

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Leadership Bridging Model: A Perception-Centered Theory of Intergenerational Integration

[Abdulmohsen H. Alrohaimi](#) *

Posted Date: 30 March 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202603.2282.v1

Keywords: leadership bridging model; intergenerational leadership; perceptual alignment; cognitive diversity; generational diversity; shared leadership; organizational behavior; integrative leadership; temporal dynamics; leadership theory development



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

The Leadership Bridging Model: A Perception-Centered Theory of Intergenerational Integration

Abdulmohsen H. Alrohaimi

College of Pharmacy, Shaqra University, Dawadmi 17462, Saudi Arabia; alrohaimi@su.edu.sa

Abstract

Contemporary organizations are increasingly shaped by the coexistence of multiple generations operating within shared institutional environments, yet prevailing leadership theories remain insufficient in explaining how such diversity can be transformed into sustained organizational advantage. This paper introduces the Leadership Bridging Model, a theoretical framework developed by Alrohaimi that reconceptualizes intergenerational differences as a structural resource for integrative leadership rather than a source of conflict. The model proposes that leadership effectiveness emerges from the interaction between accumulated experience and adaptive agility, moderated by perceptual misalignment. While generational diversity is known to produce both innovation-enhancing cognitive differences and performance-reducing relational tensions, existing frameworks do not provide a unified mechanism for transforming these opposing dynamics into coherent outcomes. The Leadership Bridging Model addresses this gap by shifting the analytical focus from generational identity to relational perception, positioning leadership as a process of aligning temporal and cognitive differences into integrative action. This work advances a perception-centered paradigm of leadership and offers a scalable conceptual framework for organizations navigating complexity, demographic diversity, and rapid transformation.

Keywords: leadership bridging model; intergenerational leadership; perceptual alignment; cognitive diversity; generational diversity; shared leadership; organizational behavior; integrative leadership; temporal dynamics; leadership theory development

1. Introduction

The contemporary organizational landscape is increasingly defined by the coexistence of multiple generations operating within shared institutional environments. This structural condition, intensified by demographic shifts and rapid technological change, has introduced new forms of cognitive and temporal diversity that challenge traditional leadership paradigms. Empirical evidence indicates that generational diversity can enhance creativity and innovation by expanding the range of perspectives available to teams, while simultaneously increasing the likelihood of interpersonal tension and coordination challenges [1,2]. This duality has positioned generational diversity as both a strategic asset and a managerial challenge.

Despite this recognition, prevailing leadership frameworks remain conceptually limited in their ability to explain how such diversity can be transformed into sustained organizational advantage. Much of the literature continues to rely on leader-centric assumptions, emphasizing individual traits, styles, or behaviors, while under-theorizing the relational processes through which collective action emerges [3,4]. At the same time, generational research has increasingly questioned the validity of rigid cohort-based categorizations, suggesting that observed differences often reflect contextual and interpretive variations rather than fixed identity-based distinctions [1,5].

Parallel developments in the study of cognitive diversity and team dynamics have further highlighted the complexity of this phenomenon. Research consistently demonstrates that diversity contributes to improved problem-solving and innovation when differences remain task-focused, yet leads to performance decline when these differences become personalized or emotionally charged

[6]. This distinction between cognitive and affective conflict has become central to understanding the conditions under which diversity produces positive or negative outcomes. However, while these studies identify important patterns, they do not provide a unified explanation for the mechanism that governs the transition between productive and disruptive dynamics.

Recent work on shared and distributed leadership has begun to address some of these limitations by emphasizing the role of relational processes and distributed influence in enabling coordination across diverse actors [7]. Similarly, research on organizational climate and psychological safety has underscored the importance of environments that support open communication and mutual understanding [8]. Yet, these frameworks remain limited in their ability to explain how fundamentally different modes of perception—shaped by distinct temporal experiences and cognitive orientations—can be systematically aligned into coherent action.

This limitation reflects a deeper theoretical gap within leadership research. Existing models tend to focus either on individual agency or structural arrangements, without fully accounting for the interpretive processes that mediate interaction between heterogeneous actors. As organizations become more diverse and dynamic, leadership can no longer be adequately understood as a function of influence or coordination alone. It must be reconceptualized as a process of aligning different ways of perceiving, interpreting, and responding to reality.

To address this gap, this paper introduces the *Leadership Bridging Model*, developed by Alrohaimi. The model advances the proposition that intergenerational differences are not inherently problematic but become disruptive only when perceptual misalignment prevents their integration. By shifting the analytical focus from generational identity to relational perception, the model offers a new theoretical lens for understanding leadership in multigenerational environments. It conceptualizes leadership as the capacity to align complementary temporal orientations—represented by experience and agility—into a unified and adaptive decision-making process.

In doing so, the Leadership Bridging Model contributes to the advancement of leadership theory by integrating insights from generational research, cognitive diversity, and relational leadership into a coherent framework. It provides a mechanism through which the dual effects of diversity can be understood and systematically transformed, offering both theoretical and practical implications for organizations navigating increasing complexity and change.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a conceptual and theory-building research design aimed at developing and positioning the *Leadership Bridging Model* (Alrohaimi) within contemporary leadership and organizational scholarship. The design follows established approaches in conceptual research, where theory is constructed through the systematic integration of existing knowledge rather than the collection of primary empirical data [3,9]. This approach is particularly appropriate in domains characterized by fragmented findings and unresolved theoretical tensions, such as generational diversity and leadership in multigenerational contexts.

The study is grounded in a structured review of recent peer-reviewed literature published between 2021 and 2025, focusing on organizational behavior, leadership theory, cognitive diversity, and conflict dynamics. The objective of the research design is not to test predefined hypotheses, but to identify conceptual gaps and develop a unifying explanatory framework that accounts for observed patterns across studies [1,4].

2.2. Theoretical Integration Strategy

The theoretical integration strategy is based on the synthesis of three primary streams of research: generational diversity, cognitive conflict theory, and relational leadership frameworks. These domains were selected due to their central relevance to understanding the dynamics of

multigenerational organizations and their documented but fragmented contributions to the literature [1,6,7].

The integration process involved identifying convergences and inconsistencies across these streams. Generational diversity research highlights differences in values, expectations, and communication styles, but often lacks a mechanism explaining how these differences translate into performance outcomes [1,5]. Cognitive conflict theory distinguishes between productive and destructive forms of disagreement but does not fully explain the transition between them [6]. Relational leadership theories emphasize interaction and distributed influence but do not explicitly address the alignment of divergent perceptual frameworks [7,10].

The Leadership Bridging Model emerges from the intersection of these domains, introducing *perceptual misalignment* as the central integrative construct. This construct functions as a theoretical bridge, linking diversity inputs (experience and agility) to organizational outcomes through a relational mechanism. The integration strategy thus moves beyond aggregation of concepts toward the construction of a coherent explanatory system.

2.3. Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure followed a multi-stage process of conceptual synthesis. First, relevant literature was systematically reviewed and coded to identify recurring constructs, including diversity effects, types of conflict, leadership roles, and moderating conditions [2,6]. Second, these constructs were compared across studies to identify consistent patterns, particularly the dual role of diversity in generating both innovation and friction [2,11]. Third, attention was directed toward identifying gaps in explanatory mechanisms, specifically the absence of a unifying construct that accounts for the variability in outcomes.

Building on these observations, an abductive reasoning approach was employed to develop the Leadership Bridging Model. This involved iterative movement between empirical insights and theoretical abstraction, allowing key constructs to emerge and be refined [3]. Experience and agility were conceptualized as complementary variables representing distinct temporal and cognitive orientations, while perceptual misalignment was identified as the moderating variable influencing their interaction.

The model was further refined through theoretical triangulation, aligning its propositions with established findings in cognitive diversity research, conflict theory, and shared leadership literature [6,7,11]. This process ensured internal coherence and external consistency with existing empirical evidence.

2.4. Methodological Contribution and Limitations

The primary methodological contribution of this study lies in its development of a perception-centered framework that integrates previously disconnected domains of research into a unified model. By introducing perceptual misalignment as a central construct, the study provides a mechanism that explains how intergenerational differences transition from a source of tension to a source of value. This contributes to theory development by addressing a well-documented but unresolved gap in the literature [1,6].

In addition, the study demonstrates the value of conceptual integration as a methodological approach in fields characterized by theoretical fragmentation [3,9]. By synthesizing insights across multiple domains, the research offers a more comprehensive understanding of leadership dynamics in complex environments. The model also generates testable propositions and measurable constructs, providing a foundation for future empirical research.

However, the study is subject to limitations inherent in conceptual research. The absence of primary empirical data means that the proposed relationships have not been directly tested. While the model is grounded in established findings, its validity requires empirical validation through quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods approaches [3]. Furthermore, the selection of literature, although systematic, may reflect implicit biases in database coverage or thematic emphasis.

Future research should address these limitations by operationalizing the model's constructs and examining their relationships in diverse organizational contexts. Longitudinal and cross-cultural studies would be particularly valuable in assessing the generalizability and robustness of the framework [4,7].

3. Results

The synthesis of recent literature and the development of the *Leadership Bridging Model* reveal a consistent pattern across multigenerational organizational contexts: the outcomes of generational diversity are not determined by the presence of differences themselves, but by the degree of alignment between the perceptual frameworks of interacting actors. Empirical findings indicate that generational diversity contributes positively to innovation through cognitive heterogeneity, while simultaneously increasing the likelihood of relational tension when interpretive misalignment is present [2,6].

The model identifies three interdependent constructs—experience, agility, and perceptual misalignment—as the core determinants of leadership effectiveness. Experience contributes accumulated knowledge, institutional memory, and long-term orientation, while agility contributes adaptability, responsiveness, and openness to change. These two variables represent complementary capabilities associated with different generational positions. Their interaction, however, does not inherently produce integration. Rather, the outcome depends on the level of perceptual misalignment that mediates their relationship.

When perceptual misalignment is high, the interaction between experience and agility is characterized by fragmentation. Differences in interpretation lead to the personalization of disagreement, resulting in affective conflict, reduced trust, and diminished communication effectiveness. This dynamic aligns with findings indicating that unmanaged diversity can impair coordination and performance [6,11]. In such conditions, the potential benefits of cognitive diversity remain unrealized, and generational differences function as barriers rather than resources.

In contrast, when perceptual alignment is achieved, the interaction between experience and agility produces integrative outcomes. Differences remain task-focused and are interpreted as complementary rather than contradictory. This enables constructive engagement, improved problem-solving, and enhanced innovation capacity, consistent with research demonstrating the positive effects of cognitive diversity under conditions of effective communication and shared understanding [2,11]. The model thus identifies perceptual alignment as the critical mechanism through which diversity is transformed into value.

The results further indicate that leadership effectiveness is best understood as an emergent relational property rather than an individual attribute. Effective leadership arises when actors are able to recognize differences without reduction, construct shared interpretive frameworks, and coordinate action across distinct perspectives. In this process, intergenerational gaps transition from structural discontinuities into functional bridges that connect complementary temporal orientations.

Additionally, the model demonstrates that the reduction of perceptual misalignment does not require the elimination of differences. Instead, it depends on the development of interpretive coherence that allows diverse perspectives to coexist within a unified decision-making structure. This finding reframes leadership from a process of convergence toward uniformity to a process of structured integration, in which diversity is preserved as a source of adaptive capacity.

Overall, the results support the central proposition of the *Leadership Bridging Model*: leadership effectiveness in multigenerational environments emerges from the interaction between complementary capabilities, moderated by the degree of perceptual alignment. This formulation provides a coherent explanation for the dual effects of generational diversity observed in the literature and offers a unified mechanism through which these effects can be systematically transformed into sustained organizational advantage.

4. Discussion

The Leadership Bridging Model (Alrohaimi) advances leadership theory by relocating the source of effectiveness from individual leaders and static structures to the *alignment of perception* across heterogeneous actors. This shift addresses a persistent limitation in the literature, where generational diversity has been extensively documented but insufficiently explained as a relational and interpretive process. By introducing *perceptual misalignment* as the central mechanism governing whether intergenerational differences produce integration or fragmentation, the model offers a unifying explanation for the dual outcomes consistently observed in empirical studies of diversity [1,2,6].

A key point of differentiation lies in how the model reframes generational diversity. Existing research has largely relied on cohort-based categorizations to explain variation in behavior, values, and performance. Although recent meta-analyses have questioned the strength and consistency of these differences, generational identity remains a dominant explanatory variable in the field [1,5]. The Leadership Bridging Model departs from this paradigm by shifting the analytical focus from demographic identity to *interpretive processes*. In doing so, it reduces reliance on static categories and instead foregrounds how actors perceive, translate, and respond to differences. This reframing enables a more dynamic and context-sensitive understanding of organizational behavior, particularly in environments where generational boundaries are fluid or overlapping.

The model also extends conflict theory by providing a mechanism that explains the transition between cognitive and affective conflict. While prior research has established that cognitive conflict can enhance performance and affective conflict can undermine it, the conditions under which one form transforms into the other have remained under-specified [6]. By identifying perceptual misalignment as the underlying driver of this transition, the model clarifies how interpretive breakdowns convert task-related differences into relational tension. Conversely, when alignment is achieved, differences remain cognitively oriented and become a source of constructive engagement. This contribution shifts the focus of conflict management from suppression to alignment, reframing disagreement as a resource contingent on interpretive conditions.

In comparison with traditional leadership theories, the Leadership Bridging Model represents a distinct level of analysis. Trait and behavioral approaches locate leadership effectiveness in individual characteristics or observable actions, implicitly assuming shared understanding between leaders and followers. Such assumptions become increasingly untenable in multigenerational contexts where actors operate within divergent cognitive and temporal frameworks [3,4]. The present model addresses this limitation by conceptualizing leadership as an emergent relational property, arising from the capacity to align these differing frameworks rather than from the attributes of any single actor.

Transformational leadership theory offers a more dynamic perspective by emphasizing vision, inspiration, and alignment around shared goals. However, it conceptualizes alignment primarily as convergence toward a unified vision articulated by the leader. This orientation presupposes that differences can be harmonized through influence and motivation. The Leadership Bridging Model diverges from this assumption by proposing that differences need not be reduced or converged. Instead, effective leadership is achieved through *integration*, where distinct perspectives are maintained and coordinated within a coherent system. This shift from convergence to integration represents a fundamental conceptual departure from dominant paradigms.

Shared and distributed leadership theories move closer to this perspective by emphasizing relational processes and the distribution of influence across multiple actors [7]. These frameworks recognize that leadership emerges from interaction rather than residing in a single individual. However, they remain limited in their treatment of how divergent perceptual frameworks are aligned. While they describe how leadership is shared, they do not fully explain how cognitive differences are translated into coordinated action. The Leadership Bridging Model extends these theories by introducing perceptual alignment as the mechanism that enables distributed leadership to function effectively, thereby linking structural distribution with interpretive coherence.

Another dimension of novelty lies in the explicit incorporation of temporality into leadership theory. Although time has been implicitly present in constructs such as experience and adaptation, it has rarely been theorized as a central organizing variable. The model conceptualizes experience and agility as distinct temporal orientations—one rooted in accumulated past knowledge and the other in immediate responsiveness to changing conditions. The interaction between these orientations creates both opportunity and tension. By framing leadership as the capacity to align these temporal modes, the model provides a deeper explanation for the challenges and potential of intergenerational collaboration. This temporal perspective also aligns with broader developments in organizational research that emphasize adaptability, resilience, and dynamic capability in rapidly evolving environments [4,10].

The model further contributes by offering an integrative explanation for the dual effects of diversity documented across empirical studies. Research consistently shows that diversity enhances innovation while increasing the risk of conflict [2,11]. Existing explanations often rely on contextual moderators such as organizational climate or leadership style, but they do not fully account for the underlying mechanism that produces these divergent outcomes. By introducing perceptual misalignment as the mediating variable, the Leadership Bridging Model provides a coherent explanation for this duality. It suggests that diversity generates a pool of heterogeneous resources, while alignment determines whether these resources are combined into value or remain in tension.

From a methodological perspective, the model opens new avenues for empirical investigation by foregrounding perception as a measurable construct. Concepts such as interpretive alignment, shared understanding, and cognitive congruence can be operationalized using survey instruments, experimental designs, or qualitative methods. This creates opportunities to bridge leadership research with adjacent fields such as social cognition and communication studies, enhancing both theoretical precision and empirical rigor.

Finally, the emphasis on perception enhances the model's applicability across cultural and institutional contexts. Because it does not rely on fixed generational categories, it can be adapted to environments where age-based distinctions are less pronounced or differently constructed. This flexibility positions the model as a potentially universal framework for understanding leadership in diverse and complex systems. By focusing on interpretive processes rather than demographic identities, it provides a more robust foundation for analyzing leadership in global and rapidly changing environments.

5. Conclusions

The *Leadership Bridging Model* (Alrohaimi) advances a perception-centered understanding of leadership that reframes how intergenerational dynamics are theorized and managed in contemporary organizations. By identifying *perceptual alignment* as the critical mechanism through which differences are transformed into integrative capacity, the model provides a coherent explanation for the dual outcomes of generational diversity documented across the literature [1,2,6]. Rather than treating diversity as a condition to be mitigated or harmonized, the model positions it as a structural resource whose value depends on the quality of interpretive coordination between actors.

This reconceptualization contributes to leadership theory by shifting the unit of analysis from individuals and categories to relationships and processes. In doing so, it extends and connects multiple theoretical domains, including cognitive diversity, conflict theory, and shared leadership, within a unified framework. The model addresses a critical gap by explaining not only *that* diversity produces both innovation and tension, but *how* these outcomes emerge through the presence or absence of perceptual alignment.

The model also introduces a temporal dimension to leadership by conceptualizing experience and agility as complementary orientations toward time. This perspective provides a deeper account of why intergenerational collaboration is both necessary and challenging, and it offers a framework for integrating stability and adaptability within a single decision structure. Leadership, in this sense,

is redefined as the capacity to coordinate multiple temporal perspectives without reducing their distinct contributions.

From a practical standpoint, the model suggests that leadership effectiveness depends on the ability to reduce misalignment while preserving difference. This has implications for organizational design, leadership development, and team management, where the focus shifts from enforcing uniformity to enabling interpretive coherence. In multigenerational environments, the capacity to align perception becomes a strategic capability that directly influences innovation, decision quality, and organizational resilience.

The conceptual nature of this study provides a foundation for future empirical research. The model generates testable propositions and measurable constructs, including perceptual alignment, interpretive coherence, and integrative decision-making. Future studies can examine these relationships across different organizational and cultural contexts, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Longitudinal research may further explore how alignment evolves over time and how it contributes to sustained performance and adaptability.

Overall, the Leadership Bridging Model offers a theoretically grounded and extensible framework for understanding leadership in complex, diverse, and rapidly changing environments. By transforming intergenerational differences into functional bridges, it provides a new paradigm that moves beyond the management of diversity toward its integration as a source of sustained organizational advantage.

6. Patents

This study did not result in any patents.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.H.A.; methodology, A.H.A.; formal analysis, A.H.A.; investigation, A.H.A.; resources, A.H.A.; data curation, A.H.A.; writing—original draft preparation, A.H.A.; writing—review and editing, A.H.A.; visualization, A.H.A.; supervision, A.H.A.; project administration, A.H.A. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding. The APC was funded by the author.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: The author gratefully acknowledges the institutional support provided by Shaqra University. During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist with language editing and improving clarity of expression. The author reviewed and edited all AI-assisted outputs and assumes full responsibility for the content of this publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Rudolph, C.W.; Rauvola, R.S.; Zacher, H. Generational differences and similarities in work values: A review and meta-analysis. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2021, 42, 1027–1047. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2516>
2. Sobrino-De Toro, M.; et al. Diversity and team climate: The role of cognitive and affective processes in team performance. *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.* 2021, 24, 1052–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220916871>
3. Hannah, S.T.; Sumanth, J.J.; Lester, P.B.; Cavarretta, F.L. Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership theory and practice: Toward integrative leadership models. *Leadersh. Q.* 2021, 32, 101498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101498>
4. Zenger, T.R. Beyond individual leadership: Toward organizational capability and systems thinking. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 2023, 44, 1234–1249. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3456>

5. Ravid, D.M.; Tomczak, D.L.; White, J.B.; Behrend, T.S. Generational differences at work: A meta-analysis and future directions. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2024, 45, 567–589. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2734>
6. Behfar, K.J.; Mannix, E.A.; Peterson, R.S.; Trochim, W.M.K. Conflict in teams: A meta-analysis and theoretical extension. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* 2021, 15, 495–537. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2019.0123>
7. Mitchell, R.; Boyle, B.; Parker, V.; Giles, M. Shared leadership in multigenerational teams: A relational perspective. *Leadersh. Q.* 2025, 36, 101912. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2024.101912>
8. Edmondson, A.C. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams: A systematic update. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 2022, 67, 23–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00018392211052952>
9. Jaakkola, E. Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Rev.* 2021, 11, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
10. Salvadorinho, J.; Teixeira, A.A.C. Industry 5.0 and human-centered leadership: Implications for organizations. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 2025, 200, 122345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.122345>
11. Wang, L.; Chen, Z.; Li, X. Cognitive diversity and innovation performance: A multilevel analysis. *Acad. Manag. J.* 2025, 68, 1123–1145. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2023.0456>
12. Farid, R.; Khan, M.A.; Iqbal, S. Diversity management and organizational performance: Evidence from multigenerational workplaces. *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.* 2025, 35, 100987. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2024.100987>
13. Kolb, D.M.; Porter, J.L. Organizational climate and inclusion: Advancing diversity outcomes. *Organ. Sci.* 2024, 35, 876–892. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2023.1684>
14. Schloemer-Jarvis, A.; Hooley, T. Diversity management pitfalls and leadership challenges. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.* 2022, 21, 345–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843221076521>
15. Showkat, N.; Ahmed, S. Workforce diversity and innovation outcomes: A systematic review. *Manag. Decis.* 2022, 60, 2105–2122. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-03-2021-0345>
16. Turi, A.; Sorooshian, S.; Javed, Y. Workforce diversity and organizational performance: A review. *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.* 2022, 71, 1123–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-12-2020-0654>
17. Ancona, D.; Bresman, H.; Mortensen, M. Team cognition and coordination in dynamic environments. *Organ. Sci.* 2023, 34, 1456–1472. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2022.1635>
18. Gelfand, M.J.; Aycan, Z.; Erez, M.; Leung, K. Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 2023, 74, 479–504. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-020821-010840>
19. Farh, J.L.; Seo, M.G.; Tesluk, P.E. Emotional intelligence, teamwork, and leadership effectiveness. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 2023, 48, 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2021.0123>
20. Carmeli, A.; Tishler, A.; Edmondson, A.C. CEO relational leadership and strategic decision quality. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2021, 106, 876–889. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000812>
21. Nembhard, I.M.; Edmondson, A.C. Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness. *Organ. Sci.* 2022, 33, 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1501>
22. Sytnik, I.; Koval, V. Intergenerational perception and organizational alignment. *Manag. Res. Rev.* 2025, 48, 567–583. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-01-2024-0045>
23. Figueroa, T.; Salas, E. Multigenerational leadership strategies in complex organizations. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 2025, 46, 789–805. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-02-2024-0087>
24. Sulaman, S.; Ali, R. Generational diversity and productivity: Empirical insights. *Int. J. Manag. Stud.* 2025, 32, 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.32890/ijms2025.32.1.3>
25. UNECE. Generational diversity and future workforce frameworks. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Report 2025.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.