

Intra-Generational Differences in the Personality Traits of Millennial Leaders in Indian IT Sector

¹N. Bargavi, ²Anand A. Samuel and ³P. James Daniel Paul

¹VITBS, VIT University, Chennai, India

²VIT University, Vellore, India

³Department of Management and Data Services,
World Vision Intranational Global Centre, Manila, Philippines

Abstract: Each generation is shaped by distinct experiences and events during their developmental stages. These experiences whether positive or negative, mold the culture of individuals belonging to each generation. Generational shift from gen-X to Y has resulted in changes in cultures which occur gradually and highly influence the generation's personality traits and attitudes. Hence, this study contributes to intrapret the humanistic drive of intra-generations in terms of their personality traits at workplace, based on their year of birth. The sample comprised of 525 responses from millennial leaders working in the Indian IT industry. MANOVA is performed to test the hypothesis whether early millennial leaders differed significantly in their personality traits when compared to late millennial leaders.

Key words: Millennial leaders, personality, work behavior, IT industry, intrapret, responses

INTRODUCTION

Today's global organizations consist of different generations of employees who array from traditionalists to millennials. A generation is a very broad term and this is the reason why breaking up birth years helps define each generation (Breyer, 2013). The generational cohorts comprised of traditionalists or (the silent generation, 1925-1942; the boomers, 1943-1960; generation X, 1961-1981; the millennials; 1982-2000) (Strauss and Howe, 1991). This prevalence of multigenerational workforce can be seen in all the organizations in a global work scenario. With years passing by, many companies in various industries like engineering, retailing, energy, manufacturing, etc. have stated that 60% of their workforce will retire within the next 3 years (Hagemann and Stroope, 2013). This describes the oceanic level of opportunities significant for the millennials worldwide. Along with multiple generations in the workplace having its differences, the information technology industry is also changing as the industry has proved to be the fastest growing part of the economy and the largest private sector employer in India (Menezes, 2015). Employees in the workplace are changing due to the growing millennials and the retiring traditionalists and baby boomers. With this rapid growth of information and technology industry in India, a rise in young bloods occupying managerial roles can be seen in

different organizations. With both the employees and the industry changing disruptively, there is a need to understand how leadership is going to change to meet these changes in the workplace. It is even more important to know what personality traits millennials are bringing to the workplace and changing the work dynamics (Breyer, 2013). Leaders should engage with executives across global horizons and mingle among other colleagues who are different in their work practices and also distinct in their personality (Stoffers, 2016). As millennials move into leadership roles within the organizations, it is important to recognize how millennials will continue to cope with changes in organizations and how organizational practices will change to accommodate the needs and expectations of millennials. This serves as the background of this study in unveiling the behavioral traits of millennials who are placed as leaders in today's organizations. This research is based on the big five theory of personality (McCrae and Costa, 1999) and the generational theory (Strauss and Howe, 2000). In the lexical tradition, personality traits have been assessed using the five factor model which acted as the most extrusive, authenticated and commonly used method (McCrae and Costa, 1997). Many studies indicated that the five tenet model is transmissible and consistent during all times (Costa and McCrae, 1988; Digman, 1989). The constructs of the five-factor model are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and

conscientiousness. As there are plethora's of studies elaborating on the big five traits, it is further elucidated how 'self-esteem' is considered as an added personality trait by twenge and campbell in 2008. They elucidated that millennials exhibited high self-esteem, more external locus of control, anxiety and lower need for social approval. The future generations that followed the gen x, continued to emphasize on the individualistic effects which gradually increased as many youngsters started to focus deeply on the concept of 'self' (Twenge, 2006). Being the children of boomers, the millennial took this trait of 'self' to the higher level. Thus, they propounded the concept of 'self-esteem' additionally to the psychological traits of millennials. Hence, the personality traits of millennial leaders are quantified using six variables namely self-esteem, openness, extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and conscientiousness.

The generational theory stated that the young individuals of millennial generation will be molded by historical happenings in the span of last 10 years or so (Strauss and Howe, 2000; Kowske *et al.*, 2010). This paved way to classify that the millennial generation as elder or the early millennials (1980-1990) and younger or the late millennials (1990-2000). The oldest members of this cohort would have spent 21 years of their job career and would be placed as leaders by supervising their younger members at work (Kowske *et al.*, 2010). The elder millennials stepped up the leadership positions in the organizational hierarchy. Strauss and Howe (1991) proposed that when the eldest of millennials would be aged 18 in the year 2000, they would possess distinguishing persona traits which will evolve with time. This description of millennials by Howe and Strauss (2000) posited as one of the critical background of this study, based on which the hypothesis of this study was formulated. Early millennial leaders differed significantly in their personality traits when compared to late millennial leaders (H_1).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants and design: The sample consists of $N = 662$ millennial leaders who worked in the Information technology industry in Chennai, South India. It comprises of technical millennial leaders who worked in companies registered under national association of software and services companies in Chennai, possessing middle-senior level managerial positions in their organizations. Millennial leaders are approached through the human resource teams of their organizations and the research instrument is disbursed using stratified proportionate random sampling, to record their thoughts

and opinions on their leadership behaviors, personality traits and resilience at work. Out of the 662 questionnaires given, 554 responses were obtained with a turn-in rate of 84%. In these 554 responses, the valid survey forms with complete entries and unmissed values resulted in 525 samples. Thus, the data of 525 respondents are analyzed using SPSS 21.0 tool and deduced.

Nature of respondents: The respondents comprise of 80.2 % male ($N = 421$) and 19.8% female ($N = 104$) technical leaders. Among them 28% are experienced <5 years, 42% are experienced between 6-10 years and 30% are experienced >10 years. Out of the 525 respondents, 239 of the millennial leaders handled <5 projects, 155 of them handled 6-10 projects, 55 handled 11-15 projects, 14 handled 16-20 projects and 62 leaders handle >20 projects. Additionally, 36% of gen Y technical leaders had travelled abroad for on-site client support and knowledge transfers while 64% of them are yet to go abroad for work transitions.

Measures: The survey questionnaire is developed based on the millennial leader's personality resilience inventory (Bargavi *et al.*, 2016) that had received prior psychometric validation which comprised of three prime themes titled leadership, resilience and personality that further consisted of several dimensions (constructs) to quantify personality attributes and measure resilience of millennial leaders. Now, few more relevant items are added from the literature to their existing constructs and are validated using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), reliability tests and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The factor structure is also evaluated using CFA and EFA procedures not only for the aggregate sample but also for each theme separately (Ramaswami *et al.*, 2016).

This resulted in the scale comprising of 45 statements with 3 sections namely leadership, personality and resilience. EFA using Principal component analysis is used to group the variables with loadings above 0.5 under every factor. Items having lower loadings (e.g., <0.4) are eliminated (VanMeter *et al.*, 2013). There are previous studies that fixed the criteria for factor weights to be at least 0.3 (Friborg *et al.*, 2005). Normally as a general rule of thumb, the significant loadings are weights >0.4. Also, factors with the eigen values >1 are only considered in this study. This resulted with leadership loading with six factors of sixteen items, personality consisted of six factors with sixteen items and resilience got loaded with five factors having thirteen items.

Under leadership, the first factor had eigen value of 5.89, explaining 30.1% of variance while the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th factors had eigen values 1.96, 1.54, 1.42, 1.17

and 1.04, respectively. The total variance accounted for by all the six factors was 68.6% which established leadership's validity (Raj and Roy, 2015). This outpaced the suggested value of minimum variance of 50% in social sciences (Mittal *et al.*, 2016; Hair *et al.*, 2010; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The same factor names are retained from the literature, based on the commonality of item groupings (Worthington and Whittaker, 2006). Also, Cronbach's α is performed to check the intranal consistency of these constructs which estimated the intranal consistency (Raykov, 2001), simply as a function of fewer items (Cronbach, 1990). These six factors of 'leadership' are reported with their Cronbach's scores and are named below as attributes ($\alpha = 0.808$), styles ($\alpha = 0.706$), efficacy ($\alpha = 0.818$), preferences ($\alpha = 0.761$), psychological dimensions ($\alpha = 0.875$) and satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.820$), respectively. Also, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is measured as 0.809, conveying the sufficiency of sample size. The significance α hich justified that each variable is sufficiently correlated. statements from 1-16 given in the Appendix 1 got loaded under the theme of millennial leadership.

Likewise, sixteen items got loaded under six factors in personality. The first factor had eigen value of 5.11, explaining 32.4% of variance while the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th factors had eigen values 3.18, 1.96, 1.39, 1.24 and 1.09, respectively. The total variance accounted for by all the six factors was 67.8% which established the validity of personality dimension. These six factors are reported with their Cronbach's scores and are named below as openness ($\alpha = 0.730$), emotional stability ($\alpha = 0.854$), extraversion ($\alpha = 0.849$), agreeableness ($\alpha = 0.715$), conscientiousness ($\alpha = 0.719$) and self-esteem ($\alpha = 0.746$), respectively. The factorial analysis also resulted in a KMO value of 0.857 and barlett's value of 0.000. statements 17-32 given in the Appendix 1 got loaded under the theme of millennial leader's personality. Finally, thirteen items got loaded on five factors under resilience. The first factor had eigen value of 5.38, explaining 31.3% of variance while the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th factors had eigen values 1.65, 1.49, 1.08 and 1.07, respectively. The total variance accounted for by all the five factors was 65.6% which established the validity of resilience. These five factors were propensity ($\alpha = 0.788$), attitude ($\alpha = 0.805$), perception ($\alpha = 0.849$), preferences ($\alpha = 0.858$) and resilience management ($\alpha = 0.856$), respectively. The dimension reduction also resulted in a KMO value of 0.805 and barlett's value of 0.000. Statements 33-45 given in the Appendix 1 got loaded under the theme of millennial leader's resilience. CFA was additionally performed during the scale formation which resulted in values of

Normed Fit Index (NFI = 0.892), Comparative Fit Index (CFI = 0.949), Tucker-Lewis Index values (TLI = 0.922), Standard Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR = 0.0011) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = 0.0374, i.e., $e < 0.06$). These values validated the psychometric properties of the scale comprising containing leadership behaviors, personality and resilience of millennial leaders; substantiated by earlier literatures (Sahadev *et al.*, 2014; Dulin, 2008; Hooper *et al.*, 2008; Thompson, 2004). Since, this study aims to explore what personal traits are exhibited by millennial leaders at work, the six constructs having 16 items quantifying the personality of millennial leaders are alone selected and analyzed further.

RESULTS

Analysis and findings: The hypothesis stating that early millennial leaders differed significantly in their personality traits when compared to late millennial leaders is tested using MANOVA. A multivariate analysis of variance is performed to assess the mean differences in personality traits between elder and younger gen Y leaders. MANOVA is an ideal technique to diagnose the existence of mean differences in continuous dependent variables. It performs tests for mean vector's equality across groups, adding post-hoc tests to deduce which of the groups varied from others on their means. It helps to answer if significant influences on dependent variables are caused by static changes in independent variables (Wells, 2011). The leader's years of birth are used to classify them as early and late millennials based on the Strauss and Howe conceptual model. This classified the millennial generation as elder millennials (1980-1990) and younger millennials (1990-2000) (Strauss and Howe, 2000; Kowske *et al.*, 2010). Hence, the predictors are fixed to be the two different intra-generational cohorts, i.e., early millennials and late millennials whereas the 'criterion' is the six personality traits of millennial leaders.

Table 1 expounds the sample size of respondents in each age group. It is visible that there were 157 millennial leaders in the late millennial generation and 368 millennial leaders in the early millennial generation. So, millennials who are elder in age are highly visible in leadership positions in the IT industry. This may be due to the reality that millennials would have joined the workforce as employees in the beginning and progressed further with several promotions in their work-roles, becoming team

Table 1: Between-subjects factors

Years	Value label	N
1	1990-2000	157
2	1980-1990	368

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

Personality traits	Years	Mean	SD	N
Openness	1990-2000	3.8128	0.62	157
	1980-1990	3.9710	0.56	368
Extroversion	1990-2000	3.8280	0.71	157
	1980-1990	3.6549	0.87	368
Conscientious	1990-2000	3.8687	0.66	157
	1980-1990	4.0722	0.74	368
Agreeableness	1990-2000	3.5824	0.72	157
	1980-1990	3.5966	0.76	368
Self-esteem	1990-2000	3.1338	0.79	157
	1980-1990	3.1196	0.73	368
Emotional stability	1990-2000	3.6726	0.89	157
	1980-1990	3.7930	0.84	368

Table 3: Box's test of equality of covariance matrices

Variables	Values
Box's M	37.128
F	1.741
df ₁	21
df ₂	354959.440
Sig.	0.059

Design: intercept+gen Y years

leaders or team managers in their organizations. This may be one of the reasons due to which a higher number of millennials who are born early during 1980-1990 are prevalent in high numbers in the IT industry.

Table 2 elucidates the mean and standard deviation of personality traits. The mean scores of millennial leaders were used to compared which age group differed in one of their personality traits. The early millennial leaders (elder) scored high in traits like openness (M = 3.97), conscientiousness (M = 4.07), agreeableness (M = 3.59) and emotional stability (M = 3.79). The late millennial leaders scored high in traits like extraversion (M = 3.82) and self-esteem (M = 3.13).

The box's test highlights the equality of co-variance results which has to be non-significant in the case of MANOVA as it is an assumption in MANOVA, testing the null hypothesis that the observed dependent variable's covariance matrices are equal across groups. If they are not the same, it infers that the significance value is <0.005 and the equality of covariance matrices are not satisfied. From Table 3, it is apparent that $F(21, 354959.44) = 1.741, p(0.059) > \alpha(0.005)$. This fulfills the criteria that the equality of covariance is non-significant and thus the null hypothesis of equality is accepted.

Table 4 gives the description of multivariate analysis results which can be intrapreted either through the Pillai's trace. Pillai's trace protects from rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true. Pillai's trace is smaller and highly robust to violations of assumptions in covariance. The tabulated values show the MANOVA value of 0.001 and actual F-value is 2.508 which is significant at $p < 0.005$. This leads to the rejection of null hypothesis that there are no differences in personality traits of early and late millennial leaders as per the results of MANOVA which is derived by combining dependent

variables together in a canonical variance. Partial eta squared shows 0.028 which infers 2.8% of variability in personality traits in a canonical MANOVA which is accounted by the millennial's year of birth. This leads to the rejection of null hypothesis, proving that there is a statistically significant difference in the personality traits of millennial leaders based on whether they are early millennials or late millennials, $F(6, 518) = 2.508, p < 0.0005$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.972$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.028$. Hence, early millennial leaders differed significantly in their personality traits like emotional stability, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness when compared to late millennial leaders.

Further, levene's test of equality of error variances was also executed in Table 5 to check the assumption of homogenous variance. It is a basic pre-requisite for a test of equality that a statistically significant difference exists between the means of two or more groups while analysis of variance. The levene's values construed that some of the personality traits like openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and emotional stability have proved to be significant with $F(1.523), p < 0.05$. Hence, the test for null hypothesis of equal error variance across personality traits is rejected, paving way to test each of the dependent variable with a series of ANOVA's. Levene's test reconfirmed that the early millennial leaders possessed different personality traits than Late millennial leaders.

Table 6, i.e., the test of between subject effects expounds the synthesized output of one-way anova for every outcome in the Manova. The homogeneity of variance results can be matched with the values shown in this table. Four personality traits like openness $F(3.521) = 7.452, p > 0.05$; partial $\eta^2 = 0.014$, conscientiousness $F(3.521) = 7.452, p > 0.05$, agreeableness and emotional stability showed statistical significance while the rest of them didn't show any significant results. Thus, alternative hypothesis is accepted, construing that there is a significant difference in the personality traits between early and late millennial leaders. This condition executes the need to run a post-hoc test in order to check where the difference between three groups occurs. Meanwhile, as the predictor comprises of only two groups of years which classify the millennials as late and early do not qualify for a post-hoc test as it cannot be run where there are less than three predictor variable groups. The notion of millennial leaders to feel delighted around a group of people and being talkative were influenced by their young age and their self-esteem was also high, consistent with previous findings in literature (Twenge and Campbell, 2008; Trzesniewski and Donnellan, 2010). Hence, it can be deduced based on the mean scores that the early, i.e., the elder millennial leaders significantly differ in personality

Table 4: Multivariate tests

Gen Y years/Effects	Values	F-values	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial η^2	Noncent parameter	Observed power ^c
Pillai's trace	0.028	2.508*	6	518	0.001	0.028	15.046	0.839
Wilk's lambda	0.972	2.508*	6	518	0.001	0.028	15.046	0.839
Hotelling's trace	0.029	2.508*	6	518	0.001	0.028	15.046	0.839
Roy's largest root	0.029	2.508*	6	518	0.001	0.028	15.046	0.839

*Design: intercept+genY years; ^bExact statistic; ^cComputed using alpha = 0.05

Table 5: Levene's test of equality of error variances

Personality traits	F-values	df ₁	df ₂	Sig.
Openness	1.830	1	523	0.007
Extroversion	12.002	1	523	0.278
Conscientious	5.635	1	523	0.018
Agreeableness	1.180	1	523	0.001
Self-esteem	0.979	1	523	0.323
Emotional stability	1.815	1	523	0.049

Design: Intercept+gen Y years

Table 6: Tests of between-subjects effects

Source	Dependent variable	Type 3 sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-values	Sig.
Gen Y years	Openness	2.754	1	2.754	7.452	0.007
	Extroversion	0.022	1	0.022	0.039	0.843
	Conscientious	4.559	1	4.559	8.714	0.003
	Agreeableness	3.29	1	3.299	4.752	0.030
	Self-esteem	0.922	1	0.882	1.039	0.772
	Emotional stability	1.596	1	1.596	2.170	0.041

traits like openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability than early millennial leaders.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are earlier literature works which stated that there are individual differences within the generations which resulted in the formation of groups like 'early', 'middle' and 'late' groups (Kowske *et al.*, 2010). These individual differences among the intra-generational group of millennials are tested with respect to their differences in personality traits. The early millennial leaders (elder) scored high in traits like openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability.

This infers that as the early millennial leaders were elder to late millennial leaders by a span of 10 years, they were more flexible in their openness to experience any events, more scheduled and orderly in planning work, highly agreeable with other member's opinions and possessed high level of emotional stability. This aspect of millennials weren't explored earlier but similar findings are found with older individuals exhibiting positive feelings and emotional stability (Carstensen *et al.*, 2011; Riediger *et al.*, 2009).

Similarly, the elder millennials had poor extroversion and self-esteem as they had got accustomed to their work environment and they knew that they couldn't be extroverts all the time and they were required to be flexible in maintaining their self-esteem while communicating with top management executives in the organization. This

decreased their level of extroversion and self-esteem as they eventually gained more experienced at work, being born elder to the other intra-generational group by a span of 10 years.

The late millennial leaders scored high in traits like extroversion and self-esteem. This denotes that as the late millennials were born in between 1990-2000, they were the newest intra-generation to join the workforce in finite numbers. Their prevalence was low but still they managed to exhibit their skills and talents during changing times and accepted every challenge as opportunities. This enabled the millennials to step up the organizational ladder of hierarchy, moving from the role of a common employee to a team leader at work (Murray, 2011).

Since, they were too young as leaders, their flexibility was comparatively low which made them possess high extroversion and self-esteem. Their notion to feel delighted around a group of people and being talkative were influenced by their young age and their self-esteem was also high, consistent with previous findings in literature (Twenge and Campbell, 2008; Trzesniewski and Donnellan, 2010).

The level of flexibility of an individual increases gradually as he starts adapting himself to the organizational culture and work environment (Carstensen *et al.*, 2011). Since, their flexibility was low, the late millennial leaders scored low in other personality traits like emotional stability, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness.

CONCLUSION

It is found that millennials who are elder in age are highly visible in leadership positions in the IT industry. Early millennial leaders differed significantly in their personality traits like openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability when compared to late millennial leaders. Those leaders born in between 1980-1990 are more flexible in their openness to experience any events, more scheduled and orderly in planning work, highly agreeable with other member's opinions and possessed high level of emotional stability.

LIMITATIONS

While showing about the personality characteristics of intra-generational millennial leaders, one of the limitations of this study is the elimination of multi-generational data. Here, millennial leaders were partitioned into two groups as per their year of birth, resembling their age. Earlier literature works which stated that there were individual differences within the generations which resulted in the formation of groups like 'early', 'middle' and 'late' groups (Kowske *et al.*, 2010).

This results difficulty in ascertaining if differences among intra-generational groups, i.e., the early or late millennials is caused really by age or intra-generational disparities. Example, increased self-esteem is a true characteristic which is reflected only in the late millennial generation or does it get acquainted with age?

Are there possibilities that the younger (1990-2000 born) millennial leader's self-esteem and extraversion will increase, regardless of what generation they are termed to be? To delve further, a multi-generational study to explore personality traits of leaders from different generations can be initiated. An understanding of employee's cognition of their work can help team leaders and managers allocate appropriate individuals to various tasks (Batra *et al.*, 2016).

Also, millennial leaders at work have a basic limitation of age. It is a quandary that the oldest members of this cohort would have spent 21 years of their job career and would be placed as leaders by supervising their younger members by the time the entire generation in the workforce could be researched. In order to overcome this limitation and resolve this dilemma, future studies should explore the personality and resilience effects on leadership behaviors after three-fourths of millennials enter the workforce. This can be implemented only

through consistent collection of data in different periods, by just anticipating for time to fly and gen Y's to age till then.

IMPLICATIONS

The inference of this research threw light on its managerial implications. It demonstrated that early millennial leaders (1980-1990) differed significantly in their personality traits by possessing higher openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability. This was consistent with earlier findings where many differences were noticed higher when illustrated by age, despite generational differences (Wong *et al.*, 2008).

This implies that members of the same generation exhibit higher differences than different other generations. These intra-generational differences in personal qualities are a result of various developmental stages which is shaped by historical events that enable generational identity formation (Kowske *et al.*, 2010). As defined by Strauss and Howe (2000), the eldest of the millennial generation was 18 in the year 2000 with its youngest members getting remarkably shaped by historical events in the next ten years to come.

This classified them as early millennials who were born elder in the first phase of the millennial generation and late millennials who were born later in the last phase of the millennial generation. As a result, the outcome of this finding that early millennial leaders differed in their personality traits emphasized the need to focus specifically on individual differences, heedless of intra-generational differences. By throwing light on the psychological traits of young leaders, this outcome can be applied effectively by the top management in promoting leaders with specific personality traits according to the persisting work situations.

Being given the hype, millennial leaders should importantly understand that individualistic differences exist in personality. If they are over-looked or stereotyped, it may lead to serious consequences of diminishing job performance. When individuals are not treated properly without understanding their personal characteristics, a leader may fail to recognize the strengths and weakness of their teams in order to coach them and make them perform better. This may result in a common misunderstanding that all young leaders may be homogenous in their persona. This is also supported earlier where differences in personality traits across generations at work is magnified by studies unveiling that work performance is affected and influenced by individual differences in personality (Witt *et al.*, 2002; Tett and Burnett, 2003).

APPENDIX

Appendix 1 (Survey questionnaire):

This research is titled “Personality Related Leadership Effects of Millennials in 21st century Organizations” which is about how our generation’s attitude keep changing and how they behave as leaders in organizations. This survey is collected as a part of my research process and all the details will be strictly kept confidential.

Your name please: _____ Age: _____
 Gender: a) M b) F Education: _____ Experience: _____
 Designation: _____ Marital Status: _____ No. of projects handled: _____
 No. of superiors you report to: _____ No. of team members under you: _____
 How often you travel abroad for official work: ____ If yes which country you travel to: _____

(These are collected to understand the flexibility in the psychological behavior of the Millennial generation at work. I assure that it will strictly be kept confidential.) Please TICK Strongly Agree (S/A), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly disagree (S/D).

S. No.	Statements	S/D	D	N	A	S/A
1.	I communicate effectively with others					
2.	I am satisfied with the technical competency of my team members					
3.	I stay fixed on goals despite interference					
4.	I provide constant feedback to my members					
5.	I develop teamwork with my members					
6.	I provide employees with opportunities for professional growth					
7.	I use different leadership styles in different situations					
8.	I emphasize having a collective mission					
9.	I consider an individual as having different needs and aspirations from others					
10.	I don't implement changes when necessary					
11.	I feel efficient when I take good decisions in less time					
12.	I doubt frequently and am less self-assured					
13.	I feel my work is not worth my time and energy					
14.	I like to have a greater say while giving suggestions					
15.	I am satisfied with the way my members share information with me					
16.	I am contented with the way I stimulate learning among members					
17.	I express my thoughts boldly in any situation					
18.	I share positive feelings with others					
19.	I enable a trusting atmosphere					
20.	I understand other's emotions and make them comfortable					
21.	I don't feel good when I am around people					
22.	I plan my work in advance					
23.	I have a need for personal achievement					
24.	I think once before acting or speaking					
25.	I have sympathy for others					
26.	I feel positive about myself					
27.	I have active concern for the welfare of others					
28.	I like to have authority over people					
29.	I like to be the center of attention					
30.	I don't like to interact with people					
31.	I get stressed and feel guilty easily					
32.	I act on cravings and desires					
33.	I act differently when I view challenge as an opportunity					
34.	I behave differently based on my responsibilities					
35.	I take a chance regularly					
36.	I act differently in various situations due to my involvement in work					
37.	I wish to be different, when compared to my colleagues					
38.	I keep changing my attitude because of the benefit I get being different					
39.	I can minimize my flexibility if I control my emotions					
40.	I feel understanding myself initially can increase my coping behavior					
41.	I can manage flexibility by identifying events where I tend to behave differently					
42.	I can manage my flexibility by having a fixed mindset					
43.	I am extremely cautious while taking a chance					
44.	I have a great sense of impulsivity					
45.	I see any event as an opportunity					

REFERENCES

- Bargavi, N., P.J.D. Paul and A.A. Samuel, 2016. Quantifying resilience in the personality of millennial leaders. *Indian J. Sci. Technol.*, 9: 1-28.
- Batra, S., N. Vohra and N. Vohra, 2016. Exploring the linkages of cognitive style and individual innovativeness. *Manage. Res. Rev.*, 39: 768-785.
- Breyer, M.A., 2013. How will the personality traits of millennials systematically change future leadership in non-profit healthcare organizations?. Ph.D Thesis, The College of St Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota.
- Carstensen, L.L., B. Turan, S. Scheibe, N. Ram and E.H. Hershfield *et al.*, 2011. Emotional experience improves with age: Evidence based on over 10 years of experience sampling. *Psychol. Aging*, 26: 21-33.
- Costa, P.T. and R.R. McCrae, 1988. Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *J. Personality Social Psychol.*, 54: 853-863.
- Cronbach, L., 1990. *Essentials of Psychological Testing*. 5th Edn., Harper, New York, USA.,.
- Digman, J.M., 1989. Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability and utility. *J. Personality*, 57: 195-214.
- Dulin, L., 2008. Leadership preferences of a generation Y cohort: A mixed-methods investigation. *J. Leadersh. Stud.*, 2: 43-59.
- Friborg, O., D. Barlaug, M. Martinussen, J.H. Rosenvinge and O. Hjemdal, 2005. Resilience in relation to personality and intelligence. *Intl. J. Methods Psychiatric Res.*, 14: 29-42.
- Hagemann, B. and S. Stroope, 2013. Developing the next generation of leaders. *Ind. Commercial Train.*, 45: 123-126.
- Hair, Jr. J.F., W.C. Black, B.J. Babin and R.E. Anderson, 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th Edn., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ., ISBN-13: 9780138132637, Pages: 785.
- Hooper, D., J. Coughlan and M. Mullen, 2008. Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electron. J. Bus. Res. Methods*, 6: 53-60.
- Howe, N. and W. Strauss, 2000. *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation*. Vintage Books, New York, USA., ISBN:9780375707193, Pages: 415.
- Kowske, B.J., R. Rasch and J. Wiley, 2010. Millennials (lack of) attitude problem: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *J. Bus. Psychol.*, 25: 265-279.
- McCrae, R.R. and P.T. Costa Jr., 1997. Personality trait structure as a human universal. *Am. Psychol.*, 52: 509-516.
- McCrae, R.R. and P.T. Costa Jr., 1999. A Five-Factor Theory of Personality. In: *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, John, O.P., R.W. Robins and L.A. Pervin (Eds.). The Guilford Press, New York, USA., ISBN:978-1-59385-836-0, pp: 139-153.
- Menezes, B., 2015. Indian IT services exports seen growing 12-14% in year ahead. HT Media Mass Media Company, New Delhi, India.
- Mittal, S., S. Mittal, D. Chawla, D. Chawla and N. Sondhi *et al.*, 2016. Impulse buying tendencies among Indian consumers: Scale development and validation. *J. Indian Bus. Res.*, 8: 205-226.
- Murray, A., 2011. Mind the gap: Technology, millennial leadership and the cross-generational workforce. *Aust. Lib. J.*, 60: 54-65.
- Raj, M.P.M. and S. Roy, 2015. Impact of brand image on consumer decision-making: A study on high-technology products. *Global Bus. Rev.*, 16: 463-477.
- Ramaswami, S.N., S.N. Ramaswami, S. Raju, D.C. Page and D.C. Page, 2016. Conceptualizing and measuring resistance to change in brand relationships. *J. Indian Bus. Res.*, 8: 180-204.
- Raykov, T., 2001. Estimation of congeneric scale reliability using covariance structure analysis with nonlinear constraints. *Br. J. Math. Stat. Psychol.*, 54: 315-323.
- Riediger, M., F. Schmiedek, G.G. Wagner and U. Lindenberger, 2009. Seeking pleasure and seeking pain: Differences in prohedonic and contra-hedonic motivation from adolescence to old age. *Psychol. Sci.*, 20: 1529-1535.
- Sahadev, S., S. Seshanna and K. Purani, 2014. Effects of competitive psychological climate, work-family conflict and role conflict on customer orientation: The case of call center employees in India. *J. Indian Bus. Res.*, 6: 70-84.
- Stoffers, J., 2016. 21st Century leadership the symbiosis between global insights and a specific regional context. *Asian J. Appl. Sci.*, 4: 1198-1199.
- Strauss, W. and N. Howe, 1991. *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*. Morrow, New York, USA., ISBN:9780688081331, Pages: 538.
- Tabachnick, B.G. and L.S. Fidell, 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 5th Edn., Pearson Education, Boston, MA., ISBN-13: 9780205465255, Pages: 980.
- Tett, R.P. and D.D. Burnett, 2003. A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 88: 500-517.
- Trzesniewski, K.H. and M.B. Donnellan, 2010. Rethinking generation me a study of cohort effects from 1976-2006. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.*, 5: 58-75.
- Twenge, J.M. and S.M. Campbell, 2008. Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *J. Managerial Psychol.*, 23: 862-877.

- Twenge, J.M., 2006. *Generation Me: Why Today's Young Americans are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled-and More Miserable than Ever Before*. Free Press, New York, USA., ISBN-13:978-0-7432-7697-9, Pages: 296.
- VanMeter, R.A., D.B. Grisaffe, L.B. Chonko and J.A. Roberts, 2013. Generation Y's ethical ideology and its potential workplace implications. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 117: 93-109.
- Wells, D.D., 2011. Leadership preferences of a Generation Y African American cohort. MSc Thesis, Capella University, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Witt, L.A., L.A. Burke, M.R. Barrick and M.K. Mount, 2002. The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 87: 164-169.
- Wong, M., E. Gardiner, W. Lang and L. Coulon, 2008. Generational differences in personality and motivation: Do they exist and what are the implications for the workplace?. *J. Managerial Psychol.*, 23: 878-890.
- Worthington, R.L. and T.A. Whittaker, 2006. Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *Counsel. Psychol.*, 34: 806-838.