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Article examines perceptions of leadership of two different generations of Ukraine using Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI). Leadership practices accepted in certain societies correlate with the dominant culture and reflect its norms and expectations. This quantitative research project focused on adaptation of LPI and testing leadership concepts in Ukraine, a country with an interesting history and unique geopolitical location. The survey results showed peculiarities and differences of Ukrainian leadership perceptions of two different generations.
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Introduction

The concept of leadership in modern Ukrainian society was shaped mainly during the Soviet Union times. But during the last two decades, the influence of Western culture has become considerable. In this survey two main issues were studied: whether Western concepts of leadership are appropriate for Ukraine and the possible differences between younger and older generations on this concept.

Each culture has its own unique challenge of balancing its own cultural norms and expectations with the demands and expectations placed on its leaders. Therefore, as culture changes and the demands of leaders change, leadership praxis changes (Hartog et al., 1999).

Historical Background
Ukraine is a country in Eastern Europe bordered by Poland, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, and Moldova in the west, Russia in the east and Belarus in the north. In the south, Ukraine has an outlet to the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. It is second-largest country in Europe after Russia, and Kyiv is the capital of Ukraine.

From the 9th to the 12th century AD, a medieval state of Kyivan Rus existed on the current territory of Ukraine. During the 14th century, Poland and Lithuania fought wars against the Mongol invaders, and eventually most of Ukraine passed to the rule of these two countries. In later centuries, the eastern part of Ukraine was subjugated by Russia, and southern Ukraine, including Crimea, was under the rule of the Ottoman Empire until conquered by Russia in the late 18th century. As Szporluk (1997) believed, "the national identity of modern Ukrainians was formulated by those who, in defining Ukraine, rejected both the Russian identity and the Polish identity" (p. 86).

Indeed, peasants who escaped serfdom, both from the Polish and Russian parts of Ukraine, formed their own self-governing commune on a small island on the Dnipro river. They were called Cossacks and fought against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Russia and the Ottoman Empire. They developed some elements of democratic governance, such as elections of military chiefs, and had a constitution that dates back to 1710 and is believed to be the first written constitution in Europe, "providing a model blueprint for popular democracy well before the American and French Revolutions" (Smith et al., 1998, p. 38).

Following World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, the country collapsed into chaos, and Ukrainian leaders attempted to establish an independent state with the help of Germany. The Ukrainian state, in various forms, existed from 1917 to 1922 when it became a part of the Soviet Union.

Under Soviet rule, Ukrainians were forced to assimilate with Russians. Many among the Ukrainian elite, especially nationalists and religious leaders, became victims of Soviet repression. The Famine of 1932-33, known as Holodomor, is believed to be a de facto genocide of Ukrainians by the Soviet state. The losses from Holodomor are estimated to be 10 million people (Wolowyna, 2008).

Ukraine declared its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991. Grounds for this action were prepared by the nationalist People's Movement of Ukraine, Rukh, founded in 1989. It was one of the forces behind the referendum in 1991, in which 90 percent of
Ukrainians voted in favor of independence (Beissinger, 2002).

Contemporary Ukrainian history is marked by many social changes:

- 1917: Bolshevik Revolution;
- 1932-33: Famine as result of Stalin’s collectivisation of Ukrainian farms;
- 1941-1945: Great Patriotic War;
- 1986: Chernobyl nuclear accident;
- 1990: Collapse of the Soviet Union;
- 1991: Declaration of Independence;
- 2004: Orange Revolution;
- 2013: EuroMaidan;
- 2014 Crimean Crisis;

According to the CIA World Factbook (2009), the population of Ukraine is around 45 million (down from 52 million at independence). Urbanization is 68%. There are more women than men in Ukraine: the ratio is 0.86 male for 1 female, and women in Ukraine have a longer life expectancy. Literacy rate among the population is 99.4%. Around 22% of the Ukrainian population use the Internet (World Bank, 2007). For the first time, GDP growth was registered in 2000 and averaged 7% in subsequent years. A minor crisis occurred in 2005, the year after the Orange Revolution, when apprehensions about political stability prompted citizens to withdraw their deposits from banks (IMF, 2008).

The Orange Revolution, the first landmark event in the modern history of independent Ukraine, took place between November 2004 and January 2005, when millions of Ukrainians gathered in the central square of Kyiv to protest against the results of fraudulent presidential elections that were won by Viktor Yanukovych, a Russian-leaning politician with a criminal record. His opponent, Viktor Yushchenko, led the non-violent general strike that culminated in the second round of elections won by him with 52% of the vote, while Yanukovych received 44% (The Electoral Knowledge Network, 2009).

In 2013, Ukraine experienced a second major political crisis when the government failed to sign a pro-European treaty under economic pressure from Russia. This caused a major uprising when thousands of people, mainly from western and central Ukraine, gathered on the Independence Squire in Kyiv to protest against Yanukovych’s regime. The event was called EuroMaidan, a civil
disobedience campaign in support of European civil rights and democracy. In the beginning of 2014, Ukraine was thought by some to be on the brink of a civil war, with over 80 civil protesters killed in confrontations with special police forces. After negotiations between President Yanukovych and the Opposition, with European politicians as intermediaries, a peace treaty was signed. Soon after this Yanukovych left the country, and the Parliament (Rada) proclaimed new presidential elections. However, the Yanukovych government left the country in a deep economic crisis.

**Ukrainian Value Dimensions**

Ukrainian and Russian sociologists have made attempts to measure "value dimensions" of Ukraine, which are the basic social traits that are found in cultural and national groups. To do this, studies have attempted to examine Ukrainian culture in regards to individualism vs. collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. General Ukrainian values were measured within 1994-2006 Sociological monitoring (Panina, 2005). Ukrainian researcher Dr. Ruchka A. (Institute of Sociology NAS) conducted a value survey focused on risk taking, professor Dr. Sheremet P. (Kyiv Mohyla Academy) also examined Ukrainian society using G. Hofstede’s four value dimensions for comparing cultures, and found high power distance, and middle levels of individualism. The level of uncertainty avoidance (avoiding risk) is close to other southern European counties – Greece, Portugal, Italy, and Spain. Russian sociologists Vladimir Magun and Maskim Rudnev compared Ukrainian values to other European counties within a European Social Survey (ESS) using Schwartz’s value indicators and dimensions. According to this survey Ukrainians are characterized by stronger inclinations to the values of the category called Conservation (Security, Conformity, Tradition) and less to the values category named Openness to Change (Self-Direction, Hedonism, Stimulation). According to the survey Ukrainians were higher than the other Europeans on the Conservation and Self-enhancement values. The survey also compared values of four Ukrainian macroregions. The results showed that Western Ukraine appeared to have stronger supporters of the Openness to Change values (and weaker supporters of Conservation values) than the Central Ukraine inhabitants. Western Ukraine is closer to European counties than to the Central Ukraine region (Magun, Rudnev, 2007). Ukrainian Sociologist Olga Kutsenko stated in her research that one of the most significant findings is related to the decomposition of objective class positions and dispositions. Based on the individualism-universalism duality, co-embodiment of values becomes a societal value characteristics of individuals, who are representing various class positions (Kutsenko, 2007).
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The Impact of History

In this section, three major historical events that helped shape Ukrainian national identity and cultural psychology will be discussed. The first event is the Khmelnytsky Uprising which is widely regarded as a turning point in the development of the Ukrainian nation (Plokhy, 2008). The uprising was led by Bogdan Khmelnytsky, a prominent Cossack leader, against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Cossacks aligned with Crimean Tatars and were joined by local peasants. A vast territory of Ukraine was freed from the rule of Polish nobility, Catholic priests and Jewish traders. Based on cultural similarities and Orthodox faith, Khmelnytsky sought protection from Russia. The uprising culminated in the "1654 Pereyaslav Agreement, which placed the Ukrainian Cossack state under the protection of the Muscovite tsar and initiated a long era of Russian domination in Ukraine" (Plokhy, 2001, p. 489).

This event has profound implications for leadership. It indicates that Ukrainian identity has developed as a "resistance identity" in the atmosphere of oppression and abuse. However, the Ukrainian fight for freedom and independence did not cease for many centuries until it culminated in full Ukrainian independence. Furthermore, the organization of a Cossack republic points to a deep respect of for the principles of democracy and equality among Ukrainians. Unlike in other European countries where nobility played a prominent role in nation-building, Ukrainian national identity was developed by the people in a bottom-up manner.

The second event that heavily influenced Ukraine was World War II. Since World War II, Ukraine has existed in its current borders. According to the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact signed in 1939, Germany and the USSR agreed to partition Poland. Western Ukraine, which was a part of Poland before these events, was invaded by Soviet troops (Boshyk, Waschuk & Wynnyckyj, 1986). However, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) saw Western Ukraine as independent. They saw the invasion of Soviet Ukraine by German troops as an opportunity to win the long-desired goal of statehood. A Ukrainian state was proclaimed in 1940 in Lviv but existed only for 10 days before being dispersed by the Germans. A radical wing of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, OUN(B), the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), fought a guerilla war against the Soviet Red Army.
The third event that defined Ukrainian identity in modern times was its decision to give up its nuclear arsenal. Voices in the foreign policy establishment that argued it was a gross mistake are particularly strong now, eighteen years later. In the light of the deepening economic crisis, Russia’s war with Georgia, the ongoing conflict over the Black Sea fleet, secessionism in Crimea, and annual gas disputes with its Eastern neighbor, Ukraine’s geopolitical standing is severely compromised. Ukraine’s decision to give up its nuclear arsenal, the world’s third largest in the early 1990s, was made in return for security guarantees from the U.S. and Europe. However, according to popular belief, the West failed to provide the security assurances it should have offered to the ex-Soviet country in return for disarmament, especially with regard to countering pressure from Russia. The decision to renounce nuclear weapons was a sign of a firm pro-Western orientation in Ukraine and its desire to construct a foreign policy identity as a peaceful and cooperating nation. At the same time, it can be regarded as another example of reliance on external forces for protection.

**The Impact of Culture**

One of the biggest cultural issues of Ukraine is language: Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism. Roughly half of Ukraine speaks Ukrainian and the other half speaks Russian (although many are bi-lingual). Ukraine is a particularly interesting context for investigation of post-Soviet language politics because in 1991 it housed the largest Russian population of all the former Soviet republics, numbering 11.4 million out of 47 million Ukrainian citizens. In addition, 72% of eastern Ukrainians spoke Russian as their first language (Zevelev, 2001), and so did Jews and members of many other ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, Ukrainian authorities proclaimed Ukrainian the only official language of Ukraine (1989 language law, followed by article 10 of the 1996 Constitution), while Russian became a minority language. Ideologies of linguistic correctness take center stage in Ukrainian identity politics. Political leaders use language issue to win the votes of different parts of Ukraine. However, a notable relationship exists between language and social power: political leaders tend to know and speak both languages fluently.

**The Impact of Independence**

After the declaration of its independence in 1991, Ukraine chose a democratic way of development. The main economic and social changes focused on building an open society with a market economy and democratic bases of organization. The key impact of
Independence was a new direction of change - a “democratization” vector (Panina, 2004). Social transformations within Ukraine are determined by Independence, which led to the formation of new transitioning institutional, social and class structure of the society. Post Independence years have demonstrated interesting connections between market shifts, social changes, consciousness and structure, institutional quality and political accountability. Ukrainians experienced an inflation of expectations in 2004-2005, followed by mass disappointment due to political turmoil, deregulation and economic crisis (Kutsenko, 2009).

Context of the Study

Ukraine was chosen for this study because of its unique position (historical, political, cultural, and geographical) as well as the changes in leadership it has had over the past century. As noted, Ukraine announced its independence in 1991, the first Soviet republic to do so. But there has been a challenge of transitioning to a market economy and to democratic political institutions. The country was at a crossroads as to its future: the past leadership models have been questioned, but new models has yet to fully emerge and be accepted.

During the Soviet era (1917–1991), Ukrainians, as Soviet citizens, understood leadership only in political terms. Therefore, leadership was both authoritarian and, in some cases, paternalistic. After 1991, the word “leader” in Ukrainian culture was considered a negative concept. In fact, there is even no word “leader” that is native to the Ukrainian language. The word that comes closest and was used in description of Communist party leaders is “руководитель” (rucovoditel). After the collapse of the Soviet ideology, there was no one to lead people through the dramatic changes that followed. Using Hofstede's concept, in a country where uncertainty avoidance is very high, this dramatic experience of the entire collapse of ideology left people with enormous uncertainty. So leadership training was imported, but it was comprised of Western assumptions and did not align with the Ukrainian worldview.

Theoretical Foundations

In this study, an investigation of leadership was done using five practices of “exemplary leadership” based on research by Kouzes and Posner (2005):

1) Model the Way - set a motivating example, interim goals, standards of excellence, and the way people should be treated.
2) Inspire a Shared Vision - generate a common purpose, create an ideal image of the organization.

3) Challenge the Process - take risks from the status quo and look for innovative ways to improve the organization.

4) Enable Others - facilitate true teamwork, foster collaboration and mutual respect.

5) Encourage the Heart - recognize contributions of the team, keep determination, and celebrate accomplishments of individual team members.

The questionnaire, developed by Kouzes and Posner has six questions for each of the five practices, and all these were used in this research.

**Rationale for the Study**

Ukraine was chosen for this study because of its unique position as well as the dramatic changes in leadership it experienced over the 20th century. For the purposes of the study, two groups (ages of those in their 20s and 50s) were selected because they have had very different experiences of political, social, economic, and religious leadership over the past 40 years.

The purpose of the study was to examine perspectives on leadership among two generational groups in Ukraine. Each group has experienced very different kinds of leadership, across various aspects of society. The two groups were comprised of a sample of those in their 20s, and a sample of those in their 50s, representing 25 locations across all regions of the country.

**Method**

This survey was based on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) theory by Kouzes and Pozner (2005), which investigates five practices of "exemplary leadership."

**Sample (Respondents):**

Two generations of Ukrainian citizens: junior respondents (20-29 years old), senior respondents (50 – 59 years old). Total number of respondents: junior group: 799 people, senior group: 504 respondents.
Structure of the study:

**Phase 1:** Translation of the LPI into Ukrainian and Russian, with back translation.

**Phase 2:** Data collection, with 1,200 more respondents (translated tool). Detailed analysis by US and Ukrainian researchers.

**Geography:** 25 cities, 1,200 respondents
- Western Ukraine: Lviv, Rivne, Ivano-Frankivsk
- Central Ukraine: Kyiv, Smila, Cherkasy, Uman, Cherhiniv, Zhashkov, Kaniv
- Eastern Ukraine: Poltava, Sumy, Dnipropetrovsk, Dniprozderzhinsk,
- Southern Ukraine and Crimea: Odesa, Melitopol, Berdyansk, Kryvyi Rih, Sevastopol, Simferopol, Feodosia, Yevpatoria, Yalta, Kerch, Nizhnehorskyy

**Reliability and Validity**

In order to determine the reliability of scales, the Alpha Cronbach’s analysis was implemented.

This type of analysis allows identifying the degree to which the scale measures the same notion. It allows discover of the relationship between the individual items of the scale. Using reliability analysis, the extent to which the items in the questionnaire are related to each other can be found, to obtain an overall index of repeatability or internal consistency of the scale. Also, this analysis allows finding out the problem aspects of the scale that need to be removed (the questions that are worsening the reliability of the scale in whole).

**Table 1. The basic statistics for Alpha Cronbach’s are as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Items: 30

This is a coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha for the Overall Leadership – all 30 questions (N of items) that were put into analysis. The value of the coefficient varies from 0 to 1. The higher the value, the more
reliable and consistent is the scale. There is no precise lower limit, starting from which one can claim that the scale is reliable, however, scales with Alpha greater than 0.5 (in social sciences) are considered reliable.

**Results: Analysis of Responses**

In order to reveal the differences in Leadership Perception by two age groups of respondents, Z-test and T-test were implemented.

**Z-test:** this test reveals significant differences between a series of proportions;

**T-test:** this test reveals significant differences between a series of means.

These two types of tests were used for comparing the responses of two groups of respondents.

TOP 3 boxes for each question were put together for analysis. These alternatives include “8 - Usually,” “9 - Very Frequently,” and “10 - Almost Always.” These 3 alternatives were chosen, because they relate to internalization of certain behavior. If a person is doing something at least usually, it means that certain type of behavior is intrinsic for this person.

Due to the large sample sizes, a 95% confidence level was selected. This means that the statistical differences are significant with probability of a mistake only up to 5%.

**Model the Way Results:**

On the level of scale (the sums of responses for corresponding statements), the significant difference between responses of Younger and Older groups was not found, which indicates that on the whole, this aspect of leadership is perceived equally in both groups (see Table 2: Model the Way)
Table 2: Model the Way

The Older group demonstrated a higher proportion of those whose own distinctive features (TOP 3 boxes) include “Setting a personal example of what I expect from others,” “Spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on,” and “Build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization,” as compared to the Younger group. The last two patterns of behaviour are more typical for the Older group from the point of view of mean scores (significant differences were found), which implies that in general, the Older group adhere to these principles more often than the Younger group. The possible explanation for it might lie in the fact of a longer professional experience of the Older Group (see Table 3: Model the Way Questions by Group)
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### Table 3: Model the Way questions by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>TOP 3 boxes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Set a personal example of what I expect of others.</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Follow through on the promises and commitments I make.</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The statistical differences in the table are marked with Red (Higher) and Blue (Lower) color – as compared to the Younger group.

Conversely, the share of Younger who Usually, Very frequently, or Almost always “ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance” is higher as compared to the Older group, which means that they are less confident in own actions (which potentially is in line with less professional experience of the Younger group). In addition, there might be another hypotheses-explanation that needs testing: the Younger are a little bit more self-centred, and that is why it is more important for them to know how they are being evaluated by other people – a possible answer to a question “How is my ego perceived?”

**Set a personal example of what I expect of others**

Despite an absence of significant differences for mean scores for answers to this question, the share of those who follow this rule Usually or Almost always is higher in the Older group as compared to the Younger one. The Younger group also displays a higher share of those who follow this pattern of behavior Sometimes or Fairly often.

**Spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.**

The Younger group displays a higher share of those who follow this pattern of behavior Seldom or Occasionally and a lower share of those who do it Usually or Very frequently as compared to the Older group.
group. The mean scores for answers to this question also significantly differ by groups: for the Older group, this type of behaviour is more intrinsic on the whole.

Follow through on the promises and commitments that I make. No significant differences were found. Ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.

The Younger group displays a higher share of those who follow this pattern of behavior Almost always, as compared to the Older group.

Build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.

For the Older group, the concern about building a consensus around a common set of values for running the organization is a more typical behavior than for the Younger group (the mean score for the Older group is significantly higher than for the Younger one). While the Younger have a higher share of those who build consensus Once in a while or Occasionally (against the Older group), the Older display a higher share of those who do it Usually or Very frequently.

Am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

The Younger have a higher share of those who are Usually clear about their philosophy of Leadership against the Older.

**Inspire a Shared Vision Results**

On the level of scale, no significant differences in mean scores of each group were found (*Table 4: Inspire a Shared Vision*):
### Table 4: Inspire a Shared Vision

The Older group appears to display more expertise in focusing on future trends, while the Younger group focuses less on the influence of the future on their common work. The Older group seemed to be more eager to speak about the higher meaning and purpose of the work.

#### TOP 3 boxes:

```plaintext
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP 3 boxes</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint the &quot;big picture&quot; of what we aspire to accomplish.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Base:** Younger - 705; Older - 441 respondents

Red/blue frame indicates scores significantly higher/lower than for other group at the 95% confidence level

If coming to the level of separate dimensions (statements) of the scale:

The Older demonstrate higher share of those to whom 'talking about future trends that will influence how their work gets done' and 'speaking with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of their work' is intrinsic, as compared to the Younger group. Also these two types of behavior are more inherent in the Older group as a whole (the mean scores for the given two statements are significantly higher for the Older group as compared to the Younger group (See table 5: Inspire the shared vision questions by group)
### Table 5: Inspire the shared vision questions by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>TOP 3 boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paint the &quot;big picture&quot; of what we aspire to accomplish.</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The statistical differences in the table are marked with Red (Higher) and Blue (Lower) color – as compared to the Younger group.

For all statements of the scale, the significant differences were found in terms of distribution of answers:

**Talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done:**

The Older group has a higher share of those who talk about future trends Very Frequently and a lesser share of those who do it Sometimes, compared the Younger group. In general, the Older group is more willing to talk about future trends: this might be related to the expertise and knowledge of the sphere they work in.

**Describe a compelling image of what our future could be like:**

The Older group has a higher share of those who Usually describe a compelling image of what their future could be and a smaller share of those who exercise this practice Seldom against the Younger group.

**Appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future:**

The variations in responses among the groups were found in the lower part of the scale, and it has not influenced the average scores.
of the groups. The Younger group has a highest share of those who appeal to others to share an exciting dream of future Almost Never and a smaller share of those who do it Occasionally as compared to the Older group.

*Show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision:*

The Older group have a smaller share of those who Almost always show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision compared to the Younger group.

*Paint the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish:*

The Older group has a smaller share of those who paint a big picture Sometimes compared to the Younger.

Speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work:

For the Older group speaking with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of their work is a more Usual practice than for the Younger group. It is reflected both on the level of question average (it is significantly higher for the Older group as compared to the Younger). Also, the Older display a higher share of those who follow this practice Usually and a smaller share of those who follow this practice Once in a While, compared to the Younger group.

**Challenge the Process Results**

On the level of scale in the whole, this type of behavior is more typical for the Older group as compared to the Younger group. The mean score for the scale is significantly higher in the Older group *(See table 6: Challenge the process).*
The Younger group appears to be more "locked in" to the framework of their working environments. It is reflected in the motivation to try some innovative ways of doing their work, going out of formal boundaries. For the Younger group, the frequency of such practices is lower. The higher frequency of these practices for the Older group might be partially related to authority at work and less fear of breaking the rules.

### Challenge the Process

The Older group displays a higher share of those to whom "challenging people to try out new and innovative ways of doing their work" and "searching outside the boundaries of organization for innovative ways to improve what they do" are intrinsic in terms of behavior. This might be related, on the one hand, to less fear to break the established frames of work due to greater professional experience. On the other hand, it might be an adaptive mechanism. Leadership requires both responsibility and risk-taking. The Older group might try to take this proven risk in order to avoid taking risks when there is a chance of failure – the mean score on this statement is significantly lower for the Older group compared to the Younger one (Table 7: Challenge the process questions by group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP 3 boxes:</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask &quot;What can we learn?&quot; when things don't go as expected.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Younger – 705; Older – 441 respondents

Red/blue frame indicates scores significantly higher/lower than for other group at the 95% confidence level.
Table 7. Challenge the process questions by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>TOP 3 boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ask “What can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected.</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The statistical differences in the table are marked with Red (Higher) and Blue (Lower) color – as compared to the Younger group.

The analysis of responses distribution across each statement of the scale:

Seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities:

The Younger group is a little more ambitious than the Older one with a higher share of those who try to test themselves Almost Always as compared to the Older group. At the same time, the share of those who follow this pattern of behavior Occasionally is smaller in the Younger group, but the share of those who do it Once in a While is higher against the Older group. On the whole, the frequency of exercising this type of behavior is the same in both groups.

Challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work:

The only significant difference found between two groups is the following: the Younger group displays a smaller share of those who usually challenge other people to try innovative ways of doing their work, compared to the Older group.
Search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do:

The Older group has a higher share of those who search outside the boundaries very frequently in contrast to the Younger one (15% against 10%)

Ask "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected:

The Younger group has a higher share of those who learn when things do not go as expected Seldom compared to the Older group.

Experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure:

On the whole, this type of behavior is more typical in the Younger group (as stated previously). As for the distributions of answers, the Older group demonstrate a higher share of those who take risks Seldom in contrast to the Younger group.

No significant differences in distribution of the responses of the two age groups were found for the statement "Make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on," which means that both groups are interested to the same extent in stable working environment and an absence of stress at work.

Enable Others to Act Results

On the level of scale, no significant differences in mean scores of each group were found (see table 8: Enable others to Act).
Table 8. *Enable others to Act*

Enable Others to Act

On this scale there are almost no significant differences found, except for the development of cooperative relationships with people from the working environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively listen to diverse points of view.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the decisions that people make on their own.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Younger – 705; Older – 441 respondents

The Older group displays a higher share of those who Usually, Very frequently, or Almost always develop cooperative relationships among the people they work with. This pattern of behavior is more typical for the Older group on the whole (the mean score for the statement #4 is significantly higher in the Older group in contrast to the Younger one (See table 9: Enable others to act questions by group)
Table 9. Enable others to act questions by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>TOP 3 boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Actively listen to diverse points of view.</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Treat others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Support the decisions that people make on their own.</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The statistical differences in the table are marked with Red (Higher) and Blue (Lower) color – as compared to the Younger group.

The analysis of responses distribution across each statement of the scale:

For only two statements out of six that belong to the scale Challenge the Process significant differences in distribution of responses were found:

Develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with:

This type of behavior, as stated previously, is more typical for the Older group. The frequency (mean score) is significantly higher for this group.

The Younger group displays a smaller share of those who follow this pattern of behavior Usually, Very frequently, Almost always (reflected in TOP3 boxes differences too). At the same time, the share of those who follow this behavior Once in a while and Sometimes is higher in this group compared to the Older one. This might be partially related to the higher mobility of the Younger group: they might be less attached to their workplace since in this age (20-29 yrs.), the first steps on professional ladder are made while the Older group, having much more experience, might value their own reputation more and thus be less mobile in order to be treated seriously by colleagues from other companies.

Treat others with dignity and respect:
The Older group displays a higher share of those who treat others with dignity and respect sometimes. As for all other alternatives for response on this question, no significant differences were found.

**Encourage the Heart Results**

On the level of scale, no significant differences in mean scores of each group were found (See table 10: Encourage the Heart).

**Table 10. Encourage the Heart**

The Younger group displays a higher frequency of finding ways to celebrate accomplishments. The mean score for this statement is lower in the Older group. It might mean that the Younger are more inclined to have fun in general and pay more attention to this part of life, even if it is related to their work. Also, it might be related to the notion of some ‘tiredness’ of the Older group. They might have to make more effort in order to stay energetic and compete with the Younger group in terms of "proactive" behavior (See table 11: Encourage the heart questions by group).
The analysis of responses distribution:

No significant differences in group claimed behavior were found on the following statements:

Praise people for a job well done.

Make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.

Publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.

Give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

These types of behavior are typical to an equal extent for both groups.

Make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects:

The Younger group displays a higher share of those who follow the given pattern of behavior Seldom as compared to the Older group.
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Find ways to celebrate accomplishments.

For this statement, the situation is somewhat different: the Older group possess a higher share of those who find ways to celebrate accomplishments Occasionally. At the same time, we should remember that for the Younger group, the share of those to whom such type of behavior is intrinsic is higher than for the Older group.

**Analysis and Interpretation**

In Ukraine, as just one example, we have seen how intricate and nuanced leadership systems, styles, and expectations seem to be.

**Research Findings 1**

Variables with greatest difference in means between the two age groups were:

Model the Way: significant differences in mean scores in 4 out of 6 questions.

Challenge the Process: significant differences in mean scores in 3 of 6 questions.

**Preliminary Interpretation 1**

"Model the Way" focuses on finding and affirming shared values and setting an example of good leadership for others.

The younger respondents valued the personal example of expressing what they expected of others while the older respondents scored higher in building a consensus on common values.

"Challenge the Process” focuses on seizing initiative and innovation as well as taking risks.

The younger respondents scored higher in challenging others to try new ways of working and also in looking for innovative ways to improve what they do.

**Research Findings 2**

The questions with the greatest differences in means between the groups were:
Making sure coworkers follow principles and standards that were agreed on (older = higher)

Experiment and take risks, even if there is a chance of failure (younger = higher)

Discussing future trends that will influence how work gets done (older = higher)

Develop cooperative relationships with those one works with (older = higher)

Preliminary Interpretation 2

Older respondents were more concerned with conformity and cooperation (perhaps due to collectivist history and culture?)

But they were also interested in future trends (perhaps because of a dissatisfaction with the "status quo" and the usual way of working?)

Younger respondents were more interested in risk taking and experimenting with new ways (perhaps due to wider exposure to other cultures?)

They also were more concerned with celebrating accomplishments (perhaps a small sign of growing individualism?)

Research Findings 3

Highest mean on 1-10 scale for both respondents in their 20s and 50s was for the same behavior: “Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.”

Lowest mean for both groups was also for the same behavior: “Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.”

Second Highest mean for both respondent groups was also the same: “Treats others with dignity and respect.”

Second Lowest mean for both groups was: “Seeks out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.”

Preliminary Interpretations 3

Appreciation and support for efforts by team members is significant
for both age groups (perhaps due to mid range levels of individualism and collectivism?)

Low levels of wanting to share "an exciting dream of the future" is shared by younger and older respondents (perhaps an indication that many citizens of Ukraine have a less than optimistic view of how the future will be?).

The treatment of others was another important feature for both groups (perhaps because of the high level of Conservation found in earlier research, and thus the need for reliance on others?)

The low level of desire for challenging opportunities to test skills and abilities appears to contradict the finding on "Challenge the Process" for the younger group (perhaps due a conflict between Conservation values and a growing desire for take risks for a better future?)

Limitations

As any research, this study has limitations. The first limitation is the geographical scope of the context (Ukraine). Future research should consider additional settings. A second limitation is to what extent these findings can be applied in different leadership contexts (i.e. business, education, government, healthcare, etc.). This could be examined in more detail. And a third limitation is that cultural factors need to be considered in greater depth, as these form a foundation for leadership assumptions. This, however, was beyond the scope of the study.

Implications for Research and Practice

The current findings demonstrate slight differences in generational perceptions, and thus future research should look deeper into perceptions of Ukrainians about leadership. Due to differences in scales reliability by groups, it might be useful to make an in-depth look at the wording the respondents use to express their leadership perceptions. This should be of use in case there is any possibility of adapting the five dimensions of leadership to Ukraine.

It’s recommended that future research should utilize an additional tool to reveal the causes of similarities and differences between leadership perceptions of two age groups. To have a closer look at the differences revealed, it might be useful to examine the working positions of respondents of both age groups. This variable, as well as others, might help to explain some differences and similarities in their leadership perceptions. One could code the working positions
on the scale of employed population (e.g. Eric Wright scale) and explore in more depth the positions of two investigated age groups.

**Conclusion**

Leadership is a key part of any society. This study has shown that there are some differences in the understanding and perceptions of leadership between younger and older generations of Ukrainians. The representatives of the older generation share attributes such as “fairness” and their concept of leadership corresponds somewhat with Soviet leadership models. The younger generation doesn’t appear to have a well-formed concept or model, but still differs from the older group. The young generation seem to share a disillusionment in leaders, which may well have an impact on the future of Ukraine as it moves into a new and challenging period in its development as a nation.
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