Check for updates

Article

Management Communication Quarterly
1–36
© The Author(s) 2019
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0893318919851177
journals.sagepub.com/home/mcq

What Young Adults Want: A Multistudy Examination of Vocational Anticipatory Socialization Through the Lens of Students' Desired Managerial Communication Behaviors

Leah M. Omilion-Hodges[1], Scott E. Shank Jr.[1], and Christine M. Packard[1]

Abstract

Without experience or in the face of limited work experience, refined expectations for what it means to work or what to expect in terms of communicative role behaviors from a manager may largely be composed of desires. Therein lies the tension; if young adults are unable or unwilling to see work processes and managerial behavior the way that they are, they may reorient their attention from realistic expectations to a focus on their individual desires and preferences. Through a sequential-explanatory mixed-method design (focus groups and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis), prominent managerial archetypes are explored, categorized, and validated. The archetypes are composed of sets of corresponding communicative and relational behaviors that encompass common approaches to managing.

[1]Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, USA

Corresponding Author:
Leah M. Omilion-Hodges, School of Communication, Western Michigan University, 1903, W. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008, USA.
Email: leah.omilion-hodges@wmich.edu

Conversation regarding the overlap and divergence of desires with actual manager communication behaviors may better prepare matriculating students as they transition into the workplace.

Keywords
vocational anticipatory socialization, leader–member relationships, managerial communication

Everyday talk informs young adults' desires regarding employment, how they conceptualize what it means to work, and what they anticipate their future leader–member relationship to look like. These conversations may also serve as a sensemaking tool to parse out what one seeks in a position (Cheney, Zorn, Planalp, & Lair, 2008). Yet, prior to full-time employment, it may be challenging for young adults to sort out realistic assumptions for their future leader–member relationships, and even those with part-time work experience or internships grapple with identity, role, and organizational tensions (Dailey, 2016; Woo, Putnam, & Riforgiate, 2017). Moreover, targeted socialization messages often leave young adults and adolescents without a clear picture of what it means to enact or perform specific professions (Jahn & Myers, 2015), and messages from parents may emphasize the challenges associated with work rather than focusing on more positive organizational encounters (Levine & Hoffner, 2006; Scarduzio, Real, Slone, & Henning, 2018). Put simply, without experience or in the face of limited work experience (i.e., internships), refined expectations for what it means to work or what to expect in terms of communicative role behaviors from a manager may largely be composed of desires. Therein lies the tension; if young adults are unable or unwilling to see work processes and managerial behavior through a lens that reflects actual work experience, they may reorient their attention from realistic expectations to focus on their individual desires and preferences.

Expectations and desires may initially appear similar; however, closer observation reveals fundamental differences in how they influence the sensemaking that occurs during the socialization process in young adults. Expectations, such as the expectation that an organization will provide a salary and benefits package in exchange for an employee's contributions, are rooted in realistic beliefs about what will happen or how someone will behave (Burgoon, Stern, & Dillman, 1995). For example, young adults may expect that managers will withhold information or favor certain employees over others based on what they have heard from parents, friends, and the media.

Conversely, desires detail strong preferences for a best case or wished for scenario—including a manager who is patient, cultivates employees professionally and personally, and shields members from unnecessary organizational politics. Thus, when approaching an ambiguous situation, such as the transition from student to employee, young adults may have to reconcile information about the realities of the workplace they have learned from trusted others (i.e., parents, faculty, and recruiters) that is potentially threatening or has been interpreted in a negative light with what they hope or desire to experience when they transition to full-time employment. In place of accepting what they reasonably know to expect, young adults may instead shift to what they want in a position and a manager as a means of reducing dissonance.

Vocational anticipatory socialization (VAS) explores the conversations about work that impacts thoughts, fears, and expectations associated with the visualization of future workplace roles and interactions (Jahn & Myers, 2015). With the move from a focus on liberal arts to a focus on career preparation, higher education in the United States is increasingly explored by communication scholars as an important VAS cultural site (Ashcraft & Allen, 2009; Lair & Wieland, 2012; O'Connor & Raile, 2015). This turn helps to emphasize the importance of talk *about* work, rather than a primary focus on talk *at* work. While this move may seem slight, it considers how those who have not worked full-time engage in conversations and meaning making to demystify the workplace and to consider how they may need to adapt communicatively to successfully transition from student to employee. Focusing on talk about work may also help to disentangle young adult's wants or desires, from more realistic expectations based on what they have learned about work from their experiences and in conversations with friends and family members. Given the influence communication *about* work possesses in shaping assumptions prior to job market entry, and the fact that higher education is increasingly becoming the context through which young adults grapple with work–life and work–education discourses, understanding how students visualize future interactions with supervisors becomes a value-rich opportunity. Researchers, teacher-scholars, and organizational leaders alike benefit from understanding students' work wants in general, and the specific relational-communicative desires placed on the leaders with whom they will soon interact.

This study extends previous exploratory qualitative work (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019) that identified five archetypes that categorize managerial relational role behaviors expressed by matriculating millennials. This study uses a sequential-explanatory mixed-method design (focus groups and exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses) to nuance, categorize, and

validate the managerial archetypes (Greene, 2007) while exploring how young adults want their managers to interact with them. The archetypes consist of relational behaviors that typify common communicative enactments of management and usefully identify desires for the way members believe managers should communicate to accomplish tasks and approach relationships. This study considers how young adults without full-time work experience make sense of managerial communication and how various enactments of communication may lead young adults to desire distinct relational behaviors related to the archetypes. More specifically, this collection of studies explores positive managerial behavior as a means to nuance what students' want in terms of managerial communication behaviors.

This research contributes to extant VAS and leadership communication literature in three ways. First, archetypes are particularly powerful in terms of anticipatory socialization and for helping young adults make sense of the potential landscape of their future organizations by allowing them to proactively consider the relational desires they place on leaders. Second, nuancing archetypes may generate a more concrete understanding of typical communicative approaches to management. This nuancing may prove helpful during critical transitional times, such as entering an organization or onboarding new employees, when communication is often taken for granted or relegated to the background. Finally, research-based categories help teacher-scholars and managers pinpoint misconceptions and provide young adults with a more realistic expectation of the role managers play in organizations.

Literature Review

By attending to the meaning of work, organizational communication scholars can consider communication *about* work in addition to the communication that takes place *at* work in organizational settings (Ashcraft, 2007; Cheney et al., 2008). Moving beyond job satisfaction, the meanings associated with work include sensemaking at an individual level as well as societal discourses that inform workplace identity, culture, and interaction (Wieland, 2010). The intersubjective nature of the sensemaking process places communication at the center of the negotiation over the purpose and meaning of work. As individuals engage in conversation both inside and outside workplace contexts, communication serves as both the means and resources through which work acquires meaning. To understand what work means, therefore, is to understand how people communicate about it.

Lair and Wieland (2012) argued that higher education sites are ripe for exploring young adults' meanings of work. This call becomes even clearer considering that the primary purpose of college is increasingly seen as

preparation for employment as universities produce "worker-consumers rather than citizen-subjects." (p. 424). Students encounter conversations around post-graduation intentions from various sources all interested to learn of plans to monetize the education that cost so much to attain. Conversations around questions like "What are you going to do with that major?" not only prompt students to feel pressure to provide "the appropriate answer" that makes economic sense, but induce anxiety for those who may have difficulty fitting their major into the narrative of education as job preparation (Lair & Wieland, 2012). Relatedly, Cheney et al. (2008) acknowledged the impact of time and culture to explain the variations of how the meaning of work is understood and enacted. Attentiveness to differences in student desires over time provides insight into variations of work-life expectations across generations. In a replication study, O'Connor and Raile (2015) explored Gen X-millennial differences regarding their encounter of the phrase "real job" and found millennials' view of work assigns higher value to the utility of a job to provide for their needs through a wider range of benefits than salary alone.

Taken together, these studies show how the university setting affords ample opportunities for students to discuss work-related goals and possibilities, thereby informing student wishes for future interactions with leaders and coworkers. The talk that occurs throughout one's college experience, whether formal or informal, helps students make sense of and assimilates them into a culture where work is an utmost priority. Work-education is therefore a valuable intersection to explore the conversations students have, as they implicitly and explicitly grapple with questions related to what they want to do with their lives and how they are able to do it.

Vocational Anticipatory Socialization

Prior to entering the workforce, individuals gain knowledge about what it means to work through engagement with organizational literature or interactions with other applicants, interviewers, current employees, and so on (Jablin, 2001). Organizational assimilation research focuses on two types of anticipatory socialization: organizational and vocational. The former examines communication through which individuals learn about and integrate into a particular organizational culture, whereas vocational concerns socialization into the world of work in general and how work-related roles are developed (Jablin, 2001). Originally concerned with how newcomers assimilate into organizations, research on anticipatory socialization has broadened to consider how communication in general—including messages received as a child—influence the socialization process (Kramer & Miller, 2014). Young adults are socialized into ways of viewing work early in life through

communication with parents, teachers, friends, and mass media (Jablin, 2001). Interactions such as these not only shape young adults' ideas of work in general but also influence desires that may continue even after entrance into the marketplace.

Young adults may naturally focus more on desires rather than expectations during the process of VAS stemming largely from their lack of or limited firsthand experience. However, the world of work largely remains a black box (Abrantes, 2013) and what is pieced together about the workplace comes from intentional and unintentional messages. Levine and Hoffner (2006), for example, found students received information about work from parents and friends which was commonly depicted in negative terms such as "difficult, stressful, and not enjoyable" (p. 662). Overhearing parents express frustrations or process challenging work encounters may prompt young adults to shift their focus from realistic expectations to what they want or desire in an organization and leader–member relationship. More recently, Jahn and Myers (2015) found that even though junior high and high-school aged young women received explicit instruction on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) careers, these same students indicated they did not have a concrete understanding of related professions, of the career process as a whole, and why adults continued to emphasize the importance of math and science courses. Thus in the absence of experience and without a concrete understanding of the workplace and various career paths, it is challenging for young adults to develop pragmatic expectations.

As the Jahn and Myers (2015) study illustrated, even in the face of intentional instruction about the world of work, young adults may not have the context necessary to meaningfully interpret well-intended messages. Without realistic beliefs in place and in hoping for a work environment free of the challenges expressed by parents, teachers, or individual experiences, wants and desires may be young adults' primary foci during the sensemaking process. Simply stated, in place of seriously considering realistic workplace scenarios that young adults reasonably know to expect based on their cumulative VAS experiences, thinking about future employment in terms of individual wants and desires may be a more manageable way to navigate the ambiguity and concerns with their upcoming transition to full-time work. Thus, communication teacher-scholars have a unique opportunity to assist young adults during this process to develop normative relational skills (i.e., introducing and framing one's self) and adapt a meaning-centered view of communication. This focus allows young adults to use their time at the university to wrestle with the complexities and realities of the world of work and their role within it (Woo et al., 2017). Educational institutions not only share similarities with workplace settings such as an emphasis on competence,

competition, and submission to authority figures, but also provide a context for students to talk about work-related colloquialisms such as "get a real job" and "What do you plan to do with that major?" (Lair & Wieland, 2012; O'Connor & Raile, 2015). College affords students time to formulate responses to such questions—and others related to their future work. As college is often the last step before transitioning into the workplace, students are more likely to use this time to start to develop desires for working in certain types of companies and with particular types of managers.

Leader–Member Relationships

Leader–member relationships are produced by and are a byproduct of communication. Fairhurst (2008) noted that leadership is a process ascribed by followers, arguing that communication itself constitutes these relationships and is the very basis upon which perceptions are made. Thus, these pivotal organizational relationships emerge through communicative interactions that manifest during the process of working together to accomplish organizational tasks. Recent research (Omilion-Hodges & Baker, 2017) indicated notable distinctions in the way that leaders related with followers of different statuses. Employees who share a high-quality relationship with their leader receive thoughtful, employee-centered communication, the manager's professional trust and blessing to make decisions on his or her behalf, and behaviors that convey genuine care. Conversely, employees with a low-quality relationship may be the target of negative manager-initiated communicative exchanges such as being excluded from organizational and social-related information, having their ideas ignored, or feeling as though their personal development is stagnated or blocked. These findings suggest relationships are inherently communicative and that it is impossible to unravel leader communicative, task, and relationship behaviors into distinct and mutually exclusive categories. These findings also illustrate the importance of helping young adults to disentangle expectations from desires as a means to better prepare them for industry. In place of attempting to neatly parse out individual communicative, task, and relationship behaviors, a meaning-centered approach to communication yields a more complex view of the enactment of managerial behavior.

In relating to individual employees, those in formal authority positions generally tend to fall into one of two camps via their commonly enacted communication behaviors: manager or leader (Kotter, 2007). The type of leader–member relationship that develops among dyads will largely be decided by the quality and frequency of communicative exchanges (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, & Oostenveld, 2010). In developing positive and negative leader–member

communication scales, Omilion-Hodges and Baker (2017) explained that frequent use of communication tactics on the negative scale are not necessarily indicative of a poor leader–member relationship. However, if one's formal supervisor uses more control-based communication exchange tactics, he or she may be enacting more of a managerial (rather than leadership) approach to their authority role. Decades of leader–member exchange literature tout the benefits of employees in high-level communal relationships with their managers including praise, friendship, and coaching. This indicates that in some leader–member associations, those in formal authority positions may serve to fulfill followers' interpersonal needs, not only task and professional inquiries (Madlock, 2008). Thus, some of the managerial archetypes (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019) that focus on coping with complexity by creating staffing plans and using various forms of control to solve problems may enact more traditional managerial communicative traits (Kotter, 2007). Other archetypes (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019) may take a more strategic and long-term view in considering how to motivate and inspire employees by aligning them and setting a direction that would require the enactment of leader communication (Kotter, 2007). Yet, in detailing role distinctions, Kotter (2007) made it clear that organizations require both managers and leaders to be successful for a long term. Understanding young adults' wants regarding managerial relational behaviors is paramount considering that a successful leader-member relationship can result in individual, workgroup, and organizational advantages (Culbertson, Huffman, & Alden-Anderson, 2010).

Managerial archetypes. One way to explore young adults' desires regarding their future managers is by uncovering prominent managerial archetypes. Archetypes—common defining characteristics or approaches to managing—become powerful sources of information for discerning how young adults want managers to fulfill their formal leadership role. Although archetypes help to define and exemplify common characteristics or behaviors, parceling out these categories does not mean that an individual is only capable of or always enacts one particular archetype. However, awareness of archetypes and more importantly, young adults' desires of managerial archetypes, generates insight into the expectations they foster regarding how their leader should communicate most of the time. In an earlier two-part qualitative study, the authors (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019) laid a foundation for exploring young adults' archetype constructions. Omilion-Hodges and Sugg (2019) examined matriculating college students' expectations for managerial behavior and, in a follow-up study, sought to understand predominate managerial archetypes. The two studies resulted in five prototypical approaches to managing: mentor, friend, manager, gatekeeper, and teacher (Table 1). While the

Table 1. Initial Working Leader Archetype Conceptualizations and Defining Communication Behaviors.

Archetype	Conceptualization
Mentor	An empathetic advocate, professional, and personal guide
Manager	A proxy for organizational leadership who takes a transactional approach to leader-follower relationships
Teacher	Seen as a traditional educator who provides role testing episodes, clear feedback, and opportunities for redemption and growth
Friend	Although in a managerial position, perceived as an informed and approachable peer
Gatekeeper	A high-status actor who is positioned to either advocate for or against an employee

open-ended online surveys allowed participants to consider and describe the archetypes in their own words, the format did not allow for follow-up probes regarding specific relational elements of managerial behavior nor for the statistical validation of the archetypes. To extend the initial study, the current research delves into young adults' perceptions regarding their future leader–member relationships. However, the lack of firsthand experience (Lair & Wieland, 2012; O'Connor & Raile, 2015), the inability to interpret VAS advice as it is intended (Jahn & Myers, 2015), individual, role, and peer tensions (Dailey, 2016; Woo et al., 2017), and the encounter of potentially negative or undesired accounts of leader–member interactions (Scarduzio et al., 2018) indicate that without full-time experience, young adults may focus more on individual desires, rather than thinking critically about scenarios they are more likely to experience. Put simply, young adults may focus on what they want in a future manager and organization, rather than consider that they may work for someone who is not invested in their personal growth, or who misses deadlines, or is a poor steward of resources.

Therefore, to further sort out how young adults make sense of the categories, compare and contrast archetypes, and conceptualize the distinct communicative behaviors of each prototypical manager, a series of focus groups, followed by an exploratory and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), were performed to answer the following questions:

> **Research Question 1 (RQ1):** What do young adults report wanting in terms of interpersonal interactions with their future managers?
> **Research Question 2 (RQ2):** How do young adults categorize and define common managerial relational behaviors?

Thus, further understanding these archetypes and young adults' desires regarding managerial communicative behaviors becomes the chief goal as one concrete means to lessen the gap between higher education and industry.

Methods

A multipronged data-collection approach in the form of a sequential-explanatory mixed-methods design (Greene, 2007) was employed. This mixed-methods study design generates data that offers a more comprehensive understanding of managerial archetypes than any of the methods could do alone. First, a series of focus groups was conducted to better understand young adults' desires of the roles managers should perform for individual employees and within organizations. The implementation of focus groups allowed participants to engage in collective sensemaking, piggybacking their thoughts and perceptions of how they plan to relate with their future manager, and offered the ideal environment when considering the impact anticipatory socialization has on their perspectives. Focus groups also generated participant feedback on relational-communicative behaviors specific to each archetype.

Two quantitative studies followed the focus groups. Since the relational behavior items had not yet been sorted or factor analyzed, but rather initially generated via two previous qualitative studies (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019) and nuanced in the focus groups in this study, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was completed to examine factor structure. After completing the EFA, a confirmatory factory analysis was conducted with a new sample to validate a leader archetype scale. The CFA was done as a means to verify the factor structure of the archetypes, yielding a practical tool for use with young adults or for use by organizations during the onboarding process.

Study 1: Focus Groups

As Tracy (2013) noted, focus groups are valuable for strengthening and developing data. She suggested that focus groups provide researchers the ability to ask participants to verify, elaborate, define, refute, or expand upon relevant concepts. Moreover, as VAS often involves collective conversation with multiple influencers, focus groups generated an ideal environment to emulate a shared sensemaking process to further nuance the archetypes forwarded in earlier research (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019). In addition, focus groups offered the opportunity to holistically observe and understand the expressed desires young adults hold regarding the communicative tendencies of managers.

Participants

The researchers conducted four focus groups, which each had 5 to 6 participants (all young adults), for a total of 22 participants. Participants were recruited from survey communication courses from a large, Midwestern public university, and earned a nominal amount of extra credit for participation. Time slots were made available in SONA, an online system used for scheduling. Upon arrival to the focus group, participants checked in by providing a SONA identification number; names were not used for privacy protection. On average, focus group participants were 22 years old ($SD = 3.24$) and were roughly equivalent in terms of male ($n = 10$) and female ($n = 12$) participants. One group consisted entirely of male participants, whereas the others included both sexes.

Procedure and Analysis

The researchers used a semi-structured interview guide where participants initially responded to rapport building questions regarding general desires for managers, the frequency and quality of communication, and how they anticipate these desires may morph once they transition into full-time positions. Participants were then asked to discuss what communicative exchanges would help them to identify a manager as primarily a mentor (or as a manager, friend, teacher, or gatekeeper). After discussing the defining communication behaviors of each archetype, participants were asked to compare and contrast the archetypes in terms of how they believed the manager would relate to them. On average, each focus group lasted 60 minutes.

Focus groups were audio-recorded and notes were also taken during the sessions to document group dynamics and nonverbal behaviors. After all focus groups concluded, the recordings were transcribed by a communication graduate student resulting in 92 pages of single-spaced interview text. Participant responses regarding relational managerial behaviors were initially identified and grouped based on the five archetype categories identified in the preceding study (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019). Responses were then coded in chunks by one member of the research team to examine descriptions of managerial relational behavior as well as expressions of desires regarding future interactions with managers. Owen's (1984) guidelines for qualitative analysis were employed to search for recurrence, repetition, and forcefulness. Findings were discussed at weekly research team meetings and disagreements were addressed collaboratively. All categories were examined and reexamined throughout the data collection and analysis process and considered in tandem with the results of the earlier research study (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019) and extant

literature to nuance what is known about typical managerial behavior and young adults' perspectives regarding it. In line with other communication research (i.e., Treem, 2012), the authors employed a 50% threshold for inclusion, meaning that most participants endorsed the themes included below.

Findings

The feedback and perceptions of young adults regarding their communicative desires for each leader archetype are discussed in depth in the following sections. In response to RQ1, participants' relational desires are highlighted for each respective archetype. Expectations regarding feedback and respect are then considered, which represent more nuanced thinking in terms of realistic managerial behavior and a shift away from ideal or best-case scenario behavior. In total, three themes emerged: (a) the importance of a communicative leader-member relationship and young adults' (b) managerial relational desires and c) socialization desires. Summary of managerial archetype conceptualizations and related communicative and relational behaviors is presented in Table 2, as the archetypes have already been identified and defined in earlier research (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019).

Communicative Behaviors

Across focus groups, participants echoed the importance of a high-functioning leader–member communicative relationship. For example, one young woman suggested the most important thing in her opinion is ". . . to have someone that you could be able to communicate with . . . if you can't approach your manager than [sic] it might be hard to work for them . . . to do the best work long-term." Not only did she emphasize the importance of the leader-member relationship in employee productivity, but also tacitly acknowledged how vital strong communication is to an effective leader–member relationship. The specific examination of the communicative expectations associated with each leader archetype is explored in detail below.

Participants first explored the manager as manager archetype and described communication as task-oriented, informative, and professional. One participant expressed her desire for managers to "tell me what they're expecting of me, especially in regards to what needs to be done, or new guidelines and rules that are being instilled" Another followed, "I agree . . . communication is key just so I have an idea of what's going on." Participants concurred that a manager would clearly state expectations with explicit instructions as well as demonstrating high levels of task management skills.

Table 2. Managerial Archetype Conceptualizations and Corresponding Communicative and Relational Behaviors.

	Representative definition	Communicative and relational behaviors
Mentor	A mentor is professionally and personally invested in your growth and accomplishments and will go out of their way to help you improve	Role model, leads by example, makes and leaves an impact, advocate, and life coach
Friend	A friend is a manager who you share an established professional and personal relationship with and is committed to helping you succeed	Well-developed relationship outside of work, empathetic; support in all areas of your life, similarity, identity development, values employees as whole people, relationally focused
Manager	A manager works to maintain organizational rules and regulations by setting clear goals and standards, assisting in daily tasks, delegation, and quality control	The nuts and bolts of a functional organization, lack of personal relationship, monitor and delegate tasks, maintain the establishment, structured and organized, stick to the plan, follow rules and regulations, strictly business, rules, hierarchy, protocol, and proficient
Teacher	A teacher creates a learning culture and is always pushing employees to expand their knowledge, skills, and abilities	Dedicated, provide learning opportunities, supportive, dedicated to growth of the organization, information delegation, provides necessary resources, provides explicit directions and feedback, one on one instruction
Gatekeeper	A gatekeeper is a high-ranking organizational member who holds power over employees and monitors them based on the best interests of the organization	Removed from day-to-day operations, strategic, can help you advance or hold you back, rules and regulation abiding, restricts information at their discretion, communicates only to influence, controls the successes and or failures of followers

Note. All themes were supported by at least 50% of the sample.

Similarly, participants described the communication from a manager as teacher in terms of formal dissemination of information and clear instruction in a group setting. Managers as teachers were also described as being highly communicative in terms of providing feedback at the individual level. One participant suggested that "if you have questions, you would go to them . . . they would not take as much time to explain everything . . . they just care that you have what you need to do the job at hand." Teachers were described as those who simply provide feedback regarding tasks which "had to be learned." The task-oriented learning associated with teachers contrasts with the "life-based" learning participants perceived accompanies interaction with a mentor.

Descriptions of mentor communication further diverged from manager and teacher archetypes in that a mentor was described as someone who communicates one-on-one and in small groups to provide "hands on learning" to "help push you outside your comfort zone." Furthermore, the perceived purpose of mentor communication shifted from task achievement to the personal development of the employee. In addition to sharing expertise from past work-related experiences, mentors were perceived to communicate in ways that helped their employees "grow" so they can "get where they [the employees] need to go" and be "fulfilled" with their work. Several participants agreed that mentors would express support rather than simply provide direction.

The concept of manager as gatekeeper elicited negative connotations from most participants. Perceived as distant power brokers who communicate "strategically" from "behind the scenes," this type of supervisor "controls advancement, information and resources." Participants acknowledged the role that power had in relation to this archetype, especially regarding both promotion and demotion. Young adults perceived gatekeepers communicated by strategically moving the pieces within an organization and were viewed as the "certain person you go through," "impress," or "kiss up to" for advancement in the company.

Straying furthest from the other managerial archetypes in regard to communication was manager as friend. Perceived as "very understanding and flexible in their communication style," friends "talk to you like a person and not like an employee." Although viewed as "less professional than other types of leaders" by one participant, another described friends as "some of the hardest working managers because they're not just speaking *at* everyone, they're speaking *with* everyone individually." Descriptions from focus-group members show distinct conceptualizations regarding the communicative behaviors associated with each of the five managerial archetypes. In the following section, participant desires for specific relational behaviors associated with each archetype are considered.

Relational Desires

Distinct desires about the relationship with different types of supervisors became evident in focus group conversations. Participants generally did not anticipate a close relationship when conversing about manager and teacher archetypes. Rather the relationship involved instrumental terms associated with work tasks. One male participant explained,

> the better you develop your relationship with your manager . . . that is a great way to eventually see things in his perspective and get the idea of what exactly he or she wants and how exactly he or she wants you to go about doing it.

Teachers were connected to the provision of "tools and resources" related to "outcomes" and what was necessary for work and no more. Discussions presented teachers and managers as generally unavailable; however, participants shared their desire for managers to still be "approachable, fair, consistent," and "always professional."

Descriptions of mentors took on a more personable and interactive role in comparison to other archetypes. Participants saw mentors as high achievers who have "been there," yet have the time and willingness to "pass on their wisdom that got them there." A mentor would also be "someone who looks out for and grooms" an individual. One young adult explained a mentor should show willingness to equip an individual for success with the understanding that he or she may choose a different path than the mentor. Furthermore, mentors were discussed as fallible humans who were, interestingly, expected to not only teach mentee but to also learn from them. One male participant put it this way: "even though they may know all the answers, they will approach the situation or the relationship in a way that is 'I'm teaching you but I'm willing to open up and also learn from you.'" Of the five archetypes, two-way communicative relationships were most prevalently ascribed to mentors. By and large, participants concluded sessions by stating mentors would be their preferred type of manager.

In contrast, supervisor as friend was often described as someone who would be "less professional in how they interact with young people," and "more concerned with personal well-being" than professional development. They were perceived to be more flexible and willing to "let things slide" regarding tasks and deadlines. Several participants mentioned having experience working for this type of supervisor, and despite the positive characteristics of being "laid back" and "covering for you," the friend was generally portrayed as less desirable due to the reported tendency to favor certain followers over others.

This propensity to favor members was also associated with the gatekeeper archetype. There was a clear acknowledgment that the gatekeeper was expected to have more power than other archetypes and was largely perceived as "strategic and intimidating." One participant explained, "gatekeepers may lead to a more hostile work environment depending on if they're going to use it [power] against you or [to] motivate you." However, one focus group collectively agreed a gatekeeper would be able to "recognize hard work" and "open a door for you trying to get you somewhere where you could make even more of a difference." Overall, this managerial archetype was seen as attentive to individual performance and concerned with promoting or limiting one's growth within the organization. For reasons mentioned above, participants appeared ambivalent about whether a close relationship with a gatekeeper was desirable.

Managerial Socialization Desires

Participants resoundingly articulated the desire for prompt and respectful two-way communication with their leaders and explicit guidance as they enter the workforce. Throughout their conversations, it was evident many were already experiencing interactions like this with their professors and at part-time college jobs, which influenced their desires regarding the VAS process. Moreover, it appears that young people want supervisors to provide feedback but not to be overly critical, especially while they are learning. This theme came up in each of the four focus groups, suggesting that young adults are eager to learn and to impress but that they hope supervisors are mindful of their language and use discourse that addresses shortcomings as "teaching moments" rather than "mistakes." Furthermore, participants indicated that "managers will be kind and understanding and always keep their subordinates' needs in mind" in addition to providing "step-by-step guidance and training." In this way, it appears that young adults expect and want supervisors—at least during the onboarding process—to assume the role of a hands-on guide. Considering these perspectives, it was not surprising the researchers found that most ($n = 18$) participants expressed a desire for all supervisors to assume a teacher and or mentor role.

Feeling respected was also a prominent theme, as exemplified by one participant statement: "I like to be told what to do, but I don't like to be disrespected when I'm told what to do." Another participant indicated that, "I don't need to be talked down to . . . I'll do whatever they [the supervisor] ask me to do, so I expect mutual respect." Most interestingly, in each of the four focus groups, participants reiterated that it was the supervisor's job to earn their respect, not necessarily the other way around. Participants suggested

that "because young people are doing their best to get positions and careers in an extremely competitive environment" and because "managers in the future will be even younger and society will be run by young people" that leaders "are in the position to earn respect from subordinates." It is important to note that the notion that managers will be even younger in the future is a student perception, as recent research indicates that people are not retiring earlier, but rather working longer (Allen, 2011; "Why people are working longer," 2018). Therefore, while it seemed that young adults harbor some insecurity in regard to the potential learning curve on a new job and want their manager to guide them, at least initially, they were quick to note that "managers should expect to learn from me as well" perhaps because "I am coming out of school with the most innovative knowledge that will help my manager look good."

Between direct and explicit reciprocal communication expected from supervisors and an emphasis on respectful discourse characterizing the leader-member relationship, most participants also forwarded the idea that "it's on them [the supervisor] to tell me if my work isn't at the quality it should be." Thus, there appears to be a clear tension in displaying assertive and proactive task behaviors, but also in presuming that unless, the supervisor offers suggestions or critiques that new hires are performing satisfactorily.

Overall, the focus group discussions further explained and developed what is known about young-adult perceptions of typical approaches to management. Furthermore, Study 1 helped refine relational behaviors associated with each archetype that are explored quantitatively in Studies 2 and 3. The archetypes were generated in an aforementioned study, which sought to identify the ways young adults view managers. Study 1 extended this categorization to explore relational desires associated with perceived interactions with each of the various archetypes. Distinct relational desires for each archetype assisted in the refinement of previously constructed survey items (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019). Illuminating these discreet relational behaviors gave researchers specific descriptors, which allowed for the quantitative validation of the categories in the subsequent studies.

Study 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factory analysis (EFA) is recommended for use when it is not clear how many factors may emerge, or as is the case in this research, when it is uncertain what measures load on what factors (Kenny, 2016). The decision to initially subject one data sample to EFA was made because the earlier studies were qualitative and did not seek participant sorting or confirmation of various relational behaviors by archetype. As a result, an EFA was run

before collecting additional data and seeking to confirm factor structure through a CFA.

Participants and procedure. After securing HSIRB approval, undergraduate participants were recruited through large-lecture survey courses from the same, large public Midwestern University as the Study 1 participants and signed up for the study via SONA software management software. The software management system protects participants' anonymity while also offering alternative assignment options as a means of earning research credit.

The sample included 153 undergraduate students and was roughly equivalent in terms of participant sex with 56% (n = 85) of the sample identifying as female and 44% (n = 68) as male. Participants were approximately 20 years old (SD = 0.85) and most of the sample identified as Caucasian (71%, n = 108), followed by 18% Black/African American (n = 27), 5% Asian (n = 7%), 3% bi or multicultural (n = 4), with 2% not disclosing ethnicity.

Instrumentation. Items were developed via a four-step process. In the first step, working items were developed from the findings in Study 1 in conjunction with the earlier study this work is founded on (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019). Thus, the focus groups allowed the research team to qualitatively confirm the specific relational traits that young adults brainstormed in the preceding study. No new relational behaviors were noted in the focus groups, but responses allowed for a more nuanced understanding of what young adults want in terms of relating to and working with their future managers. In the second step, the research team drafted sample items independently and then engaged in several active work sessions to discuss the validity of items. In the third step, items were shared with graduate organizational communication students as a means to gain feedback. In the fourth and final step, the working items and categories were discussed with organizational communication faculty. This approach aligns with established organizational research approaches (Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker, 2007; Hinkin, 1998) for item creation with the goal of scale validation through widely solicited feedback (i.e., graduate students) and employing subject matter experts (i.e., faculty) throughout the process.

On a 7-point Likert-type scale, participants indicated how important the various relational characteristics were in their future full-time manager (Table 3). Sample items included: "My manager works with me to set personal goals," "My manager takes an authoritative approach to managing," and "My manager gives me clear instructions for a project." As participants have not yet worked full-time and therefore have limited experience working with a manager, we followed the long-established and well-validated process of using scales anchored by examples of normative behavior (i.e., my manager

Table 3. Initial Archetype Items.

Archetype	Items
Mentor	1. My manager takes a genuine interest in my individual development
	2. My manager is always available to serve as a sounding board for my ideas
	3. My manager is a positive role model for me
	4. My manager is personally invested in my successes
	5. My manager empowers me to develop my own strengths, beliefs, and personal attributes
	6. Conversations with my manager help me narrow ideas to concrete actions
	7. My manager always listens to my concerns
	8. My manager asks questions that help me generate my own solutions
	9. My manager works me with to set personal goals
	10. My manager works me with to set professional goals
	11. My manager is empathetic when I make a mistake
	12. My manager prefers asking me a question to providing advice
Friend	13. My manager is also my friend
	14. My manager gives me extra freedom at work because we have an established relationship
	15. My manager trusts me to do make decisions because we have an established relationship
	16. My manager is aware of the happenings of my personal life
	17. My manager is available if I need to discuss happenings in my personal life
	18. My manager is sympathetic to the fact that I have a life outside of work
	19. My manager is open about his or her personal life
	20. My manager plans events for our group to get together outside of working hours
	21. My manager asks about my weekend
	22. My manager believes in my abilities to do my job well because we have an established relationship
Manager	23. My manager is an expert at delegating tasks
	24. My manager is very business-like at all times
	25. My manager uses an authoritative approach to managing
	26. My manager centralizes all of the information about my department and only delegates that which is necessary
	27. My manager maintains a very structured work environment
	28. My manager generally only interacts with me when it is necessary

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

	29. My manger generally only communicates with me when something is wrong
	30. My manager does not necessarily care about my professional development
	31. My manager frequently reminds me of organizational policies and procedures
	32. My manager punishes me and my peers when we don't adhere to organizational policies
	33. My manager is a clear representative of senior leadership
Teacher	34. Is someone who I consider a teacher
	35. My manager gives me clear instructions for a project
	36. My manager gives me opportunities to practice new skills before I have to use them
	37. My manager gives me detailed feedback on what I did well as well as areas for improvement
	38. My manager takes the time to teach me new skills
	39. My manager creates a safe environment to learn my job
	40. My manager creates an environment where it's okay to make a mistake
	41. My manager uses a clear feedback and assessment structure
	42. My manager gives me the opportunity to try again if I make a mistake
	43. My manager has frequent individual check-in meetings with me
	44. My manager uses incentives to push me to higher levels of performance
Gatekeeper	45. My manager is a high-status actor within the organization
	46. My manager knows how to play the "political game" within the organization
	47. My manager keeps tracks of every detail
	48. My manager advocates for or against employees based on their performance
	49. My manager has access to confidential information
	50. My manager is direct with his or her communication
	51. My manager is strategic in his or her communication
	52. My manager is able to see strategic, long-term goals
	53. My manager is strategic in his or her behaviors
	54. My manager is a respected actor within the organization

is personally invested in my successes). Using anchors, based on having observed similar behaviors (i.e., relating, coaching, and controlling), permits participants to evaluate various categories—such as archetypes—without

sacrificing specificity (Smith & Kendall, 1963). This approach has been used to test and develop reliable and valid measures in the health care context, with undergraduate students, and in a variety of leadership, management, and organization-based studies (Barlow, Nock, & Hersen, 2009; Lord & Maher, 2002; Smith & Kendall, 1963). Participants also responded to basic demographic inquiries.

Analysis and Results

The initial 54 items were subjected to a maximum likelihood extraction using SPSS, version 23. Maximum likelihood model extraction was selected because it uses the same algorithm employed by Amos statistical software. Amos is a SPSS companion software that was used for the subsequent CFA.

The authors started with a five-factor model to align with the theoretical results of the earlier studies. Thus, in place of asking SPSS to sort the data based on eigenvalues, the authors sought to see how the items clumped based on the five managerial archetypes. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser–Meyer–Oklin value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .60 (Kaiser, 1974) and Barlett Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

The maximum likelihood model revealed the presence of five factors (all above the generally accepted eigenvalue of 1.00); however, the first four factors explain most of the variance: 28%, 11%, 9%, 8%, and 4%. In addition, the five-factor model explained 48% of variance, falling shy of the standard 50% threshold. In review of the reproduced correlations, the five-factor model demonstrated 15% nonredundant residuals with absolute values greater than .05, indicating poor fit. Finally, review of the pattern matrix demonstrated several cross-loading items, particularly between the gatekeeper and managerial factors. Two gatekeeper items also loaded on the teacher factor and in review of the communalities table, items that fell below the .30 threshold were removed from the subsequent four-factor EFA.

After removing gatekeeper items and those that fell below the .30 threshold, a four-factor solution explaining 56% of variance was found. To aid in the interpretation of these four factors (i.e., manager, friend, mentor, and teacher), oblimin rotation was performed, revealing the presence of a simple structure (Thurstone, 1947) with each of the factors demonstrating strong loadings and all variables loading substantially on one factor (Table 4). Moreover, the nonredundant residuals in the four-factor model were 4.00%, meeting the 5.00% or lower threshold. In sum, the four-factor model with the

Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis Pattern Matrix.

	Factor			
Items	Manager (α = .80)	Friend (α = .86)	Mentor (α = .83)	Teacher (α = .86)
My manager is very business-like at all times	.64			
My manager uses an authoritative approach to managing	.83			
My manager centralizes all departmental information and only delegates that which is necessary	.75			
My manager maintains a very structured work environment	.63			
My manager is aware of the happenings of my personal life		.70		
My manager is available if I need to discuss happenings in my personal life		.76		
My manager is open about his or her personal life		.84		
My manager plans events for our group to get together outside of working hours		.68		
My manager asks about my weekend		.74		
My manager is always available to serve as a sounding board for my ideas			.68	
My manager is a positive role model for me			.76	
My manager is personally invested in my successes			.82	
My manager empowers me to develop my strengths			.74	
Conversations with my manager help me to narrow ideas to concrete actions			.62	
My manager gives me clear instructions for a project				.71
My manager creates a safe environment for me to learn my job				.66
My manager gives me detailed feedback on what I did well and areas for improvement				.86
My manager takes the time to teach me new skills				.83

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization (rotation converged in 5 iterations).

gatekeeper items removed indicated a better fit than the original five-factor model. The reliabilities for each of the four factors were also above the .7 threshold.

After establishing a simple structure (Thurstone, 1947), additional data were collected to confirm the factor structure.

Study 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The factor structure found in the EFA (Table 4) was subjected to CFA with a new sample. Employment of Amos statistical software verified the structure of the four-factor model (i.e., Mentor, Friend, Manager, and Teacher). The manager and teacher factors consisted of four items each, whereas the mentor and friend factors each had five items in an effort to forward a parsimonious scale (Thurstone, 1947).

Participants and procedure. Recruitment of participants ($n = 249$) entailed invitation from large survey courses at the same university. Young adults who participated in Study 2 were prohibited from participating in this study. Participants signed up for the online survey through SONA software in an effort to maintain the anonymity while ensuring they earned research credits. After reviewing the information sheet, participants responded to the 18 items (Table 4) that were employed for the EFA. In addition to reporting standard demographic questions, participants also responded to additional organizational scales that are part of a larger data set.

The sample was largely similar to the one recruited for the EFA; 51% ($n = 130$) identified as female, 47% as male ($n = 119$), 1% ($n = 3$) as non-binary, with 1 participant neglecting to disclose sex. Participants reported a mean age of 20 ($SD = 2.99$) and identified predominately as White (72%, $n = 183$), followed by 13% Black/African American ($n = 32$), 7% Hispanic/Latino ($n = 18$), 4% bi or multiracial ($n = 10$), with less than 2% of the sample identifying as Asian. Most of the sample (74%, $n = 187$) reported working or interning from 1 to 5 years, 8% ($n = 20$) indicated that they have worked or interned for 1 year or less, whereas the remainder of the sample reported working or interning for 6 or more years (18%, $n = 45$).

Analysis and Results

A CFA was conducted on the 18 items of the managerial archetype scale. An initial examination of the model indicated an acceptable fit, with a CMIN value of 1.35, which fell well below the recommended upper threshold of

3.00. The fit indices, including goodness of fit index (GFI = .93) and the normed fit index (NFI) = .95, were above the accepted levels (Byrne, 1994). Additional fit indices also confirmed a strong fit for the model as the comparative fit index (CFI = .98), incremental fit index (IFI = .98), and Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) = .97, were above the generally recommended level of .95. Finally, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .04, was lower than the generally accepted level of .08.

Validity and reliability of the model were also demonstrated. More specifically, convergent validity was evidenced by average variance explained (AVE) of all factors above the .50 threshold. Divergent validity was demonstrated by review of composite reliability with all factors loading above a .70, whereas discriminant validity was evidenced by the fact that the square root of AVE is greater than any interfactor correlation within the matrix.

The results of these two quantitative studies indicate support for a four-factor managerial archetype scale. These findings, by and large, align with those that were yielded in Study 1 and the authors' previous work (Omilion-Hodges & Sugg, 2019).

Discussion

While it is important to consider talk that occurs *at* work, for young adults who have yet to work full-time, exploring talk *about* work yields far-reaching insights for VAS. Considering that communication is the primary instrument used by both leader and member, as they collaborate to accomplish organizational tasks, generating and validating prototypical relational-communicative approaches to managing helps to assuage common anxieties that may surface during transitional times—such as the onboarding process. The onboarding process is key, as it becomes the on-ramp for bridging the gap between higher education and industry. Thus, in place of taking communication for granted, when young adults find themselves in the liminal space of shedding the student role and assuming the role of an employee, empirically validated managerial archetypes can help to make the unknown more manageable. This research also equips teacher-scholars to coach students to think realistically about a meaning-centered view of communication that stresses adaptability, connection, and shared goals. Findings also offer suggestions for formal managers and organizations. After gaining a nuanced understanding of young adults' desires through focus groups, an EFA, and a CFA, a practical tool was validated to assist in workplace socialization of young adults and/or newly hired members. Theoretical, pragmatic, and methodological implications are discussed below.

Theoretical Implications

Communicative exchanges and relational desires feature prominently in the creation and maintenance of leader–member relationships, and prior to entrance into the workforce, young adults' communication about work shapes perceptions of work in general and managerial role behaviors in particular. Furthermore, exploring managerial archetypes provides a foundation to tease out those desires young adults have regarding how managers will communicate and as a natural extension, relate to them in the future. Theoretically, this collection of studies contributes to extant literature regarding anticipatory socialization, leader–member relationships, and the meaning-centered or constitutive view of communication.

Vocational anticipatory socialization. Concentrating on vocational anticipation—the excitement and visualization of future workplace interaction—is a ripe area for exploration of work-related desires, specifically related to communication exchanges likely to occur with future supervisors. Whereas recent VAS research has provided valuable insight into the ways in which high-school STEM courses and college internships socialize young adults for the marketplace (Dailey, 2016; Jahn & Myers, 2015; Myers, Jahn, Gaillard, & Stolzfus, 2011; Woo et al., 2017), the current research assists in the understanding of young adults' desired state of workplace communication by forwarding archetypes that detail managerial communicative behaviors. As preparation for employment continues to become a primary motivation for enrollment in higher education, universities may play an even more formative role in the VAS of their students.

Some socialization findings in the current project appear to be in direct contrast to traditionally-held beliefs. By illustration, young adults suggested that managers should work to earn their respect in contrast to the historical model that indicates members strive to earn their manager's esteem through a series of role-taking and role-testing episodes (Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Ilies, 2009). Similarly, participants indicated that they believe their future managers are responsible for developing them professionally and personally. In other words, the findings suggest that young adults would rather be led than managed (Kotter, 2007), indicating young adults prefer leader–member communication to be tailored to their individual needs rather than managers who enact an average leadership style with all employees. In a departure from classic conceptualizations of management, participants largely rejected the traditional role of managers as proxies for the organization. Instead of accepting role, power, and status distinctions, young adults indicate that they want to be inspired, that they aspire to develop trusting two-way reciprocal

relationships, and that they believe that managers, in some ways, are charged with looking out for them as they grow as employees *and* as people. Thus, the manager is no longer seen primarily as a source of task or procedural information, but rather as a trusted guide who should be willing to communicate about a breadth of professional and personal topics. These desires bring implications for the relational aspects of the leader–member relationship.

Future of leader–member relationships. The quality of the leader–member relationship relates to a host of positive outcomes in terms of career satisfaction, growth, longevity, and earning potential. In review of the findings, it appears that young adults want managers to clearly articulate task expectations, provide detailed feedback, and help them to set realistic, yet achievable goals that will allow them to thrive in their work and nonwork lives. Thus, the data shine a light into how leader–member relationships may transform and evolve in the coming years as millennials and members of Generation Z assume managerial roles. This finding aligns with extant literature (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; Rentz, 2015) that indicates millennials seek more feedback both in terms of quantity and quality than their generational predecessors and have outranked older cohorts in their ability to see others' perspectives. Millennials are positioned to be strong future leaders owing to their high standards, work ethic, and follow-through (Emeagwali, 2011; Rentz, 2015).

Desires for a communicatively adept and adaptive manager, most likely in the form of manager as mentor, suggest that young adults will also likely take a more communicative approach to socialization and relationship development. Whereas Baby Boomers and members of Generation X were more likely to use low social cost socialization tactics such as observation and approaching peers with carefully curated questions (Miller & Jablin, 1991), participants indicated that they intend to use direct and unstructured strategies such as asking their managers for feedback, guidance, and mentoring. This approach for seeking information in a developing leader–member relationship aligns with suggestions that sharing stories and social encounters can result in reduced role ambiguity (Hart & Miller, 2005). Therefore, differences in generational assumptions and desires may account for an increased need for constructive conversations between leaders and followers to negotiate the role and communicative desires between leaders and organizational members (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Thus, requests for more communicative leader–member relationships among participants may foreshadow increasingly relational and interaction-based member–manager associations in the future.

Transitioning to more communicative leader–member relationships also aligns with the current findings, in that young adults prefer a leader to a

manager. While organizations require managers and leaders to be successful (Kotter, 2007), the spectrum of communication behaviors associated with the archetypes indicate that young adults prefer someone who can cope with change, set a direction, align employees, and use communication to motivate and inspire. The manager as mentor and teacher takes an audience-centered, communicatively rich approach to the leader–member relationship. In communicating, these managers tailor messages to the individual member, recognizing that a one-size-fits-all approach rarely fits anyone and instead offer patient, empathetic responses geared to help employees succeed. These managerial archetypes may appear at odds with the manager-manager who communicates primarily as a means to assign or clarify tasks, oversee quality control, or implement organizational policies, which also align with the conceptualization of managers (in contrast to leaders) by Kotter (2007). However, in helping young adults recognize that concern for employees may be demonstrated just as readily in direction about quality control, as it is in conversations about one's personal life, may help to color and enrich perceptions about the various ways managers—including manager-mangers—may enact relational behavior to satisfy role requirements. The ability to look past various surface uses of managerial communication requires students to develop a communicatively complex view.

Meaning-centered approach to communication. A constitutive view of communication emphasizes the foundational role of communication, rather than viewing it only as a tool to pull out during times of conflict or for goal-achievement. Therefore, common communicative approaches to managing help young adults to consider a multitude of ways in which communication functions and is enacted in organizational settings. Moreover, upper undergraduate students may begin to consider in more definitive terms how their future manager will address them, approach work, and communicate in a variety of organizational situations. In return, this practice allows young adults to contemplate what a meaning-centered communication approach might look like with the various archetypes. The ability to flex communicatively is especially important because if new hires and/or managers communicate in ways that are divergent from what the other desires, it can hinder assimilation, group cohesion, and productivity, ultimately impacting leader, coworker, and team relationships (Culbertson et al., 2010; Madlock, 2008). Considering that in the absence of experience, young adults transitioning into the workforce may fall back on desires in place of prudent expectations (Burgoon et al., 1995), it becomes even more important to proactively prepare students on the distinction between desires and realistic expectations.

A large component of the assimilation process rests on new hires fulfilling their organizational role in normative or otherwise expected ways. Thus the role-taking phase of leader-member relationship development rests on the leader observing and assessing the employee's ability to meet role demands. This phase is largely ruled by task-demands, evaluation of capabilities and feedback, where rich communicative exchanges can propel the relationship to the role-making phase (Nahrgang et al., 2009). Conversely, if the transactional communication of the role-taking stage does not transform to richer dialogue or the new hire is resistant to the leader's feedback, the relationship may become stagnant. Yet, it is in the role-making phase where the employee is granted more agency in terms of role adaption, which is a communicative give and take between leader and member (Omilion-Hodges & Baker, 2017). In the communicative negotiation that typifies the role-making phase, leader and member may develop trust, which is an important component for assimilation and continued relational intimacy. However, relationship development is more than the ability to successfully complete projects—it involves employees not violating the manager's relational expectations. Thus, while it may require give on the part of both young adults and managers (especially those in different generational cohorts), linking pragmatic expectations with performed managerial communication behaviors benefits the workgroup as a whole.

Interaction adaptation theory (IAT; Burgoon et al., 1995) suggests that individuals (leaders and members in this case) approach relationships with assumptions. These assumptions are fueled by three interrelated and hierarchical factors—those that are required, expected, and desired. These factors rest on social and cultural norms, each actor's communicative goals, and individual preferences. Preferences or wants can be especially ambiguous among new actors, as these are idiosyncratic and unique to one's own desires. Returning to this study, a disconnect may present when a new hire feels that he or she can only thrive with a mentor-manager and continues to attempt to relate to the leader by seeking personal and professional advice and individualized goal setting. These member behaviors would likely violate the manager's expectations if they saw these requests falling outside of the scope of their professional role. Thus teaching students about IAT and its counterpart theory, expectancy violations (Burgoon, 1993), helps them to consider potential consequences of being unable to separate realistic expectations from individual desires. Instead, a meaning-centered approach enhances theoretical understanding of how wants impact member–manager interaction, yet, can also be practically applied by organizational leaders and university faculty interested in assisting young adults toward greater realism in what might await them as they enter the workplace.

Pragmatic Implications

In exploring young adults' desires regarding managerial communication, a glimpse into what supervisory approaches will fare best with this group is generated. In addition, in nuancing matriculating students' wants for various communicative approaches to managing, teacher-scholars are equipped to aid young adults in adjusting unrealistic assumptions and helping them to brainstorm how they may tailor their communication to understand and relate to their future manager. Findings may also help managers and recruiters to lessen the distance between new hires' desires and organizational realities via communication-rooted solutions. Finally, awareness of young adults' preferences for leader relational behaviors yields insight on how to manage and coach them for success.

Teacher-scholar considerations. As teacher-scholars, validated managerial archetype categories provide a concrete means to commence conversations about realistic expectations. Faculty may ask students to consider previous managers, coaches, or teachers whom they have worked with in an effort to discuss how communication changes based on a formal authority figure's predominant approach to relating with members. Teacher-scholars may also use themselves as an example to discuss how they see their predominate approach to communicating and relating with students exemplified in the archetypes. Drawing from the authors' experiences, this is a productive way to help young adults to understand how concern for tasks and relationships is enacted communicatively in myriad ways. That is, a faculty member may discuss how with some students a manager–manager approach is the most effective in helping the student meet deadlines and be successful. However, other students may require or request a manager–teacher communication style to excel in the course. In these conversations, faculty may facilitate student discussion surrounding the benefits and drawbacks of various archetypes and how employees may flex their own communication styles as a means to consider how to form a fruitful leader-member relationship with each archetype. Engaging in discussions about scenarios, students are likely to encounter may be especially important if the students find themselves working with an archetype that does not align with their desired managerial archetype (i.e., Burgoon et al., 1995).

In addition, focus group responses indicate student desires for future interaction with managers may be rooted in current experience with university faculty. For example, many faculty, especially in major-related courses, take an individual, student-centered approach. While this can facilitate student comprehension, it may inadvertently set students up for a harsh reality check

following commencement. Thus having explicit discussions about the archetypes could allow faculty to productively reinforce realistic expectations of interactions with those in positions of authority. Opportunities to explicitly discuss archetypes and rational expectations for authority figure relational-communication may occur in revealing instructor intentions or goals related to the level of autonomy in completing course assignments, the level of instruction provided for coursework, and in the amount of feedback provided. Discussing the syllabus or returning to it throughout the semester, for example, can lead to a productive discussion about goal setting, expectations, performance, and feedback.

Finally, focus groups show that participants appear to adjust expectations depending on which archetype they perceive the supervisor to enact. If this is true, then the archetypes serve a useful purpose to adjust expectations from their desired manager to the expectations associated with the archetype of the particular manager they find themselves working with. This finding reiterates the importance of helping young adults learn to recognize communication strategies associated with the various archetypes to consider how the manager's use of communication may help the workgroup to successfully fulfill organizational demands. Likewise, engaging students in thoughtful discussion about managerial behavior may shift young adults' focus from a surface level reaction of liking or disliking various prototypical approaches to management and rather consider student agency in how they may adapt their communicative behavior to work productively within the group. This finding aligns with the emphasis on a constitutive meaning-centered view of communication, where teacher-scholars can create opportunities for young adults to reflect on what happens when their preferred archetype converges or diverges with the typical communicative approach enacted by their future manager.

Managerial and recruiter considerations. It serves managers well to have research-based categories to interpret managerial roles and communicative practices. Using archetypes to label the purpose of communication with a new employee might usefully clarify what type of role or hat the manager is wearing. For example, "As a teacher, I'd like to see greater attention paid in how the task is completed . . ." or "As a gatekeeper, I'd encourage you to be aware of advancement opportunities for employees with ___ training." "As a manager I expect X, but as your mentor . . ." Therefore, these archetypes might serve as important sensemaking resources and contribute to relational clarity as managers onboard new employees. Similarly, VAS is concerned with minimizing reality shock between unrealistic work desires with worker experience in the first months of employment. The findings generated in the

current research provide value to hiring managers and recruiters as tools for communicating about what interactions between managers and employees look like. For example, a manager or a recruiter may be able to instruct new employees in terms of what to expect relationally and task-wise from various organizational members: “Jim, you might think of as more a teacher type of manager, whereas Florence is the gatekeeper around here,” and so on.

Second, the archetypes can be used by a recruiter to elicit newcomer desires, thus facilitating sensemaking prior to the first day on the job. For example, archetypes may be used as an expectation-lowering procedure (ELP) tactic, as research shows ELPs typically involve strategic messages by recruiters. Recruiters might do well to ask questions about archetypes to elicit the perspective of new hires. As new hires do more of the talking, recruiters can facilitate sensemaking and adjust misconceptions.

Methodological Implications

Using a mixed-method approach to understand managerial archetypes illuminated insights that would have been missed otherwise. Focus groups allowed participants to process specific communicative and relational behaviors associated with each archetype, which afforded a collective opportunity for sensemaking, while at the same time uncovered participant preferences related to how they envision future interactions with supervisors. Learning how young adults distinguished communication between archetypes through qualitative data assisted in the refinement of items to be used during scale development and validation and brought those categories to life through descriptions of each archetype. EFA ultimately led to the decision to remove the gatekeeper archetype, setting the stage to confirm the four-factor structure. The combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses resulted in a nuanced understanding of communicative preferences placed on supervisors by matriculating millennials as well as a practical tool to use in classrooms and organizations to assist in young adults’ socialization into the workforce.

Limitations and Future Research

Although focus groups efficiently elicited desires young adults had regarding managerial types and their corresponding communicative behaviors, these data did not look at the sources and conversations that informed these thoughts, as participants were not asked to reflect on or share the influences that have contributed to their workplace preferences. Moreover, participants were not asked how their desires diverge or converge with the work experiences expressed by their parents or others they have talked to about full-time

employment. Although focus groups may have served as an occasion for participants to engage in collective sensemaking, verbalizing previously latent beliefs and understandings about workplace communication, further research should consider the sources of conversations about work that occur in various family, work, and university contexts. Because the purpose of college is increasingly viewed as preparation for the marketplace, it would be interesting to examine the frequency and quality of conversations about work that occurs within that context in particular. Furthermore, several focus group responses indicate that student desires for future interactions with their managers may be rooted in current experiences with university faculty. Thus, future research might also consider whether the desire for teacher and mentor archetypes may develop to compensate common student experiences such as feeling overwhelmed, in need of guidance, or unsure of the future.

Conclusion

As a diverse multi-generational workforce may require managers to perform multiple relational roles, this anticipatory socialization tool can help to assess which relational behaviors associated with each archetype a manager most frequently enacts. Without experience or in the face of limited work experience, new employees' refined expectations for what it means to work or what to expect in terms of communicative role behaviors from a manager may largely be composed of desires. Conversation regarding the overlap and divergence of member desires with actual manager communication behaviors may enhance relational development, thus underscoring the importance of communication in leader–-member relationships. Considering the explanatory work forwarded by this scholarship, future research should continue to explore not only the wants young adults have toward managerial communication but also the sources and processes through which anticipatory socialization occurs throughout youth and into young adulthood. This line of future research could be a way to further delve into the processes and communicative exchanges that construct the complex, dynamic, and fascinating relationship that occurs between organizational members and their leaders.

Authors' Note

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 68th Annual International Communication Association Conference in Prague, Czech Republic.

Acknowledgments

The authors would also like to extend their gratitude for the helpful comments and insights provided by Dr. Patty Sias and three anonymous reviewers.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Leah M. Omilion-Hodges https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5574-5155

References

Abrantes, P. (2013). Opening the black box of socialization: Emotions, practices, and (biographical) identities. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, *5*, 391-401. doi:10.5897/IJSA2013.0484

Allen, B. J. (2011). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity* (2nd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Ashcraft, K. (2007). Appreciating the 'work' of discourse: Occupational identity and difference as organizing mechanisms in the case of commercial airline pilots. *Discourse & Communication*, *1*, 9-36. doi:10.1177/1750481307071982

Ashcraft, K. L., & Allen, B. J. (2009). Politics even closer to home: Repositioning CME from the standpoint of communication studies. *Management Learning*, *40*, 11-30. doi:10.1177/1350507608099311

Barlow, D. H., Nock, M., & Hersen, M. (2009). *Single case experimental designs: Strategies for studying behavior for change* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Leader–member social exchange (LMSX): Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *28*, 979-1003. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/30162603

Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *12*, 30-48. doi:10.1177/0261927X93121003

Burgoon, J. K., Stern, L. A., & Dillman, L. (1995). *Interpersonal adaptation: Dyadic interaction patterns*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Byrne, B. M. (1994). Testing for the factorial validity, replication, and invariance of a measuring instrument: A paradigmatic application based on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *29*, 289-311. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr2903_5

Cheney, G., Zorn, T. E., Planalp, S., & Lair, D. J. (2008). Meaningful work and personal/social well-being organizational communication engages the meanings of work. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *32*, 137-185. doi:10.1080/23808985.2008.11679077

Culbertson, S. S., Huffman, A. H., & Alden-Anderson, R. (2010). Leader-member exchange and work-family interactions: The mediating role of self-reported challenge and hindrance-related stress. *The Journal of Psychology*, *144*, 15-36. doi:10.1080/00223980903356040

Dailey, S. L. (2016). What happens before full-time employment? Internships as a mechanism of anticipatory socialization. *Western Journal of Communication*, *80*, 453-480. doi:10.1080/10570314.2016.1159727

De Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., & Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership = communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge sharing and leadership outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *25*, 367-380. doi:10.1007%2Fs10869-009-9140-2

Emeagwali, N. S. (2011). Millennials: Leading the charge for change. *Techniques: Connecting Education and Careers*, 86, 22-26. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ925286.pdf

Fairhurst, G. T. (2008). Discursive leadership: A communication alternative to leadership psychology. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *21*, 510-521. doi:10.1177/0893318907313714

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry* (Vol. 9). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.

Hart, Z. P., & Miller, V. D. (2005). Context and message content during organizational socialization: A research note. *Human Communication Research*, *31*, 295-309. doi:10.1093/hcr/31.2.295

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, *1*, 104-121.

Jablin, F. M. (2001). Organizational entry, assimilation, and disengagement/exit. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 732-818). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Jahn, J. L. S., & Myers, K. K. (2015). When will I use this? How math and science classes communicate impressions of STEM careers: Implications for vocational anticipatory socialization. *Communication Studies*, *66*, 218-237. doi:10.1080/10510974.2014.990047

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*, 31-36.

Kenny, D. A. (2016). *Multiple latent variable models: Confirmatory factor analysis*. Retrieved from http://davidakenny.net/cm/mfactor.htm

Kotter, J. P. (2007). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*, 96-103.

Kramer, M. W., & Miller, V. D. (2014). Socialization and assimilation: Theories, processes, and outcomes. In L. L. Putman & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 525-547). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Lair, D. J., & Wieland, S. M. B. (2012). "What are you going to do with that major?" Colloquial speech and the meanings of work and education. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *26*, 423-452. doi:10.1177/0893318912443776

Levine, K. J., & Hoffner, C. A. (2006). Adolescents' conceptions of work: What is learned from different sources during anticipatory socialization? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *21*, 647-669. doi:10.1177/0743558406293963

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (2002). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Madlock, P. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, *45*, 61-78. doi:10.1177/0021943607309351

Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences tactics, and a model of the process. *The Academy of Management Review*, *16*, 91-120.

Myers, K. K., Jahn, J. L. S., Gaillard, B. M., & Stolzfus, K. (2011). Vocational anticipatory socialization (VAS): A communicative model of adolescents' interests in STEM. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *25*, 87-120. doi:10.1177/0893318910377068

Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *25*, 225-238. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9172-7

Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Ilies, R. (2009). The development of leader-member exchanges: Exploring how personality and performance influence leader and member relationships over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*, 256-266. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.09.002

O'Connor, A., & Raile, A. N. W. (2015). Millennials' "Get a 'real job'": Exploring generational shifts in the colloquialism's characteristics and meanings. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *29*, 276-290. doi:10.1177/0893318915580153

Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Baker, C. R. (2017). Communicating leader-member relational quality: The development of leader communication exchange scales to measure relationship building and maintenance through the exchange of communication-based goods. *Journal of Business Communication*, *54*, 115-145. doi:10.1177/2329488416687052

Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Sugg, C. E. (2019). Millennials' views and expectations regarding the communicative and relational behaviors of leaders: Explore young adults' talk about work. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, *82*, 74-100. doi:10.1177/2329490618808043

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *70*, 274-287.

Rentz, K. C. (2015). Beyond the generational stereotypes: A study of U.S. Generation Y employees in context. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, *78*, 136-166. doi:10.1177/2329490615576183

Scarduzio, J. A., Real, K., Slone, A., & Henning, Z. (2018). Vocational anticipatory socialization, self-determination theory, and meaningful work: Parents' and children's recollection of memorable messages about work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *32*, 431-461. doi:10.1177/0893318918768711

Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *47*, 149-155.

Thurstone, L. L. (1947). *Multiple factor analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Treem, J. W. (2012). Communicating expertise: Knowledge performances in professional service firms. *Communication Monographs*, *79*, 23-47. doi:10.1080/03637751.2011.646487

Why people are working longer. (2018, June 11). *Economist*. Retrieved from https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2018/06/11/why-people-are-working-longer

Wieland, S. M. B. (2010). Ideal selves as resources for the situated practice of identity. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*, 503-528. doi:10.1077/0893318910374938

Woo, D., Putnam, L. L., & Riforgiate, S. E. (2017). Identity work and tensions in organizational internships: A comparative analysis. *Western Journal of Communication*, *81*, 560-581. doi:10.1080/10570314.2017.1312510

Author Biographies

Leah M. Omilion-Hodges (PhD, Wayne State University) is an associate professor in the School of Communication at Western Michigan University. Her research interests include leadership communication, leadership-member, peer and team relationships in the context of intact workgroups, and interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary health care teams.

Scott E. Shank, Jr. (MA, Western Michigan University) is an associate basic course director and a part-time instructor in the School of Communication at Western Michigan University. His interests include leadership communication, mixed-methods research, and the interpenetration of metatheoretical perspectives in organizational research.

Christine M. Packard (BA, Western Michigan University) is a second year Master's student and teaching assistant in the School of Communication at Western Michigan University. Her main research interests include exploring the role of power dynamics and communicative exchanges in the workplace and young adult socialization and empowerment in academic and professional environments.