisfaction and role-motivation (Ahmad & Ibrahim, 2015). Another example is that Millennials are viewed as ‘entitled’ and that they are far more informal, casual, and relational in their manner and approach in the workplace (Howe & Nadler, 2012). However, older generations were both perceived and found to be more formal and prefer clear definable lines of responsibility (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010; Lester et al., 2012; Van Velsor & Wright, 2012).

Some generalised common traits describe Baby Boomers as valuing work as a survival necessity (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012) as well as deferring their own individualism towards conforming to authority (Ferri-Reed, 2013). Gen-Xers and Baby Boomers were most driven by results (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010) and authority (Wong et al., 2008); whereas Millennials were most focused upon career-motivations inspired by meaning and not achievement, and are less optimistic concerning their future. Another proven difference was that Baby Boomers place great importance on notions of professionalism than do Gen-Xers and Millennials (Eckert & Deal, 2012). It has been found that managers can better motivate Baby Boomers with overtime and salary (Gibson, Greenwood, & Murphy, 2009; Gravett & Throckmorton, 2007; Tulgan, 2003) and that they appreciate praise and recognition for their position and status (Parry & Urwin, 2011; Sullivan et al., 2009). If sufficiently enticed, they will embrace and champion a cause, however this needs to be deeply cultivated and inspired (Gibson et al., 2009).

Baby Boomers are also motivated by a desire to have colleagues recognise their experience and wisdom by younger generations (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). When examining the intrinsic and extrinsic motivators for motivation, Gen-Xers value extrinsic reward of salary and benefits (Twenge et al., 2010). For Millennials, work is a priority in life, but it is not the *only* priority (Smola & Sutton, 2002). Millennials have been found to seek greater job security than their predecessors (Kowske et al., 2010; Twenge, 2010).

Gen-Xers, wary of the experience of their parents' job-insecurity have an ingrained belief in the necessity of constant training and up-skilling (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). This form of self-improvement reflects their innate value of self-sufficiency (Eisner, 2011). However, less independent, Millennials have been found to perform best when their workplace goals and product are closely individualised to their

own ability (Glass, 2007), which reflect their desire for recognition based on who they are and not what they achieve (Baruch, 2004; Staff & Schulenberg, 2010).

Both Salt (2007) and Sayers (2007) found that Millennial employees also desire deep social relationships and network of friends in the workplace and therefore are highly motivated when they find the workplace socially-vibrant and enjoyable to work in (Sayers, 2007). Millennials are more likely to be less committed to their employer and more likely to experience greater job mobility and higher pay (Richardson, 2010; Taylor & Keeter, 2010); depending upon availability, opportunity and developing their breadth of experience (Twenge & Campbell, 2011; Van Velsor & Wright, 2012). Many attribute this to their experience as they have entered the professional phase of their lives, and by necessity, responding to the twin influences of globalisation and the 2008 Global Financial Crisis (Eckert & Deal, 2012; Park, Twenge, & Greenfield, 2014). Millennials have a strong affinity to social responsibility (Wright, Marvel, & Des Marteau, 2014).

There are considerable differences between the generational cohorts in terms of motivation, and therefore, it is advantageous to research further how this trait is reflected within teacher aspirations towards leadership roles.

2.4.2 Work Ethic

When it comes to the issue of perceived generational differences, work ethic another significant starting point for study (Taylor & Keeter, 2010). This value is commonly shared by each of the generations currently in the workforce. Statistical evidence is shown to prove that work ethic is a key to personal and vocational success (Meriac et al., 2010). Hulin and Judge (2003) generally define attitudes towards work ethic as both cognitive and affective; and they vary from generation to generation

(Becton et al., 2014; Cogin, 2012; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Strauss & Howe, 2000; Twenge, 2010), although it is mixed and incongruous (Kowske et al., 2010). Twenge (2010) found that Gen-Xers and Millennials shared a common lower attitude to work ethic than Boomers (Cennamo & Gardner, 2011).

Baby Boomers perceive younger generations as having have poorer work ethic and are unwilling to work hard as they do (Appelbaum et al., 2004; Zemke et al., 2013; Sullivan et al., 2009). With the exponential development of societal and cultural attitudes along other influences such as technology and material growth, newer generations demonstrate more identifiably different values than preceding generations with potential for conflict (Lancaster & Stillman, 2009; Murphy, Gibson, & Greenwood, 2010; Twenge & Campbell, 2011; Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). In a study involving 8,040 participants, Gen-Xers have been found to be less likely to work than Millennials and Baby Boomers (Becton et al., 2014; Twenge et al., 2010), therefore contending the stereotype that Millennials are less hard-working than the previous two generations (Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2007).

Using the MWEP (Multi-dimensional Work Ethic Profile), Meriac et al. (2010) found that Millennials ranked higher than Gen-Xers on the dimensions of hard work, gratification-delay and individual morality. Smola and Sutton (2002) found that cohort attitudes toward work ethic change and evolve over time. In a significant meta-analysis study of 20 other studies, it was found that although the different generational cohorts do have conflicting perceptions of each other, these differences have not been supported (Costanza, Badger, Fraser, Severt, & Gade, 2012). Twenge et al. (2010) in a study involving over 15,000 high school graduates who were measured in 1976, 1991 and 2006 found that Gen-Xers and Millennials place less value on working for work's sake or as

the ultimate means of defining of personal identity; instead seeking greater balance between their career and other lifestyle factors such as family and leisure (Meriac et al., 2010).

Millennials are also willing to place family and friends before workplace commitments (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008). This emphasis of balance can be perceived as a lack of commitment to the workplace and therefore is worth further exploration. Other studies have also supported this trend of increased primacy and importance of family and leisure in work/life balance (Lai, Chang, & Lien, 2012; Meriac et al., 2010). The younger generations have a great desire for workplace flexibility (Real, Mitnick, & Maloney, 2010; Twenge, 2010; Wong et al., 2008), which is also strongly influenced by family influences (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010), and that these changing priorities do contribute to workplace management-tension (Galinsky, Aumann, & Bond, 2009). Hansen and Leuty (2012) found in their 30-year study of 1689 participants representing the different generational cohorts using the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire measuring 20 attributes of work ethic that there were not significant differences of work-related attitudes. Interestingly in contrast to stereotype, this study, the strength of which was on its ability to distinguish between generational and age differences, found that Gen-Xers placed greater importance on working conditions and ethic than Baby Boomers and Millennials (Hansen & Leuty, 2012).

Reviewing this trait of Work Ethic within pre-dominantly commercial literature, has found that there is a need for further research into inter-generational perceptions of how this trait directly contribute to teacher perceptions in the school workplace, and, their potential leadership aspirations.

2.4.3 Professional Feedback & Mentoring

Feedback and mentoring are both developmental training techniques utilised for the professional skill and ability of workplace employees. The different generations in the workplace have differing preferences and expectations in how these methods are conducted.

Baby Boomers require little ongoing, regular feedback instead preferring to get on with the job (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). Gen-Xers are accustomed to receiving feedback via email or other forms of digital communication (Glass, 2007; Smyrl, 2011).

When it comes to expectations for mentoring Gen-Xers feel that they have had to be self-reliant and not depend upon Baby Boomers who did not actively mentor, and therefore do not believe they are obliged to mentor Millennials, expecting them to do their job (Deal et al., 2010; Tang et al., 2012). Millennials share this trait with Gen-Xers, however they prefer this form of feedback engagement on a personal face-to-face level (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998; Zemke et al., 2013). This suggests their preference for coaching, as opposed to being directed (Sayers, 2007; Sajjadi, Sun, & Castillo, 2012).

Millennials are more likely to respond positively to continuous feedback than older generational cohorts (Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Smyrl, 2011). Sujansky and Ferri-Reed (2009) found that Millennials both desire and demand frequent and honest feedback from their older colleagues, especially leaders. They find formal processes of role reviews and evaluations as impersonal and redundant (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012; Smyrl, 2011). Millennials require a different management style experienced and practiced by Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers, preferring an individualised, 1:1 coaching style from their supervisors as experienced from their personalised experience in education (Sauser & Sims, 2012). This includes being led by a manager or supervisor who understands the

value of mentoring to cultivate creativity (Espinoza, Ukleja, & Rusch, 2010; Staff & Schulenberg, 2010). However, this coaching model preference is seen by older generations as an inconvenient imposition on their time and need to explain rationale behind decision-making (Strauss & Howe, 2000; Twenge et al., 2010). This demand by Millennials for access includes 1:1 communication, and they are near-relentless with their questioning (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Eisner, 2011). Both Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers are dismissive of what they perceive as unwillingness by Millennials to undertake menial work associated with their roles (Sauser & Sims, 2012; Zemke et al., 2013). When willing to mentor younger generations, Baby Boomers have an expectation that their approach and process would be readily accepted and adopted (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008). Millennials prefer to be mentored by Baby Boomers who they see as authoritative and knowledgeable, rather than Gen-Xers who they believe are jaded and cynical (Morrison, Erickson, & Dychtwald, 2006).

Both Sayers (2007) and Steinmetz (2007) mutually supported each others' findings that Millennials desire a personalised approach to being motivated and professionally developed; and that these come from a need for strong relational engagement and individualised stimulation. Steinmetz (2007) in her study of university students, also noted how this is linked to Millennials' need for respect, encouragement and support from their supervisors.

Sherman (2008), Smyrl (2011) and Stevens (2010) found that employers need to be adaptable with multiple, rather than a single approach to knowledge transfer between their generational cohorts. A singular, formal 'one-size-fits-all' approach to the professional development and training of staff is ineffective (Parry & Tyson, 2011; Sherman, 2008; Ware, Craft, & Kerschenbaum, 2007).

Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007, p. 359) endorse the utilisation of a mentoring program for the twin purposes of knowledge/skills transfer and the mutual benefit of workers across both ends of the generational spectrum learning from another. Stevens (2010) also actively encourages a concept of reverse mentoring where knowledge and experience is mentored in both directions between generational cohorts, especially as a method to minimise inter-generational misunderstanding (Burch & Strawderman, 2014) and maximise shared benefit of workplace skills and other factors including technology (Aiman-Smith, Bergey, Cantwell, & Doran, 2006, pp.75-76).

2.4.4 Leadership Preferences and Expectations

There are numerous areas of difference between the generations upon leadership attitudes towards expectations, aspirations, advancement, succession management, suitability, and, retention issues.

Despite being closer to Baby Boomers in age, on matters of management style, Gen-Xers are anxious, frustrated and increasingly disengaged because Baby Boomers are working longer in the workplace than previous generations (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). They also feel that they are being blocked from promotion and are seen as reluctant in surrendering leadership opportunities and ‘pipelines’ towards those roles (Fink & Brayman, 2006; Fox, 2011; Layton, 2015; You, 2015).

Gen-Xers are worried that they will be passed over when the Baby Boomers retire and that these positions will be given to Millennials, despite their patience and length of waiting (Zemke et al., 2013). In watching this phenomenon, Millennials see Gen-Xers as cynical bitter and abrasive; and interpret these characteristics as a motivation and

tendency to withhold knowledge transfer (Aiman-Smith, Bergey, Cantwell, & Doran, 2006, p. 75; Smyrl, 2011).

A perceived trait confirmed by research is that Millennials have a higher expectation for career ascension (Kowske et al., 2010; Murphy, 2006). This desire for quick promotion may be due to the attention and recognition in their formative pre-adult years (De Hauw & De Vos, 2010). There has also been links established between Millennials' desire to be fast-tracked through leadership development programs (Glass, 2007; Ng, Lyons & Schweitzer, 2012) their need for career-portability rather than popular assumption that this is based on their need for affirmation (Stillman & Lancaster, 2014a; Tulgan, 2009; Zemke et al., 2013). Vicere (2005) recommends that employers are able to tap directly into Millennials' desire to have an impact by encouraging inclusive decision-making and shared-leadership processes (Albion & Gutke, 2010). Millennials' desire to be trusted and involved in decision-making contribute to their ideal candidacy for employers seeking to establish a culture of shared leadership in their organisations.

2.4.5 Hierarchy

For the purpose of this study, term 'hierarchy' refers to the leadership structure, personnel administration of an organisation. Perceptions towards leadership culture and practice are a key determinant in the aspirations of employees considering applying for management roles.

Baby Boomers are associated with a deep appreciation for organisational loyalty, professionalism, authority and hierarchical organisational leadership (D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008; Eckert & Deal, 2012; Davis, Pawlowski, & Houston, 2006; Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2007; Tolbize, 2008). On advancement they feel they deserve from longevity and

experience to have the right to be in charge (Gibson et al., 2009), and prefer a ‘top-down’ model of management (Haeberle et al., 2009; Smith & Clurman, 1997). Generational dynamics and organisational hierarchy are deeply connected. Salt (2007) confirmed the findings Sayers (2007) and Steinmetz (2007) that key hierarchical structures and processes were currently preferentially designed, maintained and protected by Baby Boomers, and that this provokes some forms of conflict, resentment, and frustration from Gen-Xers and Millennials (Karp et al., 2002).

Millennials view Baby Boomers as being ‘risk-averse’ and are frustrated by what they view as only being communicated to on a ‘need-to-know’ basis (Eisner, 2011). Lester et al. (2012) found that Millennials perceived Baby Boomers as valuing formal authority based on structures and role titles than Baby Boomers self-reported. While priding themselves as being equal and consultative in their management style, Baby Boomers often instead have a tendency to micro-manage (Twenge et al., 2010; Zemke et al., 2013). Millennials desire to be at the apex of organisational decision-making (Zemke et al., 2013) especially on matters that directly affect them, despite doubts by older generational cohorts about their capability, experience and questions as to whether they have ‘earnt’ that right (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). Gen-Xer’s have a preference for being allowed to undertake their job without constant supervision or micro-management, due to their independent self-reliance (Cekada, 2012; Raines & Arnsperger, 2009).

Millennials are distrustful of organisations, but not necessarily organisational leaders (Becton et al., 2014). They are viewed as being lower in their commitment (D’Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008; Haeberle et al., 2009). Howe and Nadler (2012) noted that despite their stereotype, Millennials are respectful of authority and organisation structure as long as expectations are clearly identified, purpose-driven, and adhered to with

consistency (Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). As team members, Millennials have reported that they respond well to authority and structure, value clear expectations and goals, and prefer large teams with strong leaders (Howe & Nadler, 2012). Due to their high-level of education and experience of online socialisation they feel they are capable, yet not sufficiently recognised (Holliday & Li, 2004; Sujansky & Ferri-Reed, 2009) by older generations. Millennials' desire for responsive communication (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007, p. 360), informality between roles and relational interaction with their managers may have contributed to their image as unprofessional (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). In a study involving 400 human resource managers, Taylor and Keeter (2010) found that Millennials are highly frustrated at the change-resistance of older generations, especially Baby Boomers.

In summary, researchers have found that through the lens of GCT it is possible to locate both similarities and differences in the workplace attitudes, beliefs, preferences and practices of organisations and their employees. These factors are relevant when considering how interactive relationships impact workplace dynamics and leadership succession issues. There is significant opportunity for investigation as to whether these factors can also be found within the context of Catholic education, and how these factors may affect and influence school leadership shortages.

2.5 Changing Generational Demographics In The Education Sector

This next section of the literature review seeks to explore research undertaken on the demographic nature of the teaching workforce and is an essential foundation for understanding the context within which the study is undertaken; exploration of the

potentiality of these demographics in influencing the nature of the phenomenon of generational differences itself; as well as, the leadership aspirations of teachers.

Australia's workforce is ageing (ABS, 2006, 2014). A significant slowing of Australia's population growth has been projected to lower further in the next five decades, declining from 1% to 0.2% anticipated for 2040 (ABS, 2006). In 1976, the average working age was 28, in 2006 it was 37, and in 2016, it is 40 (ABS, 2006).

Subsequently, the Australian workplace includes three generations spanning 60 years (ABS, 2006, 2014; Access Economics, 2001). A defining moment in Australian federal public policy was the Federal Government's 2002 *Intergenerational Report* (Commonwealth Department of Treasury [CDT], 2002) that, in response to a growing national recognition of Australia's ageing population required substantial policy direction, examined the predicted societal and economic impact of the changing nature and demographics of Australia's workforce (CDT, 2002). Its latest 2015 edition (CDT, 2015) predicted that Australia's 'ageing population, economic growth is projected to be slightly slower over the next 40 years than over the past 40 years.' (p. xii)

Significant sociological and corporate research has been undertaken in exploring the differing characteristics of these generations in the commercial sector (Burke, Antoniou & Cooper, 2015; Edger, 2005; Jorgensen, 2003; Yu & Miller, 2005; Salt, 2004; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

Table 2.4

Australia's Generational Population and Workplace Profile

Generation	Population	Percentage of Population 2014	Percentage of Workforce 2014	Percentage of Workforce 2025
Baby Boomers	5.2 million	22%	27%	13%
Gen-Xers	4.86 million	21%	35%	29%
Generation Y	5.1 million	22%	31	31%

Source: McCrindle Research, 2014.

Recognition of an examination of the impact of generational differences in educational institutions has increased (Lovely & Buffum, 2007). These workplace trends in Australia (refer to Table 2.4) are reflected in the educational context and give demographical foundation for investigating generational differences and leadership succession.

2.5.1 Demographics of Teachers in Australia

The ageing of Australia's teaching workforce and the education system's difficulty in retaining younger generations of teachers, is directly affecting school leadership succession (McKenzie et al., 2014). Considering potential leadership candidates are drawn from teacher ranks, it is essential to understand the nature and effectiveness of 'pipelines' of candidates for identification, professional training, and planning for future role opportunities (Fink, 2011). Therefore, it is appropriate to study the demographic profile of teachers, and how this profile has transformed in recent decades (McKenzie et al., 2014; Weldon, 2015).

Approximately 42% of teachers in 1981 were under the age of 30 years, however by 2008, this figure had decreased to 16% (Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations [DEEWR], 2007). The over-50 grouping of teachers had increased to 32% (DEEWR, 2008). By 2008, the average age of a secondary teacher in Australia had increased to 44 (DEEWR, 2008). The largest population distribution of teachers by percentage (49%) was also between the Baby Boomer bracket of 41-55 years of age (DEEWR, 2008), and represent profound implications for staffing and leadership succession as this group plans for retirement in the coming 10 to 15 years (refer to Table 2.5).

Table 2.5

Percentage of Secondary Teachers by Age in 2007 and 2013

Secondary Teachers by %		
Age Range	2007	2013
21-25	5	6
26-30	11	13
31-35	10	13
36-40	11	10
41-45	14	12
46-50	16	13
51-55	19	14
56-60	11	13
61-65	4	4
66 +	1	1
TOTAL	100	100
Age Average	44	44

Sources: DEEWR, 2008; McKenzie et al. 2008; McKenzie et al. 2014

With the impending retirements of teachers in the coming decade, is the increased numbers of teachers leaving the education sector (Canavan, 2007; Weldon, 2015). This

attrition of teaching staff, has led education authorities and government policymakers to be alarmed at the impact of this loss of knowledge and experience from the profession (Canavan, 2007; DEEWR, 2008; Gronn & Lacey, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2014). Gronn (2003a) suggests that the key reason that the education system is struggling with increasing teacher-attrition can be attributed to career-disenchantment. This 'unsure' figure potentially suggests a lack of confidence and dissatisfaction from these teachers (McKenzie et al., 2014). The *Teacher workforce data and planning processes in Australia* report found that 43% of those teachers considering leaving the profession are for familial motivations (DEEWR, 2008). McKenzie et al. (2014) found that 45% of teachers under the age of 35 are looking towards opportunities outside the profession for better financial incentives or work/life balance (Weldon & Ingvarson, 2016). Factors contributing to teachers deciding to seek opportunities outside of the profession suggest dissatisfaction with their existing workplace (Australian Education Union [AEU], 2005; Barty, Thomson, Blackmore, & Sachs, 2005; Canavan, 2007). Both the AEU (2005) and Canavan (2007) agree with the findings of increasing disenchantment of teachers from all generations, citing the large percentages of younger teachers planning on leaving the profession within their first 5 years of practice. This alarming rate at the younger end of the teacher demographic scale represents an increasing burden on educational authorities and existing school leaders to retain younger generations of teachers; failure to do so only pressures the already declining number of leadership aspirants. With teacher-attrition representing a significant problem for classroom staffing, it translates into being a key contributor to the problem of replenishing teacher-leaders from their ranks (DEEWR, 2008; Gronn, 2007; McKenzie et al., 2014).

In Victoria, the Teacher Supply and Demand Reference Group (TSDRG) found in its 2006 report that the age profile of principals in all three sectors – Government, Catholic and Independent – were ageing (TSDRG, 2006). This fact too was reflected in other senior school leadership positions. In the previous 10 years, in 1996, approximately 38% of principals were over 50 years of age and by 2006, that figure had grown to 65% (TSDRG, 2006).

Table 2.6

Percentage of Catholic Teachers intending to leave teaching before retirement in 2007 and 2014

Teacher Leaving Intentions	Percentage of Secondary Catholic Teacher	
	2007	2013
Yes	10	8.4
No	48	56.9
Unsure	36	34.7
Unknown	6	-
No.	100	100

Source: DEEWR, 2008; McKenzie et al. 2008; McKenzie et al. 2014

In the Catholic sector, approximately 12% of teachers left the Catholic system annually (TSDRG, 2006). These ageing and attrition rates place incredible pressure on the Catholic system's ability to replenish and retain school leadership in senior leadership positions (Canavan, 2013; Canavan, 2007; Gronn, 2007). In the Catholic sector (refer to Table 2.6) authorities Australia-wide are both alarmed at the percentage of teachers intending to leave the profession before retirement (10%) and the number of those who are unsure (36%). This presents a profound problem and implications for the Catholic sector in preparing long-term strategies for leadership recruitment and succession.

2.5.2 Demographics of School leaders in Australia

Of 20,000 principals and deputies across Australia, the average age is 50 (DEEWR, 2007). This will have profound implications for the teacher and school leader workforce of Australia's schools, in terms of staffing (DEEWR, 2007), leadership succession and development (Marks, 2013; McKenzie et al., 2014; Watterston, 2015), policy planning (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership [AITSL], 2015), pedagogical knowledge transfer (Guerriero, 2014), student outcomes (Mulford, Leithwood & Silins, 2006), and curriculum innovation (Lane, 2012).

Under the auspices of the Australian Council of Educational Research, McKenzie et al. (2014) published their *Staff in Australia's Schools 2013* report. The report's purpose was to investigate the nature of Australia's education sector from the responses of nearly 13, 000 teachers and school leaders. A significant portion of the report covered the leadership-intentionality of teachers and school leaders. Its authors McKenzie et al. (2014) noted significant concerns concerning the declining rate of leadership-intentionality and aspiration by teachers and existing leaders in pursuing more senior leadership roles. Its key findings included that within the Catholic sector, the average age of a school leader was 51.7 (McKenzie et al., 2014). This mean-age is only getting older as the report found that while in 2010 the modal age across all education systems (Government, Catholic and Independent) changed from 51-55 years to 56-60 in 2013 (McKenzie et al., 2014). The number of leaders in Catholic secondary schools in the 41-45 year age group declined also in this 3-year period. A major area covered in the report included motivational factors for teachers in aspiring towards a senior leadership position (McKenzie et al., 2014). Only 7.5% of secondary teachers have any intention of applying

for a Principal or Deputy role within the next 3 years (McKenzie et al., 2014). They also found that the three biggest contributing reasons for not intending to apply for senior leadership positions are time demands, perceived difficulty in achieving a comfortable work/life balance, and, their desire to remain in the classroom working with students (McKenzie et al., 2014). This is important to consider when reflecting upon motivational factors concerning generational perceptions and desirability of leadership roles. Another key contributing finding was that increasing workload and school-related activities for school leaders averaged 58.5 hours per week in 2013 (McKenzie et al., 2014), rising to 60 hours per week in 2016 (Weldon & Ingvarson, 2016). This is also particularly relevant concerning motivation when considered alongside the increase of principal (and deputy) salaries (McKenzie et al., 2014). This confirms that work/life balance is increasing in importance as a motivational factor alongside more traditional incentives such as salary and remuneration. As in previous reports in 2007 and 2010, role perks such a ‘community standing’ and salary or financial benefits were not over-arching motivators for their decision to apply for a senior role (McKenzie et al., 2014). While those have senior roles state their high level of individual role-satisfaction, 29.7% of leaders believe that these roles are unattractive to future potential applicants (McKenzie et al., 2014).

This senior leadership shortage is also discussed in the *OECD: Improving leadership activity – Australia country background* report (Department of Education, Science, and Training [DEST], 2007). It found that the global decline in rates for teachers applying for these positions was presenting a significant leadership succession problem. It distinctly mentioned both issues concerning generational-replenishment of senior school leaders, alongside the considerations and perceived concerns of wellbeing and

work/life balance concerns linked to these roles (DEST, 2007). Also included were reasons centred around parental expectations or administrative burdens (DEST, 2007).

In acknowledging these government and sector-sanctioned reports, and other studies, Marks (2013) proposes a strategy of retaining principals to alleviate the unbalanced ratio of those senior leaders retiring and the declining rate of aspirant applicants. He notes the gap in research towards the reasons younger generations offer for not seeking these roles, such as a desire to remain in the classroom, rejection of perceived increase of administrative burden, and work/life balance (Marks, 2013).

Table 2.7 presents a summary of numerous studies that have been undertaken in Australia's states investigating the scope of this educational leadership succession problem (Barty et al., 2005; d'Arbon et al., 2002; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; Marks, 2013; Watson, 2007).

Table 2.7

Summary of key state-based reports on leadership succession in Australia

	Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei (2003)	d'Arbon et al. (2002)	Barty et al. (2005)	Watson (2007)	Marks (2013)
Is there a senior leadership shortage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declining rate of both quality and quantity of candidates high number of principals can be expected to exit over the coming decade declining rate of applicants per role increasing each year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Retirement & low replenishment rate Significant number of middle or senior leaders (42%) unwilling to apply for principal Only 6% actively applying for senior roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shrinking rate of applicants Current grouping of principals the oldest cohort in teaching service Increasing number of retiring leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'declining pool of applicants' has reached a 'crisis' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number of senior leadership retirements
Reasons for shortages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ageing demographic of teacher-leaders Lack of engagement and opportunity for potential candidates Leadership is 'greedy work/ occupational servitude' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ageing demographic of teacher-leaders Leadership disengagement Risk of litigation/ industrial relation issues Impact of work demand on family life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ageing demographics Declining number of applicants Locational geography of available roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ageing demographics Role perceived as 'stressful' and 'demanding' Tension between desiring of being 'educational leader' versus reality of being 'manager' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ageing demographics Unmatching replenishment rate of aspirants to replace incumbents

Motivational factors contributing to reluctance of younger generations to apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplace politics • Concerns over increased role administrative & accountability duties • Little effort recruiting 'next generation' • Middle leaders not desiring senior roles due to perceptions of administrative burden • 'blockage' by institutional and leader incumbency in 'pipelines' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work/life balance • Reluctance of younger potential candidates over recruitment process and 'cloning' expectations • Concern over 'fairness' and 'integrity' of application process • 41% deterred by requirement to be a practising Catholic to be a senior leader • 71% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parental expectations • Administrative burden • Work/life balance • Concerns of younger staff 'suitability' by older leaders • Rigid incumbency of older senior leaders • Workplace politics & integrity of application process • Negative interaction of leadership after interaction with existing senior leaders • Negative media portrayal of principal/leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large percentage (24%) would like to apply but for role perceptions • Concerned about upward 'mobility' and role flexibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle leaders and younger teachers concerned about leadership pressures • 'Generational collide' • Proposes principal-retention strategies to accommodate/alleviate shortages
---	---	---	--	---	--

These studies explored a range of motivational and personal factors contributing to senior leadership shortages.

2.6 Connecting Generational Workplace Differences and Leadership Succession

When it comes to managing an effective process of leadership succession within organisations, Conger and Fulmer (2003) believe that, "At the foundation of a shift toward succession management is a belief that *leadership* talent directly affects organizational performance" (p. 84).

Salopek (2007) believes that succession management "can be a valuable weapon in the battle for talent. Aside from the obvious benefits of ensuring future leadership and

shoring up bench strength, succession management can aid your company's recruitment and retention programs” (p. 22). He also links the concept of generations in the workplace by noting the importance of “tailoring” development across the generations in reviewing an earlier edition of the work by Zemke et al. (2013).

Rothwell (2005) advocates that organisations should form and develop talent-pools of teams or individuals for latitudinal or ascending role opportunities. He believes an organisation that develops a succession culture, as opposed to the successional cultivation of individuals is preferable in being better prepared for that organisation’s future leadership requirements (Rothwell, 2005).

Conger and Fulmer (2003) agree with this approach, stating that succession management, “must be a flexible system oriented toward developmental activities, not a rigid list of high-potential employees and the slots they might fill” (p. 78). This way, an organisation’s efforts does not risk only replacing existing roles, but rather, are culturally focused upon leadership successors ready to inherit existing leadership responsibility as well as being prepared for further organisational growth and innovative adaptability (Parry, 2015; Rothwell, 2005).

In their definition of leadership succession Charan, Drotter and Noel (2001) invoke the allegory of an organisational ‘pipeline’ that also encapsulates a model and process, in their definition of leadership succession. They describe leadership succession as an “enterprise by filling the pipeline with high-performing people to assure that every leadership level has an abundance of these performers to draw from both now and in the future” (p. 167). For this ‘pipeline’ to work, they call for leadership at all organisational levels to be proactively engaged in the cultivation of leaders at all levels; and inter-level interaction to be high in design, competence and performance (Charan, Drotter, & Noel,

2001). Specifically relevant to this study into inter-generational relationship dynamics, Karaevli and Hall (2003) believe that the need for the utilisation of developmental relationships in cultivating the next generation of leaders is imperative (Karaevli & Hall, 2003). This ‘pipeline’ allegory is also effectively utilised by Fink (2011) in his examination of leadership shortages in Catholic education in Australia.

An organisation’s staff and the nature and ability in which they interact are at the heart of any school’s organisational behaviour and culture. Therefore in terms of educational leadership management and succession, Hart (1993) found that socialisation is a key factor in her two case studies into the organisational socialisation of a new leader by existing staff within an established school culture. By definition, Hart (1993) proposed four phases of the leadership transition process including looking ahead, enchantment, disenchantment, and equilibrium. The key ingredient for the manner and process of these phases interacting are the relational dynamics of the staff within the context (Hart, 1993). This involves cultivation of relational engagement by the organisation’s leaders, where individuals at different levels of leadership can interact and negotiate their different identities (Fink, 2011; Rothwell, 2005).

With the changing nature of work and management dynamics, Cetron and Davies (2005) note that “the new generation of worker cannot be hired and then ignored. They must be nurtured, paid well, and made to feel appreciated” (p. 45). Stone-Johnson (2016) directly links how GCT influences, and therefore, can be utilised to better understand and implement educational leadership change and management.

Therefore, in sectors such as education where employees with specific workplace skills are in short supply, it is critical for organisations to attract and retain talented staff (Cetron & Davies, 2005). School system authorities must realise that traditional methods

of leadership recruitment, succession and retention of teachers are no longer suitable for a workforce who are incentivised and motivated by changing needs, values and expectations (Di Paola, 2003). Leadership succession is also key not only to the health to a school's leadership, but also in turn, that school's long-term performance (Duignan & Bezzina, 2006; Fink, 2011; Fink & Brayman, 2006; Zepeda, Bengtson, & Parylo, 2012).

There is little, if any research undertaken as to the reasons why younger generations are reluctant to undertake middle or senior leadership roles in educational institutions (d'Arbon, Duignan, & Duncan, 2001; Barty et al., 2005; Dorman & d'Arbon, 2003a, 2003b; Gronn & Lacey, 2006; Gurr & Drysdale, 2013; Rhodes, 2012; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009; Ruwoldt, 2006). Research has been undertaken by Catholic Education Offices across Australia investigating leadership succession issues, for example reports undertaken in the two largest diocesan education systems of Sydney and Melbourne including the *A Catholic School Leadership Framework* (Catholic Education Office Sydney [CEOS], 2001), and *Leadership in Catholic Schools* (Catholic Education Office Melbourne [CEOM], 2005).

Much literature has been written on the need for leadership succession development within Catholic schools within Australia. Current research on the leadership role of school principal and the need for succession planning is wide-ranging (Canavan, 1999; d'Arbon et al, 2002; Fink & Brayman, 2006). However, almost exclusively, this concern has concentrated upon the role of principal.

Specifically, literature in Australia into the increasingly-daunting demands of a principal's administrative work and the daily dilemmas they face (Addison & Brundrett, 2008; Fink, 2011; Lacey, 2004; Marks, 2013; Mulford, 2008; Weldon & Ingvarson, 2016), is reflective of increasing pressures that senior leaders in schools face each day

(Gronn & Lacey, 2005; Gronn & Lacey, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2014). These anecdotal and empirical studies have fed into media reports that demonstrate this issue is not only localised in Australia, but is also manifesting in the United States, England, and Canada where there is also a growing shortage of candidates for senior education leadership positions (Bloom, 2015; Busher, 2005; Day, 2009; McKenzie et al., 2014; Ng & Szeto, 2015; Rowe, 2000; Winton & Pollock, 2013).

As Canavan (2013) predicted, there was little evidence that Catholic schools were embracing succession strategies, “apart from an ardent prayer that there will be someone out there, somewhere, who will be able to fill the vacancy” (p. 73).

This phenomenon is shared by the fact that principals are recruited from the ranks of teachers and in Western countries (Fink & Brayman, 2006, p. 63; Renihan, 2012), the numbers of people joining the ranks of the teaching profession has declined, thus creating a shortage of leadership recruitment (Barker, 2006; Blandford, 2006; Bush, 2011; Cowie & Crawford, 2009; Gurr & Drysdale, 2012; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Lewis & Butcher, 2003; Quezada, 2015; Slater, 2008; Zuljan & Vogrinc, 2011). If there is a shortage of teachers and potential leadership candidates, then it is logical that the impact of subsequent leadership shortages in Australia must be investigated (Gronn, 2003b, 2007; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; McKenzie et al., 2014). Given the growing popularity of Catholic schools the reluctance of teachers to take on senior leadership roles, has led to a leadership-candidate crisis that ultimately impacts the effectiveness and cohesion of schools (d’Arbon et al., 2001; Duncan, 2002; Fink, 2011; Gronn & Lacey, 2005).

One effort written over ten years ago, was the *Leadership Succession for Catholic Schools in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania* report (Carlin, d’Arbon, Dorman,

Duignan & Neidhart, 2003). This was an extensive study on leadership succession undertaken by Catholic education authorities from Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania. The report identifies the key reasons for people unwilling to apply for senior leadership positions in Victoria, Australia. However, there is an emphasis on leadership succession focussed upon the end goal of increasing candidates for principal positions, rather than developing middle to senior leaders for the sake of those positions in themselves to increase the quality of the school's learning environment. Many principals who participated in the study felt they had limited experience and development in middle leadership positions such as coordinator or faculty head (23% of respondents) or only experienced a middle leadership position in one school (29% of respondents). In Melbourne, 50% responded that they were deputy principal in only one school. This factor was a contributing feeling of unpreparedness readiness in becoming principal. One of the reports central recommendations called for the development of a leadership pathways framework to increase leadership capability. Another finding was the reluctance of senior leaders to apply for principalship due to overwhelming administrative responsibilities and internal/external role expectations. The subsequent report recommendation called for a decentralisation of the principal's duties through a shared, distributive leadership model. However, for such responsibilities to be devolved there needs to be greater capability development amongst the school's emerging and middle leaders.

The Catholic Education Office Melbourne [CEOM] (2005) has since developed the *Leadership Standards Framework*, a continuum of leadership formation designed to increase leadership capability of educators. The framework is driven by five guiding conceptions of leadership sourced from the work of Elmore (2000) and Fullan (2004) that

calls for schools to develop leaders at various stages of the leadership path. Initially, development focussed upon aspiring principals. There have been efforts in middle leadership pathways development, but again in subsequent practice the emphasis is predominantly on increasing principal candidates.

Numerous academics and practitioners have identified the preparation and development of Catholic principals (Bezzina, 2012; Canavan, 2007, 2013; Fink, 2011; Gronn & Lacey, 2004; Marks, 2013) as being critical in planning for the future of the system. The need for systemic planning of leadership succession planning has been responded to by Catholic education officials (CEOM, 2005; CEOS, 2001), but almost exclusively, had been focussed upon the leadership role of principal rather than middle and senior leaders (Fink, 2011).

As much as CEO or Congregational/Private Catholics are struggling to fill principal vacancies, principals themselves are noting that middle/senior leadership positions have to be re-advertised (CEOS, 2001). They also have concern there are fewer suitable or appointable candidates who are willing or having the capacity to apply for these positions. These issues of willingness and suitability/preparedness of generationally-younger teachers are important to explore further in this study.

This second group highlights candidate concern over issues such as role impact on personal life balance, increasing administrative/bureaucratic responsibilities (Canavan, 2013; d'Arbon et al, 2001; Fincham, 2010; Marks, 2013), inflexible role expectations (Canavan, 1999; d'Arbon et al, 2002; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003), insufficient role support and mentoring, time commitment (Fink & Brayman, 2006, p. 67; Marks, 2013), perception of losing proximity in interacting with colleagues and students, gender-related concerns (Neidhart & Carlin, 2003a, 2003b), and adequate compensation/remuneration

(Bezzina, 2012; Fink, 2011). A central factor this study seeks to explore is the question of whether generational differences are contributing to the unwillingness of many younger potential educational leadership aspirants to apply for leadership positions, and whether this perception dynamic requires a rethink in policies and school leadership cultures developed by older generations that they view as inconsistent with their motivation, values, goals, relevance and lifestyles (Caldwell, 2000b; Duignan & Bezzina, 2006) including practices such as hierarchical decision-making, role preparation, mentoring and professional feedback. These areas have all contributed to development of this study's intended survey data-gathering instrument.

These different groups, in their daily interaction in the school setting, develop conflicts that occur because of differing work expectations, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours (Bezzina, 2012; d'Arbon, 2006; Fink, 2011; Marks, 2013). These common-across-all-sector conflicts can lead to frustration (Gronn, 2007), relational misconceptions (Appelbaum et al, 2004), work ethic differences, connection between teacher morale/motivation issues and student performance (OECD, 2016), staff-retention problems (Bezzina, 2012; Duignan, 2006), disenchantment of younger teachers with traditional leadership culture (Duignan & Bezzina, 2006; Lovely & Buffum, 2007); and most significantly, leadership succession failings (d'Arbon, 2006; Fink & Brayman, 2006, p. 79; Gronn, 2007).

Considering the scope of literature on the nature of GCT, and the need for further development of leadership pipelines in Catholic schools, it seems naturally appropriate to explore the relationship between the defining generational differences and how they are contributing towards leadership cultivation and succession (Fink, 2011). It is important that school and system leaders accept that generational similarities and differences are a

legitimate feature of staff diversity and are can be influential in teacher and leadership inter-generational dynamics (Kelan, 2014). These dynamics can potentially lead to either greater staff cohesion or conflict. As each cohort moves through their life-phase, it is equally incumbent on building a leadership culture that is responsive to these current and future needs rather than strictly adhering to methods and practices still strictly designed for generations-past (Addison & Brundrett, 2008; Barty et al., 2005; Fink, 2011; Fink & Brayman, 2006, pp. 71-82; Sherman, 2008).

2.7 Summary of Literature Review Findings

Specifically from the material in this review of literature, this researcher is seeking to explore the generational attitudes towards undertaking leadership activity and dynamics stemming from differing generational expectations in the school workplace; leadership style preferences; work/life balance and ethic; and commitment to mentoring and succession planning. The review of this literature has demonstrated that there is at the very least, a link between perceptions of generational similarities and differences which contribute to inter-generational workplace dynamics and conflict.

This review of literature upon GCT, and the potential of generational differences affecting the leadership aspirations of younger generations of teachers have highlighted several areas for further consideration and study. This summary considers each of these areas and draws conclusions regarding existing gaps in research and opportunities for further investigation.

There has been significant research upon GCT in the commercial sector, particularly in workplace attitudes and relational interaction of employees. The review has found that there are generational differences in the workplace. These differences also

are distinct and obvious in the traits relevant to the direction of this study, including: Motivation, Work Ethic, Professional Feedback and Mentoring, Leadership Preferences and Expectations, and Hierarchy. However, there are minimal studies into how these traits are perceived by teachers in a school workplace, internationally or more locally, in Australia. This conclusion is more evident on the minimal research undertaken within a Catholic school context (Bezzina, 2012; Canavan, 2007; Fink, 2011). Calls for further empirical research of leadership shortages within the Catholic sector have been growing as system-wide implications have been predicted in recent past years, are now currently being realised (Canavan, 2007; Marks, 2013).

Noteworthy research has been undertaken into the demographical nature of existing and predicted school leader shortages in all three education sectors (Government, Independent, and Catholic), and in Australia, there have been extensive national and statewide studies into this phenomenon (McKenzie et al., 2014; Carlin et al., 2003; Dorman & d'Arbon, 2003b; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009). Even still, the majority of studies have focused upon the statistical and geographical nature of school leadership shortages (DEEWR, 2007; DEEWR, 2008; McKenzie et al., 2014; TSDRG, 2006). Contributing reasons, such as retirement intentions, the increasing proportion of ageing, older teachers, and career intentions and retention issues of younger staff have been examined. However, this review has found that there is a need for further research into the nature and motivational factors for teacher-leadership aspiration. This also includes perception variability amongst the three generations of Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennials in how they perceive themselves and each other's generational stereotype and subsequently, how these perceptions contribute to their attitudes and aspirations towards leadership (Gronn & Lacey, 2006). This also includes their generational differences in

their perceptions in expectations of how they are to assume these leadership roles (Gronn & Lacey, 2006). In understanding these leadership aspirational beliefs and attitudes, further exploration of links between inter-generational interaction and influences is required. By exploring how generational perceptions influence teacher and leader relationships, a different range of insights into how teachers perceive leadership and make decisions to become leaders could be discovered. Also minimal in research is investigation of school hierarchies in understanding and accommodating for generational differences in the leadership preferences and development of their teaching staff.

This review has found that while there is some literature on investigations into the aspirations of government, Independent and Catholic sector teachers to apply for leadership roles, almost exclusively, this has centered on the role of principal (AITSL, 2015; Barty et al., 2005; d'Arbon, 2006; Marks, 2013; Ruwoldt, 2006). There is a need for further research into teacher aspirations towards middle, or pipeline, leadership roles (AITSL, 2015; Fink, 2011). More research is required, and has been recommended, into the reasons that contribute to why or why teachers will not apply for these middle roles. This is imperative, as it is from a pool of qualified and prepared middle leaders, where senior leaders will be recruited. Such studies could lead to leadership formational programs that directly seek to support potential school leaders.

There is also a gap in the research of the perceptual differences between younger and older teachers in expectations of role and function of leadership; understanding motivational factors linked with these perceptions; as well as the innate reasons contributing to their decision-making towards applying for middle and senior leadership roles. This gap further extends to the context of Catholic education in

Australia, and more specifically, how these differences outwork in a Catholic secondary school. This substantial gap is explored in this current study.

Informed by the literature review and through the theoretical framework of GCT, this study's goal was to investigate how generational differences influence teacher leadership aspirations.

A question requiring further research and investigation is: *How do generational differences affect leadership succession issues within a Catholic school?*

This question will be investigate in two parts that inform the six hypotheses discussed in the next Chapter:

- Research Question 1: *Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*
- Research Question 2: *Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

Specifically, these hypotheses built from the central research question and secondary research questions seek to answer, thus addressing gaps of evidence concluded from the literature review:

- Identify any generational differences amongst teachers in a Catholic school, and consequently,
- Do these generational differences contribute to the leadership aspirations of younger teachers?

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The only relevant test of the validity of a hypothesis is comparison of prediction with experience. (Friedman, 1953)

3.1 Introduction

This third chapter discusses the theoretical underpinnings for this study, and details the approach and justification for the paradigm and methodology utilised to develop the research questions. The theoretical framework that gives foundation for this study is GCT, and the methodological framework is underpinned by Positivism.

The purpose of this quantitative study is to establish whether there are associations between the traits and characteristics of distinct generations and leadership succession amongst the teaching faculty of a Catholic school.

3.2 Research Questions

This research study seeks to contribute to existing research identified in the literature review in Chapter 2 by examining the existence and nature of perceptions between generational cohorts with a quantitative instrument and measure whether those perceptions influence current leadership succession issues in a Catholic school.

This study seeks to answer the following two research questions:

- Research Question 1: *Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

- Research Question 2: *Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

Out of these two guiding research questions, a series of hypotheses were developed. Within a quantitative design, hypotheses are expected outcomes from predictions made of relationships between variables (Creswell, 2013). The following five hypotheses were developed from the literature review to investigate Research Question 1:

- H1. Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H2. Determinants of Work Ethic are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H3. Perceptions towards Professional Feedback are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H4. Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H5. Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational Cohorts.

Answering the second research question was accomplished through testing the next four hypotheses upon inter-generational attitudes toward a school's Leadership Succession culture:

- H6. A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement and the generation/age of the individual.
- H7. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational Cohorts.
- H8. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning

Leadership Styles amongst Generational Cohorts.

H9. Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences are different between Generational Cohorts.

3.3 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of GCT was utilised to guide this study (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2013), to investigate educational leadership succession characteristics (Fink & Brayman, 2004; Hargreaves, 2005). Zikmund (2003) supports the idea that social theories (such as GCT) provide organisational leaders with a framework to explore perceptions and attitudes (Zikmund, 2003). Through a quantitative method, this study is grounded on the exploration of the beliefs and attitudes towards leadership succession that allows an examination of how a school considers generational differences in planning for progression of teachers into senior leadership roles. Fink and Brayman (2004) found that leadership succession, when not designed and implemented has a negative impact on school performance and student outcomes (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). This study's theoretical framework is outlined in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Generational Cohort Theory and Leadership Succession Model

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
<i>Generational Cohort Theory</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baby Boomers • Gen-Xers • Millennials 	<i>Workplace Behaviours</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation • Work Ethic • Feedback & Mentoring • Leadership Development Culture • School Hierarchy <i>Leadership Planning</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succession Planning • Leadership Mentoring Culture • Leadership Styles & Expectations • Catering for Generational Differences

The literature review has detailed existing research on the independent variable of generational differences (GCT) and dependent variables of workplace behaviours including Motivation, Work Ethic, Feedback and Mentoring, Leadership Development Culture, and School Hierarchy; as well as leadership and succession management including Succession Planning, Leadership Mentoring Culture, Leadership Styles and Expectations, and Catering for Generational Differences (Rothwell, 2005). Therefore, this study seeks to gather empirical data that can identify generational differences with succession management in a school context.

3.4 Methodology: Positivism

This study has been undertaken through a positivist paradigm, with a quantitative instrument for the purpose of collecting data in relation to the aforementioned research questions (Rea & Parker, 2014). Creswell (2013) believes it is important for the researcher to commence with a theory, collect data that either endorses or rejects the

theory, and subsequently, refining and revising the ideas surrounding the theory based on the data's findings. For Creswell (2013), objectivity was a critical aspect of scientific inquiry, and he discusses quantitative strategies that include experiments, quasi-experiments, and correlational studies.

All disciplines of science and humanities have different views of what research is, and how accumulated data and knowledge is cultivated. A paradigm, or worldview and the individual's place within it, is a set of beliefs that inform social reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Mertens, 2005) that in turn can direct how decisions are made when conducting research (Guba, 1990; McGregor & Murnane, 2010). A paradigm, says Kuhn (1962), is "an integrated cluster of substantive concepts, variables and problems attached with corresponding methodological approaches and tools" (p. 8). It allows for methods in thinking upon and understanding complexities including actions and practices within the world (Coetzee, 2001; Johnson & Christensen, 2013; Mertens, 2005; O'Leary, 2010). Creswell (2013), Rooney (2013), and Guba and Lincoln (1994), all note that understanding a paradigm requires three considerations:

1. Ontology – Explores what is the nature of reality, and the form it takes. This allows for an assumption regarding the causes of a particular social behaviour to be rationally explored through an empirical process (Jacquette, 2002).
2. Epistemology – By following a prescribed process, this valuation of independence between the researcher and what can be known guards against a decrease in validity (Rooney, 2013).
3. Methodology - How does the researcher find out whatever they believe can be known? Hypotheses are empirically tested allowing for falsification or confirmation, allowing for replicability (Creswell, 2013).

In the current study, this researcher considered the positivist's belief that true knowledge can only be derived from scientific method – where evidence is yielded from observation (McGregor & Murnane, 2010). In terms of method, Brand (2008) states that positivism is “concerned with experimentation and manipulation; verification of hypotheses forms the basis of this model” (p.433). This includes a process where a series of hypotheses (from the Greek *hau'pvθisis*, meaning to test a supposition) are proposed and examined to investigate phenomena (McGregor & Murnane, 2010). This study is conducted through a positivist paradigm due to its ability to generate hypotheses through deductive reasoning (Creswell, 2013; Kim, 2003) and empirically-detached approach moving from suppositional theory to observation and measurability (Fox, 2014).

The foundational heritage of positivism can be traced back to the 19th Century Enlightenment philosophers Pierre-Simon Laplace (1952) and Auguste Comte (1858). Both believed that knowledge must be based upon scientific method rather than metaphysical beliefs (Comte, Martineau & Harrison, 2000; Gillispie, Fox & Grattan-Guinness, 1997). Swanson and Holton (2005) define postivism as “positivism assumes that an objective world exists and that scientific methods can mirror and measure while seeking to predict and explain causal relations among variables” (p. 18).

Lincoln and Guba (1985) locate the wide acceptance of positivism as an approach to scientific method around the dominance of Utilitarianism where science was viewed as the summit of efforts to solve any problem. In *A System of Logic*, John Stuart Mill (1875) classified and ordered scientific principles that could be applied to social sciences as much as the so-called ‘hard sciences’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

This researcher has synthesised key positivistic dimensions in Table 3.2 when applying to a research process to this study:

Table 3.2

Synthesis of key dimensions of Positivism

	POSITIVISM
KEY IDEAS & ASSUMPTIONS	Facts-driven and value-free approach to scientific knowledge Truth is independent of the researcher World is perceived as external and objective
KEY THEORIES IN PARADIGM	Theory-testing Aim is to theorise, predict and test for explanation
KEY FIGURES	Laplace (1952); Comte (1858); Mill (1875); Durkheim (2014)
PARADIGM GOAL	Theory-measurement Explanations must demonstrate causality/correlations
NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE or FORM OF THEORY	Knowledge is gained from empirical observation Verified hypotheses established as fact or laws Science is both deterministic and mechanistic Replicable findings are in fact, 'true'
CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING RESEARCH	Deductive Reasoning Postulate theories/hypotheses to be tested empirically Verification, not falsifiability Intellectual rigour
UNIT OF ANALYSIS	The variable
RESEARCH METHODS and TYPE(S) OF ANALYSIS	Experiments; quasi-experiments; tests; questionnaires; data analysis; quantitatively coded documents Quantitative: regression; Likert scaling; structural equation modelling Qualitative: grounded theory testing

With positivism, the researcher is able to explore the factors that impact the results. Positivists therefore have an onus to set aside their prejudices and see the world as it is. Kuhn sought to expand scientific discovery from individual theories or suppositions to whole shifts in paradigms or worldviews. In *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) he explains the role of the individual, and that the 'scientific enterprise',

...as a whole does from time to time prove useful, open up new territory, display order, and test long-accepted belief. Nevertheless, the individual engaged on a normal research problem is almost never doing any one of these things. Once engaged, his motivation is of a rather different sort. What then challenges him is the conviction that, if only he is skillful enough, he will succeed in solving a puzzle that no one before has solved or solved so well. (p. 38)

The positivist researcher seeks to ensure this process is value-free and objective to minimise any potential bias in interpretation of results (Creswell, 2013; Gray, 2004; McGregor & Murnane, 2010). On explaining the objective dynamic of the researcher utilising a positivist method, Aliyu, Bello, Kasim & Martin (2014) state that the,

...positivist investigator has an idea or notion that the universe or world conforms to permanent and unchanging laws and rules of causation and happenings; that there exist an intricacy and complexity that could be overcome by reductionism; and with the intention of asserting an importance and emphasis on impartiality, measurement, objectivity and repeatability. (p. 81-82)

In answering questions regarding the nature of reality or relationships between the participant and researcher, there are ontological, axiological and epistemological questions about whether the quantitative approach is independent and value-free/unbiased (Gallagher, 2008; Hawkins & Jacob, 2011); as well as the researcher's objectivity (Angrosino, 2010; Creswell, 2013). A key objective for a researcher when undertaking a quantitative study is to generalise the data findings (Briggs, Coleman & Morrison, 2012; Gray, 2004). That is, can the findings from a study be applied to a wider population of individuals who identify with similar traits and characteristics? For the sake of validity of such a process of generalisation, the sample had to be reflective of the wider group of

people who are the focus of this research. To increase a higher standard of rigour and trustworthiness, emphasis will be placed upon the recording process of this study, as well as scrutiny from other scholars (Corman & Poole, 2000).

As an objective scientific method, positivism is expedient through its ability to investigate ideas and issues through a reduced microcosm of the wider population of individuals for investigation (Gray, 2004). However, due to the fact this study is using a small sample size, the ability to generalise from the findings will be limited.

For this current study, the aim is to locate truth and facts within a series of relationships among variables (Starnes, Yates, Moore, & Yates, 2012). The central independent variables are the assumed cause of relationships amongst selected generational cohorts alongside the dependent variables of workplace attitudes and perceptions towards motivation, work ethic, mentoring, school hierarchy; and leadership dimensions of succession planning, mentoring culture, leadership styles and expectations and, attitudes and awareness of generational differences.

To answer this study's research questions, a quantitative methodology was selected for several reasons:

- Acceptance from the research community
- Its frequent use within business, especially over issues concerning management and human resources (Swanson & Holton, 2005).
- Ability to use a small group of people to “make inference about larger groups that would be prohibitively expensive to study” (Swanson & Holton, 2005, p. 33).
- Quantitative research methods allow for measurement of data.

Selection of the appropriate research design and method requires an approach that

is dependent upon the research question being explored (Robson, 2011). This study seeks to identify issues concerning the perceptions, opinions and beliefs towards each other's generational attitudes on motivation, work ethic, mentoring, and attitudes towards school hierarchy and leadership succession. Cooper and Schindler (2006) state:

Quantitative research attempts precise measurement of something. In business research, quantitative methodologies usually measure consumer behaviours, knowledge, opinions or attitudes. Although the survey is not the only methodology of the quantitative researcher, it is considered a dominant one. (p. 146)

The quantitative approach to research seeks to identify phenomena by analysing collected information using methods that are deductive and mathematically-based (Sukamolson, 2007). Creswell (2013) explained that quantitative methods are used fundamentally to “test or verify theories or explanations, identify variables to study, relate variables in questions or hypotheses, utilise statistical standards of validity and reliability, and employ statistical procedures for analysis” (p. 18).

Creswell (2013) prescribes that all research requires procedural descriptions that are detailed for guidance and maintaining integrity. When it comes to a quantitative method, as is relevant to this study, Creswell (2013) encourages two questions underpinning the design. These questions (Creswell, 2013) concern:

- those involved in the study, and who do they reflect?
- what instrumentation will be used to measure results, and why was this particular instrument selected?

In this study, a group of teachers reflecting a wider population of teaching staff across the Catholic education sector have been selected to participate in the research. As

to instrumentation, a questionnaire for gathering data on teacher attitudes and perceptions concerning generational differences was chosen.

Sukamolson (2007) frames the following criteria for a quantitative approach after the development of a hypothesis:

- Cause and effect
- Static design (i.e. categories isolated before study)
- Generalisations leading to prediction
- Explanation and understanding
- Accurate and reliable through increased validity and reliability

Sukamolson (2007) also identified seven distinct advantages of using the quantitative approach:

1. Offers estimations of wider-populations,
2. Elucidates the extent of people's attitudes and beliefs
3. Produces data for statistical results
4. Gives the researcher comparative data from various groups
5. Apportions precise data that is clear and definitive precision
6. Measures level of occurrence, actions and trends
7. Answers questions such as 'How many?' and 'How often?'

Gerhardt (2004) believes that quantitative research allows for its effectiveness with precision-accuracy and ability to facilitate comparative analysis. This is due to the collected quantitative data being 'hard' factual evidence, acquired through questionnaires (Gerhardt, 2004; Nutley, Walter, & Davies, 2007; Skinner, Tagg, & Holloway, 2000).

Proponents of the quantitative method argue that the value and strength of statistical analysis and comparison lies in its collection of hard data across relatively large

numbers of events, individuals and/or objects (Creswell, 2013; Nutley, Walter, & Davies, 2007). Equally Babbie (2015), Ulmer and Wilson (2003) and Creswell (2013) believe that a higher standard of evaluation occurs with quantitative analysis across distributions, aggregate patterns or key tendencies, probabilities, and correlations.

However, one of the most significant weakness or limitations with quantitative research is in the area of in-depth problem-exploration. Creswell (2013) notes that the quantitative approach utilising predetermined instruments adheres to the positivist claim for knowledge building. Other researchers suggest this is a common misconception over whether things can be explained. For example, Hardy and Bryman (2004) note assertions from critics that there is a limit to the volume of variables in a given study, and the fact that the researcher defines the variables to be studied (Blumer, 1956; Flick, 2009; Gray, 2004). This includes the notion that total verification of relations and final proof are unattainable (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Gray, 2004). Put another way, quantitative methods assume that facts are the same and true for all people, all of the time (Neuman, 2010; Punch, 2013; Robson, 2011). The researcher must have a strong, well-designed plan to allow for a true investigation of both 'what happens' and 'why' of the studied issue. (Babbie, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Sukamolson, 2007).

Another potential limitation, especially regarding questions of validity, is that of the role of researcher and their understanding and practice of objectivity. Individuals have cognitive frameworks and socialisations that shape their worldview and perception (Flick, 2009). The quantitative approach to research begins with the assumption that a researcher, in order to maintain independence, must take a detached and objective stance from the participants of the data collection process (Babbie, 2015; Gray, 2004). This detachment should also include their environment (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This

potentially weak characteristic is acknowledged by Guba and Lincoln (1994) that outsider views “may have little or no meaning within the... studied individuals, groups, societies, or cultures.” (p. 198). However, to guard against this, potential weakness, Creswell (2013) reminds us that variable design and process design can be significant in guarding against bias. His suggestions include a process of cross-checking facts for discrepancies; or other forms of personal bias in the form of content manipulation of the research question and study itself to suit the personal bias of the researcher; information-organisation protocols to enhance integrity (Creswell, 2013).

3.5 Summary

The design of a research study must be foundationally built from sound theoretical framework. It has been argued that the present research study has such a foundation, which enabled a process upon which to build further knowledge and understandings of generational differences associate and influence attitudes and perceptions of teachers towards senior leadership roles within a Catholic school. This chapter outlined the research questions for the investigation, justified the adoption of the selected paradigm and methodology, as well as identified the utilised research instrument as the means for gathering data from a group of teachers from a Catholic school. This chapter also covered the study’s research questions, paradigm, method, hypotheses, instrumentation and data collection and analysis; and finally, potential study limitations and delimitations. The next chapter outlines the characteristics of the instrument sample, description of the instrument and procedures followed to gather the data.

CHAPTER 4

THE PRESENT STUDY

“We do not see things as they are, we see it as we are.” (Nin, 1961)

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the quantitative instrumentation, data collection, nature of the sample participants, and the subsequent process of data analysis. It then summarises issues of validity, reliability, limitations, and delimitations, and finishes with a reflection of the study’s ethical considerations.

4.2 Sampling

Samples are designed to represent large populations (Butcher, 1966; Scheaffer, 2012). Instead of representing larger populations, smaller samplings of participants can be used to provide important data (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 2003; Groves, 2004).

Adopting a non-probability sampling method (Levy & Lemeshow, 2013), the units of data for this study are the teaching staff of a school who encompass the three generational cohorts studied for this enquiry.

A commonly-used form of sampling is the convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling uses participants who are easily accessible to the researcher, and who agree to undertake the sample-instrument (Salkind, 2010, p. 254). The researcher is able to distribute an instrument to whoever is available, meets the eligibility criteria, and who is willing to participate (Creswell, 2008). Its greatest advantage is that it is easy to use in both time and geographical accessibility (Salkind, 2010; Thyer, 2010). Other

benefits include practical factors for the researcher such as expense (Thyer, 2010). A disadvantage is that it is extremely difficult to use this method for representation of a wider population, and therefore, the researcher may make error-laden findings (Creswell, 2008; Scheaffer, 2012).

4.3 Participants

The participants of this enquiry were qualified under the main criterion of being permanent or contract teachers of a school selected to participate in this research study. After several invitations for participation with a number of secondary Catholic schools in the Archdiocese of Melbourne, including two that initially agreed then had to cancel due to competing internal demands, the researcher was able to gain the agreement from the participating school in March 2015.

The sample school was in the inner-east of Melbourne, and consists of 1,100 students. It is a single-sex school (girls) under religious auspices. It has approximately 95 teaching (permanent and contract) staff. It was also located conveniently for easy access for the researcher during the different stages of the study. The selection criteria required participants to be qualified, registered and employed teaching staff of the selected school.

A total of 95 teachers were invited to participate. The school principal was contacted with written correspondence concerning the study's purpose and procedure according to the process prescribed by McMillan and Schumacher (2010), along with the Catholic Education Office Melbourne (CEOM) and Australian Catholic University (ACU) guidelines.

The participation rate of those invited 95 teachers was 56.8% (54 teachers provided responses). Table 4.1 describes the variable name and measurements of demographic section of the questionnaire.

Table 4.1

Generational Perceptions to Teacher-Leadership Instrument (GPSLi) Variables and A Brief Personal Description of Their Measurements

Variable Name	Measurement
Year of Birth	Year of Birth
Years of Service as a Teacher	Period in Years
Gender	Male or Female
In a Leadership Position?	Yes or No

The ‘Year of Birth’ variable enabled identification of the participants within a generational grouping (Baby Boomer, Gen Xer, or Millennial). The ‘Years of Service as a Teacher’ variable identified the length of that participant’s teaching experience in the profession. The ‘Gender’ variable identified the sex of each participant. The ‘In a Leadership Position’ identified the number of participants in a current leadership position. The demographic breakdown of the GPSLi questionnaire participants are described in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Demographic Breakdown of Participants Responding to the GPSLi Questionnaire

Characteristic	Baby Boomer (n=17; 37.7%)	Gen-Xer (n=27; 51.9%)	Millennial (n=8; 15.4%)	Total (n=52)
Gender				
Male	5 (29.4%)	11 (40.7%)	3 (37.5%)	19 (36.5%)
Female	12 (70.6%)	16 (59.3%)	5 (62.5%)	33 (63.5%)
Years of Service				
Less than 1 year	0 (0%)	2 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)
1-5 years	0 (0%)	7 (25.9%)	8 (100%)	15 (28.8%)
6-10 years	0 (0%)	6 (22.2%)	0 (0%)	6 (11.5%)
11-20 years	1 (5.8%)	10 (37.1%)	0 (0%)	11 (21.1%)
More than 20 years	16 (94.2%)	2 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	18 (34.6%)
Have Position of Leadership (POL)				
Yes	10 (58.8%)	11 (40.7%)	1 (12.5%)	22 (42.3%)
No	7 (41.2%)	16 (59.3%)	7 (87.5%)	30 (57.6%)
Intend to Apply for Position of Leadership (POL)				
Yes	8 (47%)	15 (55.6%)	3 (37.5%)	26 (50%)
No	7 (41.2%)	8 (29.6%)	5 (62.5%)	20 (38%)
Maybe	1 (5.9%)	3 (11.1%)	0 (0%)	4 (7.6%)
Missing Response	1 (5.9%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)

The participants of this small sample comprised of 54 instrument participants.

Two were deleted, and two participants had missing data on their instrument. Of the 52 participants whose data were utilised for this study, 17 were Baby Boomers, 27 were

Gen-Xers, and 8 were Millennials.

4.3.1 Gender

Of the group, the generational cohort that comprised of the highest number of women are Baby Boomers (70.6%), followed by Millennials (62.5%), and then Gen-Xers (59.3%). Interestingly, this also indicates a larger gender difference between Baby Boomers, whereas the Millennial and Gen-Xer cohorts were a lot closer to each other. Also significant is the difference of the Baby Boomers' gender percentage from the other two generational cohorts.

4.3.2 Years of Service

Of the sample, there is one group that is distinctly less than others in terms of length of service. Of the 52 participants, only 6 (11.5%) are in the 6-10 years range. These 6 are also exclusively Gen-Xers. The highest number of years of service was with the 18 participants who had served for more than 20 years (34.6%). The second highest grouping was at the lower end of length of service with 15 participants having served between 1-5 years (28.8%). When considering in terms of generational cohort groupings, not surprisingly, the Baby Boomers were the largest group overall in this category of 'length of service', with 16 participants (94.2%). No Baby Boomers were in the three groups under 10 years of length of service. Gen-Xers were second in group-size with 10 participants (37.1%). For Millennials, they were only located in the 1-5 years of service group with 8 participants (100%). Gen-Xers were the only generational cohort who were represented in each of the length of service categories.

4.3.3 Have a Position of Leadership (POL)

Of the 52 participants, 30 (57.6%) responded that they were not in a Position of Leadership (POL). The largest grouping of respondents who were not in a leadership position with a difference from the other generational cohorts, were 16 Gen-Xers (59.3%). Of those 22 (42.3%) who were in leadership positions, 10 (58.8%) were Baby Boomers, and 11 (40.7%) were Gen-Xers. Only 1 (12.5%) Millennial was in a leadership position.

4.3.4 Intend to apply for a Position of Leadership (POL)

Of those 52 participants who intended to apply for a Position of Leadership (POL) in the future, 26 (50%) said 'yes', and 20 (38%) responded 'no'. A noticeably large number of 15 Gen-Xers (55.6%) were in this group who said 'yes'. Only 4 (7.6%) respondents were undecided as to whether at the time of completing the instrument that they intend to apply for a leadership position. Less than the number who said 'maybe' were the 3 Millennials (37.5%) who said 'yes' they do intend to apply for a leadership position. Nearly double the Millennials who said 'yes' were the 8 Baby Boomers (47%). This question also had 2 respondents (3.8%) who missed filling in a response.

After receiving the responses, the researcher registered the results with SPSS software (Version 22) for analysis. SPSS software enabled the organisation and examination of the results, including the development of tables to demonstrate analysis conclusions.

This in turn informed an analytical process of the issues and trends surrounding generational cohort perceptions and leadership succession issues.

4.4 Instrument and Procedure: Questionnaire

As discussed earlier, a questionnaire for data-gathering was selected for this study into teacher perceptions and attitudes to generational differences. This was selected as the appropriate primary means of expediently collecting numerical data for the production of quantified and generalisable results (Muijs, 2010; Rea & Parker, 2014). Questionnaire research is a valid form of data gathering on issues pertaining to educational research such as the participants' beliefs and perceptions (Brace, 2013; Rea & Parker, 2014) explored in Chapter 3, as well as a method for utilising a small sample of participants to represent a wider population (Rea & Parker, 2014). Certain design principles were taken into consideration with the development of this quantitative questionnaire (Fowler, 2013). The GPSLi questionnaire's content, formatting and layout needed to be easily understood whilst leading to data for appropriate analysis. Rea and Parker (2014) established three factors for questionnaire effectiveness including clarity, comprehensiveness, and acceptability; as well as for the benefit of research effectiveness and usability for the researcher (Bordens & Abbott, 2010). This study's questionnaire design is also broken into sections that flow from a sequence of categories (Rea & Parker, 2014).

A hard-copy, Likert Scale questionnaire "Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi)" (see Appendix A) was designed to elicit data from teachers and leaders that would seek to draw participants' "...thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, values, perceptions, personality and behavioural intentions of participants... content of a questionnaire will respond to the researcher's objectives" (Johnson & Christensen, 2013, p. 192).

It was originally arranged for the researcher to visit the school in April 2015 and speak at a staff meeting to explain the purpose and procedure of the study and

questionnaire. However, after three postponements due to school internal calendar changes it was arranged in mid-May 2015 that the Deputy Principal would communicate this to the teaching staff, and distribute the instrument for their voluntary completion. The teaching staff participants were given the questionnaire by the sample school's Deputy Principal and were given two weeks to complete. This was an appropriate timeframe given the simplicity and length of the study. The DP then collected the completed 54 questionnaires and returned them to the researcher.

For this study, all teaching staff at the participating school were invited to undertake a questionnaire designed to elicit data (on areas developed and discussed in Chapter 2) about:

- Generational perceptions toward their colleagues
- Motivation
- Work Ethic
- Professional Feedback
- Mentoring
- Attitudes toward School Hierarchy
- Leadership Succession Planning and Advancement

This researcher has followed Bell's (2010) recommended process for questionnaire development:

- Question selection
- Question writing – precisely-related (language) to the research question for the best elicitation of data
- Collection - Design (formatting), distribution and return of the questionnaires

The use of a Likert scale-instrument was selected in order that a truer measure of strength and feeling toward the question-statements concerning perceptions and attitudes to be can ascertained (Bell, 2010) and allowed for replicability.

Firstly, participants were invited to give details with a series of personal description questions based on gender, age; length of teaching service; whether they currently maintained a middle or senior POL position; or their intent on applying for the POL or Executive leadership position. Respondents were not required to nominally identify themselves, as this information was irrelevant to the study. This also had the design-intent to encourage a greater willingness for deeper honesty from the opportunity to undertake the questionnaire anonymously. The questionnaire then sought to elicit participant responses by being constructed into two sections.

The first section concentrated around fifteen questions that sought the participants' attitudes toward their own and each other's Workplace Perceptions (see Table 4.3). It consisted of a series of items subject to a Likert scale response of 1 = "Strongly Disagree"; 2 = "Disagree"; 3 = "Don't know"; 4 = "Agree"; 5 = "Strongly Agree". These items are derived from the literature review, relating to the perceptions that each of the generational cohorts have of each other with the dimensions of dependent variables of motivation (items 8, 11, 12); work ethic (items 4, 5, 10); professional feedback (items 2, 6, 15); school hierarchy (items 1, 7, 9) and leadership development culture (items 3, 13, 14).

Table 4.3

The Present Study's Research 1 Question, Construct, Hypotheses and the GPSLi

Questions

Research Question 1:	Construct: Workplace Perceptions		
<i>Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?</i>	Hypotheses:	Dimension:	Item:
	H1. Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts.	Motivation	8. Plan to stay with the school over the long term
			11. Career-driven
			12. Seek work/life balance
	H2. Determinants of Work Ethic are different between Generational Cohorts.	Work Ethic	4. Give maximum effort and have strong work ethic
			5. Adapt and learn quickly
			10. Results-driven
	H3. Perceptions towards Professional Feedback are different between Generational Cohorts.	Professional Feedback	2. Willing to ask for help when needed
			6. Prefer informality amongst colleagues
			15. Prefer ongoing, informal feedback
	H4. Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development are different between Generational Cohorts.	Leadership Development Culture	3. Value mentoring of potential leaders
			13. Accepting of Change
			14. Prefer to work in teams
	H5. Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational Cohorts.	School Hierarchy	1. Willing to navigate 'office politics'
			7. Like structure and process
			9. Respectful of school hierarchy

The second section of the questionnaire focussed on fifteen questions, seeking to elicit the teaching staff's personal perceptions of their school's leadership succession culture (see Table 4.4). This also consisted of a Likert scale response of 1 = "Strongly

Agree”; 2 = “Agree”; 3 = “Disagree” and 4 = “Strongly Disagree”. These questions were asked to “indicate your thoughts on whether, when it comes to your leadership culture, that at your school there is:”. These too were focussed around the dimensions of dependent variables of Intentional Leadership Succession Planning (questions 16, 19, 20); Culture of Mentoring Leaders (questions 22, 23, 26); Leadership Styles and Expectations (questions 17, 18, 27, 30); Awareness of, and catering for Generational Differences (question 21, 24, 25, 28, 29).

Table 4.4

The Present Study’s Research 2 Question, Construct Hypotheses and GPSLi Questions

Research Question 2:	Construct: Leadership Perceptions		
<i>Do these Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?</i>	Hypotheses:	Dimension:	Item:
	H6. A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement, and the generation/age of the individual.	Intentional Leadership Succession Planning	16. A difference in expectations for leadership advancement between generations? (ie. Preparedness, seniority, ability, entitlement, etc)
			19. A tendency of colleagues from other generations to not respect their own leadership
			20. A perception of work demands and expectations of leadership that discourage particular age groups of teachers taking on middle or senior leadership roles?
	H7. A relationship exists between expectations, culture and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational	Culture of Mentoring Leaders	22. Intergenerational mentoring (formal or informal)
			23. Leaders from different generations learning from one another
			26. A mentoring program to encourage teachers of different generations to work together and share experiences

	Cohorts.		
	H8. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Styles and Expectations amongst Generational Cohorts.	Leadership Styles & Expectations	17. A difference in leadership styles and expectations between different generations?
			18. Conflict regarding acceptable work hours between teachers of different generations.
			27. Encouragement of an environment that highlights the benefits of an intergenerational workforce
			30. Training of school middle & senior leaders on leading people of diverse age groups
	H9. Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences are different between Generational Cohorts.	Awareness of, and catering for Generational Differences	21. An understanding by your school's Executive of differing generational learning styles for training & leadership development?
			24. Communication of important information in multiple ways (i.e., via e-mail and during meetings)
			25. Awareness by the School Executive of generational issues
			28. An intentional culture of teachers of different generations being assigned to work together where possible
			29. An offering of different types of training (i.e., computer-based and seminars) for generational styles

4.5 Validity and Reliability

The fundamental task of the researcher is to determine what and how gathered information should be utilised (Creswell, 2013, Gay, 1987). Wheeler (1999) says that 'before numerical information can be useful, it must be analysed, interpreted and assimilated' (p. 1)

Therefore, the manner and method in which data is collected, understood and evaluated is enhanced if the study's instrumentation is valid and reliable, which in turn leads to increased value and credibility. Zikmund (2003) states that measuring instruments are evaluated in terms of:

1. Validity - 'the ability of a scale or measuring instrument to measure what it is intended to measure' (p. 302)
2. Reliability - 'degree to which measures are free from error and therefore yield consistent results' (p. 302)
3. Sensitivity – 'as a measurement instrument's ability to accurately measure variability in stimuli or responses' (p. 302).

Validity of this study is limited to the GPSLi Questionnaire and its effectiveness in eliciting teacher-responses to questions identifying their perceptions and attitudes deriving from their generational cohort and views of school leadership. Gay (1987) stated that "the appropriate validation procedure for a given questionnaire will depend upon the nature of the instrument" (p. 198). Mouly (1970) stated that "the actual validation of a questionnaire utilises the same principles and procedures as the validation of any instrument of testing or measurement" (p. 254). Zikmund (2003), "Face and content validity refers to the subjective agreement among professionals that a scale logically appears to reflect accurately what it purports to measure" (p. 302). The GPSLi Questionnaire instrument was reviewed for face and content validity by three Doctoral-level of educational professionals to strengthen the ability of the instrument to measure what it purports to measure.

To further enhance content validity (Lissitz & Samuels, 2007; Newman, Lim, & Pineda, 2013), a process was followed where questions for the instrument that

minimised margin of error were created to lead to responses that allowed for an accurate assessment of what the study was designed to measure (Saris & Gallhofer, 2007, pp. 83-84). This process also needed to ensure the questions were not designed to fulfil this researcher's expectations for the results (Newman et al., 2013). This researcher considered what was to be studied, and assertions deriving from the literature review were specified (Saris & Gallhofer, 2007, p. 84). This allowed for a higher level of content validity for the instrument to measure what was planned to be measured (Bordens & Abbott, 2010). Consideration of content validity extended also to the language of the questions themselves in the researcher's utilisation of the answers (Brace, 2013, p. 11). An example of this is where a question concerning the age of the study participants must match the subject of another question concerning representation of a particular generational cohort.

The questions too must be scrutinised to minimise bias (Brace, 2013). Best and Kahn (1989, p. 193) argued that "basic to the validity of a questionnaire are the right questions". Important too is the sequence and unity of the questions when grouped together (Mouly, 1970) for coherent understanding the information sought to answer the study's research questions (Mislevy, 2007). Goode and Hatt (1952, p. 15) stated that the questions that make up a questionnaire "must not only elicit stable or reliable answers but must also provide the kind of information which the research wants". Brace (2013) identifies five specific problems that can lead to errors in response validity because of ill-formulated questions:

1. Ambiguity in the question
2. Order effects between questions
3. Order effects within a question

4. Inadequate response codes
5. Wrong questions asked because of poor routing

Creswell (2013) also lists four potential threats to a study's validity:

1. Internal – which include factors such as history, maturation, selection, compensation, and instrumentation (Creswell, 2013, pp.163-164). This researcher recognised his own teaching and educational leadership experience may have biased his perceptions and sought to minimise his own generational and educational background-lens. Since the study was conducted the instrumentation without compensation during one time period, this was not a significant concern. This also was true for the open-invitational nature for all teaching staff of the selected school to participate by completing the instrument, thus further reducing any potential researcher validity bias.
2. External – ‘threats as the interaction of selection and treatment, the interaction of the setting and treatment, and the interaction of history and treatment’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 165). This study was conducted within a selected Catholic school in the metropolitan area of Melbourne, Victoria. Further external validation can be achieved with the study with a wider group or population of teachers being conducted in the future to determine if this research is true in another area.
3. Statistical - the ability to infer that the independent and dependent variables are related and the strength of that relationship (Creswell, 2013). The number of teachers who undertook completion of the instrument as compared to the number of staff within the study's location enabled statistical validity for representation across the generational cohorts at the participating school.

4. Construct - may change with the change of time and hence the application of measurement reliability is necessary to measure the consistency of the research process (Creswell, 2013). “Construct validity as the ability of a measure to confirm a network of related hypotheses generated from a theory based on the concepts... implies that the empirical evidence generated is consistent with the theoretical logic about the concepts” (Zikmund, 2003, p. 303). To determine the construct validity of the instrument, a pattern of intercorrelation, factor analysis was utilised to check the consistency of the data set. The functional structure of the instrument using factor analysis and examining the pattern of correlations among subscales were examined for evidence of postulated interrelationships. The factor analysis is discussed in Chapter 4 that outlines the collected data.

Validity pertains to the means to which the measurement instrument is able to test the related variables. The measurement instrument used in this research is designed based on the research questions explored in the literature review upon both perceptions of generational workplace traits and differences, and culture of leadership and succession planning. As referred to in Table 4.5, other instruments covering leadership succession and generational differences where both question-content and language were explored and considered. The opinions of other researchers familiar with this study was sought and approved by them.

Table 4.5

Details of content validity for the development of the GPSLi

Research Question 1	Confirmed by:	Research Question 2	Confirmed by:
SHRM Generational Differences Survey (Burke, 2005).	Cogin, 2011; Luna, 2012	Neefe Succession Planning Survey (NSPS). (Neefe, 2009).	Neefe, 2009
		Leadership Circle 360° Profile Instrument. (McCauley & Velsor, 2004)	Sessa et al., 2007; Smolter, 2011
		Wright-Coward Succession Planning and Management Survey (WCSPMS). (Coward, 2012).	Coward, 2012

4.6 Analysis of Data

Data for this study, was collected and analysis through by utilisation of SPSS software (Babbie, Wagner, & Zaino, 2015; Muijs, 2010). Non-parametric process of analysis assisted with result evaluation. A non-parametric process of analysis was used to answer the research questions by allowing for the examining of the strength of differences between inter-generational perceptions and attitudes of the sample of teacher participants.

This researcher selected the non-parametric technique for two reasons. Firstly, this questionnaire utilises an ordinal Likert scale model for a series of questions. Secondly, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for data analysis to provide statistical evidence for the evaluation of the six hypotheses. The Kruskal-Wallis method “assesses the differences among three or more independently sampled groups on a single, non-normally distributed continuous variable” (Weiner & Craighead 2010, p. 904).

The Kruskal-Wallis H test is non-parametric in nature (Lowry, 2013), and was able to assist with the comparison of median data. Its ability to not require a large number of instrument participants suits this study's small sample size. Kruskal-Wallis utilises all information as compared with the median test, which only uses the information above or below the group median (Lowry, 2013). Another benefit of the Kuskal-Wallis H test is that it is advantageous when there is a disparity of sample size participants (Lowry, 2013). This is relevant to this study as validity is enhanced because with the Kruskal-Wallis H test, as it is only necessary for each group within the sample size to be at least five (McDonald, 2014). This is due to its approximation of the chi-square distribution is close to the sampling distribution (Lowry, 2013; McDonald, 2014). Each hypothesis tested was undertaken at the 0.5 level of significance. If after analyses the null hypothesis is rejected then the experimental H1 and H2 was accepted. To understand the level of significance identified by Kruskal-Wallis, further post-hoc analysis was conducted utilising the Mann-Whitney U test, which is a median test that ranks scores from highest to lowest (Black, 2014). Mann-Whitney is designed to establish if two independent random samples of scores were derived amongst the same population (Black, 2014).

Results from these analyses are presented in Chapter 5 and discussed in Chapter 6.

4.7 Limitations

A number of limitations were considered and prepared for with the conduct of this quantitative study, some of which have already been discussed:

- Generalisability – specifically, the transferability of the accumulated data across the number of schools in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. Only one

school will be investigated in this study and there is an increased risk of error when it comes to generalisation of results with the small-sizing nature of this study (Robson, 2011).

- The study may be limited in its analysis because results from participants will depend on their knowledge of their school's leadership development processes and those of the CEOM. Research only captures the opinions and nature of these generational groupings at the time the instrument is utilised.
- Delimitation of the study being reduced to focus on three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials) as the initially-considered fourth group 'Traditionalists' have recently retired or left the school workplace. This fourth group therefore were not analysed.

4.8 Ethical Considerations

Due to the small scope of this study, there was a low-need to cater for any significant circumstances of ethical risk. Risks, psychological or physical to study participants were minimal, but all care was taken to avoid any discomfort of any sort. The biggest risk that was considered concerned respondent-anonymity especially within the context of one closely knit community on matters concerning leadership attitudes. Therefore, in order to maintain anonymity of respondents, care was given to assure that their responses were in no way able to be personally identified.

Ethical requirements and procedures from both Australian Catholic University (ACU) and the Catholic Education Office Melbourne (CEOM) were adhered to. ACU has clearly-defined guidelines for undertaking research, and all stages of this research would be carried out within these parameters. Punch (2013) categorises ethical risks within

social research into the areas of “harm, consent, deception, privacy and data-confidentiality” (p. 43). Level of risk assessment are required in both measuring ethical protections and process guidelines (Panter & Sterba, 2011), as well as ensuring validity (Hammersley & Traianou, 2012, pp. 1-2).

The risks associated with this study’s participants were deemed by the ACU Ethics Committee as in the category of ‘Low Risk 2’. This is in accordance to the definition in section 2.1.6 of the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (National Health & Medical Research Council, 2015) that says:

Research is ‘low risk’ where the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort. Where the risk, even if unlikely, is more serious than discomfort, the research is not low risk. (p. 15)

The processes and procedures of this study to strengthen ethical requirements included adherence to:

- ACU Ethics Committee permission (see Appendix B) stipulations that the requirements of approval from both the CEOM, and the participating school’s Principal be acquired;
- CEOM Ethics Committee Approval and Certification (see Appendix C);
- Formal (see Appendix D) and email correspondence was required and undertaken with the participating sample school’s Principal, Deputy Principal (Staff) and teachers explaining the purpose of the study, the processes and procedures for their anonymous participation as well as gaining permission and consent for their participation. This correspondence also included details regarding the participants’ right not to participate, confidential treatment of

their completed questionnaire, privacy and the specific uses of the data collected from their completed questionnaire for the study;

- Privacy & Disclosure Issues including adherence also to participating the sample school's HR & Privacy Policies;
- Questionnaire distribution and collection process – questionnaires were distributed to all teaching staff of the selected sample school by the Deputy Principal (Staff), who in turn collected all completed questionnaires and sent via registered mail to the researcher in a provided secure envelope;
- It was clearly explained in the Participation Invitation Letter (see Appendix E) that participants by virtue of completing the questionnaire instrument gave their consent (see Appendix F);
- Participants were not required to identify themselves on the questionnaire instrument
- Participation was voluntary;
- The Questionnaire instrument did not require, nor have a space on the page, for the participants to identify themselves, as their nominal identity was deemed irrelevant to the purpose of the study. The only form of personal information that was required for the study was for participants to nominate their age;
- Data gathered, then coded and organised by the SPSS software program from completed questionnaire instruments would be stored securely and destroyed after a nominated period of time.

4.9 Summary

This quantitative study sought to identify whether statistically different generational perceptions between Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennial cohorts exist between each other, and whether they can be considered as an influence of leadership succession shortages in a Catholic school. This chapter has covered this present study's sampling, participants, instrumentation, validity and reliability, ethical considerations, limitations and delimitations. The adoption of strategies such as member checking, respondent validation and auditing ensured the data gathered was trustworthy, credible, transferable, dependable and confirmable. Chapter 5 will identify the results gathered from the implementation of these methodologies.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

“There are two possible outcomes: if the result confirms the hypothesis, then you've made a measurement. If the result is contrary to the hypothesis, then you've made a discovery.” Enrico Fermi (Jevremovic, 2005)

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results from the study's use of the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi) instrument (refer to Appendix A). The study seeks to investigate two secondary research questions discussed in previous chapters:

- Research Question 1: *Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*
- Research Question 2: *Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

The GPSLi is comprised of 30 questions measuring the two constructs of *Workplace Perceptions* and *Leadership Perceptions*, comprised of nine subscales (detailed in Chapter 4).

The first section assessing the first construct of *Workplace Perceptions* underpinning Research Question 1 assessed the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis for each of the five subscales of *Motivation* (M); *Work Ethic* (WE); *Professional Feedback* (PF); *Leadership Development Culture* (LDC); and, *School Hierarchy* (SH). The following five hypotheses

(detailed in Chapter 3) were developed from the literature review for this first construct of *Workplace Perceptions*:

- H1. Motivational (M) factors are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H2. Determinants of Work Ethic (WE) are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H3. Perceptions towards Professional Feedback (PF) are different between Generational Cohorts.
- H4. Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development (LDC) are different between Generational Cohorts .
- H5. Perceptions toward School Hierarchy (SH) are different between Generational Cohorts.

The second section assessing the second construct of *Leadership Perceptions* underpinning Research Question 2 assessed the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis for each of the four subscales of *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning* (ILSP); *Culture of Mentoring Leaders* (CML); *Leadership Styles and Expectations* (LSE); and *Awareness of, and catering for Generational Differences* (ACGD). The following four hypotheses (detailed in Chapter 3) were developed from the literature review for this second construct of *Leadership Perceptions*:

- H6. A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement (ILSP) and the generation/age of the individual.
- H7. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring (CML) amongst Generational Cohorts.
- H8. A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Styles (LSE) amongst Generational Cohorts.
- H9. Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences (ACGD) are

different between Generational Cohorts.

Each subscale was evaluated to see if there were any differences on attitudes and perceptions between the three generations (Baby, Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) as measured by the GPSLi instrument using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H-Test (KW-H). This was then followed up by post-hoc analysis using the Mann-Whitney U-Test (MW-U) only where there was a significant KW-H result for each possible pairing of generational cohorts to determine the levels to which the generational pairings were significantly different. All hypothesis testing was conducted at the $p < .05$ level of significance. The statistical analyses for each construct will include an outline of descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation of the data collected; calculations of subscale relationships via Pearson's correlation coefficient (Pearson's r); KW-H test; and subsequent post-hoc pairwise analyses of MW-U test results.

5.2 Results for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

The next section details results for the first construct for this study.

5.2.1 Descriptive Results of Totals and Subscales by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

Table 5.1 depicts the descriptive statistics test results for participants who fully completed the RPTLi of each generation, by the mean and standard deviation of the five subscales. The range of measured variables for each of this construct's subscales is 1 – 15.

Table 5.1

Workplace Perceptions Total and Subscales Means and Standard Deviation by Generation

Subscale	Baby Boomers <i>N</i> = 17		Gen-Xers <i>N</i> = 27		Millennials <i>N</i> = 8		Total <i>N</i> = 52	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
M	11.65	1.50	10.70	2.16	8.50	1.60	10.67	2.12
WE	12.59	1.87	11.55	2.15	10.87	1.96	11.79	2.09
PF	11.88	1.93	11.59	1.42	12.87	1.73	11.88	1.68
LDC	10.94	1.71	11.92	1.77	12.00	0.92	11.61	1.69
SH	11.53	1.94	10.55	1.94	6.12	2.03	10.19	2.63
TOTAL	58.59	6.54	56.33	5.99	50.38	4.69		

Subscales: *Motivation* (M), *Work Ethic* (WE), *Professional Feedback* (PF), *Leadership Development Culture* (LDC), *School Hierarchy* (SH)

For the five subscales under the *Workplace Perceptions* construct, totals for the subscale results from the participants are as follows. The subscale of *Professional Feedback* ($M = 11.88$) is reported as being the highest, followed by *Work Ethic* ($M = 11.79$), followed by *Leadership Development Culture* ($M = 11.61$), followed by *Motivation* ($M = 10.67$), and finally, *School Hierarchy* ($M = 10.19$) reported as lowest. Descriptive totals by generation reported Baby Boomers ($M = 58.59$), Gen-Xers ($M = 56.33$), and Millennials ($M = 50.38$).

Description for the subscale means for variables as reported by each generational cohort is as follows. Baby Boomers ($M = 11.65$) reported means higher than Gen-Xers ($M = 10.70$) and Millennials ($M = 8.50$). On *Work Ethic*, Baby Boomers ($M = 12.59$) were also higher first than Gen-Xers ($M = 11.55$) and then Millennials ($M = 10.87$). On *Professional Feedback*, Millennials ($M = 12.87$) were higher than first Baby Boomers ($M = 11.88$), and then Gen-Xers ($M = 11.59$). On *Leadership Development Culture*, Millennials ($M = 12.00$) were higher than the other generational cohorts, but this time, first by Gen-Xers ($M = 11.92$)

and followed by Baby Boomers ($M = 10.94$). On the last subscales of School Hierarchy, Baby Boomers ($M = 11.53$) scored higher than first Gen-Xers ($M = 10.55$) and then Millennials ($M = 6.12$). A KW-H test was then conducted to determine if there were any differences.

5.2.2 Pearson Correlations of Subscales by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

As shown in Table 5.2, a total of 11 of the 40 RPTLi subscales were statistically significant Pearson correlations as being $< .05$ when measuring the relationship amongst the construct subscales. These 11 starred items report statistically significant bivariate association between the subscale variables in this construct. There were no significant negative correlations.

The *Workplace Perceptions* construct's subscales of *Motivation*, *Work Ethic*, and *School Hierarchy* experienced a statistically higher number of associations amongst the three generational cohorts of Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennials. These findings do suggest that there are significant associations of perceptions towards workplace behaviours.

Table 5.2

*Pearson Correlations of the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi)**Instrument Subscales by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions*

Subscale	2	3	4	5
<u>M (1)</u>				
Baby Boomers	.15	.11	.45	.22
Gen-Xers	.49**	.07	-.17	.73**
Millennials	-.16	.28	-.58	-.37
Total	.40*	-.01	-.11	.62**
<u>WE (2)</u>				
Baby Boomers		.75**	.56*	.46
Gen-Xers		.01	.04	.59**
Millennials		.22	.32	.58
Total		.19	.13	.55**
<u>PF (3)</u>				
Baby Boomers			.55*	.47
Gen-Xers			.28	.25
Millennials			.36*	.41
Total			.36**	.09
<u>LDC (4)</u>				
Baby Boomers				.31
Gen-Xers				-.09
Millennials				.76*
Total				-.03
<u>SH (5)</u>				
Baby Boomers				
Gen-Xers				
Millennials				
Total				

Subscales: *Motivation (M), Work Ethic (WE), Professional Feedback (PF), Leadership Development Culture (LDC), School Hierarchy (SH)*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

5.2.3 Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney Test Results by Generation for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

Table 5.3 shows the cohort mean rank differences generational cohorts for Workplace Perceptions towards the five subscales. Differences were sought between the mean rankings. Due to the small sample it is best to use a non-parametric approach to measure the mean rankings (for details refer to Chapter 4).

Table 5.3

Mean Ranking of Generation by Subscales for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

Subscale	Baby Boomers		Gen-Xers		Millennials	
	<i>N</i>	MR	<i>N</i>	MR	<i>N</i>	MR
M	17	32.50	27	27.33	8	10.94
WE	17	32.35	27	24.87	8	19.56
PF	17	27.41	27	23.43	8	34.94
LDC	17	20.85	27	29.24	8	29.25
SH	17	34.09	27	27.81	8	5.94

Subscales: *Motivation (M), Work Ethic (WE), Professional Feedback (PF), Leadership Development Culture (LDC), School Hierarchy (SH)*

***N* Total** = 52

MR = Mean Rank

Participants had a choice of a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) in the GPSLi instrument on how participants perceive generational differences. When ranking in order of importance by generation Baby Boomers considered *School Hierarchy* (MR = 34.09) as the most important of the five subscales for the *Workplace Perceptions* construct, and *Professional Feedback* (MR = 27.41) the least important. Gen-Xers considered *Leadership Development Culture* (MR = 29.94) the most important, and like the Baby Boomers,

Professional Feedback ($MR = 23.34$) as least important. Significantly, Millennials differed from the older generational cohorts by ranking *Professional Feedback* ($MR = 34.94$) as the most important, and viewed *School Hierarchy* ($MR = 5.94$) as considerable less important.

When comparing the generational cohorts against each other (in Table 5.4) in the *Workplace Perceptions* construct subscale of *Motivation*, Baby Boomers ($MR = 32.50$) ranked highest over Gen-Xers ($MR = 27.33$), followed by Millennials ($MR = 10.94$). With *Work Ethic*, Baby Boomers ($MR = 32.85$) also ranked higher than Gen-Xers ($MR = 24.87$) and Millennials ($MR = 19.56$) respectively. Baby Boomers ($MR = 34.09$) also ranked higher than Gen-Xers ($MR = 27.81$) and Millennials ($MR = 5.94$) on the subscale of *School Hierarchy*. Millennials ranked higher ($MR = 34.94$) than Baby Boomers ($MR = 27.41$) and Gen-Xers ($MR = 23.43$) on *Professional Feedback*. On each of these subscales, the Gen-Xers did not rank higher than either Millennial or Gen-Xer cohorts.

Table 5.4 depicts the cohort differences identified by the Kruskal-Wallis test results of *Workplace Perceptions* construct subscales and their Chi-Square and level of significance. Two of the five subscales, *Motivation* ($p < .01$) and *School Hierarchy* ($p < .001$), were identified as having differences and were then analysed through post-hoc Mann-Whitney pairwise analysis to further understand the nature and level of significance of these inter-generational differences of perceptions towards their school's leadership succession culture.

Table 5.4

Kruskal-Wallis H-Test and post hoc Mann-Whitney U-Test Results between the Generational Cohorts for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

Subscale	Kruskal-Wallis		Mann-Whitney	
	χ^2	Baby Boomers vs Gen-Xers <i>U</i>	Gen-Xers vs Millennials <i>U</i>	Baby Boomers vs Millennials <i>U</i>
M	11.51*		42.00**	9.50***
WE				33.50*
PF				
LDC				
SH	19.50***		10.00***	1.50***

Subscales: *Motivation (M), Work Ethic (WE), Professional Feedback (PF), Leadership Development Culture (LDC), School Hierarchy (SH)*

Significance: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

They were then analysed through post-hoc analysis by evaluating pairwise differences to further understand the nature and level of significance of these inter-generational differences of perceptions (see Table 5.4). Multiple comparisons revealed that there were no differences ($p > .05$) in the *Work Ethic*; *Professional Feedback*; and, *Leadership Development Culture* subscales, and therefore, no further analysis was undertaken for each of these three subscales.

5.2.3.1 Results for Motivation Subscale

Teachers were asked to rate their perception toward three items (refer to Table 4.3) concerning the subscale *Motivation* from the first section of the RPTLi . A KW-H test was conducted to evaluate differences among the independent variables of the three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) on median change in the attitudes and perceptions they had for themselves, under the dependent variable subscale of *Motivation*.

The test was significant $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 11.51, p = .01$. Follow-up post-hoc analysis tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the three groups by using the MW-U approach. The Mean Rank (*MR*) results of the MW-U tests (see Table 5.4) indicated a significant difference ($U = 9.50, p < .001$) in perceptions toward *Motivation* with the Baby Boomers ($MR = 16.44$) being greater than Millennials ($MR = 5.69$). There was a significant difference in perceptions toward *Motivation* ($U = 42.00, p < .01$) with the Gen-Xers ($MR = 20.44$) being greater than Millennials ($MR = 9.75$). However, perceptions of *Motivation* between Baby Boomers ($MR = 25.06$) and Gen-Xers ($MR = 20.89$) were not significantly different ($U = 186.00, p > .05$). Therefore the hypothesis, '*Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts*', is supported.

5.2.3.2 Results for School Hierarchy Subscale

Teachers were asked to rate their perception toward three items (refer to Table 4.3) concerning the subscale *School Hierarchy* from the first section of the RPTL instrument. A KW-H test was conducted to evaluate differences among the independent variables of the three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) on median change in the attitudes and perceptions they had for themselves, under the dependent variable subscale of *School Hierarchy*. The test was significant $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 19.48, p < .001$. Follow-up post-hoc analysis tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the three groups by using the MW-U approach. The results of the MW-U tests (see Table 5.4) indicated a significant difference ($U = 1.50, p < .001$) in perceptions toward *School Hierarchy* with the Baby Boomers ($MR = 16.91$) being greater than Millennials ($MR = 4.69$). There was a significant difference ($U = 10.00, p < .001$) in perceptions toward *School Hierarchy* with the Gen-Xers ($MR = 21.63$) being greater than Millennials ($MR = 5.75$). However, perceptions of *School Hierarchy* between Baby Boomers ($MR = 26.18$) and Gen-Xers ($MR = 20.19$) were

not significantly different ($U = 167.00, p > .05$). Therefore the hypothesis, '*Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational Cohorts*', is supported.

5.2.4 Summary of Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions

In summary, only the two dimensional-subcales for Hypothesis 1 (*Motivation*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 11.51, p < .01$; and Hypothesis 5 (*School Hierarchy*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 19.49, p < .001$ were supported. Discussion is undertaken in the next chapter as to which questions in the RPTL instrument influenced how those differences occurred in the two subscales of *Motivation* and *School Hierarchy*.

The other three dimensional-subcales of Hypothesis 2 (*Work Ethic*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 4.64, p > .05$; Hypothesis 3 (*Professional Feedback*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 3.81, p > .05$; and Hypothesis 4 (*Leadership Development Culture*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 3.68, p > .05$, yielded no significant differences of *Workplace Perceptions*, and were thus not supported. A summary of results is detailed in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5

Summary Results for Research Question 1 Hypotheses

Research Question 1: <i>Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?</i>		
Subscale:	Hypotheses:	Finding:
1. Motivation	<i>Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts.</i>	Supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Baby Boomers & Gen-Xers greater than Millennials, significant difference • Gen-Xers & Baby Boomers no significant difference
2. Work Ethic	<i>Determinants of Work Ethic are different between Generational Cohorts.</i>	Not Supported – no significant difference between generations
3. Professional Feedback	<i>Perceptions towards Professional Feedback are different between Generational Cohorts.</i>	Not Supported – no significant difference between generations
4. Leadership Development Culture	<i>Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development are different between Generational Cohorts.</i>	Not Supported – no significant difference between generations
5. School Hierarchy	<i>Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational Cohorts.</i>	Supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Baby Boomers & Gen-Xers greater than Millennials, significant difference • Gen-Xers & Baby Boomers no significant difference

5.3 Results for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

The next section details results for the second construct for this study.

5.3.1 Descriptive Results of Totals and Subscales by Generation for Construct 2:

Leadership Perceptions

Table 5.6 depicts the descriptive statistics test results for participants who fully completed the RPTL instrument of each generation, by the mean and standard deviation of the four subscales for the *Leadership Perceptions* construct by raw score totals. The ranges

for this research question's subscales varied. Both *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning (ILSP)* and *Culture of Mentoring Leaders (CML)* subscales were each 1 – 12. The range for *Leadership Styles and Expectations (LSE)* was 1-16. The range for *Awareness of, and Catering of Generational Differences (ACGD)* was 1-20.

Table 5.6

Leadership Perceptions Total and Subscales Means and Standard Deviation by Generation

Scale	Baby Boomers <i>N</i> = 17		Gen-Xers <i>N</i> = 27		Millennials <i>N</i> = 8		Total <i>N</i> = 52	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
ILSP	6.89	1.69	7.63	1.71	5.25	1.16	7.02	1.81
CML	7.23	1.68	7.70	1.73	9.62	0.92	7.87	1.77
LSE	9.18	1.24	10.11	1.34	10.37	1.19	9.85	1.39
ACGD	12.65	1.87	13.04	2.08	14.50	1.93	13.13	2.05
	35.94	3.78	35.48	3.06	39.75	3.99		

Subscales: *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning (ILSP)*; *Culture of Mentoring Leaders (CML)*; *Leadership Styles and Expectations (LSE)*; *Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences (ACGD)*

For the four subscales under this *Leadership Perceptions* construct, subscale totals for the participants are as follows. The subscale of *ACGD* ($M = 13.13$) is reported as being the highest, followed by *LSE* ($M = 9.85$), followed by *CML* ($M = 7.87$), and finally, *ILSP* ($M = 7.02$) reported as lowest. Descriptive totals by generation reported Baby Boomers ($M = 6.89$), Gen-Xers ($M = 7.63$), and Millennials ($M = 5.25$).

Description for the subscale means for variables as reported by each generational cohort are as follows. Gen-Xers ($M = 7.63$) rated *ILSP* higher than Baby Boomers ($M = 6.89$) and Millennials ($M = 5.25$). On *CML*, Millennials ($M = 9.62$) were higher than first Gen-Xers ($M = 7.70$), and then Baby Boomers ($M = 7.23$). On *LSE*, Millennials ($M = 10.37$) were

higher than the other generational cohorts, again first by Gen-Xers ($M = 10.11$) and followed by Baby Boomers ($M = 9.18$). On the last subscale of *ACGD*, Millennials ($M = 14.50$) again scored higher than first Gen-Xers ($M = 13.04$) and then Baby Boomers ($M = 12.65$).

5.3.2 Pearson Correlation of Subscales by Generation for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

The Pearson's r correlation coefficients ranged from .03 to .77 for the RPTL total scale and the four subscales for *Leadership Perceptions construct* are presented in Table 5.7. Table 5.7 presents a bivariate correlation analysis to determine the relationships between the subscale variables amongst the generations in *Leadership Perceptions* construct. There were 7 of the 24 RPTL subscales that were statistically significant Pearson correlations being $< .05$. These 7 starred items report statistically significant bivariate association between the subscale variables in this construct. Three of the 7 significant correlations were negative, indicating that the secondary variable was weaker in relationship than the primary variable.

The generational totals of the *Leadership Perceptions* construct subscales of *ILSP*, *CML*, and *ACGD* experienced a statistically higher ($p < .00$) number of associations amongst the three generational cohorts of Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers and Millennials.

These simple bivariate correlations analyses do not consider any other control variables so it is difficult to draw any firm conclusion about these relationships. However, these findings do suggest that there may be associations of perceptions amongst teachers of different generational cohorts' perceptions towards their school's leadership succession culture.

Table 5.7

Pearson correlations of the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi)

Instrument Subscales by Generation for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

Subscale	7	8	9
<u>ILSP (6)</u>			
Baby Boomers	-.21	.52*	-.05
Gen-Xers	-.51**	.04	-.37
Millennials	.37	.44	.13
Total	-.44**	.18	-.29*
<u>CML (7)</u>			
Baby Boomers		-.20	.37
Gen-Xers		-.14	-.42*
Millennials		.67	.77*
Total		.03	.50**
<u>LSE (8)</u>			
Baby Boomers			.33
Gen-Xers			.07
Millennials			.41
Total			.24
<u>ACGD (9)</u>			
Baby Boomers			
Gen-Xers			
Millennials			
Total			

Subscales: *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning (ILSP); Culture of Mentoring Leaders (CML); Leadership Styles and Expectations (LSE); Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences (ACGD)*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

5.3.3 Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney Test Results of Subscales by Generation for

Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

As shown in Table 5.8, Kruskal-Wallis testing revealed significant mean rank differences in perceptions towards the four subscales concerning leadership succession issues

between specific generational cohorts for the construct *Leadership Perceptions*. Differences were sought between the mean rankings. Due to the small sample it is best to use a non-parametric approach to measure the mean rankings (for details refer to Chapter 4).

Table 5.8

Mean Ranking of Generation by Subscales for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

Scale	Baby Boomers		Gen-Xers		Millennials	
	N	MR	N	MR	N	MR
ILSP	17	26.00	27	31.19	8	11.75
CML	17	20.91	27	25.41	8	42.06
LSE	17	19.41	27	29.31	8	32.06
ACGD	17	23.50	27	25.35	8	36.75

Subscales: *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning (ILSP), Culture of Mentoring Leaders (CML), Leadership Styles and Expectations (LSE), Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences (ACGD)*

N Total = 52

MR = Mean Rank

Participants had a choice of a scale from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 4 (*strongly disagree*) in the GPSLi instrument on how participants perceive generational differences. When ranking in order of importance by generation, Baby Boomers considered *ILSP* ($MR = 26.00$) as the most important of the four subscales for the *Leadership Perceptions* construct, and *LSE* ($MR = 19.41$) the least important. Gen-Xers also considered *ILSP* ($MR = 31.19$) the most important, but considered *ACGD* ($MR = 25.35$) as least important. Significantly, Millennials differed from the older generational cohorts by ranking *CML* ($MR = 42.06$) as the most important, and viewed *ILSP* ($MR = 11.75$) as considerably less important.

By mean ranking of the three generational cohorts in comparison to each other, on associations over perceptions of the subscale *ILSP*, Gen-Xers ($MR = 31.19$) ranked highest

over Baby Boomers ($MR = 26.00$), followed by Millennials ($MR = 11.75$). With *CML*, Millennials ($MR = 42.06$) also ranked higher than Gen-Xers ($MR = 25.41$) and Baby Boomers ($MR = 20.91$) respectively. Millennials ($MR = 32.06$) also ranked higher than Gen-Xers ($MR = 27.81$) and Baby Boomers ($MR = 19.41$) on the subscale of *LSE*. Millennials ranked higher ($MR = 36.75$) than Gen-Xers ($MR = 25.35$) and Baby Boomers ($MR = 23.50$) on *ACGD*. On each of these subscales, the Baby Boomers did not rank higher than either Millennial or Gen-Xer cohorts.

Table 5.9

Kruskal-Wallis H-Test and Mann-Whitney U-Test Results between the Generational Cohorts for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

Subscale	Kruskal-Wallis		Mann-Whitney	
	χ^2	Baby Boomers vs Gen-Xers U	Gen-Xers vs Millennials U	Baby Boomers vs Millennials U
ILSP	10.48**		27.00**	31.00*
CML	11.20**		35.50*	16.00**
LSE	6.09*	143.00*		34.00*
ACGD	4.62			32.50*

Subscales: *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning (ILSP), Culture of Mentoring Leaders (CML), Leadership Styles and Expectations (LSE), Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences (ACGD)*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 5.9 depicts the Kruskal-Wallis test results of *Leadership Perceptions* construct subscales and their Chi-Square and level of significance. Three of the four subscales, *ILSP*, *CML*, and *LSE*, were identified as having significant differences and were then analysed

through post-hoc Mann-Whitney pairwise analysis to further understand the nature and level of significance of these inter-generational differences of perceptions towards their school's leadership succession culture.

As discussed in the previous chapter, this was done to determine whether two independent random samples of scores were drawn from the same population where different groups have larger population-values than others (Baby Boomers: $N = 17$, Gen-Xers: $N = 27$, Millennials: $N = 8$).

5.3.3.1 Results for Intentional Leadership Succession Planning Subscale

Participants were asked to rate their perception toward 3 items (refer to Table 4.4) concerning the subscale *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning* (ILSP) from the second section of the RPTL instrument. A KW-H test was conducted to evaluate differences among the independent variables of the three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) on median change in the attitudes and perceptions they had for themselves and their school, under the dependent variable subscale of *ILSP*. The test was significant $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 10.48, p < .01$. Follow-up post-hoc analysis tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the three groups by using the MW-U approach. The results of the MW-U tests indicated a significant difference in perceptions toward ILSP ($U = 31.00, p < .05$) with the Baby Boomers ($MR = 15.18$) being greater than Millennials ($MR = 8.38$). There was a significant difference in perceptions toward ILSP ($U = 27.00, p < .001$) with the Gen-Xers ($MR = 21.00$) being greater than Millennials ($MR = 7.88$). However, perceptions of ILSP between Baby Boomers ($MR = 19.82$) and Gen-Xers ($MR = 24.19$) were not significantly different ($U = 184.00, p > .05$). Therefore, the non-parametric and post-hoc tests support the hypothesis, '*A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement, and the generation/age of the individual*'.

5.3.3.2 Results for Culture of Mentoring Leaders Subscale

Teachers were asked to rate their perception toward 3 items (refer to Table 4.4) concerning the subscale *Culture of Mentoring Leaders* (CML) from the second section of the RPTL instrument. A KW-H test was conducted to evaluate differences among the independent variables of the three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) on median change in the attitudes and perceptions they had for themselves and their school, under the dependent variable subscale of *CML*. The test was significant $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 11.2$, $p < .01$. Follow-up post-hoc analysis tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the three groups by using the MW-U approach. The results of the MW-U tests indicated a significant difference in perceptions toward CML ($U = 31.00$, $p < .001$) with the Millennials ($MR = 19.50$) being greater than Baby Boomers ($MR = 9.94$). There was a significant difference ($U = 35.50$, $p < .001$) in perceptions toward CML with the Millennials ($MR = 27.06$) being greater than Gen-Xers ($MR = 15.31$). However, perceptions of CML between Baby Boomers ($MR = 19.97$) and Gen-Xers ($MR = 24.09$) were not significantly different ($U = 186.50$, $p > .05$). Therefore the non-parametric and post-hoc tests support the hypothesis, '*A relationship exists between expectations, culture, and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational Cohorts*'.

5.3.3.3 Results for Leadership Styles and Expectations Subscale

Teachers were asked to rate their perception toward 4 items (refer to Table 4.4) concerning the subscale *Leadership Style and Expectations* (LSE) from the second section of the RPTL instrument. A KW-H test was conducted to evaluate differences among the independent variables of the three generations (Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) on median change in the attitudes and perceptions they had for themselves and their school,

under the dependent variable subscale of *LSE*. The test was significant $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 6.08, p < .05$. Follow-up post-hoc analysis tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the three groups by using the MW-U approach. The results of the MW-U tests indicated a significant difference in perceptions toward *LSE* ($U = 143.00, p < .05$) with the Gen-Xers ($MR = 25.70$) being greater than Baby Boomers ($MR = 17.41$). There was a significant difference in perceptions toward *LSE* ($U = 34.00, p < .05$) with the Millennials ($MR = 17.25$) also being greater than Baby Boomers ($MR = 11.00$). However, perceptions of *LSE* between Gen-Xers ($MR = 17.61$) and Millennials ($MR = 19.31$) were not significantly different ($U = 97.50, p > .05$). Therefore the non-parametric and post-hoc tests support the hypothesis, '*A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Styles and Expectations amongst Generational Cohorts*', is supported.

5.3.4 Summary of Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions

After the instrument was analysed, three of the four dimensional-subcales for Hypothesis 6 (*Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 10.48, p < .01$; Hypothesis 7 (*Culture of Mentoring Leaders*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 11.20, p < .01$; and, Hypothesis 8 (*Leadership Styles & Expectations*), $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 6.09, p < .05$ yielded significant differences, and therefore, each of these hypotheses were supported. Discussion is undertaken in the next chapter as to which questions in the RPTL instrument caused those differences to occur in these three of the four subscales.

The subscale of Hypothesis 9 (*Awareness of, and catering for Generational Differences*) $\chi^2(2, N = 52) = 4.62, p > .05$ yielded no significant differences in perceptions, and therefore the hypothesis was not supported. A summary of hypothesis results is detailed in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10

Summary Results for Research Question 2 Hypotheses

Research Question 2: <i>Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?</i>		
Subscale:	Hypotheses:	Finding:
6. Intentional Leadership Succession Planning	<i>A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement, and the generation/age of the individual.</i>	Supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Baby Boomers & Gen-Xers greater than Millennials, significant difference • Gen-Xers & Baby Boomers about same, no significant difference
7. Culture of Mentoring Leaders	<i>A relationship exists between expectations, culture and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational Cohorts.</i>	Supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millennials greater than both Gen-Xers & Baby Boomers, significant difference • Gen-Xers & Baby Boomers about same, no significant difference
8. Leadership Styles & Expectations	<i>A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Styles and Expectations amongst Generational Cohorts.</i>	Supported: Gen-Xers & Millennials greater than Baby Boomers, significant difference Gen-Xers & Millennials about same, no significant difference
9. Awareness of, and catering for Generational Differences	<i>Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences are different between Generational Cohorts.</i>	Not Supported – no significant difference between generations

5.4 Summary

The purpose of the research study was to investigate whether differences of perceptions between the generational cohorts in their workplace behaviours existed, as well as their perceptions towards the leadership succession culture of their school. The study did this by identifying differences of nine subscales and corresponding hypotheses among the three generational cohorts (Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials) that were grouped

into the two constructs of *Leadership Perceptions* and *Workplace Perceptions* to examine the two research questions.

Results yielding significant differences in two (*Motivation* and *School Hierarchy*) of the first five subscales for Research Question 1 construct of *Workplace Perceptions*; and results yielding significant differences amongst the generational cohorts in three (*Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*; *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*; and, *Leadership Styles and Expectations*) of the four subscales for Research Question 2 construct of *Leadership Perceptions* were presented. There is evidence of significant differences in perceptions between the generational cohorts for Research Question 2 concerning leadership succession culture, that indeed invite opportunities for further investigation, especially as they are they are spread across three of the four subscales to strongly support each of the four corresponding hypotheses to confirm. Discussion concerning the results for this study is detailed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

“Each generation imagines itself to be more intelligent than the one that went before it, and wiser than the one that comes after it.” (Orwell, 1968)

6.1 Introduction

This study sought to elicit a deeper understanding of the perceptions and attitudes of differing generations of teachers towards workplace behaviours; and how these differences in perspectives may influence their attitudes and perceptions towards their school’s leadership succession culture.

The first aim was to identify and describe the nature of inter-generational similarities and differences between the generational groupings of Baby Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials with the Generational Perceptions of School Leadership (GPSLi) instrument. The second component of this study was to understand how these generational differences were associated with leadership succession issues within a Catholic school.

6.2 Discussion

A number of notable findings were revealed from this study. It identified significant differences (using bivariate analysis of variance) between the three generational cohorts of teachers on the self-reported measures from the instrument subscales for Research Questions 1 and 2. When statistically significant differences were indicated from Kruskal-Wallis H-tests, further analysis using Mann-Whitney U-tests were conducted to determine where those differences occurred.

Under the construct of *Workplace Perceptions*, analysis of two Research Question 1 subscales for *Motivation* and *School Hierarchy* revealed statistically-significant differences between the three generations; the other three subscales revealed no statistically significant differences in perceptions toward *Work Ethic*, *Professional Feedback*, and, *Leadership Development Culture*.

Under the construct of *Leadership Perceptions*, analysis of three Research Question 2 subscales revealed statistically significant differences between the three generations with *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*, *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, and, *Leadership Styles and Expectations*. The fourth subscale of *Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences* revealed no statistically significant differences in perceptions between the three generations.

The following is the summary of the hypotheses that were constructed and discussed in Chapter 4, and results for each described in Chapter 5.

6.3 Discussion of Leadership Perceptions Construct Hypotheses

This section discusses the hypothesis-findings of the first research question that was to determine the perceptual differences amongst the three generations in a Catholic school on workplace behavioural perceptions:

- Research Question 1: *Are there differences in the workplace perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

6.3.1 Hypothesis 1 (Subscale – Motivation): Motivational factors are different between Generational Cohorts

As described in the data analysis in Chapter 5 (refer to Table 5.4), results did support this hypothesis for the *Motivation* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting statistically significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .003$). This finding supports previous anecdotal and empirical findings discussed in the review of literature in Chapter 2 (refer to Table 2.7) concerning different perceptions toward ‘work/life balance’ (Barty et al., 2005) and intentions to continue in the profession (d’Arbon et al., 2002) between the generational groups. Especially relevant is the confirmation this study provides in the differences of prioritisation of *Motivation* from both the Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers rating higher over the Millennials, yet not reporting any differences between each other. With instrument items such as, ‘Plan to stay with the school over the long-term’, ‘Career-driven’, and ‘Seek Work/Life Balance’ (refer to Table 4.3), this finding implies these generations have very significant differences in perceptions and expectations toward these *Motivation* elements. These results suggest that educational senior leaders avoid the use of broad, generic assumptions concerning workplace issues of their teachers of different generational demographics when factoring decisions over motivational incentives in the teaching context. Such areas for renewed consideration by educational authorities and senior school leaders include increasing expectations over working hours or co-curricular commitments, and expectations toward teacher-employee loyalty to their school organisation, and general staff morale and wellbeing issues (Watson, 2007). It is also important that educational authorities establish those aspects of *Motivation* where Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers share similarities for mutual enhancement and deeper collaboration. On issues of retention, the systemic leadership of Catholic Education, as well as union representatives, are encouraged to consider the needs and priorities of different generational cohorts when deciding how to approach

motivational incentives for teacher-leaders (Canavan, 2013; Fink, 2011). This includes targeted remuneration and family-friendly/flexibility incentives (Watson, 2007) in order to both attract and recruit younger generations (especially Millennials) into the profession (Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003). It is also imperative to find new ways to retain experienced teachers considering opportunities in other industries (Gen-Xers), or retirement (Baby Boomers) (Marks, 2013).

6.3.2 Hypothesis 2 (Subscale – Work Ethic): Determinants of Work Ethic are different between Generational Cohorts

The results (refer to Table 5.4) did not support this hypothesis for the *Work Ethic* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting no significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .098$). The items for this subscale, derived from the literature review (refer to Table 2.7), included ‘Results-driven’, ‘Gives maximum effort and have strong work ethic’, and ‘Adapt and learn quickly’ (refer to Table 4.3). This unsupported hypothesis was designed to explore whether differences existed in the *Work Ethic* workplace trait, as a result of literature (discussed in the review from Chapter 2) from previous research findings examining generational differences in workplace behavioural perceptions in other industries (Jobe, 2014; Taylor & Keeter, 2010; Yu & Miller, 2005).

This finding is important as *Work Ethic* is a central component of workplace behaviours (Parry & Urwin, 2011; Taylor & Keeter, 2010), and research for identifying differences in generational perceptions has produced mixed results. For example, Becton et al. (2014) and Zemke et al. (2013) found that Baby Boomers and Millennials do have higher regard for work ethic than Gen-Xers. These findings contradict the popularised stereotype of Millennials as less hard-working. Conversely, Hansen and Leuty (2012) in their longitudinal

study found the opposite, with Gen-Xers having a higher sense of work ethic than Baby Boomers and Millennials.

This study's results indicate that its participants, from an educational context, did not have significant differences in generational perceptions regarding *Work Ethic* and supports findings from previous research that this is not a major point of difference between the generations (Costanza et al., 2012; Kowske et al., 2010), and therefore contradicts anecdotal stereotypes (Hansen & Leuty, 2012). It is worth noting that while there was not a significant difference in this subscale's results, there was a pattern between Baby Boomers (highest) and Millennials (lowest).

6.3.3 Hypothesis 3 (Subscale – Professional Feedback): Perceptions towards

Professional Feedback are different between Generational Cohorts

The results (refer to Table 5.4) did not support this hypothesis for the *Professional Feedback* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting no significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .149$). The items for this subscale, derived from the literature review (refer to Table 2.7), included 'Willing to ask for help when needed', 'Prefer informality amongst colleagues', and 'Prefer ongoing, informal feedback', and (refer to Table 4.3). This unsupported hypothesis was designed to explore whether differences existed in the *Professional Feedback* method of staff and leadership development, as a result of literature (discussed in the review from Chapter 2) from previous research findings between the generations in other industries concerning the importance of communication and knowledge transfer in leadership management (Smyrl, 2011).

An organisation's value and process of feedback is important for role growth and organisational outcomes (Smyrl, 2011; Stevens, 2010). Previous research has found that Millennials prefer informal and personalised feedback options (Sauser & Sims, 2012; Sayers,

2007; Steinmetz, 2007); Baby Boomers' preferences for structured feedback processes including formal reviews (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012); and Gen-Xers' preferences for self-reliance (Deal et al., 2012). Other studies have found that workers across other industries prefer multiple feedback methods due to differing preferences between the generational cohorts (Parry & Urwin, 2011).

This present study's results did not report any significant generational differences concerning their school's approach to professional feedback, and therefore did not correlate with these previous findings. It is interesting that while perceptions toward this workplace attribute did not reveal significant differences for this subscale (however there was a high score for Millennials indicating tentative support for this hypothesis), the opposite was true to the seventh subscale, *Culture for Mentoring Leaders*, where feedback would be an inherent component of such a mentoring-culture.

6.3.4 Hypothesis 4 (Subscale – Leadership Development Culture): Perceptions and expectations toward Leadership Development are different between Generational Cohorts

The results (refer to Table 5.4) did not support this hypothesis for the *Leadership Development Culture* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting no significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .159$). The items for this subscale, derived from the literature review (refer to Table 2.7), included 'Value mentoring of potential leaders', 'Accepting of Change' concerning ever-increasing change-management expectations for all levels of teachers and school leaders, and 'Prefer to work in teams', and (refer to Table 4.3). This unsupported hypothesis was designed to explore whether differences existed in the *Leadership Development Culture* method of staff and leadership development, as a result of

literature (discussed in the review from Chapter 2) from previous research findings between the generations in other industries (Becton et al., 2014; Zemke et al., 2013).

This hypothesis too, potentially contradicts the finding for *Leadership Perceptions* construct subscales of *Leadership Style and Expectations*, and *Culture of Mentoring Leaders* (as summarised in Table 5.10). This potentially suggests that participants did not consider these subscales' conceptually within reference to each other from the instrument questions in reference to each other. For example, it is interesting that while perceptions toward this workplace attribute of itself did not reveal significant differences for this subscale, the opposite was true to the seventh subscale, *Culture for Mentoring Leaders*, where feedback would be an inherent component of such a mentoring-culture.

6.3.5 Hypothesis 5 (Subscale – School Hierarchy): Perceptions toward School Hierarchy are different between Generational Cohorts

The results (refer to Table 5.4) did support this hypothesis for the *School Hierarchy* (SH) subscale, with the generational groupings reporting statistically significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .000$). This finding supports previous anecdotal and empirical findings discussed in the review of literature in Chapter 2 (refer to Table 2.7) concerning different perceptions toward the culture and processes of *School Hierarchy* between the generational cohorts. Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers value *School Hierarchy* significantly higher over the Millennials, yet not reporting any differences between each other. With instrument items such as, 'respect of school hierarchy', 'office politics' or 'structure and process' (Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003), this finding implies these generations have very significant differences in perceptions and expectations toward these *School Hierarchy* elements.

These results suggest that a one-size-fits-all approach to a school's hierarchical and management processes do not necessarily meet the different expectations and needs of the

three different generational cohorts. These factors include differences in desires for formality or informality in position roles and interaction identified in research from other industries; top-down management (Haeberle et al. 2009); change-management (Taylor & Keeter, 2010); increased administrative duties and responsibilities (Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003); and, blockage by educational leadership/management incumbents (Barty et al., 2005; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; Marks, 2013). This is especially required as these issues of workplace pressures are deeply connected to school performance (Duignan & Bezzina, 2006; Fink, 2011). One suggestion for the Catholic Education Office Melbourne (CEOM), and school leadership and management is to explore more defined understanding of how each of the generational cohorts perceive the different hierarchical structures and process of their schools' administration and management. Also, another recommendation for future research with this hypothesis concerning *School Hierarchy* is the differing perceptions between the generations in the role toward an individual's 'Catholicity', as well as the school's unique Catholic identity, plays (Canavan, 2013; Neidhart & Carlin, 2003b); and how this relates to issues concerning the school's *School Hierarchy* image and practice, especially when it comes to staffing and leadership planning.

6.3.6 Summary of Discussion of Workplace Perceptions Construct Hypotheses

Therefore, the results of the measurement subscales purporting to respond to Research Question 1 provided clarification to previous research indicating that while differences were revealed in the areas of *Motivation* and *School Hierarchy*; generational similarities were more prevalent than generational differences in the workplace behaviours of *Work Ethic*, *Professional Feedback* and *Leadership Development Culture*. As well as responding to the differences of generational perceptions concerning these areas of workplace behaviours, understanding of generational similarities can provide educational leaders with areas upon

which to further develop and cultivate as common workplace behavioural strengths.

6.4 Discussion of Leadership Perceptions Construct Hypotheses

This section discusses the hypothesis-findings of the second research question that was to determine the perceptual differences amongst the three generations in a Catholic school on leadership succession issues:

- Research Question 2: *Are there differences in the leadership perceptions of three generational cohorts of teaching staff in a secondary Catholic school, as measured by the GPSLi?*

6.4.1 Hypothesis 6 (Subscale – Intentional Leadership Succession Planning): A relationship exists between expectations and willingness concerning Leadership Succession and Advancement, and the generation/age of the individual.

As described in the data analysis (refer to Table 5.9), results did support this hypothesis for the *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting statistically significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .005$). This finding supports previous anecdotal and empirical findings discussed in the review of literature in Chapter 2 (refer to Table 2.7) concerning different perceptions between the generations toward succession planning (Barty et al., 2005) and intentional ‘pipelines’ (Fink, 2011) of preparation for future leaders in the teaching profession (Marks, 2013). Especially relevant is the confirmation this study provides in the differences of prioritisation of *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning* from both the Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers rating higher over the Millennials, yet not reporting any differences between each other. This hypothesis’ instrument included items such as leadership advancement expectations between generations, ‘tendency of colleagues from other generations to not respect their leadership’,

and, work demand expectations of leadership roles discouraging ‘particular age groups of teachers from taking on middle or senior leadership roles’ (refer to Table 4.4). This finding implies these generations have very significant differences in perceptions and expectations toward the lack of *intentionality* of their school’s succession planning culture; and that current strategies for future leadership cultivation need renewed attention (Canavan, 2013), including taking into account the demographic needs and expectations of the different generational cohorts. This supported hypothesis also confirms research concerning:

- disenfranchisement of younger generations towards considering whether to apply for leadership positions (Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; Marks, 2013)
- ‘fairness’ and integrity’ of the application process (d’Arbon et al., 2002)
- increasing unwillingness to apply for positions due to concerns over role workload (Fink, 2011)
- perceptions toward role-‘cloning’ (d’Arbon et al., 2002)
- quantity of candidates including declining rate of applicants (McKenzie et al., 2014)
- quality of candidates in their preparedness/suitability for leadership (Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003).
- recommendations that educational leaders may need to further cultivate alternate strategies for principal/senior leadership-retention (Marks, 2013).

Wider research across a greater number of Catholic schools would be required to inform whether this would need to be considered across the Catholic school system in Melbourne, and such a recommendation for this research to take place is encouraged.

6.4.2 Hypothesis 7 (Subscale – Culture of Mentoring Leaders): A relationship exists between expectations, culture and practice concerning Leadership Mentoring amongst Generational Cohorts

The results (refer to Table 5.9) did support this hypothesis for the *Culture of Mentoring Leaders* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting statistically significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .004$). This finding supports previous anecdotal and empirical findings discussed in the review of literature in Chapter 2 (refer to Table 2.7) concerning different perceptions between the generations toward mentoring culture (d'Arbon et al., 2002), 'pipelines' of leadership development opportunities (Fink, 2011), and maximising positive elements of generational 'collide' where generations can learn from each other (Marks, 2013). Of importance to this study too is that the Millennials rated this subscale with higher importance than both Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers (who did not rate differently from each other in levels of importance). This confirms previous research from other industries (Stevens, 2010), and education (Bezzina, 2012; Fullan, 2004) that suggests younger generations consider mentoring as a key element of training and development. Especially relevant is the confirmation this study provides in the differences between the generations in their consideration of *value* in mentoring culture within teacher-leader development. Instrument items included 'inter-generational mentoring', 'leaders from different generations learning from each other', and the place of a 'mentoring program' in their school (refer to Table 4.4). This finding implies that the generational cohorts of teachers in the case-study school have very different perceptions and expectations in the value, role and practice of mentoring for leadership development.

It is suggested that further research specifically identifying the desired characteristics and process-preferences for each generational cohort for a mentoring program that addresses concerns over leadership-'cloning' (d'Arbon et al., 2002) or in/formality of mentoring-

relationship (Watson, 2007); effective means for knowledge-transfer between experienced and inexperienced leaders (Fink, 2011); and, strategies that address concerns of leadership replenishment (Marks, 2013). This can lead to different generational cohorts of teachers feeling more engaged and understood according to their generational characteristics; and therefore more personally involved in their own and each others' leadership development, and by extension, their profession (d'Arbon et al., 2002).

6.4.3 Hypothesis 8 (Subscale – Leadership Styles and Expectations): A relationship exists between expectations and practice concerning Leadership Styles and Expectations amongst Generational Cohorts

The results (refer to Table 5.9) did support this hypothesis for the *Leadership Styles and Expectations* subscale, with the generational groupings reporting statistically significant difference in their perceptions ($p < .048$). This finding supports previous anecdotal and empirical findings discussed in the review of literature in Chapter 2 (refer to Table 2.7) concerning different perceptions between the generations toward *Leadership Styles and Expectations* when it comes to interpretation of role duties; inter-generational interaction between leaders (Barty et al., 2005); and, leadership approach/style preferences (Bezzina, 2012; Fink, 2011; Marks, 2013). Especially relevant is the confirmation this study provides in the differences of prioritisation of *Leadership Styles and Expectations* with both Gen-Xers and Millennials (while not sharing any significant differences between each other) rating significantly higher in importance than Baby Boomers. This hypothesis' instrument included items such as leadership style preferences and expectations between generations, including differences in expectations for working hours, cultivating leadership of different age groups, benefits of an inter-generational workforce, and specifically, 'difference in leadership styles and expectations between different generations' (refer to Table 4.4). This finding confirms

previous research that these generations have very significant differences in perceptions and expectations toward the style preferences and practice of a school's leadership culture (Barty et al., 2005); expectations concerning actual and perceived role duties (Canavan, 2013; Watson, 2007) and the degree of practical flexibility to undertake those roles for enhanced personal wellbeing (Barty et al., 2005); and perceptions concerning the suitability and capability of younger staff to fulfil what older generations believe are essential elements of leadership duties (Barty et al., 2005; Marks, 2013). This study supports previous research that encourages educational leaders to better understand generationally-specific preferences towards leadership styles and practice to better meet the needs and challenges of a multigenerational teaching workforce (Barty et al., 2005; Bezzina, 2012; Canavan, 2013; Fink, 2011).

6.4.4 Hypothesis 9 (Subscale – Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences): Perceptions toward the awareness of Generational Differences are different between Generational Cohorts.

This was the only subscale under the Research Question 2 construct that did not support its correlating hypothesis (refer to Table 5.9). Results for *Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences* indicated there was no significant difference in their perceptions between the generations ($p < .099$). The items for this subscale, derived from the literature review (refer to Table 2.7), included awareness and understanding of their school's senior leadership toward 'differing generational learning styles for training and leadership development'; communication and training methods; and, assignation of different generational staff working together (refer to Table 4.3). This unsupported hypothesis was designed to explore whether teaching staff perceived that their school's senior leaders considered generational differences or similarities when it came to essential process and

culture decisions for teachers, and their teachers' leadership development. While there were significant differences revealed in other subscales concerning the perceptions of the different generational cohorts, this subscale concerning their beliefs and perceptions toward their senior leaders revealed not significant differences. So while revealing significant differences in other subscale elements concerning workplace practices and leadership succession culture, this unsupported hypothesis perhaps suggests that teachers did not perceive generational differences to be a necessary element of consideration by their school's senior leaders when developing their school's leadership succession culture. A recommendation based upon the other supported hypotheses for this research question, is to encourage future research into how teachers therefore perceive the connection between their senior leaders' role, capacity and practice of developing a leadership culture.

6.4.5 Summary of Discussion of Leadership Perceptions Construct Hypotheses

Therefore, the results of the measurement subscales purporting to respond to Research Question 2 provided clarification to previous research indicating that there were strong differences revealed in the areas of *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*, *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, and *Leadership Styles and Expectations*. The subscale of *Awareness of, and Catering for Generational Differences* revealed no significant differences.

CHAPTER 7

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

One generation commends your works to another – Psalm 145:4

7.1 Introduction

This final chapter draws out key recommendations and final conclusions from the present study that contribute to the broader work of research of generational differences within the education context, and areas for possible further research.

The purpose of this study was to complement existing research into Australia's increasing shortage of educational leaders. Schools are facing the looming reality that the predominant cohort of Baby Boomers in leadership positions is entering a phase of retirement. There is minimal research into factors other than demographic distribution of teacher-leader ages are contributing to the decline of younger generations (Gen-Xers and Millennials) replenishing these leadership roles. These factors can include the differing perceptions of the younger generational cohorts toward educational leadership, such as motivation, management processes, culture, and role expectations. A 'one-size-fits-all' approach for teacher-leader recruitment and development are not meeting this problem. This wider dilemma is reflected in the Catholic Education system.

This study, conducted in a Catholic school, has confirmed there are significant differences (see discussion in Chapter 6) in teacher perceptions between the different generations towards both leadership and workplace behaviours. Understanding these differences, can contribute to the development of more targeted strategies – leadership 'pipelines' - in the school workplace for the recruitment, cultivation and retention of

teacher-leaders, with the aim of improving both the *quantity* and *quality* of potential leadership aspirants.

7.2 Recommendations for Practice

The findings of the study have implications for Catholic Education system of Victoria in both practice and research. A number of recommendations can be formulated on the basis of these implications.

7.2.1 Recommendation 1 – Paradigm Shift for System Leaders and Senior School Leaders toward teacher generational differences and leadership succession

The present study has identified that with the demographic changes of teaching staff in education, and that with the differing generational perceptions and needs of teachers, a different approach to leadership dynamics requires further investigation of these linkages. The evidence from this present study (see Table 5.10) suggests further research and consideration is required to develop wider approaches to leadership philosophy, models, structures, and development. Moving towards the 2020's, this study aligns with previous research (Marks, 2013; Bezzina, 2012) that system officials and school senior leadership could be more aware of and sensitive in their consideration of generational differences when cultivating workplace practices and responsive leadership succession needs (Sugrue, 2014). Existing leaders are required to plan effectively for replenishing teacher-leadership both in quantity and quality future leaders to replace themselves (Marks, 2013), as well as improve the quality of leadership for 21st century classrooms (Lane, 2012). This includes understanding and accommodation of differing generational workplace and leadership styles and expectations (Canavan, 2013). This is

especially true in considering the demographical wave of Gen-Xers and Millennials who have entered the teaching system in the last decade. Existing leaders can also contribute to further research into potential strategies that respect and maximise the experience of Baby Boomer teachers who dominate senior school leadership roles, and cultivate strategies that enable them to share their rich experience with the younger generations.

7.2.2 Recommendation 2 – Understanding Generational Motivational Factors

The present study identified that motivational differences amidst the generations are a significant factor toward how teachers interact in the workplace (see Table 5.4). Previous research has found that it is important to not treat all teachers and school leaders as the same when understanding their different preferences and approaches to workplace motivational factors such as remuneration, career progression, leadership style, and work/life balance (Barty et al., 2005; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003).

School leaders can incorporate generational awareness when developing management, coaching and other staffing strategies to assisting leadership aspirants on issues of support and workplace morale. For example, consideration of generational differences can be made in responding to issues concerning administrative pressures, role expectations and perceptions of workplace politics for both older and younger generations of teachers (Waite, 2016). Another example includes the different generational expectations concerning organisational loyalty, definitions of professionalism, remuneration and hours, role satisfaction and vocational calling. This study supports the notion for a more nuanced understanding of each generation's extrinsic and intrinsic motivations, and subsequent responsive strategies in enticing teachers to aspire to middle and senior leadership roles.

7.2.3 Recommendation 3 – Creating ‘Pipelines’ for Middle and Senior Leadership

The present study supported previous research (Fink, 2011; Myung et al. 2011) that not only identified future problems with the quantity of leadership candidates, but also their quality and preparedness (see Tables 5.4 and 5.9). This study identified significant differences in the areas of *Intentional Succession Planning*, *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, *School Hierarchy*, and *Leadership Styles and Expectations*. As in the state and independent sectors, there is a lack of coordinated succession planning within the Catholic system (Canavan, 2007). Pathways and progressive opportunities could be developed for future leadership candidates for both the purpose of preparation, but also in order to increase attractiveness of such pathways for leadership recruitment. This is necessary for enticing younger generations into the leadership culture of schools and combat disengagement (Marks, 2013).

Research demonstrates that younger generations dislike pathway processes that they perceive to be leadership cloning (Canavan, 2006), and that they require more diverse approaches and strategies in their opportunities for leadership cultivation. Approaches that are seen as top-down or one-size-fits-all, are not working (Marks, 2013). Increased support to leadership development programs, incentivisation and workplace culture in the Catholic sector that respond to differing generational preferences is required.

In the same way classrooms personalise student learning, school leadership development processes need to mirror such methods when cultivating existing and future middle and senior leaders. Internal professional development within schools, and training provided on a wider system-level could be designed with generational sensitivities in

mind, especially in the areas of *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, *Leadership Styles and Expectations*, and *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*. Greater levels of responsibility and decision-making in school practices and management issues can also assist with equipping suitable middle and senior leadership candidates. This widening of decision-making and increased emphasis on leadership succession can also promote collegiality, as well as improve student outcomes (Mulford et al., 2006). These processes could be designed to be more flexible, relational and informal in order to meet the workplace interaction and leadership style preferences of younger generations.

7.2.4 Recommendation 4 – Increased Emphasis on Mentoring Culture

The present study also aligns with research that mentoring culture and succession planning are fundamentally interconnected (see Table 5.9). It found that the generations differed significantly in their perceptions of *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*. There is the opportunity for more effective means of knowledge-transfer between the generations for the purpose of creating more effective means for Baby Boomers imparting their wisdom and experience to Gen-Xers and Millennials.

Schools have been developing mentoring processes, however, younger generations appear to consider these as too formal, and older generations, as tedious (Fink & Brayman, 2006; Marks, 2013). Educational leaders can more effectively develop their school's mentoring culture by creating mentoring relationships that better respond to generational needs, in both practice and content. Another suggestion from this study is the recommendation that leadership culture is developed inherently within the formative years of younger teachers within their teaching and leadership practice, not just for experienced teachers considering middle or senior leadership roles. A mentoring culture

can also widen the pool of potential leadership aspirants a lot earlier in their vocation (Gronn, 2007).

Mentoring, and indeed, reverse mentoring (Stevens, 2010), can provide significant emotional and relational support for teachers who are facing increasing administrative and academic achievement pressures; changes in pedagogy and curriculum for 21st century learning; and, more importantly, complex student wellbeing needs. This widening of collegial support can also increase the feedback and practical development of potential and existing leaders. An increased mentoring culture can not only cultivate a school's leadership culture in the explicit and implicit operational processes, but within a Catholic school, can increase the school's sense of community, and mission as a faith-based, learning environment (CEOM, 2005).

7.2.5 Recommendation 5 – Alternatives to Existing School Hierarchical Structures

The present study's findings identified that there were significant differences among the generational cohorts towards existing school hierarchical and organisational structures (see Tables 5.4 and 5.9).

The discussion in the previous chapters suggest that Catholic educational administrators and principals need to be aware that teaching staff have more diverse perceptions and preferences when it comes to school structures including leadership roles, management, interaction and organisation. It is important to explore further models of leadership and organisation that more reflect the generational expectations of those teaching staff working within. These different perceptions and expectations can lead to inter-generational tensions, which in turn can impact a school's ability to maximise their faculty potential and achieve higher learning outcomes as these tensions can manifest in a

school's day-to-day operations and classrooms.

Established administrative and management processes in other industry sectors (Kupperschmidt, 2000; Zemke et al., 2013) have made the transitional shift from traditional structures to management systems that have greater flexibility (Waite, 2010), and more reflective of the values and traits of emerging leaders in the workplace (refer to Chapter 2). Research has found that existing power-structures are designed and therefore, more reflective of the Baby Boomers' cohort, as well as not truly engaging younger generations' preferences for support and development. By tapping into each generation's unique motivational preferences, the education system would be able to better cater for teachers' leadership aspirations; role-satisfaction and morale; recruitment; and ongoing leadership-multiplication (Marks, 2013; Rothwell, 2005).

The present study identified different expectations and perceptions of existing hierarchical structures, and system leaders need to consider existing processes and factors when planning for leadership replenishment for the emerging generations.

7.2.6 Recommendation 6 – Intentional Leadership Recruitment and Retention

The present study (see Tables 5.4 and 5.9) supports extensive research into the decline in applicants from younger generations for middle or senior leadership roles in Catholic schools (Marks, 2013; McKenzie et al. 2014). There are multiple implications from this problem of a diminishing pool of potential candidates. Existing leaders are concerned about the declining number of suitable potential leaders, and those who are willing to aspire to a leadership role have limited opportunities within which to nurture and cultivate their leadership skills and experience (Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009). Along with external forces (such as economic), this is also leading to a lack of movement

amongst positions as existing leaders are asked to continue to make up recruitment gaps rather than have more opportunity to intentionally identify and train leadership aspirants. Newer approaches and strategies are required to more intentionally incorporate the needs and preferences of the generational cohorts in the planning for future leadership replenishment.

By being more aware of generational differences of leadership aspirants, educational authorities can factor into their succession planning issues such as motivation; role recognition; administrative pressures; opportunity for role-impact; remuneration; hours; and, work-life balance. As stated earlier, traditional, one-size-fits-all approaches are no longer adequate in meeting system needs.

7.3 Limitations of the Present Study

There were two significant limitations upon this study that will be addressed in this section.

Firstly, one limitation of the study was that the number of sample participants was small; and the proportion of participants' generational groupings was different. There were a total number of 52 self-reporting participants including 17 Baby Boomers, 28 Gen-Xers, and 8 Millennials. In the coming years as the Millennial cohort increases, and the Baby Boomer generation decreases through attrition or retirement, future studies would benefit from the inclusion of larger numbers of the Millennial cohort who will represent a larger sample size in any inter-generational comparative analysis. Wider representation would also enhance reliability of results.

A second and related to the first, limitation is the issue of generalisability. The results of this study were collected from a Catholic school located in Melbourne. While

significant differences were found, especially in a school's leadership succession planning culture, these findings are not readily generalisable to other schools across the Catholic Education sector in Melbourne. The results from this school may not be the same, as other schools who have a dissimilar demographic of generational cohorts. However, this limitation only invites an obvious pathway for future research into a potentially wider study including a larger sample of teachers across several, or even all schools across Melbourne's Catholic Education sector. This study may provide insights and clues as to the development of explored hypotheses, approach in instrumentation and analysis.

7.4 Recommendations for Future Research

Further research in the role and nature of generational differences in perceptions between teachers, and how these perceptions shape a school's leadership succession culture is important because the findings of this study while supporting the results of previous studies, do not support entirely other research findings. While this study revealed significant differences and similarities in workplace practices and leadership succession culture between generational cohorts, further research is required with a wider sample, as well as in a longitudinal method to determine how these perceptions range across the wider Catholic Education context, and longitudinally over a period of time. Such a longitudinal study would also better examine the changing nature and influence those perceptions would have toward leadership succession as the younger generations increase in representation both demographically, and in level of leadership-seniority. Cennamo and Gardner (2011) both believe that studying such changes over a longer period of time can better identify the impact of teacher age, generational representation,

and other variables (such as workplace behaviours and leadership succession traits). Where differences between generational cohorts were revealed, it is important to further elicit information concerning the nature of those differences. Other methods of study including qualitative methods (focus groups interviews and case studies) should be included to further understand these differences, especially over issues raised from this study's two research questions.

Also of further benefit would be to conduct wider research into not just how these generations see themselves, but how they perceive *each other*. It would be worthy to elicit information on how each generational cohort tend to perceive the other cohort groupings, and whether they directly or indirectly alter their inter-generational engagement in both the management and daily-operational dynamics of a school's teaching workforce.

Another recommendation for future research is the examination of whether generational similarities and differences reveal any trends in perceptions and practice between genders. This would be highly significant in that female teachers are far greater in number in the teaching workplace than males, yet this is not demographically reflected in leadership representation in schools across all sectors of education providers in Australia (McKenzie et al., 2014; Neidhart & Carlin, 2003a).

7.5 Conclusions

In recent years, educational leaders, systems and researchers have called for a close examination of the declining rates of teacher-leadership development, recruitment and retention (Barty et al., 2005; McKenzie et al., 2014; Marks, 2013).

This has also been reflected in the Catholic sector of education (Bezzina, 2012; d'Arbon et al., 2002; Canavan, 2013; Fink, 2011, Marks, 2013). This study confirms the needs for further discussion over the assumptions senior leaders in Catholic schools make when cultivating the leadership decisions concerning practice and succession planning. Avoiding the generational differences, and similarities, can impact a school's teaching staff when it comes to their individual and collective practice of middle and senior leadership.

The present study identified significant differences in two subscales of *Motivation* and *School Hierarchy* under the Workplace Perceptions construct; and, three subscales of *Intentional Leadership Succession Planning*, *Culture of Mentoring Leaders*, and, *Leadership Styles and Expectations* under the Leadership Perceptions construct. These results support previous research from other sectors that the generational cohorts have different motivations, perceptions, preferences, and expectations in their attitudes towards workplace behaviours and leadership culture.

Under the construct of *Workplace Perceptions*, Research Question 1 concerned generational differences in workplace behaviours of a teaching faculty, and its findings revealed statistically significant differences in perceptions toward the areas of *Motivation* and *School Hierarchy*, but not others. This lack of consistency in these area findings imply that other factors not including generational differences may be influencing teacher perceptions and expectations over workplace behaviours of *Work Ethic*, *Professional Feedback*, and *Leadership Development Culture*.

Under the construct of *Leadership Perceptions*, findings for Research Question 2 described statistically significant differences within three of the four subscales between participating generational cohorts of the sample school's teaching faculty and their

leadership succession culture. Further research is required to uncover the nature of this connection and relating factors, both within the school itself, and potentially in a wider sampling of other schools for greater generalisability of results.

The results from both of these research questions support the contention that consideration of generational differences must be made when it comes to the future practice and development of educational leadership succession planning. This study found that generational identity is closely related to leadership definition, preferences and practice. This finding may allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the changing dynamics of teacher-leader development, recruitment and retention currently encountered by educational institutions across Australia. It can also allow for the development of targeted strategies to increase the *quantity* of future leaders, as well as the *quality* of leadership-candidates to be better prepared and empowered to meet the demands and changing duties required of educational leaders for the 21st century.

The focus of this study has been to discover and explore the relationship between generational differences, workplace behaviours and leadership succession planning. While it has been demonstrated that some connections exist, further research is required to determine a deeper understanding to the nature of these generational differences and similarities shape and influence a more comprehensive discussion of leadership succession issues and its practice in Catholic Education. Its findings infer that the differences of the generational cohorts can be utilised for both further research, as well as provide opportunities for school leaders to potentially adapt and change existing practices in recruitment, development and retention strategies for both existing and aspiring leaders.

REFERENCES

- Access Economics. (2001). *Population ageing and the economy*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Addison, R., & Brundrett, M. (2008). Motivation and demotivation of teachers in primary schools: The challenge of change. *Education 3-13*, 36(1), 79-94.
doi:10.1080/03004270701733254
- Ahmad, & Ibrahim. (2015). Leadership and the characteristic of different generational cohort towards job satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 204, 14-18.
doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.104
- Aiman-Smith, L., Bergey, R., Cantwell, A., & Doran, M. (2006). The coming knowledge and capability shortage: Knowledge, skills and experience walk out industry's door opened by the growing wave of retirees. *Research-Technology Management*, 49(2), 15.
doi:10.1109/EMR.2011.6019089
- Albion, P., & Gutke, H. (2010). *Successful succession through shared leadership: preparing a new generation of educational leaders*. Paper presented to 2010 Sydney Symposium The Future of Teacher Education and School Leader Education: Creating the Vision. Sydney, NSW. (Unpublished). Retrieved from
https://eprints.usq.edu.au/8589/1/Albion_Gutke_AV.pdf
- Aliyu, A., Bello, M.U., Kasim, R., & Martin, D. (2014). Positivist and non-positivist paradigm in social science research: Conflicting paradigms or perfect partners? *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 4(3). doi:10.5539/jms.v4n3p79
- Anderson, M., Gronn, P., Ingvarson, L., Jackson, A., Kleinhenz, E., McKenzie, P., & Thornton, N. (2007). *Australian country background report for the OECD activity on*

- improving school leadership*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Angrosino, M. (2010). *How do they know that?*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland.
- Appelbaum, S., Serena, M., & Shapiro, B. (2004). Generation x and the boomers: Organizational myths and literary realities. *Management Research News*, 27(11/12), 1-28. doi:10.1108/01409170410784635
- Arrowsmith, T. (2007). Distributed leadership in secondary schools in England: The impact on the role of the headteacher and other issues. *Management In Education*, 21(2), 21-27. doi:10.1177/0892020607076657
- Arsenault, P. (2004). Validating generational differences: A legitimate diversity and leadership Issue. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 124-141. doi:10.1108/01437730410521813
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (ABS). (2006). *Population projections Australia, 2004 to 2101*. (No. 3222.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (ABS). (2014). *Population by age and sex, Australia, state and territories*. (No. 3101.0). Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (ABS). (2015). *Retirement and retirement intentions*, (No. 6238.0). Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Publishing Services.
- Australian Education Union. (AEU). (2005). *New teacher's survey 2005 – Article 1*. Abbotsford, VIC: AEU. Retrieved from <http://www.aeu.vic.asn.au/professional/nwsarticle.html>
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. (AITSL). (2015). *Preparing future leaders: Effective preparation for aspiring school principals*. Retrieved from <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/school-leadership/principal-preparation/preparing-future-leaders.pdf>

- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. (2015). *The practice of social research* (14th ed.). South Melbourne, Victoria: Cengage Learning.
- Babbie, E., Wagner, W., & Zaino, J. (2015). *Adventures in social research* (9th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Barker, B. (2006). Rethinking leadership and change: A case study in leadership succession and its impact on school transformation. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(2), 277-293. doi:10.1080/03057640600718703
- Barty, K., Thomson, P., Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2005). Unpacking the issues: Researching the shortage of school principals in two states in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(3), 1-18. doi:10.1007/bf03216824
- Baruch, Y. (2004). *Managing careers: Theory and practice*. Harlow, UK: Prentice-Hall.
- Becton, J., Walker, H., & Jones-Farmer, A. (2014). Generational differences in workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44(3), 175-189. doi:10.1111/jasp.12208
- Bell, J. (2010). *Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science* (5th ed.). Maidenhead, U.K.: McGraw-Hill Open University Press.
- Belmonte, A., Cranston, N., & Limerick, B. (2006). Voices of Catholic school lay principals: Promoting a Catholic character and culture in schools in an era of change. In *International Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE)*. Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2006/bel06236.pdf>
- Bernstein, L., Alexander, B., & Alexander, D. (2008). Generations: Harnessing the potential of the multigenerational workforce. *Catalyst*, 37(3), 17-22. doi:1623886401

- Best, J.W., & Kahn, J.V. (1989). *Research in education* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bezzina, M. (2012). It's a long way to the top: Getting past the barriers for aspiring principals. *Leading & Managing*, 18(1), 19-30. Retrieved from <http://www.educ.mq.edu.au/>
- Black, K. (2014). *Business statistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Blandford, S. (2006). *Middle leadership in schools*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Bloom, A. (2015). So you're a new teacher. Let's talk about headship. *The Times Educational Supplement*, (5154) Retrieved from <https://www.tes.com/news/tes-archive/tes-publication/so-youre-a-new-teacher-lets-talk-about-headship>
- Blumer, H. (1956). Sociological analysis and the “variable”. *American Sociological Review* 21. 683-690. doi: 10.2307/2088418
- Boggs, M., & Szabo, S. (2011). Illuminating pathways through rigor, respect, relevance, and relationships: Scaffolding cross-generational understandings. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 77(2), 27-34. Retrieved from <http://www.dkg.com>
- Bordens, K., & Abbott, B.B. (2010). *Research design and methods: A process approach* (8th ed.). Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill.
- Borg, W. (1987). *Applying educational research: A practical guide for teachers* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Brace, I. (2013). *Questionnaire design: How to plan, structure, and write survey material for effective market research* (3rd ed.). London, U.K.: Kogan Page.
- Brand, V. (2008). Empirical business ethics research and paradigm analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86(4), 429-449. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9856-3
- Briggs, A., Coleman, M., & Morrison, M. (2012). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (3rd ed.). London: P. Chapman Pub.

- Bristow, J. (2015). *Baby Boomers and Generational Conflict* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bristow, J. Brosdahl, D., & Carpenter, J. (2012). U.S. male generational cohorts: Retail format preferences, desired retail attributes, satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Retailing And Consumer Services*, 19(6), 545-552. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2012.06.005
- Broad, J. (2011). The succession challenge: building and sustaining leadership capacity through succession management. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2), 249–251. doi:10.1080/02619768.2010.546837
- Budge, D. (1994, November 18). Extra pressure piled on for Catholic heads. *Times Educational Supplement*, p. 13.
- Bunting, M. (2004). *Willing Slave: How the Overwork Culture is ruling our lives*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Burch, R., & Strawderman, L. (2014). Leveraging generational differences to reduce knowledge transfer and retention issues in public administration. *PAR*, 3(2). doi:10.5539/par.v3n2p61
- Burke, M.E. (2005). *SHRM Generational differences survey report: A study by the Society for Human Resource Management*. Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.
- Burke, R. (1994). Generation x: Measures, sex and age differences. *Psychological Reports*, 74, 555. doi:10.2466/pr0.1994.74.2.555
- Burke, R., Antoniou, A., & Cooper, C. (2015). *The Multi-generational and aging workforce*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.
- Burnett, J. (2016). *Generations: The Time Machine in Theory and Practice*. Milton Park, U.K.: Routledge.
- Burns, R. (2000). *Introduction to research methods*. London, UK: SAGE.

- Bush, T. (2011). Succession planning and leadership development for school principals: Comparing English and South African approaches. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative And International Education*, 41(6), 785-800. doi:10.1080/03057925.2011.595968
- Busher, H. (2005). Being a middle leader: Exploring professional identities. *School Leadership & Management*, 25(2), 137–153. doi:10.1080/13632430500036231
- Butcher, H. (1966). *Sampling in educational research*. Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press.
- Cahill, T., & Sedrak, M. (2012). Leading a multigenerational workforce: Strategies for attracting and retaining millennials. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 29(1), 3-15. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23050333>
- Caldwell, B. (2000a). Achieving successful leadership in schools of the third millennium. *Improving Schools*, 3(3), 20-26. doi:10.1177/136548020000300305
- Caldwell, B. (2000b). *Innovations and abandonment for successful leadership in schools of the third millennium*. Paper presented to 2000 Conference of NZ Principals' Federation and Australian Primary Principals' Association, Celebrating Leadership into the Third Millennium. Christchurch, NZ.
- Canavan, K. (1999). The transformation of Catholic schools in Australia. *Journal of Religious Education*, 47(1), 19-24. Retrieved from trove.nla.gov.au/version/166877347
- Canavan, K. (2006). The changing face of Catholic schools in Australia. *Bulletin*, 88. Sydney, NSW: Catholic Education Office Sydney. Retrieved from <http://www.ceosyd.catholic.edu.au/About/Documents/bull-88.pdf>
- Canavan, K. (2007). Preparing leaders for the future: A systemic perspective. *Leading & Managing*, 13(2), 66–78. Retrieved from <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/153066683>

- Canavan, K. (2013). Leadership succession in Catholic schools: Planned or unplanned. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry And Practice*, 5(1), 72-84. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1528&context=ce>
- Carlin, P., d'Arbon, T., Dorman, J., Duignan, P., & Neidhart, H. (2003). *Leadership succession for Catholic schools in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania*. Final Report, April 2003. Strathfield, NSW: Australian Catholic University.
- Carpenter, M., & de Charon, L. (2014). Mitigating multigenerational conflict and attracting, motivating, and retaining millennial employees by changing the organizational culture: A theoretical model. *Journal of Psychological Issues In Organizational Culture*, 5(3), 68-84. doi:10.1002/jpoc.21154
- Catholic Education Office, Melbourne. (2005). *Leadership in Catholic schools: Development framework and standards of practice*. Melbourne, VIC: Catholic Education Commission of Victoria.
- Catholic Education Office, Sydney. (2001). *A Catholic school leadership framework: Core competencies and key elements*. Sydney, NSW: Catholic Education Office, Sydney.
- Cekada, T.L. (2012). Training a multigenerational workforce. *Professional Safety*, 57(3), 40-44. Retrieved from http://www.hhs.iup.edu/cekadat/safe644tlc/Links/Mod5_Week9_Cekada_multigen.pdf
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2011). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 39(2), 24-36. doi:10.1109/emr.2011.5876170
- Cetron, M., & Davies, O. (2005). Trends now shaping the future: Economic, societal and environmental trends. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 33(3), 53-53. doi:10.1109/emr.2005.26766

- Charan, R., Drotter, S. & Noel, J. (2001). *The leadership pipeline. How to build the leadership powered company*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coates, M. (2010). Future tense. In M. Coates (Ed.), *Future schools in shaping a new educational landscape: Exploring possibilities for education in the 21st century* (pp. 3-8). London: GBR: Continuum International Publishing.
- Codrington, G.T., & Grant-Marshall, S. (2005). *Mind the gap*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Penguin.
- Coetzee, J. (2001). *Development: Theory, policy and practice*. Capetown, South Africa: Oxford University Press.
- Cogin, J. (2012). Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(11), 2268-2294. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.610967
- Cole, G. Smith, R., & Lucas, L. (2002). The debut of generation y in the American workforce, *Journal of Business Administration Online*, 1(2). Retrieved from https://www.atu.edu/jbao/fall2002/cole_smith_lucas.pdf
- Coleman, A. (2012). The significance of trust in school-based collaborative leadership. *International Journal of Leadership In Education*, 15(1), 79-106. doi:10.1080/13603124.2011.578755
- Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2003). *Business research*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Commonwealth Department of Treasury. (2002). *2002 Intergenerational Report*. Parkes, ACT: Commonwealth Department of Treasury. Retrieved from <http://nla.gov.au/nla.arc-146364>
- Comte, A. (1858). *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte* [H. Martineau, Trans.]. New York, NY: Calvin Fairchild.

- Comte, A., Martineau, H., & Harrison, F. (2000). *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte*. Kitchener, Canada: Batoche.
- Conger, J., & Fulmer, R. (2003). Developing your leadership pipeline. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(12), 76-85. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2003/12/developing-your-leadership-pipeline>
- Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2006). *Business research methods* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Corman, S., & Poole, M. (2000). *Perspectives on organizational communication*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Costanza, D.P., Badger, J.M., Fraser, R.L., Severt, J.B., & Gade, P.A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394. doi:10.1007/s10869-012-9259-4
- Coupland, D. (1991). *Generation x*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Coward, L. (2012). *A quantitative study: Administrative leaders' perceptions of succession planning and management practices within community colleges*. (Doctoral Dissertation). (OCLC no.: 798361507). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/ETD-UT-2012-05-5378>
- Cowie, M., & Crawford, M. (2009). Headteacher preparation programmes in England and Scotland: Do they make a difference for the first-year head? *School Leadership & Management*, 29(1), 5–21. doi:10.1080/13632430802646354
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Crumpacker, M., & Crumpacker, J. (2007). Succession planning and generational stereotypes: Should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a passing fad? *Public Personnel Management*, 36(4), 349-369.
doi:10.1177/009102600703600405
- D'Amato, A., & Herzfeldt, R. (2008). Learning orientation, organizational commitment and talent retention across generations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 929-953.
doi:10.1108/02683940810904402
- d'Arbon, T. (2006). Career aspirations of potential applicants for principals of Catholic schools: An Australian perspective. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice*, 10(1), 46–60. Retrieved from
<http://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2003/dar03299.pdf>
- d'Arbon, T., Duignan, P., & Duncan, D. (2001). *Leadership succession in Catholic schools in New South Wales: A research project on behalf of the Catholic Education Commission – New South Wales*. Phase Two, Final Report. Sydney, NSW: Australian Catholic University. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED460438>
- d'Arbon, T., Neidhart, H., Dorman, J., & Carlin, P. (2002). *Principal succession in Catholic primary and secondary schools in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania: Opportunities and challenges*. Presented to 2002 Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) Conference. Brisbane, QLD. Retrieved from
<http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/car02106.htm>
- Davis, J., Pawlowski, S., & Houston, A. (2006). Work commitments of baby boomers and gen-xers in the IT profession: Generational differences or myth? *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 46(3), 43-49. doi:10.1080/08874417.2006.11645897

- Day, C. (2009). Building and sustaining successful principalship in England: The importance of trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(6), 719-730.
doi:10.1108/09578230910993104
- De Hauw, S., & De Vos, A. (2010). Millennials' career perspective and psychological contract expectations: Does the recession lead to lowered expectations? *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 293-302. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9162-9
- Deal, J., Altman, D., & Rogelberg, S. (2010). Millennials at work: What we know and what we need to do (if anything). *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 191-199.
doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9177-2
- Deal, J., Stawiski, S., Graves, L., Gentry, W., Ruderman, M., & Weber, T. (2012). Perceptions of authority and leadership: A cross-national, cross-generational investigation. In Ng, E. S., Lyons, S. T., & Schweitzer, L. (Eds.) *Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the millennial generation*. (pp. 281–306). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Del Campo, R. (2010). *Managing the multi-generational workforce*. Farnham, U.K.: Gower.
- De Meuse, K.P., Bergmann, T.J., & Lester, S.W. (2001). An investigation of the relational component of the psychological contract across time, generation, and employment status. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(1), 102-118. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40604336>
- De Meuse, K.P., & Mlodzik, K.J. (2010). A second look at generational differences in the workforce: Implications for HR and talent management. *People and Strategy*, 33(2), 50-58. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-2186179361.html>
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (DEEWR). (2007). *Staffing Australia's schools 2007*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (DEEWR). (2008). *Teacher workforce data and planning processes in Australia*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). (2007). *OECD: Improving leadership activity – Australia country background report*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Di Paola, M. (2003). The Principalship at a Crossroads: A Study of the Conditions and Concerns of Principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 43-65.
doi:10.1177/019263650308763404
- Dinham, S. (2007). The secondary head of department and the achievement of exceptional student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Admin.*, 45(1), 62–79.
doi:10.1108/09578230710722458
- Dlodlo, N., & Dhurup, M. (2013). Examining social media dimensions among a cohort of generation y consumers in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 329. Retrieved from
<http://www.mcser.org/journal/index/.php/mjss/article.view/1610>
- Dorman, J., & d'Arbon, T. (2003a). Assessing impediments to leadership succession in Australian Catholic schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 23(1), 25-25.
doi:10.1080/1363243032000080014
- Dorman, J., & d'Arbon, T. (2003b). Leadership succession in New South Wales Catholic schools: Identifying potential principals. *Educational Studies*, 29(2-3), 127-139.
doi:10.1080/03055690303281

- Du, Y. (2011). *Communication disconnect: Generational stereotypes between generation x/y and baby boomers in American and Chinese organizational communication* (Order No. 1491052). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (864243171). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1168&context=masters>
- Duignan, P. (2006). *Educational leadership: Key challenges and ethical tensions*. Melbourne, VIC: Cambridge University Press.
- Duignan, P., & Bezzina, M. (2006). *Building a capacity for shared leadership in schools: Teachers as leaders of educational change*. Paper presented at University of Wollongong Educational Leadership Conference, Wollongong, NSW. Retrieved from <https://www.uow.edu.au/content/groups/public/@web/@educ/documents/doc/uow037796.pdf>
- Duncan, D.J. (2002). The preparation of leaders for Catholic education. In D. Duncan & D. Riley (Eds.), *Leadership in Catholic Education*. Sydney, NSW: Harper Collins.
- Durkheim, E. (2014). *The rules of sociological method: and selected texts on sociology and its method*. New York, N.Y.: Simon & Schuster.
- Dylan, B. (1964). The times they are a changin. On *The times they are a changing*: record. New York, NY: Columbia.
- Earley, P. & Weindling, D. (2012). The heart of the school? Middle leaders. In *British Educational Leadership Management & Administration Society: Understanding school leadership* (pp. 111-123). London, U.K.: SAGE. doi: 10.4135/9781446215678.n10
- Eckert, R., & Deal, J. (2012). Generation y: Attitude and talent at work. *Developing Leaders: Executive Education in Practice*, 22-27. Retrieved from <http://www.iedp.com>
- Edger, D. (2005). *The war over work*. Melbourne, VIC: Melbourne University Press.

- Edmunds, J., & Turner, B. (2005). Global generations: Social change in the twentieth century. *British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 559-577. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2005.00083.x
- Egri, C., & Ralston, D. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the United States. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 210-220. doi:10.1287/orsc.1030.0048
- Eisner, S. (2011). Managing generation y. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 39(2), 6-18. doi:10.1109/emr.2011.5876168
- Elmore, R.F. (2000). *Building a new structure for leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Espinoza, C., Ukleja, M., & Rusch, C. (2010). *Managing the millennials*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eyerman, R., & Turner, B. (1998). Outline of a Theory of Generations. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 1(1), 91-106. doi:10.1177/136843198001001007
- Favero, L., & Heath, R. (2012). Generational perspectives in the workplace: Interpreting the discourses that constitute women's struggle to balance work and life. *Journal of Business Communication*, 49(4), 332-356. doi:10.1177/0021943612456037
- Ferres, N. Travaglione, A., & Firms, I. (2003). Attitudinal differences between generation-x and older employees. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 6(3), 320-33. Retrieved from <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/10282/20030713-0000/www.usq.edu.au/faculty/business/departments/hrm/HRMJJournal/InternationalArticles/Volume6/FerresTravaglioneFirmsPaper3.pdf>
- Ferri-Reed, J. (2013). Quality, conflict, and communication across the generations. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 35(4), 12-14. Retrieved from asq.org/qic/display-item/index.html?item=35556

- Fincham, D. (2010). Headteachers in Catholic schools: Challenges of leadership. *International Studies In Catholic Education*, 2(1), 64-79.
doi:10.1080/19422530903494843
- Fink, D. (2010). *The succession challenge*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Fink, D. (2011). Pipelines, pools and reservoirs: Building leadership capacity for sustained improvement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(6), 670-684.
doi:10.1108/09578231111174811
- Fink, D., & Brayman, C. (2004). Principals' succession and educational change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(4), 431-449. doi:10.1108/09578230410544053
- Fink, D., & Brayman, C. (2006). School leadership succession and the challenges of change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 62-89. doi:10.1177/0013161x05278186
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Foot, D., & Stoffman, D. (2000). *Boom bust & echo*. Toronto, ONT: Stoddart.
- Foster, J., Campbell, W., & Twenge, J. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. *Journal of Research In Personality*, 37(6), 469-486. doi:10.1016/s0092-6566(03)00026-6
- Fowler, F.J. (2013). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Fox, A. (2011). Mixing it up. *HR Magazine*, 56(5), 22. Retrieved from
http://apps.keepingthepeople.com/_articles/pdfs/HR_Magazine_May_20_2011.pdf
- Fox, D. (2014). *Doing events research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Francis-Smith, J. (August 26, 2004). Surviving and thriving in the multigenerational workplace. *Journal Record*, 1. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/newspaper/1P2-2120458/surviving-and-thriving-in-the-multigenerational-workplace>

- Frank, F. D., Finnegan, R. P., & Taylor, C. R. (2004). The race for talent: Retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century. *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 27(3), 12-25. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.514.4132>
- Friedman, M. (1953). *Essays in positive economics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Frost, P. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Fullan, M. (2004). *Personal action guide and workbook: Leading in a culture of change*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Galinsky, E., Aumann, K., & Bond, J. T. (2009). *Times are changing: Gender and generation at work and at home*. (National Study). New York, NY: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.familiesandwork.org>
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. (7th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gallagher, D. (2008). Value-free inquiry. In L. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. (pp. 911-914). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. doi:10.4135/9781412963909.n478
- Gasset, J. O. (1947), *Obras Completas*. Vols. 1–11. Madrid, Spain: Revista de Occidente.
- Gay, L.R. (1987). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

- Gentry, W. A., Griggs, T. L., Deal, J. J., Mondore, S. P., & Cox, B. D. (2011). A comparison of generational differences in endorsement of leadership practices with actual leadership skill level. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(1), 39-49.
doi:10.1037/a0023015
- Gerhardt, P.L. (2004). *Research methodology explained for everyday people*. Retrieved from <http://docslide.us/documents/research-methodology-explained-for-everday-people.html>
- Getz, S. (2015). From Generation to Generation: Intergenerational relations in the kibbutz. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 13(1), 22-33.
doi:10.1080/15350770.2014.992926
- Giancola, F., (2006). The generation gap: More myth than reality. *Human Resource Planning*, 29(4), p.32-37. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:The+Generation+Gap+:+More+Myth+than+Reality> - 0.
- Gibson, J.W., Greenwood, R.A., & Murphy, Jr., E.F. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values, behaviors, and popular beliefs. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 4(3), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.cluteinstitute.com/ojs/index.php/JDM/article/view/4959>
- Gillispie, C., Fox, R., & Grattan-Guinness, I. (1997). *Pierre-Simon Laplace, 1749-1827*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial And Commercial Training*, 39(2), 98-103. doi:10.1108/00197850710732424
- González, S., & Tacorante, D. (2004). A new approach to the best practices debate: are best practices applied to all employees in the same way? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(1), 56-75. doi:10.1080/098519032000157339

- Goode, W.J., & Hatt, P.K. (1952). *Methods in social research*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Grandey, A., Cordeiro, B., & Crouter, A. (2005). A longitudinal and multi-source test of the work-family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Occupational And Organizational Psychology*, 78(3), 305-323. doi:10.1348/096317905x26769
- Gravett, L., & Throckmorton, R. (2007). *Bridging the generation gap: How to get radio babies, boomers, gen xers, and gen yers to work together and achieve more*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.
- Gray, D. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. London, U.K.: SAGE.
- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 233-233. doi:10.1177/0013161x02038002008
- Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform*. London, UK: Paul Chapman.
- Gronn, P. (2003a). Leadership: Who needs it? *School Leadership and Management*, 23(3), 267-290. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ676091>
- Gronn, P. (2003b). *The new work of educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform*. London, UK: Paul Chapman.
- Gronn, P. (2007). Grooming next-generation school leaders. In N. Dempster (Ed.), *The treasure within: Leadership and succession planning* (pp. 7-19). Canberra, ACT: ACE.
- Gronn, P., & Lacey, K. (2004). Positioning oneself for leadership: Feelings of vulnerability among aspirant school principals. *School Leadership & Management*, 24(4), 405-424. doi:10.1080/13632430410001316516

- Gronn, P., & Lacey, K. (2005). *I'd rather drive a different bus*. Final report from the ARC Discovery Project - Principal aspirations and recruitment amidst leadership disengagement. Melbourne, VIC: Faculty of Education, Monash University.
- Gronn, P., & Lacey, K. (2006). Cloning their own: Aspirant principals and the school-based selection game. *Australian Journal of Education*, 50(2), 102-121.
doi:10.1177/000494410605000202
- Gronn, P., & Rawlings-Sanaei, F. (2003). Principal recruitment in a climate of leadership disengagement. *Australian Journal of Education*, 47(2), 172-184.
doi:10.1177/000494410304700206
- Groves, R. (2004). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Guba, E. (1990). *The Paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Guerriero, S. (2014). *Teachers' pedagogical knowledge and the teaching profession: Background report and project objectives*. Paper presented at *Teachers as Learning Specialists*, ITEL Symposium (OECD), Brussels. Retrieved from
http://www.oecd.org/edu/ceri/Background_document_to_Symposium_ITEL-FINAL.pdf
- Gurr, D., & Drysdale, L. (2012). Tensions and dilemmas in leading Australia's schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(5), 403-420. doi:10.1080/13632434.2012.723619
- Gurr, D., & Drysdale, L. (2013). Middle-level secondary school leaders: Potential, constraints and implications for leadership preparation and development. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(1), 55-71. doi:10.1108/09578231311291431

- Hachtmann, F. (2008). *Generation x revisited: An exploratory cross-cultural case study*. Paper presented to American Academy of Advertising Conference. Lubbock, TX: American Academy of Advertising.
- Hachtmann, F. (2012). The effect of short-term, advertising-focused study abroad programs on students' worldviews. *Journal of Advertising Education*, 16(1), 19-29. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/journalismfacpub/68/>
- Haeberle, K., Herzberg, J., & Hobbs, T. (2009). Leading the multigenerational work force. *Healthcare Executive*, 24(5), 62-67. doi: 10.1108/17554211111162435
- Hammersley, M., & Traianou, A. (2012). *Ethics in qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Hannay, M., & Fretwell, C. (2011). The higher education workplace: Meeting the needs of multiple generations. *Research In Higher Education Journal*, 10, 1-12. Retrieved from <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/10709.pdf>
- Hansen, J.C., & Leuty, M.E. (2012). Work values across generations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(1), 34-52. doi: 10.1177/1069072711417163
- Hansen, P. (2000). The shape of catholic primary school lay principalship: Round pegs in square holes?. *Journal of Religious Education*, 48(4), 28-34. Retrieved from <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/153113053?versionId=166867199>
- Hardy, M., & Bryman, A. (2004). *Handbook of data analysis*. London, U.K.: SAGE.
- Hargreaves, A. (2005). Leadership succession. *The Educational Forum*, 69(2), 163-173. doi:10.1080/00131720508984680
- Hargreaves, A., Halasz, D.G. & Pont, B. (2008) The Finnish approach to system leadership., in B. Pont, D. Nusche & D. Hopkins, (Eds), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on Systems Leadership*, pp. 69-110. Paris, France: OECD.

- Haris, A. (2010). Future leadership: Challenges and implications. In M.Coates (Ed.), *Future schools: Shaping a new educational landscape - Exploring possibilities for education in the 21st century* (pp 70-71). London, UK: Continuum International.
- Harris, P. (2005). Boomer vs. Echo Boomer: The Work War?. *T+D (Training and Development)*, 59(5), 44-49.
- Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hawkins, J., & Jacob, W. (2011). *Policy debates in comparative, international, and development education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hazarika, A. (2009). Building the pipeline: Leadership succession is a key challenge. *Leadership in Action*, 29(4), 8–12. doi:10.1002/lia.1298
- Henning, E., van Rensburg, W., & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria, SA: Van Schaik.
- Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An Organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 211-223. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9160-y
- Hicks, R., & Hicks, K. (1999). *Boomers, xers, and other strangers*. Wheaton, ILL: Tyndale House.
- Hill, R. P. (2002). Managing across generations in the 21st century: Important lessons from the ivory trenches. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 11(1), 60-66. doi:10.1177/1056492602111020
- Hirsh, B., & Sheldrake, P. (2000). *Inclusive leadership*. Melbourne, VIC: Information Australia.
- Holy Bible: New International Version*. (2011). Grand Rapids, MI.: Zondervan.

- Holliday, W., & Li, Q. (2004). Understanding the millennials: Updating our knowledge about students. *Reference Services Review*, 32(4), 356-366. doi:10.1108/00907320410569707
- Howe, N., & Nadler, R. (2012). *Why generations matter: Ten findings from LifeCourse research on the workforce*. Great Falls, VA: LifeCourse Associates. Retrieved from www.lifecourse.com
- Hulin, C.L., & Judge, T.A. (2003). Job attitudes: A theoretical and empirical review. In Borman, W.C., Ilgen, D.R., & Klimoski, R.J. (Eds.). *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*. 12, 255-276. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hung, K., Gu, F., & Yim, C. (2007). A social institutional approach to identifying generation cohorts in China with a comparison with American consumers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(5), 836-853. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400288
- Hutton, D. (2002). Many faces, one reality: The Catholic school in Australia. In D. Duncan & D. Riley, *Leadership in Catholic Education* (1st ed.). Sydney, NSW: Harper Collins.
- Hyman, J. (2005). Getting on or getting by?: Employee flexibility and coping strategies for home and work. *Work, Employment & Society*, 19(4), 705-725.
doi:10.1177/0950017005058055
- Inglehart, R., & Baker, W.E. (2001). Modernization's challenge to traditional values: Who's afraid of Ronald McDonald? *The Futurist*, 35(2), 16. Retrieved from <http://www.wfs.org/futcontma01.htm>
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising ride: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacquette, D. (2002). *A companion to philosophical logic*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Jevremovic, T. (2005). *Nuclear Principles in Engineering*. Boston, MA: Springer.

- Jobe, L. (2014). Generational differences in work ethic among 3 generations of registered nurses. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 44(5), 303-308.
doi:10.1097/nna.0000000000000071
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2013). *Educational research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Jorgensen, B. (2003). Baby boomers, generation x and generation y?. *Foresight*, 5(4), 41-49.
doi:10.1108/14636680310494753
- Jorgensen, B. (2004). *The Aging Population: Implications for the Australian Workforce*. Sydney, NSW: Hudson Global Resources and Human Capital Solutions.
- Jurkiewicz, C., & Brown, R. (1998). Generational comparisons of public employee motivation. *Review Of Public Personnel Administration*, 18(4), 18-37.
doi:10.1177/0734371x9801800403
- Kamenetz, A. (2006). *Generation debt*. New York, NY: Riverhead.
- Karaevli, A., & Hall, D.T. (2003). Growing leaders for turbulent times: is succession planning up to the challenge?. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(1), 62-79.
doi:10.1016/s0090-2616(02)00138-9
- Karp, H., Fuller, C., & Sirias, D. (2002). *Bridging the boomer xer gap*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 280-287. doi:10.1177/0146167296223006
- Kelan, E. (2014). Organising generations - What can sociology offer to the understanding of generations at work?. *Sociology Compass*, 8(1), 20-30. doi:10.1111/soc4.12117
- Kim, S. (2003). Research paradigms in organizational learning and performance: Competing modes of inquiry. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 21(1),

- 9-18. Retrieved from https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/aisnet.org/resource/group/3f1cd2cf-a29b-4822-8581-7b1360e30c71/Spring_2003/kimpring2003.pdf
- Kowske, B., Rasch, R., & Wiley, J. (2010). Millennials' (lack of) attitude problem: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology, 25*(2), 265-279. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9171-8
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Kupperschmidt, B. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager, 19*(1), 65-76. doi:10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011
- Lacey, K. (2004). Aspiring to the principalship: What would motivate teachers? *The Practising Administrator, 26*(1), 7-9. Retrieved from http://library.acer.edu.au/document/?document_id=136382
- Lacey, K. & Gronn, P. (2006). Cloning their own: Aspirant principals and the school-based selection game. *Australian Journal of Education, 50*(2), 102-121. doi:10.1177/000494410605000202
- Lai, S., Chang, J., & Lien, Y. (2012). Does effect of workload on quality of work life vary with generations? *Asia Pacific Management Review, 17*(4). Retrieved from <http://apmr.management.ncku.edu.tw/comm/updown/DW1212255033.pdf>
- Lancaster, L. (2004). *When generations collide: How to solve the generational puzzle at work*. In R. Cox (Ed.), *Management Forum Series* (pp. 1-4). Retrieved from <http://www.executiveforum.com/PDFs/LancasterSynopsis.pdf>.
- Lancaster, L., & Stillman, D. (2009). *When generations collide*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.
- Lancaster, L., & Stillman, D. (2010). *The m factor: How the millennial generation is rocking the workplace*. New York, NY: Harper Business.

- Lane, J.M. (2012). Developing the vision: Preparing teachers to deliver a digital world-class education system. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4).
doi:10.14221/ajte.2012v37n4.7
- Laplace, P. (1952). *A philosophical essay on probabilities*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Lavery, S. (2012). The Catholic school principal: A transcendent leader?. *Journal of Catholic School Studies*, 84(1), 36-43. Retrieved from
http://researchonline.nd.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=edu_article
- Layton, D.L. (2015). *Perceptions of millennial teachers' commitment to teaching as a career* (Order No. 3714125). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1708665194). Retrieved from <http://gradworks.umi.com/37/14/3714125.html>
- Legas, M., & Sims, C. (2011). Leveraging generational diversity in today's workplace. *Online Journal for Workforce Education and Development*, 5(3), 1-9. Retrieved from
<http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28, 27-42.
doi:10.1080/13632430701800060
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.
doi:10.1177/0013161x08321501
- Lester, S., Standifer, R., Schultz, N., & Windsor, J. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19(3), 341-354. doi:10.1177/1548051812442747
- Levy, P.S., & Lemeshow, S. (2013). *Sampling of populations: Methods and applications* [E-reader]. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

- Lewis, E., & Butcher, J. (2003). Who'd be a teacher? A survey of year 12 students. *ICP Online*. Retrieved from http://www.icponline.org/feature_articles/f4_03.htm
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Lissitz, R.W., & Samuelson, K. (2007). A suggested change in terminology and emphasis regarding validity and education. *Educational Researcher*, 36(8), 437-448. doi:10.3102/0013189X07311286
- Loomis, J.E. (2000). *Gen x*. Indianapolis, IN: Rough Notes.
- Louis, K.S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010) *Learning from Leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Lovely, S., & Buffum, A. (2007). *Generations at school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lowry, R. (2013). The Kruskal-Wallis Test for 3 or more independent samples - concepts & applications of inferential statistics. In *Concepts and Applications of Inferential Statistics* (Subchapter 14a). Retrieved from <http://vassarstats.net/textbook/index.html>
- Luna, G. (2012). Planning for an American higher education leadership crisis: The succession issue for administrators. *International leadership journal*, 4(1), 56-79. Retrieved from http://www.tesu.edu/documents/ilj_winter_2012-final.pdf
- Lyons, S., Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2005). Are gender differences in basic human values a generational phenomenon?. *Sex Roles*, 53(9-10), 763-778. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-7740-4
- Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2013). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139-S157. doi:10.1002/job.1913
- Mackay, H. (1997), *Generations*. Sydney, NSW: Pan MacMillan.

- Macky, K., Gardner, D., & Forsyth, S. (2008). Generational differences at work: Introduction and overview. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 857-861.
doi:10.1108/02683940810904358
- Mannheim, K. (1952). The sociological problem of generations. In K. Mannheim (Ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge* (p. 306). London, UK: RKP (first published 1923).
- Mannheim, K. (1972). The problem of generations. In P. G. Altbach & R. S. Laufer (Eds.), *The new pilgrims: Youth protest in transition* (pp. 101–138). New York, NY: David McKay.
- Marks, W. (2013). Leadership succession and retention: It's time to get serious about a principal retention policy. *Leading and Managing*, 19(21), 1-14. Retrieved from <http://www.acel.org.au/>
- McCauley, C. D., & Velsor, E. V. (Eds.). (2004). *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCrindle, M., & Wolfinger, E. (2014). *The abc of xyz*. Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press.
- McCrindle Research. (2014). *2014 Population map and generational profile*. Retrieved from http://www.mccrindle.com.au/resources/Australia-Population-Map-Generational-Profile2014_McCrindle-Research.pdf
- McDonald, J.H. (2014). *Handbook of biological statistics* (3rd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Sparky House.
- McGregor, S., & Murnane, J. (2010). Paradigm, methodology and method: intellectual integrity in consumer scholarship. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(4), 419-427. doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00883.x
- McKenzie, P., Kos, J., Walker, M., Hong, J., & Owen, S. (2008). *Staff in Australia's schools 2007: Main report on the survey*. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). Retrieved from <http://www.ada.edu.au/>

- McKenzie, P., Weldon, P., Rowley, G., Murphy, M., & McMillan, J. (2014). *Staff in Australia's schools 2013: Main Report of the Survey*. Camberwell, VIC: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Meredith, G., Schewe, C., Hiam, A., & Karlovich, J. (2002). *Managing by defining moments*. New York, NY: Hungry Minds.
- Meriac, J., Woehr, D., & Banister, C. (2010). Generational differences in work ethic: An examination of measurement equivalence across three cohorts. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 315-324. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9164-7
- Merkes, M. (2003). *A longer working life for Australian women on the baby boomer generation? Women's voices and social policy implications on an aging female workforce* (Ph.D). LaTrobe University, Melbourne, Victoria. Retrieved from <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/>
- Mertens, D.M. (2005). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mill, J.S. (1875). *A system of logic, ratiocinative and inductive*. London, U.K.: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.
- Miller, R., & Brewer, J. (2003). *The A-Z of social research*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Mislevy, R.J. (2007). Validity by design. *Educational Researcher*, 36(8), 463–469. doi:10.3102/0013189X07311660
- Moody, A. (2007). *Examining and exploring generational differences by understanding commitment, employee satisfaction, and motivation* (Ph.D). Northcentral University, Evanston, IL. Retrieved from <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/>

- Moore, A., & Stilgoe, J. (2009). Experts and anecdotes: The role of "anecdotal evidence" in public scientific controversies. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 34(5), 654.
doi:10.1177/0162243908329382
- Morris, S., & Van der Veer Martens, B. (2008). Mapping research specialties. *Annual Review Of Information Science And Technology*, 42(1), 213-295.
doi:10.1002/aris.2008.1440420113
- Morrison, R., Erickson, T., & Dychtwald, K. (2006). Managing middlecence. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(3), 78-86. Retrieved from
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16515157>
- Mouly, G.J. (1970). *The science of educational research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Muijs, D. (2010). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mulford, W. (2008) The leadership challenge: Improving learning in schools. *Australian Educational Review*, 53. Retrieved from <http://research.acer.edu.au/>
- Mulford, W. (2012). Tinkering towards utopia: Trying to make sense of my contribution to the field. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(1), 98-124.
doi:10.1108/09578231211196087
- Mulford, W., Leithwood, K., & Silins, H. (2006). *Educational leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes*. New York, NY: Kluwer.
- Mulford, W., & Silins, H. (2011). Revised models and conceptualisation of successful school principalship for improved student outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1), 61–82. doi:10.1108/09513541111100125
- Murphy, Jr., E., Gibson, J., & Greenwood, R. (2010). Analyzing generational values among managers and non-managers for sustainable organizational effectiveness. *SAM Advanced*

- Management Journal*, 75(1), 33. Retrieved from
http://nsuworks.nova.edu/hcbe_facarticles/70
- Murphy, Jr., E., Gordon, J., & Mullen, A. (2004). A preliminary study exploring the value changes taking place in the United States since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in New York. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(1), 81-96.
doi:10.1023/b:busi.0000020879.93654.86
- Murphy, J. (2005). *Connecting teacher leadership and school improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, S. (2006). Executive development and succession planning: qualitative evidence. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 8(4), 253-265.
doi:10.1350/ijps.2006.8.4.253
- Murphy, S., & Johnson, S. (2011). The benefits of a long-lens approach to leader development: Understanding the seeds of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 459-470. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.004
- Myers, D. (2000). *The American paradox*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Myers, K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 225-238. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9172-7
- Myung, J., Loeb, S., & Horng, E. (2011). Tapping the Principal Pipeline: Identifying Talent for Future School Leadership in the Absence of Formal Succession Management Programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5), 695-727.
doi:10.1177/0013161x11406112
- National Health & Medical Research Council. (NHMRC). (2015). *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
Retrieved from <https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/>

- Neefe, D. O. (2009). *Succession planning in a two-year technical college system*. (Order No. 3360378). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304951862). Retrieved from <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/54664>
- Neidhart, H., & Carlin, P. (2003a). Pathways, incentives and barriers for women aspiring to principalship in Australian Catholic schools. Paper presented at *The New Zealand Association for Research in Education-Australian Association for Research in Education Conference*, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://www.flinders.edu.au/>
- Neidhart, H., & Carlin, P. (2003b). *To apply or not to apply: Incentives and disincentives of principalship*. Paper presented at the *International Conference on Social Sciences*, Hawaii, USA. Retrieved from <http://www.acu.edu.au/>
- Neidhart, H., & Carlin, P. (2011). Strengthening religious identity in Christian schools. *Religious Education Journal of Australia*, 27(1), 23–29. Retrieved from <http://www.acu.edu.au/>
- Neuman, W. (2010). *Social research methods* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Newman, I., Lim, J., & Pineda, F. (2013). Content validity using a mixed methods approach: Its application and development through the use of a Table of Specifications Methodology. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(3), 243-260. doi:10.1177/1558689813476922
- Ng, E., Lyons, S., & Schweitzer, L. (2012). *Managing the new workforce*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Ng, S., & Szeto, S. (2015). Preparing school leaders: The professional development needs of newly appointed principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. doi:10.1177/1741143214564766
- Nin, A. (1961). *Seduction of the minotaur*. Denver, CO: A. Swallow.

- Noonan, B., & Walker, K. (2008). Trust in contemporary principalship. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 85, 1-17. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ842497.pdf>
- Normore, A. H., & Gaetane, J. M. (Eds.). (2010). *Development and preparation of leaders of learning and learners of leadership* (vol. 11). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Nutley, S., Walter, I., & Davies, H. (2007). *Using evidence*. Bristol, U.K.: Policy Press.
- OECD (2016). *Low-performing students: Why they fall behind and how to help them succeed*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/9789264250246-en
- Orwell, G. (1968). *The collected essays, journalism, and letters of George Orwell*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- O'Bannon, G. (2001). Managing our future: The generation x factor. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(1), 95-110. doi:10.1177/009102600103000109
- O'Leary, Z. (2010). *The essential guide to doing your research project*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- O'Rand, A., & Krecker, M. (1990). Concepts of the life cycle: Their history, meanings, and uses in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16(1), 241-262. doi:10.1146/annurev.so.16.080190.001325
- Panter, A., & Sterba, S. (2011). *Handbook of ethics in quantitative methodology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Park, H., Twenge, J. M., & Greenfield, P. M. (2014). The great recession: Implications for adolescent values and behavior. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5, 310-318. doi: 10.1177/1948550613495419
- Parry, E. (2015). *Generational diversity at work: New research perspectives*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

- Parry, E., & Tyson, S. (2011). *Managing an age diverse workforce*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), 79-96.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00285.x
- Patel, D. (2005). The workplace of tomorrow. In Beatty P.T. & Visser R..M. (Eds.), *Thriving on an aging workforce: Strategies for organizational and systemic change*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim's sociology of generations: An undervalued legacy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 45(3), 481. doi:10.2307/591659
- Portolese Dias, L. (2003). Generational buying motivations for fashion. *Journal of Fashion Marketing And Management: An International Journal*, 7(1), 78-86.
doi:10.1108/13612020310464386
- Punch, K. (2013). *Introduction to social research* (3rd ed.). London, U.K.: SAGE.
- Quezada, R. L. (2015). The California council on teacher education developing faculty leaders in teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 24(1), 109-115. Retrieved from
<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/The+California+Council+on+Teacher+Education%3A+developing+faculty...-a0407527465>
- Raines, C., & Arnsperger, A. (2009). *Millennials @ work: Engaging the new generation*. Denver, CO: Claire Raines Associates.
- Rance, C. (2005). About time. *HR Monthly*, 22-28.
- Rea, L.M. & Parker, R.A. (2014). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Real, K., Mitnick, A., & Maloney, W. (2010). More similar than different: Millennials in the U. S. building trades. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 303-313.
doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9163-8
- Reisenwitz, T., & Iyer, R. (2007). A comparison of younger and older baby boomers: investigating the viability of cohort segmentation. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(4), 202-213. doi:10.1108/07363760710755995
- Renihan, P. (2012). Leadership succession for tomorrow's schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 138-147. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.487
- Rhodes, C. (2012). Should leadership talent management in schools also include the management of self-belief? *School Leadership & Management*, 32(5), 439-451.
doi:10.1080/13632434.2012.724671
- Rhodes, C., & Brundrett, M. (2008). What makes my school a good training ground for leadership development? The perceptions of heads, middle leaders and classroom teachers from 70 contextually different primary and secondary schools in England. *Management in Education*, 22(1), 18-23. doi:10.1177/0892020607085629
- Rhodes, C., & Brundrett, M. (2009). Growing the leadership talent pool: Perceptions of heads, middle leaders and classroom teachers about professional development and leadership succession planning within their own schools. *Professional Development in Education*, 35(3), 381-398. doi:10.1080/1941250902987122
- Rhodes, S. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93(2), 328-367. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.93.2.328
- Ribbins, P. (2008). A life and career based framework for the study of leaders in education: Problems, possibilities and prescriptions. In J. Lumby, G. Crow & P. Pashiardis (Eds.),

- International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 61–80). Milton Park, UK: Routledge.
- Richardson, S. (2010). Understanding generation y's attitudes towards a career in the industry. In P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo & D. Pendergast (Eds.) *Tourism and generation y*, (pp. 131–42). Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley.
- Rogler, L. (2002). Historical generations and psychology: The case of the Great Depression and World War II. *American Psychologist*, 57(12), 1013-1023. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.57.12.1013
- Rooney, D. (2013). Being a wise organizational researcher: ontology, epistemology and axiology. In W. Küpers & D. J. Pauleen (Eds.), *A Handbook of Practical Wisdom: Leadership, Organization and Integral Business Practice* (pp. 79-98). Farnham, U.K.: Gower.
- Rose, M. (2005). Do rising levels of qualification alter work ethic, work orientation and organizational commitment for the worse? Evidence from the UK, 1985-2001. *Journal of Education And Work*, 18(2), 131-164. doi:10.1080/13639080500085885
- Rothwell, W. (2005). *Effective success planning: Establishing leadership continuity and building talent from within* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: American Management Association.
- Rowe, R. (January 14, 2000). Shortage of School Principals Looming. *New Zealand Education Review*.
- Ruwoldt, M.J. (2006). *To Lead, or not to lead - that is the question: An exploration of understandings of leadership in the context of the deputy principal in the Lutheran secondary school* (Ph.D). Melbourne, VIC: Australian Catholic University. Retrieved from <http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/digitaltheses/public/adt-acuvp143.17052007/02whole.pdf>

- Ryder, N. (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 30(6), 843. doi:10.2307/2090964
- Sahibzada, K. (2005). The moderating effects of work-family role combinations and work-family organizational culture on the relationship between family-friendly workplace supports and job satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 820-839. doi:10.1177/0192513x05277546
- Sajjadi, A., Sun, B., & Castillo, C. (2012). *Generational differences in work attitudes: A comparative analysis of generation y and preceding generations from companies in Sweden*. (Unpublished bachelor's thesis). Jonkoping University, Sweden. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:531927/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Salkind, N. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Salopek, J. (2006). Leadership for a new age. *Training & Development*, 6(22), 1-3. Retrieved from <http://ngenperformance.com/perception.net/pdf/articles/TandD.pdf>.
- Salopek, J. (2007). The growth of succession management. *Training & Development*. 61(6), 22-24. Retrieved from <http://www.arnesonleadership.com/>
- Salt, B. (2004). *The big shift* (2nd ed.). South Yarra, VIC: Hardie Grant.
- Salt, B. (2007). *Beyond the baby boomers: The rise of generation y*. Melbourne, VIC: KPMG.
- Sammons, P., Gu, Q., Day, C., & Ko, J. (2011). Exploring the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1), 83-101. doi:10.1108/095135411111100134
- Saris W.E., & I.N. Gallhofer (2007) *Design, evaluation and analysis of questionnaires of surveys research*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Sauser, W., & Sims, R. (2012). *Managing human resources for the millennial generation*. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age.

- Sayers, R. (2007). The right staff from x to y. *Library Management*, 28(8/9), 474-487.
doi:10.1108/01435120710837765
- Scheaffer, R. (2012). *Survey sampling*. South Melbourne, VIC: Cengage Learning.
- Schofield, C. P., & Honoré, S. (2009). *Generations y: Inside out*. Hertfordshire, UK: Ashridge.
- Schuman, H., & Scott, J. (1989). Generations and collective memories. *American Sociological Review*, 54(3), 359. doi:10.2307/2095611
- Semler, R. (2003). *The seven-day weekend - The wisdom revolution: Finding the work/life balance*. London, UK: Century.
- Sessa, V., Kabacoff, R., Deal, J., & Brown, H. (2007). Generational differences in leader values and leadership behaviors. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10(1), 47-74.
doi:10.1080/10887150709336612
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O., & Levy-Gazenfrantz, T. (2015). Authentic leadership strategies in support of mentoring processes. *School Leadership & Management*, 35(2), 183–201.
doi:10.1080/13632434.2014.992777
- Shapiro, M., Grossman, D., Carter, S., Martin, K., Deyton, P., & Hammer, D. (2015). Middle School Girls and the “Leaky Pipeline” to Leadership. *Middle School Journal*, 46(5), 3–13. doi:10.1080/00940771.2015.11461919
- Shaw, S., & Fairhurst, D. (2008). Engaging a new generation of graduates. *Education + Training*, 50(5), 366-378. doi:10.1108/00400910810889057
- Sheahan, P. (2005). *Generation y*. Prahran, VIC: Hardie Grant.
- Sheen, V. (2000). *Older Australians: a working future? The aging population and work in the 21st century*. Melbourne, VIC: Council on the Ageing.
- Sherman, R. (2008). One size doesn’t fit all. *Nursing Management (Springhouse)*, 39(9), 8-10. doi:10.1097/01.numa.0000335251.85671.eb

- Skilbeck, M., & Connell, H. (2004). *Teachers for the future: The changing nature of society and related issues for the teaching workforce*. Canberra, ACT: Ministerial Council for Education, Employment Training and Youth Affairs.
- Skinner, D., Tagg, C., & Holloway, J. (2000). Managers and research. *Management Learning*, 31(2), 163-179. doi:10.1177/1350507600312002
- Slater, L. (2008). Pathways to building leadership capacity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(1), 55-69. doi:10.1177/1741143207084060
- Slaughter, M.J., & Swagel, P. (2004). *Does Globalization Lower Wages and Export Jobs?*. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Smith, J., & Clurman, A. (1997). *Rocking the ages: The Yankelovich report on generational marketing*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Smola, K., & Sutton, C. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 363-382. doi:10.1002/job.147
- Smyrl, B. J. (2011). *Leading a multi-generational workforce: Understanding generational differences for effective communication* (Ph.D). Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University. Retrieved from http://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=cps_professional
- Staff, J., & Schulenberg, J. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: Experiences in paid work during adolescence. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(2), 247-255. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9167-4
- Starnes, D., Yates, D., Moore, D., & Yates, D. (2012). *The practice of statistics*. New York, NY: Freeman.

- Steele, B., & Acuff, J. (2012). *Theory and application of the "generation" in international relations and politics*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Steinmetz, C. (2007). *Tertiary de-generation: What baby boomers need to know*. Paper presented to Australian Association of Research in Education (AARE) Conference. Adelaide, SA. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/06pap/ste06019.pdf>
- Stevens, R. (2010). Managing human capital: How to use knowledge management to transfer knowledge in today's multi-generational workforce. *IBR*, 3(3). doi:10.5539/ibr.v3n3p77
- Stillman, D., & Lancaster, L. (2014a). *The m-factor: How millennials are rocking the workplace*. [S.l.]: Harper Collins e-Books.
- Stillman, D., & Lancaster, L. (2014b). *When generations collide*. [S.l.]: Harper Collins e-Books.
- Stone-Johnson, C. (2011). Talkin' bout my generation: Boomers, xers, and educational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 12(2), 221-239. doi:10.1007/s10833-011-9160-3
- Stone-Johnson, C. (2016). *Generational identity, educational change, and school leadership*. Milton Park, U.K.: Routledge.
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Sugrue, C. (2014). Leadership: Succession, recruitment, retirement. *Studies in Educational Leadership*, 20, 255–273. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-9433-6_11
- Sugrue, C. (2015). *Unmasking School Leadership*. New York, NY: Springer.
doi:10.1007/978-94-017-9433-6

- Sujansky, J. (2002). Retaining your generation y workers: Now is not the time for complacency. *Expert*.
- Sujansky, J., & Ferri-Reed, J. (2009). *Keeping the millennials: Why companies are losing billions in turnover to this generation - and what to do about it*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Sukamolson, S. (2007). *Fundamentals of quantitative research*. Bangkok, Thailand: Chulalongkorn University. Retrieved from <http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/e-Journal/bod/Suphat%20Sukamolson.pdf>
- Sullivan, S., Forret, M., Carraher, S., & Mainiero, L. (2009). Using the kaleidoscope career model to examine generational differences in work attitudes. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 284-302. doi:10.1108/13620430910966442
- Swanson, R., & Holton, E. (2005). *Research in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Tang, T., Cunningham, P., Frauman, E., Ivy, M., & Perry, T. (2012). Attitudes and occupational commitment among public personnel: Differences between baby boomers and gen-xers. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(2), 327-360. doi:10.1177/009102601204100206
- Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the net generation*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Taylor, P., & Keeter, S. (2010). *Millennials: A portrait of generation next, confident, connected, open to change*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/millennials-confident-connected-open-to-change.pdf>
- Teacher Supply and Demand Reference Group. (TSDRG). (2006). *Teacher supply and demand report*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.vic.gov.au/about/publications/report/teachersupply.htm>

- Teh, E.C.E. (2002). *Intergenerational tension in the workplace: a multi-disciplinary and factor analytic approach to the development of an instrument to measure generational differences in organisations* (Ph.D). Perth, WA: Murdoch University. Retrieved from <http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/341/>
- Thorpe, A., & Melnikova, J. (2014). The system of middle leadership in secondary schools in England and its implications for the Lithuanian education system. *Education in a changing society, 1*. doi:10.15181/atee.v1i0.660
- Thyer, B. (2010). *The handbook of social work research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Tolbize, A. (2008). *Generational differences in the workplace*. Minneapolis, MN: Research and Training Center on Community Living, University of Minnesota. Retrieved from http://rtc.umn.edu/docs/2_18_Gen_diff_workplace.pdf
- Trochim, W., & Donnelly, J. (2008). *Research methods knowledge base*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Tulgan, B. (2003). *Managing generation x* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Tulgan, B. (2009). *Not everyone gets a trophy: How to manage generation y*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Twenge, J. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology, 25*(2), 201-210. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9165-6
- Twenge, J., & Campbell, S. (2011). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *IEEE Engineering Management Review, 39*(2), 72-84. doi:10.1109/emr.2011.5876178

- Twenge, J., Campbell, S., Hoffman, B., & Lance, C. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142. doi:10.1177/0149206309352246
- Ulmer, J., & Wilson, M. (2003). The potential contributions of quantitative research to symbolic interactionism. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26(4), 531-552.
doi:10.1525/si.2003.26.4.531
- Valenti, M. V. (2001). *Generation X: Act your stage! Organizational commitment and career stage perspectives* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest. (Order No. 3009357).
- Van Velsor, E., & Wright, J. (2012). *Expanding the leadership equation: Developing next-generation leaders*. (White Paper). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Vicere, A. (2005). As generation y moves in, leadership must evolve. *LeaderValues*.
Retrieved from <http://www.leader-values.com/article.php?aid=701>
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 822-836.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00178.x
- Waite, D. (2010). On the shortcomings of our organisational forms: with implications for educational change and school improvement. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(3), 225-248. doi:10.1080/13632434.2010.485183
- Waite, D. (2016). Of charlatans, sorcerers, alchemists, demagogues, profit-mongers, tyrants and kings: Educational reform and the death by a thousand cuts. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 48(1), 123-148. doi:10.1007/s11256-015-0348-3
- Walker, A. (2015). Clones, drones and dragons: ongoing uncertainties around school leader development. *School Leadership & Management*, 35(3), 300-320.
doi:10.1080/13632434.2015.1041488

- Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive case studies in IS research: Nature and method. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 4(2), 74-81. doi:10.1057/ejis.1995.9
- Ware, J., Craft, R., & Kerschenbaum, S. (2007). Training tomorrow's workforce. *Training & Development*, 61(4), 58-60,6. Retrieved from <http://www.learningcircuits.org/>
- Watson, E. (2013). *Generation X professors speak*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Watson, L. (2007). *Why would anybody want this job? The challenge of attracting and sustaining effective leaders for Australian schools*. Concurrent Paper, The Leadership Challenge - Improving Learning in Schools. Paper presented to ACER Research Conference 2007. Melbourne, VIC. Retrieved from http://www.acer.edu.au/research_conferences/2007.html
- Watterston, B. (2015). *Environmental scan, principal preparation programs*. Melbourne, VIC: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). Retrieved from [http://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/school-leadership/principal-preparation/environmental-scan-principal-preparation-programs-\(print-friendly\).pdf](http://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/school-leadership/principal-preparation/environmental-scan-principal-preparation-programs-(print-friendly).pdf)
- Weiner, I.B., & Craighead, W.E. (2010). *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Weldon, P.R. (March 2015). *The Teacher workforce in Australia: Supply, demand and data issues*. Policy Insights, Issue 2. Melbourne, VIC: ACER.
- Weldon, P.R. & Ingvarson, L. (2016). *School Staff Workload Study: Final Report to the Australian Education Union – Victorian Branch*. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/tll_misc/27
- Westerman, J., & Yamamura, J. (2007). Generational preferences for work environment fit: Effects on employee outcomes. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 150-161. doi:10.1108/13620430710733631

- Wheeler, D. (1999). *Understanding variation: The key to managing chaos* (2nd ed.). Knoxville, TN: SPC Press.
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (2009). *Research methods in education*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Wilson, M., & Gerber, L. E. (2008). How generational theory can improve teaching: Strategies for working with the “millennials”. *Currents in Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 29-44. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.372.4665&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Winslow, S. (2005). Work-family conflict, gender, and parenthood, 1977-1997. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 727-755. doi:10.1177/0192513x05277522
- Winton, S., & Pollock, K. (2013). Preparing politically savvy principals in Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(1), 40-54. doi:10.1108/09578231311291422
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R., & Krüger, M. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398-425. doi:10.1177/0013161x03253411
- Wolburg, J.M. & Pokrywczynski, J. (2001). A psychographic analysis of generation y college students. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 41(5), 33-52. doi:10.2501/JAR-41-5-33-52
- Wong, M., Gardiner, E., Lang, W., & Coulon, L. (2008). Generational differences in personality and motivation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 878-890. doi:10.1108/02683940810904376
- Woodward, B. (1996). *The choice*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Wright, E., Marvel, J., & Des Marteau, K. (2014). Exploring millennials: A surprising inconsistency in making ethical decisions. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 9, 1-14. Retrieved from <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/141878.pdf>

- Yang, K., & Jolly, L. (2008). Age cohort analysis in adoption of mobile data services: Gen xers versus baby boomers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(5), 272-280.
doi:10.1108/07363760810890507
- You, S. (2015). Educational management administration and leadership: Workplace predictions of U.S. secondary school teachers intent to leave. *Global Conference of Business & Finance*, 10(1) 465-468. doi: 10.1177/1741143214535741
- Yu, H., & Miller, P. (2005). Leadership styles: The x generation and baby boomers compared in different cultural contexts. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 26(1), 35-50. doi:10.1108/01437730510575570
- Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). *Generations at work*. New York, NY: American Management Association.
- Zepeda, S. J., Bengtson, E., & Parylo, O. (2012). Examining the planning and management of principal succession. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(2), 136-158.
doi:10.1108/09578231211210512
- Zikmund, W.G. (2003). *Business research methods*. (7th ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western.
- Zuljan, M., & Vogrinc, J. (Eds.) (2011). *European dimensions of teacher education: Similarities and differences*. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Faculty of Education, Kranj. doi: 10.13140/2.1.4136.1282

APPENDIX A

.Generational Perceptions of School Leadership Questionnaire (GPSLi)

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a research study into the generational attitudes and differences amongst teaching staff within a Catholic School. It will study the dynamics between different generations of teachers in a selected Catholic School and their attitudes, willingness, preparedness to undertake leadership roles. The attached summary of the research proposal provides greater detail for your information. The data collection for the research will be in the format of a survey, as well as a series of interviews with randomly selected staff within your school. Please complete the survey below as a teacher at your school:

• What year were you born?	Years of service as a teacher?
• Gender – M or F?	Are you in a leadership (POL) position?

Please indicate most appropriate to your experience of working amongst the different generations of school leaders in your school:

Question:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Willing to navigate 'office politics'	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Willing to ask for help when needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Value mentoring of potential leaders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Give maximum effort and have strong work ethic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Adapt and learn quickly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Prefer informality amongst colleagues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Like structure and process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Plan to stay with the school over the long term	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Respectful of school hierarchy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Results-driven	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Career-driven	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Seek work/life balance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Accepting of Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Prefer to work in teams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Prefer ongoing, informal feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please indicate your thoughts on whether, when it comes to your leadership culture, that at your school there is:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16. A difference in expectations for leadership advancement between generations? (ie. Preparedness, seniority, ability, entitlement, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. A difference in leadership styles and expectations between different generations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Conflict regarding acceptable work hours between teachers of different generations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. A tendency of colleagues from other generations to not respect their own leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. A perception of work demands and expectations of leadership that discourage particular age groups of teachers taking on middle or senior leadership roles?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. An understanding by your school's Executive of differing generational learning styles for training & leadership development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Intergenerational mentoring (formal or informal)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Leaders from different generations learning from one another	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Communication of important information in multiple ways (i.e., via e-mail and during meetings)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Awareness by the School Executive of generational issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. A mentoring program to encourage teachers of different generations to work together and share experiences	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. Encouragement of an environment that highlights the benefits of an intergenerational workforce	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. An intentional culture of teachers of different generations being assigned to work together where possible	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. An offering of different types of training (i.e., computer-based and seminars) for generational styles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. Training of school middle & senior leaders on leading people of diverse age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX B

ACU Ethics Approval Form



**Human Research Ethics Committee
Committee Approval Form**

Principal Investigator/Supervisor: Dr Deborah Robertson

Co-Investigators:

Student Researcher: : Mr Kamahl Russell

Ethics approval has been granted for the following project:

How do generational differences impact leadership succession in a Catholic School?

for the period: 18/03/2014-30/11/2014

Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) Register Number: 2013 340V

Special Condition/s of Approval

Prior to commencement of your research, the following permissions are required to be submitted to the ACU HREC:

Catholic Education Office, Melbourne; School Principals

The following standard conditions as stipulated in the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans* (2007) apply:

- (i) that Principal Investigators / Supervisors provide, on the form supplied by the Human Research Ethics Committee, annual reports on matters such as:
 - security of records
 - compliance with approved consent procedures and documentation
 - compliance with special conditions, and
- (ii) that researchers report to the HREC immediately any matter that might affect the ethical acceptability of the protocol, such as:
 - proposed changes to the protocol
 - unforeseen circumstances or events
 - adverse effects on participants

The HREC will conduct an audit each year of all projects deemed to be of more than low risk. There will also be random audits of a sample of projects considered to be of negligible risk and low risk on all campuses each year.

Within one month of the conclusion of the project, researchers are required to complete a *Final Report Form* and submit it to the local Research Services Officer.

If the project continues for more than one year, researchers are required to complete an *Annual Progress Report Form* and submit it to the local Research Services Officer within one month of the anniversary date of the ethics approval.

K. Pashley

Signed:

..... Date: 27/03/2014.....

(Research Services Officer, McAuley Campus)

APPENDIX C

Catholic Education Office Melbourne (CEOM) Approval Letter



GE14/0009

Project # 1968 Russell

27/3/2014

Mr Kamahl Russell
6 Panorama Ave
Ringwood Nth
VIC 3134.

Dear

I am writing with regard to your research application received on 6/12/2014 concerning your forthcoming project titled '*How do generational differences impact leadership succession in a Catholic School?*'. You have asked approval to involve a Catholic school in the Archdiocese of Melbourne, as you wish to involve teachers.

I am pleased to advise that your research proposal is approved in principle subject to the eight standard conditions outlined below.

1. The decision as to whether or not research can proceed in a school rests with the school's principal, so you will need to obtain approval directly from the principal of the school that you wish to involve. You should provide the principal with an outline of your research proposal and indicate what will be asked of the school. A copy of this letter of approval, and a copy of notification of approval from the organisation's/university's Ethics Committee, should also be provided.
2. A copy of the approval notification from your institution's Ethics Committee must be forwarded to this Office, together with any modifications to your research protocol requested by the Committee. You may not start any research in Catholic Schools until this step has been completed.
3. A *Working with Children* (WWC) check – or registration with the Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) – is necessary for all researchers visiting schools. Appropriate documentation must be shown to the principal before starting the research in the school.
4. No student is to participate in the research study unless s/he is willing to do so and informed consent is given in writing by a parent/guardian.

1 of 2

Mr. Kamahl Russell

- 2 -

27/3/2014

5. Any substantial modifications to the research proposal, or additional research involving use of the data collected, will require a further research approval submission to this Office.
6. Data relating to individuals or the school are to remain confidential.
7. Since participating schools have an interest in research findings, you should consider ways in which the results of the study could be made available for the benefit of the school community.
8. At the conclusion of the study, a copy or summary of the research findings should be forwarded to the Catholic Education Office Melbourne. It would be appreciated if you could submit your report in an **electronic format** using the email address provided below.

I wish you well with your research study. If you have any queries concerning this matter, please contact Ms Alison Jansz-Senn of this Office.

The email address is apr@ceomelb.catholic.edu.au.

Yours sincerely



Anna Rados
MANAGER ANALYSIS, POLICY & RESEARCH

APPENDIX D

Invitation Letter to Principal



Australian Catholic University
Brisbane Sydney Canberra Ballarat Melbourne

Melbourne Campus (St Patrick's)
Locked Bag 4115 Fitzroy MDC Fitzroy
Victoria 3065 Australia
Telephone: 03 9953 3000
www.acu.edu.au

INFORMATION LETTER TO PRINCIPAL

TITLE OF PROJECT: *'How do generational differences impact leadership succession in a Catholic School?'*

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mr. Kamahl Russell

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Deborah Robertson (Faculty of Education)

PROGRAMME IN WHICH ENROLLED: Master of Education (Research)

Dear Principal,

I am writing to ask you permission to invite the teaching staff of your school to participate in a research study into the generational attitudes and differences amongst teaching staff within a Catholic School. It will study the dynamics between different generations of teachers in a selected Catholic School and their attitudes, willingness, preparedness to undertake leadership roles. Further information is provided in the attached summary of the research proposal. Also attached is the approval form from the Catholic Education Office Melbourne to conduct research in your school.

The data collection for this research will be in the format of a survey, as well as a series of interviews of randomly selected staff within your school. The survey consists of 30 questions based on your staff's experience of generational leadership within a Catholic School. The survey's results will be anonymous, and the collected raw data will not be seen by your school's administration.

The survey your teaching staff are invited to participate in will take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. It is anticipated that an opportunity for staff to complete this survey may take place at the end of a faculty staff meeting. Afterwards, a small number of randomly selected staff will be invited to participate in a series of 1:1 interviews (conducted within 30 minutes) in which they will be asked a series of questions on common issues and themes derived from the initial results of the survey. These interviews will be recorded to ensure accuracy of information, without any form of name-identification. Please indicate your willingness to participate in the interview phase by circling 'YES' on the Consent Form. All recordings of interviews will be stored securely and destroyed after completion of the study. These recordings will not be listened to or given to your school's administration.

The study's findings may indicate trends or point to ways of further framing leadership succession and teacher-retention issues for the wider target population of the Catholic teaching sector in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. This may also lead to publication of research results.

Staff are free to refuse consent altogether without having to justify that decision, or to withdraw consent and discontinue participation in the study at any time without giving a reason. If they have a dependent relationship to the researcher (e.g. employee, student or client), it is important to know that their withdrawal from the research will not prejudice future employment or academic progress.

Confidentiality will be ensured during the survey and interview phase of the research and in any report or document arising from it. Participants will not have their names published. Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the Principal Investigator:

Principal Investigator: Mr. Kamahl Russell
Email: euromarley@hotmail.com

Supervisor: Dr. Deborah Robertson
Faculty: Education
Email: deborah.robertson@acu.edu.au

An abstract of the results and findings of the research study will be made available to all participants, including yourself. Approval is pending from the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.

In the event that you have any complaint or concern about the way you have been treated during the study, or if you have any query that the Supervisor or Student Researcher have not been able to satisfy, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the nearest branch of the Research Services Office.

Chair, HREC
C/- Research Services
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne Campus
Locked Bag 4115
FITZROY VIC 3065
Tel: 03 9953 3158
Fax: 03 9953 3315

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. The participant will be informed of the outcome.

If you give permission for me to invite the staff of your school to participate in this project, please sign both copies of the Consent Form, retain one copy for your records and return the other copy to the Student Investigator.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kamahl Russell', with a horizontal line drawn through the middle of the signature.

Kamahl Russell
Student Investigator

APPENDIX E

Invitation Letter to Participants



Australian Catholic University
Brisbane Sydney Canberra Ballarat Melbourne

Melbourne Campus (St Patrick's)
Locked Bag 4115 Fitzroy MDC Fitzroy
Victoria 3065 Australia
Telephone: 03 9953 3000
www.acu.edu.au

INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

TITLE OF PROJECT: *'How do generational differences impact leadership succession in a Catholic School?'*

STUDENT INVESTIGATOR: Mr. Kamahl Russell

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Deborah Robertson (Faculty of Education)

PROGRAMME IN WHICH ENROLLED: Master of Education (Research)

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a research study into the generational attitudes and differences amongst teaching staff within a Catholic School. It will study the dynamics between different generations of teachers in a selected Catholic School and their attitudes, willingness, preparedness to undertake leadership roles. The attached summary of the research proposal provides greater detail for your information. The data collection for the research will be in the format of a survey, as well as a series of interviews with randomly selected staff within your school.

The survey consists of 28 questions based on your experience of leadership within a Catholic School. It is anticipated that an opportunity for you to complete this survey will take place during a faculty staff meeting. The survey's results will be anonymous, and the collected raw data will not be seen by your school's administration.

The survey you are invited to participate in will take approximately 20-30 minutes for you to complete. Afterwards, a small number of randomly selected staff will be invited to participate in a series of 1:1 interviews (conducted within 30 minutes) in which they will be asked a series of questions on common issues and themes derived from the initial results of the survey. These interviews will be recorded to ensure accuracy of information, without any form of name-identification. Please indicate your willingness to participate in the interview phase by circling 'YES' on the Consent Form. All recordings of interviews will be stored securely and destroyed after completion of the study. These recordings will not be listened to or given to your school's administration.

The study's findings may indicate trends or point to ways of further framing leadership succession and teacher-retention issues for the wider target population of the Catholic teaching sector in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. This may also lead to publication of research results.

You are free to refuse consent altogether without having to justify that decision, or to withdraw consent and discontinue participation in the study at any time without giving a reason. If you have a dependent relationship to the researcher (e.g. employee, student or client), it is important to know that your withdrawal from the research will not prejudice your future employment or academic progress.

Your confidentiality will be ensured during the survey and interview phase of the research and in any report or document arising from it. Participants will not have their names published. Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the Principal Investigator:

Principal Investigator: Mr. Kamahl Russell
Email: euomarley@hotmail.com

Supervisor: Dr. Deborah Robertson
Faculty: Education
Email: deborah.robertson@acu.edu.au

An abstract of the results and findings of the research study will be made available to all participants, including yourself. This study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.

In the event that you have any complaint or concern about the way you have been treated during the study, or if you have any query that the Investigator or Supervisor and Student Researcher has (have) not been able to satisfy, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the nearest branch of the Research Services Office.

Chair, HREC
C/- Research Services
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne Campus
Locked Bag 4115
FITZROY VIC 3065
Tel: 03 9953 3158
Fax: 03 9953 3315

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. The participant will be informed of the outcome.

If you agree to participate in this project, you should sign both copies of the Consent Form, retain one copy for your records and return the other copy to the Principal Investigator.

.....
Mr. Kamahl Russell (Student Investigator)

.....
Dr. Deborah Robertson (Supervisor)

APPENDIX F**Participant Consent Form**



PARTICIPANT (SURVEY) CONSENT FORM

Participants Copy

TITLE OF PROJECT: *How do generational differences impact leadership succession in a Catholic School?*

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: Dr. Deborah Robertson

I (the participant) have read (or, where appropriate, have had read to me) and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this study consisting of a survey realising that I can withdraw my consent at any time (without comment or penalty/without affecting my future studies/relationship with researchers etc). I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT:

SIGNATURE

DATE

SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR.....

DATE:.....

APPENDIX G

Correlations for Constructs 1 and 2

Correlations for Construct 1: Workplace Perceptions**GENERATION = BBs**

		MOTIVE	WRK_ETH	PROF_FEED	LSHIP	SCH_HIER
MOTIVE	Pearson Correlation	1	.146	.114	.454	.219
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.577	.662	.067	.399
	N	17	17	17	17	17
WRK_ETH	Pearson Correlation	.146	1	.746**	.557*	.459
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.577		.001	.020	.064
	N	17	17	17	17	17
PROF_FEED	Pearson Correlation	.114	.746**	1	.545*	.468
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.662	.001		.024	.058
	N	17	17	17	17	17
LSHIP	Pearson Correlation	.454	.557*	.545*	1	.311
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.067	.020	.024		.225
	N	17	17	17	17	17
SCH_HIER	Pearson Correlation	.219	.459	.468	.311	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.399	.064	.058	.225	
	N	17	17	17	17	17

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

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

GENERATION = GEN X

		MOTIVE	WRK_ETH	PROF_FEED	LSHIP	SCH_HIER
MOTIVE	Pearson Correlation	1	.491*	.072	-.156	.734**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.009	.722	.436	.000
	N	27	27	27	27	27
WRK_ETH	Pearson Correlation	.491*	1	.014	.041	.593**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009		.945	.838	.001
	N	27	27	27	27	27
PROF_FEED	Pearson Correlation	.072	.014	1	.277	.252
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.722	.945		.161	.206
	N	27	27	27	27	27
LSHIP	Pearson Correlation	-.156	.041	.277	1	-.088
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.436	.838	.161		.663
	N	27	27	27	27	27
SCH_HIER	Pearson Correlation	.734**	.593**	.252	-.088	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.206	.663	
	N	27	27	27	27	27

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

GENERATION = M

		MOTIVE	WRK_ETH	PROF_FEED	LSHIP	SCH_HIER
MOTIVE	Pearson Correlation	1	-.159	.284	-.577	-.373
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.707	.496	.134	.363
	N	8	8	8	8	8
WRK_ETH	Pearson Correlation	-.159	1	-.216	.315	.579
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.707		.607	.447	.133
	N	8	8	8	8	8
PROF_FEED	Pearson Correlation	.284	-.216	1	.357	.412
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.496	.607		.385	.310
	N	8	8	8	8	8
LSHIP	Pearson Correlation	-.577	.315	.357	1	.760*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.134	.447	.385		.029
	N	8	8	8	8	8
SCH_HIER	Pearson Correlation	-.373	.579	.412	.760*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.363	.133	.310	.029	
	N	8	8	8	8	8

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

Correlations for Construct 2: Leadership Perceptions**GENERATION = BBs**

		ILSP	CML	LSE	ACGD
ILSP	Pearson Correlation	1	-.210	.519*	-.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.419	.033	.838
	N	17	17	17	17
CML	Pearson Correlation	-.210	1	-.202	.367
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.419		.437	.147
	N	17	17	17	17
LSE	Pearson Correlation	.519*	-.202	1	.326
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.437		.201
	N	17	17	17	17
ACGD	Pearson Correlation	-.054	.367	.326	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.838	.147	.201	
	N	17	17	17	17

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

a. GENERATION = BBs

GENERATION = GEN X

		ILSP	CML	LSE	ACGD
ILSP	Pearson Correlation	1	-.506**	.035	-.373
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.007	.861	.055
	N	27	27	27	27
CML	Pearson Correlation	-.506**	1	-.135	.420*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007		.503	.029
	N	27	27	27	27
LSE	Pearson Correlation	.035	-.135	1	.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.861	.503		.739
	N	27	27	27	27
ACGD	Pearson Correlation	-.373	.420*	.067	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055	.029	.739	
	N	27	27	27	27

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

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

GENERATION = M

		ILSP	CML	LSE	ACGD
ILSP	Pearson Correlation	1	.368	.439	.127
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.370	.277	.764
	N	8	8	8	8
CML	Pearson Correlation	.368	1	.673	.769*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.370		.067	.026
	N	8	8	8	8
LSE	Pearson Correlation	.439	.673	1	.406
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.277	.067		.319
	N	8	8	8	8
ACGD	Pearson Correlation	.127	.769*	.406	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.764	.026	.319	
	N	8	8	8	8

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

APPENDIX H

Descriptive Results for Constructs 1 and 2

Descriptive Results for Construct 1: *Workplace Perceptions*

GENERATION = BBs

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MOTIVE	17	9.00	14.00	11.6471	1.49755
WRK_ETH	17	8.00	15.00	12.5882	1.87279
PROF_FEED	17	8.00	15.00	11.8824	1.93269
LSHIP	17	7.00	13.00	10.9412	1.71284
SCH_HIER	17	9.00	15.00	11.5294	1.94029
WORK PERC	17	44.00	69.00	58.5882	6.53891

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MOTIVE	27	5.00	15.00	10.7037	2.16288
WRK_ETH	27	7.00	15.00	11.5556	2.15430
PROF_FEED	27	7.00	14.00	11.5926	1.42125
LSHIP	27	8.00	15.00	11.9259	1.77430
SCH_HIER	27	7.00	15.00	10.5556	1.94804
WORK PERC	27	48.00	69.00	56.3333	5.98717

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MOTIVE	8	6.00	11.00	8.5000	1.60357
WRK_ETH	8	7.00	13.00	10.8750	1.95941
PROF_FEED	8	10.00	15.00	12.8750	1.72689
LSHIP	8	11.00	13.00	12.0000	.92582
SCH_HIER	8	3.00	9.00	6.1250	2.03101
WORK PERC	8	46.00	59.00	50.3750	4.68851

Descriptive Results for Construct 2: *Leadership Perceptions***GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ILSP	17	4.00	9.00	6.8824	1.69124
CML	17	4.00	11.00	7.2353	1.67815
LSE	17	7.00	11.00	9.1765	1.23669
ACGD	17	9.00	16.00	12.6471	1.86886
LEAD PERC	17	29.00	42.00	35.9412	3.78270

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ILSP	27	4.00	11.00	7.6296	1.71303
CML	27	4.00	11.00	7.7037	1.72793
LSE	27	8.00	13.00	10.1111	1.33973
ACGD	27	9.00	17.00	13.0370	2.08440
LEAD PERC	27	33.00	45.00	38.4815	3.05552

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ILSP	8	4.00	7.00	5.2500	1.16496
CML	8	8.00	11.00	9.6250	.91613
LSE	8	9.00	12.00	10.3750	1.18773
ACGD	8	13.00	19.00	14.5000	1.92725
LEAD PERC	8	35.00	46.00	39.7500	3.99106

APPENDIX I

Non-Parametric Results for Generational Perceptions (Construct 1) and Leadership Perceptions (Construct 2)

WORKPLACE PERCEPTIONS (CONSTRUCT 1)

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Ranks			
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank
WORK PERC	BBs	17	33.00
	GEN X	27	26.48
	M	8	12.75
	Total	52	

Test Statistics ^{a,b}	
	WORK PERC
Chi-Square	9.763
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.008

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: GENERATION

Mann-Whitney Test

Ranks				
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
WORK PERC	BBs	17	26.29	447.00
	GEN X	27	20.11	543.00
	Total	44		

Test Statistics ^a	
	WORK PERC
Mann-Whitney U	165.000
Wilcoxon W	543.000
Z	-1.559
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.119

Mann-Whitney Test

Ranks				
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
WORK PERC	BBs	17	15.71	267.00
	M	8	7.25	58.00
	Total	25		

Test Statistics ^a	
	WORK PERC
Mann-Whitney U	22.000
Wilcoxon W	58.000
Z	-2.688
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.007
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.006 ^b

Mann-Whitney Test

		Ranks		
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
WORK PERC	GEN X	27	20.37	550.00
	M	8	10.00	80.00
	Total	35		

Test Statistics ^a	
	WORK PERC
Mann-Whitney U	44.000
Wilcoxon W	80.000
Z	-2.521
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.010 ^b

LEADERSHIP PERCEPTIONS (CONSTRUCT 2)**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

Ranks			
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank
LEAD PERC	BBs	17	19.29
	GEN X	27	29.17
	M	8	32.81
	Total	52	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

	LEAD PERC
Chi-Square	6.117
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.047

Mann-Whitney Test

Ranks				
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
LEAD PERC	BBs	17	17.21	292.50
	GEN X	27	25.83	697.50
	Total	44		

Test Statistics^a

	LEAD PERC
Mann-Whitney U	139.500
Wilcoxon W	292.500
Z	-2.178
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.029

Mann-Whitney Test

Ranks				
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
LEAD PERC	BBs	17	11.09	188.50
	M	8	17.06	136.50
	Total	25		

Test Statistics^a

	LEAD PERC
Mann-Whitney U	35.500
Wilcoxon W	188.500
Z	-1.909
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.056
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.057 ^b

Mann-Whitney Test

		Ranks		
	GENERATION	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
LEAD PERC	GEN X	27	17.33	468.00
	M	8	20.25	162.00
	Total	35		

Test Statistics ^a	
	LEAD PERC
Mann-Whitney U	90.000
Wilcoxon W	468.000
Z	-.711
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.477
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.499 ^b

APPENDIX J

Descriptive Results by Variables

Subscale: Motivation**GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
8. Plan to stay with the school over the long term	17	3.00	5.00	4.1176	.85749
11. Career-driven	17	1.00	5.00	3.2941	1.10480
12. Seek work/life balance	17	2.00	5.00	4.2353	1.20049

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
8. Plan to stay with the school over the long term	27	1.00	5.00	3.1481	.98854
11. Career-driven	27	1.00	5.00	3.7407	.94432
12. Seek work/life balance	27	2.00	5.00	3.8148	.96225

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
8. Plan to stay with the school over the long term	8	1.00	3.00	2.3750	.91613
11. Career-driven	8	1.00	5.00	2.2500	1.48805
12. Seek work/life balance	8	2.00	5.00	3.8750	1.12599

Subscale: Work Ethic**GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
4. Give maximum effort and have strong work ethic	17	1.00	5.00	4.5882	1.00367
5. Adapt and learn quickly	17	3.00	5.00	4.0588	.89935
10. Results-driven	17	2.00	5.00	3.9412	.96635

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
4. Give maximum effort and have strong work ethic	27	2.00	5.00	3.8519	1.02671
5. Adapt and learn quickly	27	2.00	5.00	3.9259	.67516
10. Results-driven	27	1.00	5.00	3.7778	1.01274

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
4. Give maximum effort and have strong work ethic	8	2.00	5.00	4.3750	1.06066
5. Adapt and learn quickly	8	4.00	5.00	4.6250	.51755
10. Results-driven	8	1.00	3.00	1.8750	.83452

Subscale: Professional Feedback**GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2. Willing to ask for help when needed	17	2.00	5.00	3.9412	1.02899
6. Prefer informality amongst colleagues	17	3.00	5.00	4.0000	.70711
15. Prefer ongoing, informal feedback	17	2.00	5.00	3.9412	.82694

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2. Willing to ask for help when needed	27	2.00	5.00	3.8148	.87868
6. Prefer informality amongst colleagues	27	1.00	5.00	3.6667	.91987
15. Prefer ongoing, informal feedback	27	2.00	5.00	4.1111	.84732

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2. Willing to ask for help when needed	8	3.00	5.00	4.5000	.75593
6. Prefer informality amongst colleagues	8	2.00	5.00	4.1250	1.12599
15. Prefer ongoing, informal feedback	8	2.00	5.00	4.2500	1.03510

Subscale: Leadership Development Culture**GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
3. Value mentoring of potential leaders	17	1.00	5.00	3.9412	.96635
13. Technologically savvy	17	2.00	5.00	3.5882	.71229
14. Prefer to work in teams	17	1.00	5.00	3.4118	1.22774

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
3. Value mentoring of potential leaders	27	3.00	5.00	4.1481	.66238
13. Technologically savvy	27	2.00	5.00	4.0000	.62017
14. Prefer to work in teams	27	1.00	5.00	3.7778	1.08604

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
3. Value mentoring of potential leaders	8	2.00	5.00	4.0000	1.06904
13. Technologically savvy	8	3.00	5.00	4.1250	.83452
14. Prefer to work in teams	8	2.00	5.00	3.8750	.99103

Subscale: School Hierarchy

GENERATION = BBs

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Willing to navigate 'office politics'	17	2.00	5.00	3.5882	.93934
7. Like structure and process	17	2.00	5.00	4.0000	1.00000
9. Respectful of school hierarchy	17	1.00	5.00	3.9412	1.08804

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Willing to navigate 'office politics'	27	2.00	5.00	3.5556	.75107
7. Like structure and process	27	1.00	5.00	3.4074	1.04731
9. Respectful of school hierarchy	27	2.00	5.00	3.5926	.79707

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Willing to navigate 'office politics'	8	1.00	3.00	1.6250	.74402
7. Like structure and process	8	1.00	3.00	1.6250	.74402
9. Respectful of school hierarchy	8	1.00	5.00	2.8750	1.64208

Subscale: Intentional Leadership Succession Planning

GENERATION = BBs

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. A difference in expectations for leadership advancement between generations? (ie.Preparedness, seniority, ability or entitlement)	17	1	3	1.88	.781
4. A tendency of colleagues from other generations to not respect their own leadership.	17	1	4	2.76	.664
5. A perception of work demands and expectations of leadership that discourage particular age groups of teachers taking on middle or senior leadership roles?	17	1	4	2.24	.752

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. A difference in expectations for leadership advancement between generations? (ie.Preparedness, seniority, ability or entitlement)	27	1	4	2.37	.884
4. A tendency of colleagues from other generations to not respect their own leadership.	27	2	4	2.70	.609
5. A perception of work demands and expectations of leadership that discourage particular age groups of teachers taking on middle or senior leadership roles?	27	1	4	2.56	.974

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. A difference in expectations for leadership advancement between generations? (ie.Preparedness, seniority, ability or entitlement)	8	1	4	2.13	.991
4. A tendency of colleagues from other generations to not respect their own leadership.	8	1	2	1.75	.463
5. A perception of work demands and expectations of leadership that discourage particular age groups of teachers taking on middle or senior leadership roles?	8	1	3	1.38	.744

Subscale: Culture of Mentoring Leaders**GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
7. Intergenerational mentoring (formal or informal).	17	2	4	2.47	.717
8. Leaders from different generations learning from one another.	17	1	4	2.47	.874
11. A mentoring program to encourage teachers of different generations to work together and share experiences.	17	1	3	2.29	.686

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
7. Intergenerational mentoring (formal or informal).	27	1	4	2.63	.742
8. Leaders from different generations learning from one another.	27	1	4	2.44	.751
11. A mentoring program to encourage teachers of different generations to work together and share experiences.	27	1	4	2.63	.792

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
7. Intergenerational mentoring (formal or informal).	8	2	4	3.38	.744
8. Leaders from different generations learning from one another.	8	2	4	3.00	.535
11. A mentoring program to encourage teachers of different generations to work together and share experiences.	8	3	4	3.25	.463

Subscale: Leadership Styles & Expectations

GENERATION = BBs

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2. A difference in leadership styles and expectations between different generations?	17	1	3	1.82	.636
3. Conflict regarding acceptable work hours between teachers of different generations.	17	1	4	2.24	.903
12. Encouragement of an environment that highlights the benefits of an intergenerational workforce.	17	1	3	2.41	.618
15. Training of school middle & senior leaders on leading people of diverse age groups.	17	1	4	2.71	.849

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2. A difference in leadership styles and expectations between different generations?	27	1	4	2.00	.679
3. Conflict regarding acceptable work hours between teachers of different generations.	27	1	4	2.44	.751
12. Encouragement of an environment that highlights the benefits of an intergenerational workforce.	27	1	4	2.67	.784
15. Training of school middle & senior leaders on leading people of diverse age groups.	27	2	4	3.00	.679

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2. A difference in leadership styles and expectations between different generations?	8	1	3	1.50	.756
3. Conflict regarding acceptable work hours between teachers of different generations.	8	1	4	2.25	.886
12. Encouragement of an environment that highlights the benefits of an intergenerational workforce.	8	3	4	3.25	.463
15. Training of school middle & senior leaders on leading people of diverse age groups.	8	2	4	3.38	.744

Subscale: Awareness of, and catering for Generational Differences**GENERATION = BBs**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
6. An understanding by your school's Executive of differing generational learning styles for training & leadership development?	17	2	4	3.06	.556
9. Communication of important information in multiple ways (i.e., via e-mail and during meetings).	17	1	4	1.82	.809
10. Awareness by the School Executive of generational issues.	17	2	4	2.53	.624
13. An intentional culture of teachers of different generations being assigned to work together where possible.	17	1	3	2.53	.624
14. An offering of different types of training (i.e., computer-based and seminars) for generational styles.	17	1	4	2.71	.849

GENERATION = GEN X

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
6. An understanding by your school's Executive of differing generational learning styles for training & leadership development?	27	2	4	2.93	.675
9. Communication of important information in multiple ways (i.e., via e-mail and during meetings).	27	1	3	2.04	.587
10. Awareness by the School Executive of generational issues.	27	1	4	2.70	.823
13. An intentional culture of teachers of different generations being assigned to work together where possible.	27	1	4	2.89	.801
14. An offering of different types of training (i.e., computer-based and seminars) for generational styles.	27	1	4	2.48	.700

GENERATION = M

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
6. An understanding by your school's Executive of differing generational learning styles for training & leadership development?	8	2	4	3.13	.641
9. Communication of important information in multiple ways (i.e., via e-mail and during meetings).	8	1	4	2.25	1.165
10. Awareness by the School Executive of generational issues.	8	3	4	3.50	.535
13. An intentional culture of teachers of different generations being assigned to work together where possible.	8	2	4	3.25	.707
14. An offering of different types of training (i.e., computer-based and seminars) for generational styles.	8	2	4	2.38	.744