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ABSTRACT

Conventional leaders and leadership of the past are insufficient to meet the demands of the 21st Century. As we enter the new millennium, our world is characterised by unprecedented complexity, paradox, and unpredictability. Change is rapid and relentless. Today’s leaders face demands unlike any ever before faced. Standard leadership approaches that have served us well throughout much of history are quickly becoming liabilities. Conventional wisdom regarding leadership and many of its habits must be unlearned. The strong, decisive, charismatic, and independent leader may prove counterproductive in the new millennium and undermine a sustainable future. The challenges and opportunities of the 21st Century call for a new type of leader and leadership, indeed an entirely new and different way of thinking about leadership and of developing future leaders. Comprised of two parts, this paper explores the nascent millennium and eight sets of leadership qualities and capabilities expected to be crucial in the uncertain decades ahead. A significant gap remains between current leadership competencies and those needed in the future. Implications of this gap are discussed. Leadership development programs in industry and higher education have yet to refocus to produce the kind of leaders needed. Suggestions for reform are offered. Part I covers the 21st Century environment and context for leadership, compares conventional and emerging views of leadership, and documents the eight competence sets of The New Leadership. Part 2 examines leadership development, and presents an integrated curriculum for leadership development based on the eight leadership competency sets identified as crucial in the new millennium.
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INTRODUCTION

Orientation

As we enter the 21st Century there are serious questions arising concerning our capacity to deal with its challenges. Based on a review and synthesis across a range of literatures covering management, organisation, leadership, and learning and development, this paper identifies some of the issues, challenges, and opportunities likely to characterise the early decades of the new millennium. This new age will be increasingly challenging in ways not before experienced. This suggests that a new kind of leader and leadership\(^a\) are needed, and this paper outlines the most compelling of current thought on leadership qualities demanded of the 21st Century leader.

- Learnership – Leader as Learner and Teacher
- Transformational Potency
- Capacity for Complexity and Strategic Thought
- Leader as Integrator
- Service – Servant Leadership
- Emotional Intelligence and Authenticity
- Leader as Wise, Virtuous, and Ethical
- Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder

A fair degree of consensus exists across the literatures on the 21st Century canvas and the kinds of leaders and leadership that might there make their mark. From our analysis of over 250 sources,\(^b\) we have distilled eight distinct, primary categories of competence and capacity:

While aspects of these competencies have been recognised over time, others are new. (The eight sets are elaborated in the section The New Leadership.) The attention these competencies are receiving in both academic and practitioner literatures may represent a paradigm shift\(^c\) in leadership thought and practice, or what we refer to as “the leadership renaissance.” The renaissance leader has many of the attributes exceptional leaders have always had, but these are configured and balanced differently; and new qualities contribute to making the renaissance leader richer, deeper, better integrated, and more authentic than his or her counterparts of the past. Our synthesis of the emerging views of leadership suggests that the renaissance leader is personally more adaptive and resilient, broader in perspective, and more proactive than his or her predecessors. Importantly, the renaissance leader is also more effective in cultivating these habits and qualities in others. Taken together, the renaissance leader is expected to be more effective in the tumultuous and uncertain environment of the 21st Century.

The pie model shows the eight renaissance leader competency sets as individual segments. This reflects that there is no prioritisation intended or implied in the order these sets of attributes are presented. Nor is one set of competencies and capacities necessarily more complex or sophisticated than another, though we may understand or feel more familiarity with some more than others. We return to this model later in our discussion of leadership development for the 21st Century in Part II. And, as we argue throughout this paper, some measure of competence in each set is crucial. While no individual is expected to be master in all areas, teams, organisations, and communities will need to possess strengths across the eight dimensions to flourish in the new millennium. As individuals and groups increasingly shade all segments of the pie—that is, as they develop across all eight competency sets—they are approaching renaissance leadership.

This paper comprises seven major sections divided into two parts, in addition to the introduction, as follows:

Part I

- Leadership—Past and Present. Traditional / conventional perspective of leaders and leadership, including the positional-hierarchical view and

\(^a\) In this paper we do not generally distinguish leader and leadership, suggesting that both can be characterised by the same qualities. We acknowledge, however, that “leader” sounds like an individual and may be confused with positional, hierarchical leadership; further, “leader” has traditionally been and continues to be treated in the literature as “the head” or top echelons of an organisation. We, like Day (2001) and others, claim that leaders and leadership exist and are required at all levels of and throughout the organisation. This will be increasingly recognised as crucial in the evolving and emerging organisations of the new millennium.

\(^b\) The reference list at the end of this paper includes over 250 sources covering themes of relevance. Many sources examined of potential contribution were excluded due to their tangential or insubstantial nature.

\(^c\) A paradigm shift is a fundamental transformation in understanding phenomena, impacting beliefs, assumptions, biases, values, applications, and behaviour—everything related to the construct. Thomas Kuhn (1962) is credited with surfacing the importance of paradigms in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. See Hays (2008b) for a discussion and application of paradigm shifts.
predominance of the “Great Man” orientation. Significant differences between management and leadership, and their implications for individuals and organisations, and for leadership development.

- **The 21st Century.** Predictions and depictions concerning the 21st Century (of primary concern to management researchers and practitioners), including problems, opportunities, issues, emerging trends and their implications. Five major areas covered: globalisation, diversity, technology, uncertainty, and Knowledge Workers.

- **The New Leadership.** Emerging conceptions of leadership and the leadership qualities expected to be of great value in the nascent millennium. This is an elaboration on the eight competency sets comprising renaissance leadership as portrayed by multiple and diverse scholars in the field.

These three sections are followed by a brief conclusion of relevance to Part I. Major conclusions for Parts I and II are included at the end of Part II.

**Part II**

- **The Leadership Gap.** Gap between the more traditional / conventional views of leaders and leadership and those expected to be increasingly important as the 21st Century proceeds; and the research and practical implications of this gap.

- **Leadership Development.** Exploration of leadership development “state of the art”—how potential leaders are being prepared for their future roles, both industry models and management education. Contrast current practices with leadership qualities held to be essential for the coming decades. Implications for the gap between what we are producing and what we should be.

- **Leadership Development Reform for the 21st Century.** A range of leadership development objectives and strategies, both industry programs and management education, linked to the qualities established as essential in the coming decades of the new millennium.

**Conclusion:**

- Retrospective Overview. Major points and implications covered in the paper.

- Concluding Remarks. Contending with leadership challenges, including mandate for leadership development.

Following our proposals suggesting ways to reform leadership development programs, we conclude that while the way forward cannot be defined or predicted in comforting detail, it is with certainty that we must go forward and that we must advance in ways we never have previously. Leading through times changing more quickly than we can observe and interpret them is one of the great leadership challenges of the new millennium. That we must prepare our future leaders to meet this type of challenge is a given. How we go about that and how well we succeed have profound implications for both current and future leaders. We raise several of these implications, along with setting pointers for further research, in Concluding Remarks.

Renaissance Leadership: Transforming Leadership for the 21st Century consolidates diverse perspectives on the leadership challenges of the new millennium, and offers practical recommendations for developing leaders who possess the competencies necessary for leading today’s and tomorrow’s organisations and institutions. While the original sources referenced in this paper are worthwhile reading, often insightful and sometimes provocative, Renaissance Leadership: Transforming Leadership for the 21st Century distils and organises the vast range of descriptions, objectives, issues, and recommendations into one source of relevance and utility to academics and practitioners. This paper contrasts conventional and emerging notions of leadership, showing how evolving views and practices of leadership correspond to shifts in larger contextual and environmental conditions. Having intensely researched the topics of leadership and environment it is our view that the world is dramatically different than ever before and, thus, that the leadership challenge is entirely different. While threats and challenges loom large, we are heartened by the way leaders and leadership are beginning to be conceived. Renaissance leadership is very different. We are intrigued by the question of which comes first: Is renaissance leadership a consequence of environmental demands and an evolving world view, or is The New Leadership—as conveyed by the numerous sources cited in this paper—promoting the revolution in leadership theory and practice?

*Same As It Never Was*

*d We believe this spin on the lyrics of the Talking Heads song “Once in a Lifetime” (1980) to be thought-provoking. While it may have been true in the past that “the more things change, the more they stay the same” (attributed to Alphonse Karr), it appears that the 21st Century is and will continue to become dramatically different. Due to a number of
Forward

The 21st Century presents problems and opportunities the likes of which we have never had to contend. It would be difficult to spontaneously generate examples of previously unconceived or inconceivable developments, but the ability to envisage possible futures is a crucial quality of thinking that leaders will increasingly need in the new millennium. And, this is only the beginning. Not only must our leaders be able to anticipate possibilities and discern emerging trends, but they will need to identify those of most concern or opportunity and mobilise people to most effectively respond to serious threats and capitalise upon lucrative prospects.

There is much that characterises the 21st Century and, thus, that indicates the leadership qualities demanded. These attributes will be described in subsequent sections of this paper. Some of this is not particularly striking, and may appear as a continuation of the way things are. Greater use of the internet and virtual operations are obvious examples, as are the likelihood of an increasingly diverse workforce and the pre-eminence of the global marketplace. This suggests that 21st Century leaders have to be “global citizens” who—having transcended parochialism—embrace diversity, straddle continents, and penetrate complexity, knowing how to make the most of every opportunity that presents itself. This is a tall order. Crosby, speaking pessimistically about management of the 20th Century, noted in 1992 that, “The 21st century will provide a clean slate of opportunity because it will require management to deal completely with the whole world” (p. 24).

And my world keeps getting smaller every day –Neil Sedaka

One of the most interesting aspects making this new millennium different is the kind of leadership needed and, with time, the kind of leader deemed acceptable. Where for most of recorded history leaders were expected to be stalwart, tireless, bold, decisive, and dispassionate, amongst other extraordinary traits, the role of the contemporary leader is changing, and must. Strong back, thick skin, and hard head are qualities in decreasing demand, while other qualities are increasingly sought, including a range of behaviours more associated with the feminine than the masculine. Notions of who leads and how are evolving, along with our planet that is becoming smaller, yet more complex and dynamic by the hour. With any luck, our species—and the world as we know it—will survive through our collective intelligence, tenacity, courage, adaptability, and creativity—some of the survival qualities for the new millennium.

Underscoring this and other points relevant to this paper, Heifetz and Laurie (2003) write:

Adaptive problems have no ready solutions. They require that people apply their collective intelligence and skills to the work only they can do. This, in turn, requires that they unlearn the habits of a lifetime spent as a manager, learn to meet challenges that they cannot meet with their existing skills, and develop the capacity to explore and understand competing values at stake (emphasis added) (p.9).

It may sound as if the leader of the 21st Century is Superman or Wonder Woman, a perpetuation of the mythic-hero leader of the past. This couldn’t be further from the truth. If there is anything super about individuals as leaders in the new millennium it is in their ability to collaborate; to build bridges amongst and across diverse places, people, and ideas; to create power in the collective; and to nurture teams and communities that sustainably lead themselves. Des and Picken (2000 emphasise:

To compete in the information age, firms must increasingly rely on the knowledge, skills, experience, and judgment of all their people. The entire organization, collectively, must create and assimilate new knowledge, encourage innovation, and learn to compete in new ways in an ever-changing competitive environment. (Emphasis on “all” in the original; we would underscore “collectively, as well) (p.18).

The authors use the generic “people” on occasion in this paper to implicate not just “employees,” but members of communities, congregations, and institutions of all ilk. While this paper has a management slant, the authors intend to address and concern all kinds of people, not just managers or the managed.

* The authors use the generic “people” on occasion in this paper to implicate not just “employees,” but members of communities, congregations, and institutions of all ilk. While this paper has a management slant, the authors intend to address and concern all kinds of people, not just managers or the managed.

* In one of her interesting and informative papers on gendered issues, Su Olsen writes of Xena (as in Warrior Princess) as the epitomised super female, the corollary of Ulysses of the Odyssey.
The leader of the future shares leadership and power.\textsuperscript{1} He or she knows that problems are too big and complex to solve and handle alone, that opportunities are too important and multi-faceted to pursue single-handedly. He or she appreciates that no matter how powerful the leadership push or pull and effective in the short-term, such “acts” of leadership are unsustainable. To be effective, people must lead themselves; but to do so, they must develop the skills, knowledge, courage, initiative, self-efficacy, and other attributes every leader needs. Building that shared leadership is one of the prime objectives and requisite abilities of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century leader (see “Leader as Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder”). This is not to say that conventional leadership (that is, leading over others) is not necessary at decisive points. Guidance, direction, even command may be required at times. There are always consequences. The judicious 21\textsuperscript{st} Century leader understands if and when such leadership is needed, and what the implications are for asserting authority and command.

Review of the Literature

Our study set out to determine what the leadership requirements of the near-future are and how prepared our organisations and institutions are to fulfil those leadership demands. We thought it necessary to explore a range of literatures touching on different, but related topics. First, there are two future-oriented aspects:

1. Depictions (and sometimes predictions) of the future – what we refer to herein alternatively as the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century or the new millennium. This is the environment in which we can expect to find ourselves in the approaching decades. And,

2. Descriptions and prescriptions for leaders and leadership in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century—what we are calling Renaissance leadership. Here, we draw on notable and influential authorities on leadership.

By exploring these two future-oriented subjects against the context of relevant past and current leadership paradigms we sought to reveal whether or not there were any significant gaps in the theory and practice of leadership, and to identify specifically what these gaps and their implications might be. Specifically, are current beliefs about and practices of leadership sufficient to meet the leadership demands of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century?

Next, we took a look at the current literature covering leadership development, both from a professional development and management education perspective. Again, we wanted to ascertain whether or not and to what extent leadership development programs are effectively addressing the needs of 21\textsuperscript{st} Century leaders and the organisations and institutions that will depend on them. Our comparison of the leadership development “state of the art” with forecasts concerning future leadership requirements reveals several significant gaps. These gaps and their implications are summarised in two sections of the review of the literature below, The Leadership Gap and The Leadership Development Gap.

LEADERSHIP—PAST AND PRESENT

This section presents a brief, concise overview of leadership and its evolution from early days to the present. We do not intend to cover the subject exhaustively, as that is beyond the scope of this paper and has been done handsomely by others.\textsuperscript{2} Our purpose is to position leadership, conventional and contemporary, as opposed to emerging, non-traditional forms of leadership; the latter to be covered in the section titled The New Leadership. The former provides important context for where we are today, and sets the stage for considerations and implications regarding leadership and, particularly, leadership development for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century.

The Great Man theory of leadership is the earliest established view. This view essentially holds that individuals are born with potential for greatness, endowed with special personalities and abilities that destine them for leadership and success in those roles. They acquire power, wisdom, and courage naturally (Yukl, 2002). The Great Man theory was prevalent amongst scholars during the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century and into the 20\textsuperscript{th}, and may have influenced the “inherent view of leadership” that embodied much of early 20th Century thought on leadership (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991) and was largely manifest in the trait theories that gained ground in the early decades of last century.

Influenced by the Great Man theory, trait theorists also assumed that leaders were born; they possessed personal characteristics differing from the masses who, generally, were keen or needed to be led (Hollander, 1986). Traits included appearance,\textsuperscript{3}

---

\textsuperscript{b} From “Sunshine Superman,” by Donovan, from the 1966 album \textit{Sunshine Superman}. This was one of the authors’ favourite songs as a youth.

\textsuperscript{1} Some of the sources the authors have found to be useful with respect to the topics addressed herein include: Bryman (2007), Hogan and Kaiser (2005), Humphreys and Einstein (2003), van Seters and Field (1990), and Winston and Patterson (2006).
intelligence, strength, bearing, and even station or position in society. Trait theories dominated leadership research until the 1940s, but were eventually overcome by the fact that it was impossible to identify traits that explained and predicted leadership under all conditions (Nye, 2008). The assumption that Great Men and those with leadership potential are born (not bred) kept attention away from developmental aspects of leadership (Hollander, 1986): what experiences and education contribute to a leader’s development? There was also an aspect of elitism in these views: as leaders are born privileged, only the privileged could become leaders. We don’t know if such beliefs actually hindered the less advantaged or just reflected the bias inherent in society. As a postscript, trait theories are not entirely dead, as some current competency models suggest that a set of characteristics can describe effective leadership (see, for example, Hollenbeck, McCall, and Silzer, 2006).

Dissatisfied with the traits-centered approach, scholars turned to behavioural theories of leadership (Nye, 2008; Yukl, 2002). Behavioural theories, emphasising interactions with followers – how leaders should behave – were pervasive during the period spanning the 1940s to the 1960s. Early research in this area centred on classification of leadership behavior: which leadership behaviors were most effective across the broadest range of situations? Despite much research, it was difficult to identify consistently present and effective behaviour (Schiro, 1999).

Focus began to shift to situational aspects of leadership in the 1960s, leadership behaviour appropriate to context or contingent on the situation (Nye, 2008; Yukl, 2002). Fiedler’s (1967) least preferred co-worker model, Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969) situational leadership theory, and Wofford and Liska’s (1993) path-goal theory of leadership reflect this new approach. It was thought that leadership style in interaction with followers and the situation can determine the effectivenes of group performance: different leadership styles are most effective in different types of situations (Ashour, 1973; Fiedler, 1983; Vecchio, 1977).

In situational leadership theory model (SLT), leaders vary their focus on task and relationship behaviours to deal with different levels of follower readiness (ability and willingness), Hersey and Blanchard (1969). Successful leadership can be achieved with the right leadership behaviour and it is influenced by the level of the follower’s readiness (Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Nelson, 1993; Fernandez and Vecchio, 1997). The advent of behavioural and situational models and theories advanced leadership theory from something with which we are born to something we can learn, giving rise to the leadership development movement.

By far the most influential leadership theory currently in vogue is transformational leadership. Transformational and transactional leadership theory was expanded by many scholars, led by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass during the 1980s and 1990s (see, for example, Bass, 1985; Bass, et al., 1987; and Bass and Avolio, 1994). Transformational leadership theory involves contingent reinforcement. Leaders’ praise and rewards motivate followers, and negative feedback and disciplinary actions correct them. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) explained that the leader makes assignments or consults with followers about what should be done in exchange for implicit or explicit rewards and the desired allocation of resources. Thus, the transactional leader is keen to emphasise the giving of rewards if followers achieve the agreed level of performance standards (Bass et al., 1987). Transactional leadership theory is objective; it assumes that leaders and followers act rationally in accordance with the contractual relationship and fair transactions.

While transactional leadership focuses on the transactional relations of leaders with subordinates, transformational leadership attempts to include four components: charisma or idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration [most treatments of transformational leadership deal with these four components; Humphreys (2005) provides a good overview]. Transformational leaders attempt to elevate the needs of the follower in line with the leader’s own goals and objectives, while the transactional leader concentrates on maintaining the status quo by satisfying the follower’s current psychic and material needs (Bass et al., 1987). Thus, the focus of transformational leadership lies on the inner dynamics of a freely-embraced change of heart in the realm of core values and motivation, on intellectual stimulation, and a commitment to treating followers as goals, not means, while transactional leadership focuses on outcomes and aims for behavioural compliance not necessarily consistent with the genuine needs of followers (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). Transformational leadership is also considered moral leadership based on values, vision, charisma, and the leader’s concern for others in the organization. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) write.

---

1 The authors respectfully acknowledge James MacGregor Burns as the “father of transformational leadership,” he having defined and distinguished transformational and transactional leadership in his pivotal book Leadership (1978).

k This simplification neglects very real concerns regarding who determines the moral and values set, or problems when morals and values amongst the
If transformational leadership is authentic and true to self and others, it is characterized by high moral and ethical standards in each of the dimensions it aims to develop the leader as a moral person and creates a moral environment for the organization” (p. 191).

Transformational leadership theory continues to be elaborated and distinguished. Though there is little doubt of its primacy at present, there is disagreement amongst scholars as to how narrow or broad transformational leadership is and what it centrally concerns. Of relevance here is debate concerning Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears and Lawrence, 2002) and transformational leadership: is one a subset of the other, and if so which comes first?\(^1\) In our categorisation, we split the two, finding sufficient reason to treat Service / Servant Leadership and Transformational Potency as separate leadership constructs (see The New Leadership).

This quick leadership retrospective leads to several conclusions. Leadership evolution has progressed from a view that leaders are born and belong to an elite minority to a view that leaders are bred. They make themselves, or can be developed, or both. Bennis (2003) writes that “true leaders are not born, but made, and usually self-made. Leaders invent themselves” (p. 33). DePree (1989) agrees: “Leadership is an art, something to be learned over time” (p. 3). Thomas (2008) would also agree: “Crucible experiences, when properly set up, managed and mined, can help aspiring companies develop their next generation of outstanding leaders” (p. 18).\(^m\)

This has important implications for access to leadership and its potential breadth. Leadership need not remain the prerogative of the few. Limited by neither traits nor social class, many more individuals can, at least potentially, become leaders. This is good for not only individuals, but for organisations as well. The broader spectrum of qualities individuals might bring to leadership positions adds richness and variety—a hybrid vigour\(^n\)—that may make organisations adaptive and resilient.

Leadership has moved from something a man is (with notable exceptions, men have been the leaders throughout history) to something an individual does, a way of behaving in dynamic interaction with others and within situational contexts. Greater consideration is given to the nature of followers, for example (see discussion of followership under Service – Servant Leadership). Leadership is coming to be seen as a social process, consisting of mutual influence (Hernez-Broome and Hughes, 2004) and increasingly a distributed process (Crevani, Lindgren, and Packendorff, 2007; Spillane, 2005). The decentralised, networked world demands a new kind of leadership, one vested not in a single individual or elite minority, but on many. The many, for the first time in history, will all have necessary access to information; they must be willing and able to use that intelligence to make time-sensitive decisions in dynamic situations.

This notwithstanding, conventional thought continues to envisage leadership as vested in a person (the leader), the capabilities he or she has, and the relationships and interactions this person has with others. McKee, Boyatzis and Johnston (2008, ix) eloquently underscore this point about seeing leaders as single arbiters of greatness:

> To us, there is no nobler goal than to lead people to excellence, fulfillment, and collective achievement. Our lives, our society, and our planet have changed rapidly and unpredictably in recent years—and this is probably just the tip of the iceberg. If we are to find our way to a better world, a more stable environment, and societies in which all people have access to life’s gifts, we need people who can see beyond today, spark hope instead of despair, and draw others into an intentional journey of transformation.

\(^{1}\) Humphreys (2005) and Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) undertake comparisons of transformational and servant leadership. The latter allude to the question “to serve or to transform?” We think a synthesis is possible.

\(^{m}\) Crucible experiences (trial by fire), transformative processes involving challenge, adaptation, and learning, are discussed in Bennis and Thomas (2002, 2007) and Thomas (2008).

\(^{n}\) Hybrid vigour seems to be experiencing a renaissance of appreciation and application in management and organisation studies under the concept of “requisite variety” (see, for example, Espinosa, Harnden, and Walker, 2007). In complexity science, requisite variety implies alternatives or choices—the more choices a system has (and enabled to make them), the more robust it will be. We liken this to hybrid vigour, the evolutionary advantage of outbreeding and obtaining the virtues of genetically distinct parents. (We are neither cyberneticists nor geneticists…) We employ the organic metaphors of homogeneity and heterogeneity in our work with teams, with respect to performance and effectiveness (see Stacey, 2002, for an application of this).
need more great leaders who think and act in new ways—women and men unafraid to travel the road less taken, the road that requires vision and courage.

As we proceed further into the new millennium, there still seems to be a belief that the better the leader the better the performance, due to some influence he or she exerts over others. Leaders still get the credit for success and the blame for failure. And, there have been too few success stories and many sagas of horror in recent decades. There is some suggestion that conventional leadership is being supplanted because it no longer works. By conventional, we do not mean bad, but inappropriate given the circumstances of our changing world. By definition, conventional leadership became conventional because it worked. It was prevalent and favoured. Managerial leadership, for example, was an integral part of scientific management and the growth of the corporation and bureaucracy. Table 4 highlights some of the distinctions between conventional leaders and emerging views of leaders and leadership. To a lesser extent, the left column of Table 1, managers and management, reflects a view of leaders that harks to an era preceding the current “age of uncertainty” (see the following section, The 21st Century).

Conventional leaders drove progress for much of the 19th and 20th Centuries. Their strengths, however, may now be liabilities. With their conservative, risk-averse, and mechanistic tendencies, and their penchant for hierarchy, positional power, and centrality, conventional leaders cannot contend effectively with dynamic and uncertain 21st Century realities. They are just not sufficiently flexible and adaptive. If this weren’t grave enough, conventional leaders have gotten themselves and their organisations into trouble through unethical, self-serving behaviours, and misguided heroism. Kuczmarski and Kuczmarski (2007) write

They (ego centric leaders) focused on their needs rather than the needs of their people...did not deliver as promised, committed serious ethical errors, lacked a solid set of values, and incurred both mistrust and disdain. They also cost their organizations dearly in terms of prestige, reputation, and financial well-being. (p.6)

It is unfortunate that today’s leaders have gotten “a bad rap” for the failings of a few. But, perhaps, recent dramatic and much-publicised scandals have actually done us a service by diverting attention from leaders seen or behaving as if they are invincible and above the law to focus upon leaders who are doing their best to serve the common good. It is an interesting paradox that we seem to be coming full-circle. Emerging views of leadership are largely concerned with attributes such as character and authenticity—who the leader is. We may have had to explore the objective, rational, and scientific only to conclude that we are and should be human beings. The good news is we now know that many of the competencies required of the new millennium can be learned. Our primary task may be unlearning the habits of the past.\(^a\)

I'm standing at the crossroads\(^b\)

As we enter the new millennium, two (mixed) metaphors for leadership are apt: the “bubble has burst” and “leadership is at a crossroads.” The “bubble has burst” infers the notion of leader as superhuman, heroic, infallible, one man at the top, in charge and in control is vaporising (see Endnote ii). Such individuals are few and far between, if they exist at all. Aspiring to reach the heights of great power, prestige, and influence may still drive the ambitious, and lauding those who seemingly have “made it” may be common amongst us commoners, but leadership vested in one Great Man is increasingly seen as possible or desirable. This brings us to the second metaphor, that of “leadership at the crossroads.” While leadership throughout history has been seen as the prerogative and duty of the privileged and very minority elite, it is increasingly seen as a collective and shared enterprise (see Endnote iii). For the lion’s share of human evolution, our vast majority was uneducated and explicably disenfranchised. Power and control were vested and remained in the privileged who, in the best of times, ruled mercifully, if paternalistically.

\(^a\) The following are useful sources for “unlearning”: Becker, Hyland, and Acutt (2006); Bettis and Prahalad (1995); Cegarra-Navarro and Moya (2005); Cegarra-Navarro and Dewhurst (2006); de Holan, Phillips, and Lawrence (2004); Rebernik and Sirec (2007); and Sinkula (2002.)

\(^b\) From Ry Cooder’s production of “Crossroads,” written by blues legend Robert Johnson, and immortalised in the 1986 film Crossroads.
Table 1. Typical Comparisons and Contrasts between Manager and Leader Characteristics. Based on Allio (2005); Day and Schoemaker (2008); Kanungo (1998); Kent (2005), Kotterman (2006); and Taborda (1999).³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management – Managerial Characteristics</th>
<th>Leadership – Leader Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on day-to-day activities and tasks.</td>
<td>Focus on strategy and long-term objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes and improvements are incremental and in accord with accepted ways of doing things.</td>
<td>Change is fundamental, transforming the essence of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised, hierarchical, positional power.</td>
<td>Decentralised, flat, distributed power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command and Control.</td>
<td>Shared decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposed discipline.</td>
<td>Self-discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement strictly limited to “need to know.”</td>
<td>Wide involvement and engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus.</td>
<td>Diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency – doing things right. Attention to performance and consistency with respect to standards, procedures, and norms.</td>
<td>Effectiveness – doing the right things. Discern and focus on the priorities of greatest overall impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content.</td>
<td>Context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on trees – getting the elements and subsystems right.</td>
<td>Focus on forest – how all the trees comprise a whole and the relationship of the whole to other systems in the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands and works effectively within the culture of the organisation.</td>
<td>Envisages and compellingly communicates new culture and other possibilities. Leverages existing culture while embodying the change needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo.</td>
<td>Future State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer.</td>
<td>Visionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising.</td>
<td>Galvanising; mobilising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td>Why? Why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-wielding.</td>
<td>Empowering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ For readers keen on knowing more about comparisons and distinctions between leaders and managers, Bedeian and Hunt (2006) provide a fascinating exchange on the subject, covering both historical and contextual aspects. Teo-Dixon and Monin (2007) trace a provocative evolution of and between management and leadership in their qualitative analysis of the language of leadership. Zigarmi, et al (2005) distinguish leaders and managers across a number of dimensions and orientations; see, especially, p. 173).
With widespread education and a swelling middle-class, such governance is inappropriate and untenable. The vast majority can and should have more say in the affairs of their work and community, and more control over their own destiny. These are not the words of idealists and social change provocateurs. Such is the evolution of society and leadership. If shifts toward shared leadership and power weren’t occurring as a result of changing values and endemic lifestyles, they would need to occur in any event due to the increasing complexity of and rapidity of change. As we argue elsewhere in this paper: no one individual (or nation for that matter) can unilaterally solve difficult problems or make the best decisions; but, collectively, we can.

Management or Leadership—Not Just Semantics

Numerous authors have compared managers and leaders or otherwise entered into debate concerning whether or not they differ (Kotterman, 2006). We believe management and leadership differ across a number of important dimensions, and offer a range of contrasts and distinctions in the table below (see next page).

We do not suggest that either management or leadership is better than the other, and we generally agree with most current scholars who maintain organisations need both management and leadership, as discussed below. We include this section because distinctions bear on how leadership development has been focused until now. A bias (however unconscious or unintended) toward management over leadership development has had significant consequences for today’s organisations. This bias may be the result of pervasive assumptions and beliefs about leadership and who leads. It might just be a natural consequence of management skills being easier to define, instruct, and develop than leadership competencies. In any event, leadership development for the 21st Century must be transformed, and an understanding of the key differences between management and leadership is essential for needed reform.

Based on his review of the literature, Kotterman (2006) concludes that both leadership and management are important: while there are some overlaps between leading and managing, and sometimes managers lead and leaders manage, there are key differences and organisations require both. Kotterman (2006) makes several additional points of relevance here: Senior managers often “believe they are leading when in fact they are managing” and, as Kotter (1995) claimed, “most U.S. corporations are typically over-managed and under-led” (p.16). McCartney and Campbell (2005) assert that individuals can be leaders or managers, both, or neither. They add that people have varying levels of both leadership and management competence; both are needed for success, and individuals need to continue learning and developing whatever their level in the organisation. They note that the presence of either leadership or management competence can lead to a person being recognised as “high-potential,” but derailment is possible if the individual does not continue to develop both leadership and management skills.

Kent (2005) has also articulated distinctions between leaders and managers, and argued that individuals need to develop both leadership and management skills. Effective leaders and managers will be able to apply the capacities of either as the situation requires. Young and Dulewicz (2007) agree, noting that successful executives tend to be good at both leading and managing. Neuschel (2005) writes:

[S]uccessful organizations are run by men and women who are in combination both managers and leaders. All of us possess some of the qualities of each. The problem is not in deciding which to be, but rather in achieving the right balance of the managerial and leadership characteristics that each individual executive should possess. (p.30)

THE 21ST CENTURY

It’s the end of the world as we know it… –REM

Though they write of both problems and opportunities arising in the coming decades, the scenarios postulated by futurists are by and large benign. Most of the topics covered in the various treatments on the 21st Century (future trends) we reviewed can be segmented into four inter-related divisions: technology, globalisation, diversity, and Knowledge.

1 Complexity is larger than leadership and far exceed the boundaries of this paper. While skimming its surface does not do it justice, touching upon complexity is inescapable, given our aspirations to discuss leadership in the 21st Century. A couple valuable sources germane to this paper include (Espinosa, Harnden, and Walker, 2007; Hays, 2007; Plowman, et al., 2007; and van Eijnatten, 2004; See, also, Footnote 15 (hybrid vigour / requisite variety).

1 On the other hand, Lorenzi (2004) worries that “the ‘overmanaged and underled’ thesis has … produced a general denigration of management as an important business role” (p. 284), adding that “Good leadership requires good management skills; good management is an essential part of prosocial leadership” (ibid).

1 See also Pearce and Manz (2005): “The end of leadership as we know it,” as discussed in Endnote iii.
Workers, and a fifth category, uncertainty, which pervades most considerations of the forthcoming decades. Uncertainty and unpredictability have always been a part of human existence and something with which leaders have had to contend. But, there is little disputing that the pace and complexity of change is unprecedented and only likely to continue to accelerate and extend. Technology will continue to increase speed and efficiency; globalisation will change the “map” of operations as the world continues to become a smaller place; diversity will reign, changing the composition of our work-force, suppliers, customers, and other stakeholders; and the inevitable swelling of Knowledge Workers and the impact of the knowledge society will dramatically and forever change leadership and organisations.

These predictions, while reasonable, will unfold within a context of uncertainty. Never before have so many been so engaged in and with an ever-changing environment. Our needs for a sense of stability will be severely challenged. Those likely to flourish under such conditions will possess superlative resilience and adaptability.\(^1\) Going with the flow will take on an entirely new significance. In this environment, attitudes and behaviours must be much more organic, more naturally malleable and mutable. Our guides and guidelines will have to be visions, principles, and values, as directives, rules, regulations, fixed procedures, and stipulations will quickly become counterproductive and irrelevant. Those things that have traditionally made us feel safe will be our undoing.

The more salient features of the 21\(^{st}\) Century are arrayed around the four segments of the “future trends pie” and superimposed over the uncertainty oval in Figure 1, along with references to researchers and authors who have published on the respective issues. These closely related trends, or forces, have significant implications for organisations and institutions of all types. What we do, when, where and how we do it, and with and for whom are all impacted by these environmental factors.

**Globalisation.** Globalisation, in large part, is an inevitable consequence of advances in technology. Notably the internet and the access it has provided to citizens the world over to information and the connectivity it permits to people virtually no matter where they are. True, softening of regimes, borders, and trade restrictions are enabling greater traffic of people, products, and ideas. This is not to say that everyone has it good. Poverty, sickness, and injustice reign supreme is some areas of the world, and must be of concern to us all. In the globalised early-21\(^{st}\) Century environment enabled if not driven by digital communication and media, we cannot distance ourselves from these hotspots. For better or worse, we are all connected and interdependent. It does not require soothsaying abilities to predict that the coming generations will experience an upswing in global citizenship such as we have never seen, characterised by acts of brotherhood and stewardship on a grand scale, partially as recognition that we are all in this together, harking to notions of “spaceship earth” popularised in the 60s.\(^7\)

Of relevance to this paper generally and, here, to globalisation and diversity as to the next feature of the 21\(^{st}\) Century, are Mintzberg and Gosling’s (2002) characteristics of effective managers. They present five characteristics, as shown below. We have linked the five to the respective dimensions of our eight leadership competencies for the 21\(^{st}\) Century.

1. Managing Self – intrapersonal skills concerning self-knowledge, self-esteem / security, and self-control. This aligns with our Emotional Intelligence and Authenticity dimension.

2. Managing Relationships – interpersonal and collaborative skills: the ability to build and sustain relationships with people from a broad spectrum of diverse backgrounds—our Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder dimension. The ability to perceive what others may need and want and to help them see how they can obtain desired ends by working together may also point to the Leader as Integrator.

3. Managing Organisations – these are the typical managerial competencies (analytical and functional skills). We have not included these amongst our eight sets of qualities these are central to and dominant in conventional leadership in our view.

4. Managing Context – Here, Mintzberg and Gosling (2002) were concerned with the international, global context. Being exposed to and coming to understand people from diverse backgrounds and seeing what makes the world go round from different points of view enrich ones understanding of self and exposes the limits of parochial worldviews. This falls firstly into our competency set Capacity for Complexity and Strategic Thought and somewhat less so into Leader as Wise, Virtuous, and Ethical. The able context manager is, as we discuss elsewhere herein, enlightened, the

\(^{1}\) See Bennis and Thomas (2002) with respect to adaptive capacity. The single-most important attribute of successful leaders, they explain, is the ability to make the most of difficult situations and learn from challenging experiences.

5. Managing Change – Closely linked to our Transformational Potency dimension, managing change concerns both personal and organisational change (or learning and development), personal transformation sometimes necessary to achieve external change. Also of relevance to this paper and a point to which we will later return is that Mintzberg and Gosling (2002), while believing management skills can be learned, offer little encouragement for the development of management competence in the classroom. In a vicious cycle, individuals cannot learn management without management context. We agree in principle, but disagree that management cannot be learned in the classroom. As we later show, there are effective means for creating relevant context in the classroom, including the provision of management work and using diversity.

Diversity. As technology fuels and enables globalisation, globalisation, in turn, promotes diversity. Migration, alone, will account for dramatic demographic shifts, changing the face of developed countries forever. Even without this major shift, the worker of the 21st Century is a very different individual than ever before. With evolving values and lifestyles, longer life spans and improved health, and other factors, the new worker looks, sounds, and acts differently, expects more from his or her employer (indeed from community and society), and is unwilling to accept unfair treatment or unreasonable demands. With employment possibilities – for the first time, really – available to people anywhere in the world, employers are going to have to be even more attentive to serving their employees—catering to needs, preferences, quality of life and work-life balance issues, and professional development; and, in general, creating workplace environments that are caring, accepting, humanising, and offer more than just a pay check.

Technology. Coming full circle, technology will increasingly be driven by global competition: the need to do things faster, cheaper, and better will only continue. Advancements made elsewhere will be more readily incorporated locally. Ideas – the great generators of progress – will come from harnessing the collective brilliance of a diverse workforce, some of whom may never even physically be in the same space. None of this comes automatically, however, or naturally. Leaders of the 21st Century are going to have to be consummate creators of community, architects and bridge-builders that bring people together and enable and inspire them to do great things. They will need to be the role models for overcoming the challenges and making the most of diversity.

Uncertainty. With the complexity and speed of change only likely to increase, uncertainty will define our lives. The future is more unpredictable than it has ever been and the planning window even narrower because of the multiplicity of things to consider (quantity and kind of variables) and the complicated nature of their inter-relationships, and the speed with which opportunities and threats come upon us. This makes traditional planning and preparation difficult, if not impossible (Hinterhuber, 1996). We can, however, better learn to read emerging trends and consider their implications (Day and Schoemaker 2008). Scharmer (2001) advocates that leaders “develop the capacity for ‘precognition,’ the ability to sense and actualize emerging potentials… before they become manifest in the market place” (p. 137). He describes this precognitive capacity as “tacit knowledge prior to its embodiment, or self-transcending knowledge (op cited; emphasis in the original). At the risk of over-simplifying, Scharmer (2001) explains that infrastructures that promote shared action (praxis), shared reflection, and shared will are required to foster a team’s or organisation’s ability to precognate (self-transcend knowledge) that will enable the perceiving of emerging trends. We will return to this notion in exploring leadership development.

We can also exercise our responsiveness and flexibility through scenario and contingency planning (Schwartz, 1991). Day and Schoemaker (2008) counsel that vigilant leaders develop strategic foresight, which they characterise as having longer time horizons, greater flexibility, and incorporating widely diverse inputs, through the use of scenario planning, real-options thinking, and dynamic monitoring. They use an “outside-in approach to strategic planning that starts with the outside world, as opposed to an inside-out process that starts with growth targets and other financial performance measures” (p. 47).

Graetz (2002) emphasises the importance of bringing strategic thinking into strategic planning, a process that produces creative and synergistic tension between the emergent, intuitive, and synthetic cognition and the more analytic, rational process of planning. This permits leaders to contend more effectively with the volatile and unpredictable environment, focusing strategy on continuous adaptation and improvement.

---

Readers are directed to Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (2000) for broad and helpful coverage of cross-cultural differences and the development of competencies that enhance the effectiveness of cross-cultural interaction.
Technology continues to change the nature of business and will only accelerate the speed of change and influence of other trends, such as making the world economy more competitive (van Opstal, 1998); increasing outsourcing effectiveness and internationalisation (Cetron and Davies, 2008); increasing knowledge work and value of knowledge workers (Davenport, 2001; Lawler, 2001); expanding telecommuting (Mamaghani, 2006; Matathia and Saltzman, 1998; Townsend, DeMarie, and Hendrockson, 1998); and may give competitive age to younger employees who are likely to remain more technologically savvy (Bodie, Contardo, and Childs (2007) Marston, 2007). Leaders will need to stay abreast of technological advancements, possess a modicum of relevant skills, and appreciate the needs and expectations of the workforce. 

The world’s increasing interdependence and interconnectivity will continue to impact business and organisational life, making everything more complex than ever before (Cetron and Davies, 2008; Maciariello, 2006; Mamaghani; 2006; van Opstal, 1998; Rao, 2006). Greater options and opportunities may be offset by greater risk and complication. There will continue to be vast migrations of people and jobs, with jobs flowing to cheaper labour markets in developing countries (Spreitzer and Cummings, 2001; Cetron and Davies, 2008), and huge immigration to developed countries (Hankin, 2005; Cetron and Davies, 2008). Even managerial and professional jobs are likely be outsourced (Goldsmith, 2006). Leaders must be globally aware and become “global citizens.” This is likely to require new leadership development pathways and continuous renewal. 

Figure 1. Future Trends Pie, reflecting the four segments, Technology, Globalisation, Diversity, and Knowledge Workers, against a pervasive background or context of Uncertainty. The authors acknowledge that Kanungo identified (1) business globalisation, (2) explosion of Information Technology, (3) diverse labour force and market, and (4) increasing demands for business social responsibility as four mega-trends in his insightful work of 1998.
The better we can foresee coming challenges and respond to them confidently and creatively, the greater our competitive advantage over those who do not attempt to (Spreitzer and Cummings, 2001). Mroz (2006) warns, however, that despite our best efforts to predict and plan, events will happen beyond our control. We need to be adaptable and resilient, not prescribed. To that end, it seems that developing leaders, indeed all employees, to better exist with uncertainty (tolerance for ambiguity) would be a good course of action (Schwandt, 2005). The work that Luthans and others are doing on positive psychology / positive psychological capital and its application in the workplace is promising in this regard (Luthans, 2002; Luthans, Luthans, and Luthans, 2004; Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman, 2007; Luthans and Youssef, 2007). These researchers are exploring the value of healthy, constructive states such as optimism, resilience, efficacy, hope, confidence, and courage, and related behaviours such as citizenship and principled action. There are striking parallels between the focus of this positive scholarship and descriptions of and prescriptions for Renaissance leadership.

While we may not be able to predict and control events with much certainty, we can prepare ourselves to contend with the unknown, what Whyte (2004) refers to as the frontier “over the horizon.” To help employees and future leaders equip themselves for an uncertain future, we can (and, perhaps, must) begin taking them out of their comfort zones, while at the same time helping them develop the coping skills and positive attitudes that will enable them to navigate uncharted terrain (Day and Schoemaker, 2008). In so doing, individuals become more confident and competent at leading themselves, and less dependent on external, superior authority. This is not an easy task. In Threshold and Transformation, Hays (2008b) examines the dynamic between leader and led that most often reinforces the status quo and maintains the superior-subordinate relationship, with counterproductive consequences, including passivity and dependency. Even when the leader strives to empower and “let go,” pressures to remain “in charge,” ironically from subordinates themselves in some cases, are often too powerful to resist. As control is reasserted and things get back to normal, the prevailing conditions and behaviours become further entrenched.

To overcome this self-reinforcing cycle, followers must mount and successfully pass through a mental “threshold” that consists of self-limiting ways of thinking and associated behaviours. Examples of such thinking are that it is the leader’s responsibility to provide precise guidelines and clear boundaries (to tell them what they have to do, when, and how) and to solve problems for them. This may be a threshold for many of us in leadership positions, as well, which partially explains why empowerment and decentralisation are not as easily done as said. In one of many paradoxes Hays (2008b) discusses, leaders must take followers with them through the portal. Once through, both are transformed. The leader can “let go,” and followers can “take control.” The process may be arduous, risky, and painful, as might be any journey of exploration, but the payoffs are considerable and perhaps even vital in the coming decades of the 21st Century. Leaders must be willing and able to take their followers to places neither have ever been, and they must be willing and able to lead by letting go: having equipped followers with the courage, skills, and attitudes of explorers and adventurers—the ability to lead themselves and to work effectively in autonomous teams; and, moreover, the confidence to work in uncertain environments with few if any guidelines or imposed limits. Considerable trust is needed on both parts (Brower, Schoorman, and Tan, 2000; Salamon and Robinson, 2008).

Knowledge Workers. Davenport (2001) claims that the next social order will be a knowledge society. Lawler (2001) speaks of the era of human capital. In this dawning age, knowledge is the key resource, and Knowledge Workers are those who wield the power. Knowledge Workers will be the dominant group in this society and its most valuable asset (Drucker, 2002; Teo-Dixon and Monin, 2007). Kuczmasrski and Kuczmasrski (2007) maintain that “people business” is the next management frontier: people in organisations are potentially the best competitive advantage organisations will have, as it is people who work and get results within organisations. “Focusing on people instead of profits will prove profitable in the long term,” quirks Sanders (2008; 180). Unleashing the potential of Knowledge Workers and sustaining their commitment and performance will be a crucial challenge of leaders in the 21st century. Covey (2006), Glaser (2005), and others stress that it is a people

---

x Amongst their recommendations for leadership change for the 21st Century, Des and Picken (2000) declare that leaders “…must ‘loosen up’ the organisation—stimulating innovation, creativity and responsiveness, and learn to manage continuous adaptation to change” (p. 19). They point to proven methods of challenging the status quo, including creating a sense of urgency, facilitating constructive dissent, encouraging risk taking, and getting everyone involved.

---

y Day and Schoemaker (2008) assert that vigilant leaders enable exploration in their organisations, creating cultures of discovery by giving employees latitude to explore areas outside their job descriptions and encouraging creativity.
orientation that will define the new leadership. Many of the characteristics identified in our study for leaders in the 21st century embody a people orientation.

In the 21st Century, organisational worth will no longer, at least exclusively, rest in buildings, tools and technologies, or Intellectual Property – permanent things – but in people. Lorenzi (2004), in distinguishing leadership and management, notes that managers manage resources; leaders manage people, who comprise the organization’s one critical, unique resource. Factories can be copied, as can plans, ideas, systems, and other forms of resources. Most resources are hardware or software; leadership requires the management of ‘know-ware’—people and their unique cognitive skills, emotional capacities and intellectual talents. (p. 285).

The cliché “people are our greatest asset” will no longer be rhetoric, but the essential reality, people will comprise the crucial resource. Highly-skilled workers and knowledge professionals will be in higher demand than ever, and employers in the 21st Century will be increasingly struggling to hire and retain them (Spreitzer and Cummings, 2001). It is critical for future leaders to grasp what the new workforce will be like because people are the core of future success. Knowledge professionals in the 21st Century will refuse to be led by industrial age management styles. Increasingly, they expect to work with, not for. They will make up their own minds as to how much of themselves they will give to their work according to how they are treated and the opportunities they are accorded (Covey, 2006).

It will be more important – and challenging – to attract, retain, and develop workers. Many will demand latitude, challenge, and responsibility in their work, and employers will have to be flexible and creative in managing with them. It is clear that conventional leadership approaches and corresponding methods of leadership development will not suffice in such an environment. More enlightened modes that involve power-sharing, collaboration, and autonomy are necessary and fortunately emerging. Future leadership will be more about invitation, enlistment, participation, and engagement than telling and selling.

As we hope is clear from our overview of the 21st Century, momentous changes are underway and more expected that significantly impact on organisations and society, and on those who lead them. According to Nye (2008), the information revolution is transforming politics and organisations; hierarchies are becoming flatter and embedded in fluid networks; and many workers in post-industrial nations are Knowledge Workers, and hence respond to different incentives and appeals than did industrial workers of the previous century. Coinciding with these changes in the environment are shifts in the ways leaders and leadership are viewed and, thus, how they are enacted. The 21st Century is very different place than were any centuries that preceded it. The leadership landscape is entirely new, uncharted territory where everyone is finding their way, somewhat tentatively. The coming decades will be an interesting time for both leaders and those they would lead.

THE NEW LEADERSHIP

This section covers The New Leadership, an umbrella concept encompassing emerging and non-traditional / non-conventional views of leaders and leadership and, for our purposes here, leader attributes directly applied or indirectly applicable to the new millennium. The New Leadership goes by many names, some customary, some novel. A sample of the less mainstream leadership styles and notions is shown in Table 2. In addition to those leadership types and approaches listed in the Table 2, Charismatic Leadership still seems to have its following (Choi, 2006; Huang, Cheng, and Chou, 2005). Where transformational leadership might have been an emerging or fringe focus in 1980, it has now attained supreme status in the leadership arena (germane references are included in the review of the literature section, below, “Transformational Potential”). Finally, self-leadership (Choi, 2006; Houghton and Yoho, 2005; Manz and Sims, 1991) deserves recognition, as does shared / distributed (distributive) leadership (see Endnote iii).

For the most part, titles and descriptions of the new leadership unearthed in our investigation (as above) fit into the eight categories we have identified, as detailed below, those categories, themselves, having emerged from the literature. (See Table 3 at the end of this section for a summary of the eight sets of leadership competencies for the 21st Century. Taken together, they embody renaissance leadership.

* We use The New Leadership to cover the range of individual and diverse emergent views of leaders and leadership. Renaissance leadership, in our view, amalgamates and integrates many of the various distinct qualities comprising The New Leadership.
Table 2. Overview of Emerging Leadership Conceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership (Raelin, 2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate Leadership (Raelin, 2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral Leadership (Pauchant, 2005; Putz and Raynor, 2005).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metamanager (Smith, 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive or Appreciative Leadership (Lewis, et al, 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Leadership (Lorenzi, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership (see Hays, 2008a, or Sendjaya, Saros, and Santora, 2008, for recent treatments).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Leadership (Burke, 2006; Cober et al, 1998; Fairholm, 1996; Markow and Klenke, 2005).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Leadership (Edgeman and Dahlgard, 1998).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Leadership (McCrimmon, 2005).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Leadership (Mapes, 2007; McConnell, 1994).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilant Leadership (Day and Schoemaker, 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnership – Leader as Learner and Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leader of the 21st Century is continuously learning and developing new knowledge, skills, and capacities (Ghani, 2006; Maxwell, 2008), and is committed to helping others learn and develop, championing individual, team, and corporate learning and development (Ghani, 2006; Maciariello, 2006; Maxwell, 2008). Spendlove (2007) states, for example, that “coaching and mentoring are key competencies of leadership” (p. 411). Learnership equates the role of the leader as teacher – helping employees and other stakeholders to learn and grow as human beings, public servants, professionals, and leaders. Citing research by Conger and Benjamin, Brown and Posner (2001) emphasise that:

A trademark competency of future leaders will be their ability to instill a learning mindset into their organizations. The upcoming generation of leaders will have to be a generation of learning evangelists. By accentuating the importance of learning and establishing a context where employees want to and are able to learn, leaders will be more capable of strengthening their organizations for future challenges and increasing competitive and innovative abilities. (p.279)

The Leader as Learner and Teacher is humble and remains open to others and their ideas (Weick, 2001; Bailey, 2006), and is not judgemental (Scharmer, 2008). He or she fosters meaningful dialogue and conversations amongst organisational members (Martin, 2007) and with all stakeholders. Learning Leaders are open to challenge and critique (Ghani, 2006), and able to learn from mistakes (Spreitzer and Cummings, 2001). They know their shortcomings (what they, their people, and the organisation do not know and what capabilities are needed) and resolutely work to close gaps and anticipate future needs. The

“Cooksey (2003) used the term “learnership” to convey the idea of diffusing responsibility for both leading and learning throughout the organisation. Heifetz and Laurie (2003) included “leader as teacher” in the title of their joint work. Borrowing from Miles and Snow, Montuori (2000) discusses “the teaching organisation.” These three sources are cited elsewhere in this paper. We acknowledge that Senge – in his famous 1990 paper in the Sloan Management Review – spoke to the leader as teacher: “helping everyone in the organization, oneself included, to gain more insightful views of current reality” (p. 11). Leader as teacher was one of his three critical roles of leadership, along with designer (purpose, vision, and values) and steward (here, essentially, Service – Servant Leadership).
Leader as Learner and Teacher develops organisational learning capacity.\textsuperscript{bb} instils values and mindsets for learning, and builds long-term sustainability (Helgesen, 2006). Learning Leaders are always vigilant to recognise beliefs, assumptions, and habits that may be impeding performance or learning and change. Unlearning is a strategic imperative.

The 21\textsuperscript{st} Century leader is not master of all she surveys, but is student of all she confronts. President John F. Kennedy once quipped “Leadership and learning are indispensable of each other,” (in Maxwell, 2008; p. 129). Learning is an essential part of leadership, note Kouzes and Posner (2001). Blanchard and Miller (2007b) assert that great leaders are always concerned with how they and their people will continue to grow and develop. Bennis (2003) states that the key essential competence for leaders is adaptive capacity, the quality that “…allows leaders to respond quickly and intelligently to relentless change” (p. xxii). And, Weick (2001) observes: leadership is learned, so keep learning!

**Indicators**

- Learning remains at the forefront of community focus and organisational activity.
- Executive team places high priority on its own learning and development, and this is widespread knowledge through the organisation.
- Performance Reviews emphasise professional development, and individuals are placed in positions where they can grow.
- Staff rotate through positions and sections on a reasonable schedule so as to ensure everyone develops corporate knowledge.
- Budget for professional development is generous and sacrosanct.
- Every employee has a professional development plan clearly linked to corporate, team, and individual needs and aspirations.
- Strategic measures are in place for promoting learning and innovation, including rewards and recognition for idea generation and “lauding failures.”
- People development is a high priority and is not supplanted by every crisis or new challenge that arises.
- Professional development is high on meeting agendas.

**Service – Servant Leadership**

The 21\textsuperscript{st} Century leader is servant and steward first, to the public he or she represents, his or her employees, and other designated key stakeholders (Beaubien, 1998; Maciariello, 2006). Fairholm (1996) identified stewardship as one of three main responsibilities of leaders, the other two being morality and community. He sees stewardship as a democratic, egalitarian distribution of power in organisations and communities, where everyone is steward and shares equally in responsibility, obligation, and privilege.

Servant Leaders demonstrate ideals and behaviours of service, including “putting others first.” First responsibility and priority are others, not self promotion, aggrandisement, or comfort (Fisher, 2004; Rao, 2006). The Servant Leader consistently shows high levels of faith, respect, trust, and compassion to all he or she serves (Hays, 2008a). “At the core [of leadership],” Yeo (2006) asserts, “is compassion” (p. 69). Wheatley (2004) notes that having faith in people may be the greatest sign of courage. While the need for courage in our leaders is not new, a different kind of courage is called for in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century;\textsuperscript{cc} and – like leadership, itself, that will be increasingly shared – courage (“taking heart”) is something all will need. Building courageous followers (see Chaleff, 1995) is an important task for enlightened leaders of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century.

Followership, (Baker and Gerlowski, 2007; Rosenau, 2004; Townsend, 2002; Townsend and Gebhardt, 2003), a topic that continues to grow in importance, will assume more precedence in the next ten to twenty years, as foreshadowed by Kanungo (1998). Its increase in prominence mirrors the shift toward more collaborative, power-sharing, and decentralised models of leadership. You cannot have leaders that “let go” without followers who “step up” to the task of self-management. Where management research focus in the past has been on leaders and leadership and their affects, we are likely to see a greater focus on followers and effective followership in the coming decades (Bjugstad, et al, 2006).

\textsuperscript{bb} A few dependable sources on organisational learning that align with themes in this paper are: Hays (2007); Jankowicz (2000); van Eijnatten (2004). We include Shelton and Darling (2003) here due to their articulation of seven competencies that we see as relevant to the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century leader and organisation, what they refer to as “quantum skills.” These include quantum seeing (intentional), thinking (paradoxical), feeling (vitality), knowing (intuition), acting (responsible), trusting (life’s process), and being (in relationship).

\textsuperscript{cc} This is not the bravado-machismo courage of roughnecks, but that governing matters of sentiment, such as caring, compassion, and forgiveness, and traits such as vulnerability, humility, and trust (see, illustratively, Freiberg and Freiberg, 2004 or Love, 2005).
While not writing specifically about Servant Leaders, Bryman (2007) found that (a) being considerate and (b) treating staff fairly and with integrity were two of thirteen key behaviours associated with leadership effectiveness. Crosby (1992) also noted that organisations will have to create a climate of consideration for employees, if only to attract and retain them in an era when good employees—the most valuable part of the organisation—are increasingly hard to find.

The 21st Century leader leads from the heart, as well as the head (Bezzina, 2000; Freiberg and Freiberg, 2004; Love, 2005; Whyte, 2004). Effective leadership starts on the inside with a servant heart. Blanchard (2000) tells us, then moves outward to serve others. Part of the courage needed as we go forward is the strength to show one’s heart, one’s human side, including a measure of vulnerability. In his insightful treatment of leadership and spirituality, Burke (2006) makes a number of thought-provoking points. Of relevance, he writes:

The new leadership paradigm asks the leader to be the one who can show what it means to be human, what it means to be authentic, and how by modeling behaviour that sees other humans, life forms, worldviews, ways of knowing and epistemologies as not only the most important aspect of any organization but as the way of gaining deeper insights into their spiritual selves and into the spiritual lives of others. (p.23)

These insights and their potency are extremely important for, as Burke (2006) notes, it is the leader’s role and responsibility to “place emphasis on correcting the cause of much that is wrong with leadership today [and] that of the western worldview of the organization itself” (op cit). He believes that “it is only through organizational leadership that a better world is possible” (p. 20). This is discussed more fully under “Emotional Intelligence and Authenticity,” below.

The service-oriented leader of the 21st Century builds a culture of community (Goldsmith, 2006), shared purpose, and service (Rao, 2006), and treats staff and other stakeholders as equals and partners (Stallard and Pankau, 2008), and with utmost dignity (Fairholm, 1996). He or she shows concern for individual well-being and the health of the organisation (Beaubien, 1998), including seeking work-life balance (Stallard and Pankau, 2008) and ensuring justice (Rao, 2006). Porth, et al, (2003) add that employees have intrinsic value above and beyond that of productivity and the bottom line. Accordingly, the workplace of the 21st Century is predicted to be more human, a place where employees and other stakeholders are valued in their own right, not just as instruments of production.

Blanchard and Miller (2007b) informed us that the very best leaders are driven, or feel a sense of calling, to serve. Abshie (2007) noted that true leaders provide servant leadership. Wheatley (2004) emphasised that the leadership the world needs today is servant leadership. Blanchard and Carey (2006) argued that servant leadership is required to restore faith, trust, and respect in modern business. Hays (2008a) stressed that the teacher as servant was necessary to bring about major reform in the way universities educate the leaders of tomorrow, an education that prepares individuals for the challenging times ahead. Clearly, Servant Leadership values, principles, and practices will increasingly define enlightened leadership and the expectations we have for our leaders.

Indicators

- Every employee is fulfilling his or her potential and developing as leaders and good corporate citizens.
- Employees rate their units and the organisation highly on community, teamwork, and other measures of corporate health.
- Where exigencies
- Service is stressed in all communiqués and in all meetings, including performance discussions.
- Senior managers and executives are rated on “service” at every review, and are shown to have consistently high ratings.
- Decisions and courses

---

dd Bryman (2007) identified other behaviours directly related to our findings, included in subsequent subsections (Transformational Potency, Capacity for Complexity and Strategic Thought, Leader as Wise Virtuous, and Ethical, and Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder).

e Management education has not kept pace with this vision of the 21st Century leader, as revealed in Booth, Corriher, and Geurin (1995), who found that both management “faculty and students perceive head traits as more important to career success than heart traits” (p. 46). Both groups prioritised intellectual conceptualisation (head matters) over affective qualities such as relationships with others (matters of the heart). Further, this orientation appears to become greater over years of study, presumably because head matters are more strongly reinforced than matters of the heart. More current research on this is needed to determine if management education remains in the dark ages or is shifting to more enlightened emphases.
Transformational Potency

A forward-thinker, the 21st Century leader remains focussed on the long-term. He or she has a clear vision of future possibility and helps all stakeholders see the future and, providing strategic direction, the ways and means of fulfilling it (Bell, 2007; Fisher, 2004; McCormick and Davenport, 2001). Blanchard and Miller (2007b) comment that leaders are the organisation’s primary spokesperson for the vision. Thus, they take every possible opportunity to depict the future and why it is so worth striving for. Bryman (2007) agrees, finding that (a) clear strategic vision and direction and (b) communicating these well are two of the thirteen key leadership effectiveness behaviours found in his extensive review of the literature. Kanungo (1998) states that the leader’s “critical and pivotal task” is to create organisational capabilities to respond to environmental change (p. 77).

The 21st Century leader spreads energy, excitement, hope, and belief (Rao, 2006). This is very much about meaning-making, helping people make sense of their world and to find meaning and value in what they do, their contributions to the organisation and to something bigger than they and even the organisation are (see Raelin, 2006b). The leader with transformational potential is inspired and inspirational. He or she creates and uses spirit; “animating” people to act (Weick, 2001). Such 21st Century leaders encourage passion (Goldsmith, 2006), and build positive energy and an appreciative culture. They encourage people to develop to their full potential (Adler, 2007). “…spirit, energy, patience, perseverance, and imagination … are the marks of effective leadership at all levels,” write Scharmer et al, 2001. These authors note that leadership is both deeply personal and inherently collective. It involves individuals tapping their sources of inspiration and imagination, and it involves collectives actualizing emerging futures (op cited). (p.120)

The 21st Century leader keeps focused on the highest possible future for staff (Scharmer, 2008), helps them realise their potential, and wants them to be fulfilled. Buckminster Fuller (cited elsewhere herein) was a leader who focused on the best possible future – what the world should be like (Gabel and Walker, 2006). According to Gabel and Walker (2006; p. 41), “people often respond more enthusiastically to big and inspiring challenges than to safe, incremental change.” Transformational, visionary leaders recognise opportunities for innovation, improvement, and change, and are willing to reinvent the way work gets done and the organisation is structured (Blanchard and Miller, 2007b). Weick (2001) notes that such leaders are improvisational. Not fixated on formality of structure or process, they are willing to try new ways of doing things.

The enlightened leader of the new millennium understands strategic and operational aspects of change, and ensures change is undertaken positively – in ways that achieve corporate outcomes, build capacity, and promote employee welfare. This is not about change for change sake, but about making work a more productive and fulfilling task and making the organisation a more sustainable and worthy enterprise. The transformational leader of the 21st Century enlists, enthuses, and engages people in change agendas; and everyone feels a valued part of the change agenda (Martin, 2007). Scharmer (2008) says of such leaders that they connect to the deepest forces for change by opening the heart. One must feel the potential to be gained through change. Earlier, Scharmer, et al, 2001, wrote that “The most important tool for leading 21st-Century change in the leader’s self” (p. 12), adding “An effective leader will have the capacity to use his or her Self as the vehicle—the blank canvass—for sensing, tuning in to, and bringing into presence that which wants to emerge.”

In service of continuous improvement and transformational change, the leader of the 21st Century is willing and able to transform him- or herself, and creates an open and nourishing environment wherein staff and other stakeholders can transform themselves and their work. He or she builds corporate capacity for innovation and change; creates “space” for new and different ideas (Martin, 2007) and invites people into that space to learn and to share (Scharmer, 2008). Such leaders seek diverse experiences (Martin, 2007) and create cultures where diversity of thought and practice are promoted.

The 21st Century leader is adaptive and promotes adaptability. Helping people become adaptive is needed when businesses and communities must change to thrive, when current ways of doing things won’t suffice or are unsustainable (Heifetz, 2006). Enlightened transformational leaders, however, aren’t blindly focused on the future and change. They also
understand – and we would add, honour – the past and the present and appreciate what must be taken forward (Bell, 2007).

**Indicators**

- The organisation has and follows a robust roadmap for organisational transformation that includes evaluation and incorporates lessons learnt.
- Managing organisational change is seen as a crucial capacity and expertise is continually developed through training and developmental experience.
- Leaders at all levels are charged with responsibility for leading change effectively, rated, and accorded appropriate training and development.
- Foresight reigns: current problems and priorities are not permitted to detract from the requirement to think forward.
- Corporate vision (future state) is clear and compelling, emphasised at all meetings and in all communiqués; corporate change and other initiatives are all linked to vision.
- There is a framework for conceiving organisational change and developing change competence throughout the organisation.
- All members of the executive team assess themselves on transformational qualities and undertake professional development and coaching, as needed.
- All employees have links to corporate vision and change agendas in their individual role descriptions and performance agreements.
- Links are established with other government and private organisations invested in future thinking, including universities and other scientific institutions.

**Emotional Intelligence and Authenticity**

21st Century leaders know themselves as well as they know their people (Fisher, 2004); they represent themselves as they really are and encourage others to “be themselves” (Scharmer, 2008). Diversity and individuality are honoured (Greenberg-Walt and Robertson, 2001; Martin, 2007). They are honest and encourage honesty—building and maintaining trust is essential in the networked, virtual, and autonomous world of the 21st Century (Stewart, 2001). They are vulnerable and, most of all, human. Senge (2006) writes that they are open-minded and open-hearted.

They understand their own emotions and accept the emotionality of their staff and other stakeholders. They display and develop empathy (Bailey, 2006). Foremost, they are self-reflective and encourage others to practice reflection. They are self-aware; authenticity begins with self-discovery (Bailey, 2006). Weick (2001), amongst others, stresses the importance of authenticity —being honest to yourself (and others). Whyte (2004) notes that authenticity is the product of “courageous conversations” one has with oneself, probing honestly into sensitive areas others neglect, such as how readily and ably one changes, what one resists facing, or why one does what one does or does not do. We believe that emotionally intelligent, authentic leaders of the new millennium are honest and open about who they are, and their motives, values, desires, and concerns (see Sarros, 2003). Leaders of the new age “need to be human and authentic; often admitting to not knowing but wanting to learn and find out” Nixon (2003; p. 164) emphasises.

Self-awareness tops Spedlove’s (2007) list of leadership competencies (organised according to attitudes – what good leaders are; knowledge – what good leaders know; and behaviour – what good leaders do). She maintains that people skills are paramount, including team-building and communication skills, and highlighting openness, honesty, and listening.

Being deeply self-aware, enlightened 21st Century leaders connect to their deepest sources of self and will (Scharmer, 2008); we would expect this to be experienced as extremely empowering. They are characterised by a deep sense of purpose, engagement, fulfilment, truth to core values, and meaningfulness (Barendsen and Gardner, 2006). They help others find meaning and fulfill their dreams (Goldsmith, 2006). People are probably at their most committed best when purpose and endeavour are so deeply connected (Markow and Klenke, 2005). Deeply-connected leaders are courageous servers of society (Bailey, 2006; George, 2005). Their courage is not born of bravado or deception, but of belief in the value of the work they are doing and its moral rightness (Fairholm, 1996). They learn from mistakes, adversity, and trial (Abshire, 2007; Thomas, 2008). This implies that they are sufficiently humble to admit error and fallibility.

---

Readers are also pointed to Avolio and Gardner (2005), Cooper, Scandura, and Schriesheim (2005), and Gardner, et al (2005), all providing essential background on authentic leadership and authentic leadership development.
Emotionally intelligent and authentic leaders know and play to their strengths; they compensate for shortcomings by surrounding themselves with capable advisors, mentors, and subordinate leaders. “Vigilant leaders surround themselves with a smart, dynamic executive team that is always on the lookout for new opportunities,” Day and Schoemaker (2008; p. 46) emphasise. They use emotions constructively and positively, maintain composure in stressful and challenging circumstances, and understand others’ emotions.

**Indicators**

- Realistic and meaningful measures are taken to monitor corporate health, with results publicly displayed and all employees involved in activities to sustain or improve health.

- Rewards and Recognition for individuality and authenticity are deployed.

- Reflection is “part of the way we do things around here.” Employees are asked to reflect as part of the appraisal process. Teams undertake shared reflection when conducting progress checks and project debriefs. Coaches and mentors use reflective processes and tools in working with individuals and teams.

- Members of the executive team have “thermometers” showing their composure. Any executive displaying “temperatures” above a healthy level must show how he or she is endeavouring to bring heat to acceptable levels.

- Employees undergo various assessments and training and may have mentors or coaches assigned to help them understand and value who they are as people; to help them close the gap between how they see themselves and how others see them, and to help them continue to develop as individuals (authentic selves).

- All team leaders and above are assessed semi-annually on Emotional Intelligence, the results of which are discussed in performance management sessions and development plans agreed and put into effect.

For every complex question there is a simple answer, and it is always wrong—Mencken

---

Capacity for Complexity and Strategic Thought

The 21st Century leader sees the big picture and accepts that everything is inter-related, appreciating that action and inaction have profound social and environmental impacts and implications. He or she understands the nature of dynamic complexity and helps others learn to understand and cope with uncertainty and to become more responsive and adaptive to complex challenges (Martin, 2007). Capitalising on intuitive, divergent, and synthesising thinking, the strategic leader of the 21st Century is able to adapt and innovate more dynamically in fluid circumstances than his or her predecessors who sought stability (Graetz, 2002). Such leaders understand that seemingly small indications of change in the environment can have drastic consequences for the organisation (Day and Schoemaker, 2008; Montuori, 2000), and they are constantly over the horizon and around the corner for threats and opportunities.

The leader of the 21st Century with capacity for complexity and strategic thought:

- Sees the big picture, and / or seeks counsel from advisors and subordinate leaders who understand and capably contend with context. Thinks broadly and strategically (Spendlove, 2007).

- Makes reasoned decisions, defensible based on understanding the dynamic complexity of problems and opportunities and their implications. Capable leaders in times of turbulence and uncertainty, possess and rely on complex conceptual skills and abilities (Montuori, 2000).

- Anticipates problems and opportunities and prepares for them by building capacity. One of the most important aspects of leadership for the 21st Century is the dedication and ability to build capacity amongst employees (Higgs, 2003).

- Continually scrutinises self and other executives for their tendency to see “the trees but not the forest” (or that they are seeing both, systemic and focused – Cooksey, 2003).

- Purposefully seeks provocative, unpopular, and diverse perspectives on issues and opportunities to garner more informed decision-making and policy-setting. Generates conflict and acts as a “destabiliser” (Plowman, et al., 2007).

- Frequently and sufficiently seeks input from the widest range of stakeholders possible (Bryman, plausible, and wrong” is thought to be more accurate, and is attributed to Mencke’s 1920 work: *Prejudices: Second Series.*

---

**Note:** Though crisp, the quote “There is always a well-known solution to every human problem—neat, plausible, and wrong” is thought to be more accurate, and is attributed to Mencke’s 1920 work: *Prejudices: Second Series.*
• Resists temptation to solve problems or make decisions alone (see White Knight, below).

• Is comfortable with fluidity and chaos; reduces hierarchy and control (Slater, 2001); accepts, even legitimates doubt and uncertainty (Schwandt, 2005; Weick, 2001). Leaders and those led must be open to not having all the answers (Senge, 2006).

• Asks the obvious and naïve questions (Gabel and Walker, 2006): Why do we do things this way? Why can’t we do things differently? Why can’t we have our cake and eat it too?

• Tomorrow’s leader will have less time for planning and forecasting; they must be nimble, agile, and learn through and while doing (Spreitzer and Cummings, 2001). Organisations must (paradoxically) structure themselves to be responsive and adaptable, to take advantage of opportunities as they arise; building in (as opposed to eliminating) redundancy is one way to do this (Hinterhuber, 1996).

• The corporation of tomorrow is far more complex than today or in the past, defined by a web of relationships amongst disparate parts; people and communications skills are increasingly important in dealing with this complexity (Maciariello, 2006).

• Must possess foresight and be forward-thinking to capitalise upon emerging trends (Maciariello, 2006). Such leaders are able to “tune into” relevant topics, “tune out” the noise, and act at the right time (Gabel and Walker, 2006; p. 40) and (p. 41): “Picking up on so-called ‘weak signals’ long before anyone else is paying attention is a key habit leaders must develop if they are to accurately anticipate and respond to future needs.”

• Must be able to penetrate conflicting and ambiguous masses of symptoms, trends, possibilities, and problems and distil what matters, put things together in ways that make sense, and take appropriate courses of action—the synthesising mind (Gardner, 2007); have the presence of mind to make quality decisions in the midst of complexity, differences, and tensions (Thomas, 2006).

  - “Raelin (2003) identifies the making of “transcendent meaning” – the ability to see emerging realities before they occur; to see what does not yet exist – as a key leadership attribute for the 21st Century. Leaders imbued with this ability can “…conceive of action while in motion; they can act and observe at the same time” (p. 68).

  - “In more conventional terms, Day and Schoemaker (2008) speak of this form of vigilance as “peripheral vision”—scanning for faint but vital signals at the periphery” that can make a break a company; the ability to “spot opportunities and threats before rivals” do (p. 43 and 44). Scharmer, et al, (2001) explain that as the business environment becomes less stable and more dynamic, leadership must also change. They assert:

    …real power comes from recognizing the patterns of change. …the task of the leader is to sense and recognize emerging patterns and to position him- or herself, personally and organizationally, as part of a larger generative force that will reshape the world (p. 3).

• Must be aware, concerned, and able to marshal focus and efforts that span boundaries (Senge, 2006).

• Reforms the system, not the people (Gabel and Walker, 2006): “…the most-effective leverage can almost always be found by reforming the physical infrastructure in which people live and work, rather than by trying to change habit-ridden men and women” (p. 43).

• Challenges contemporary structures and hierarchies—utilises peoples skills, abilities, and desires regardless of rank or position.

**Indicators**

- Senior managers and executives prepare themselves for uncertain futures through scenario and contingency planning. Learnings are built into planning processes and training and development priorities.

- Executives require of all proposals that they incorporate a complex systems view to reduce the tendency to over-simplify and to increase the likelihood of identifying solutions that will work.

- What may seem extraordinary and unnecessary measures are taken to engage staff and other stakeholders in collaborative problem-solving, decision-making, and planning, building more capable people and ensuring better solutions.

- Executives undertake courses with the “complexity college” to develop systems thinking and big picture skills.
Spaces exist and forums are provided to allow people to work and play together.

Time is set aside to allow people to think. Extra time is built into tasks and deadlines to enable people to best understand challenges and opportunities and to do the job right.

Employees at all levels are involved in / engaged with cross-functional and inter-organisational groups and initiatives.

White Knights are impaled. hh

We’ve got stars directing our fate, and we’re praying it’s not too late—Millennium®

**Leader as Wise, Virtuous, and Ethical**

The 21st Century leader sees wisdom as the only salvation for the future (survivability and sustainability); seeks to deepen his or her own wisdom and develop deep pools of wisdom throughout the organisation. It is not about being clever, successful, or impressive, but doing the right thing for the greater good (Hays, 2007). “Leadership for the common good, based on virtues and moral principles of the leader,” Sarros (2003) reminds us, is not new; it “was written and spoken about in Homer’s *The Iliad*, Plato’s *The Republic* and Aristotle’s *Politics*” (p. 11). He also calls our attention to Homer’s *Odyssey*, noting that it “teaches that each of us should undertake our own journeys into self-awareness and self-understanding. By so doing we can develop our own leadership potential” (p. 12), a point we will return to in our section of leadership development reform.

21st Century leaders know their values and motives (Blanchard and Miller, 2007b), and conduct all affairs in accordance with a moral code and set of upstanding values and principles (Fairholm, 1996). They place virtue and values at the centre of decisions and behaviour (Heifetz, 2006). They show courage in doing the right things (Bailey, 2006), even when hard and unpopular, or what might be called hard love; they can be “uncompromising” and “outspoken” when it comes to matters of principles and values (Fairholm, 1996). Abshire (2007) maintains that such leaders – “true leaders” – speak up based on what they believe. Lorenzi (2004) describes the “prosocial leader,” someone who leads for the social good—the “collective utility.” Such leaders’ “intentions, visions, and goals are positive (‘pro’); they create or add value” (p. 283).

Leaders as Wise, Virtuous, and Ethical are the role models for staff and other stakeholders. Bryman (2007) found that leaders as role models are an important aspect of mentoring and staff development; being trustworthy and demonstrating personal integrity are linked to their capacity to be effective role models. Beaubien (1998) declared that such leaders serve as the role model for professionalism and ethics. Barendsen and Gardner (2006) elaborate: leaders must demonstrate exemplary, unwavering ethical leadership, especially in the complex, global environment characterising the 21st Century—they must “stay the course” to provide the role models for staff. Leading by example is also a theme in Gardner et al (2005) who stress the importance of leaders’ modelling “of positive values, psychological states, behaviors and self-development” (p. 358) in influencing followers and promoting their healthy development.

Reflecting one of our earlier competency sets for 21st Century leadership, the wise leader exhibits a strong sense of servant-leadership. For wise leaders, there is no difference between who they are and what they do. Work is a calling for leaders of the future; they must discover and embrace their calling (Leider, 2006). The Servant Leader is fulfilled, recharged, and in charge when giving and serving; leaders who learn from, teach, serve, and empower others... are tomorrow (Batten, 1992). Markow and Klenke (2005) suggest that calling is intrinsically related to commitment. Leaders who can help employees find meaning and calling are likely to elicit greater performance from and fulfilment amongst staff. In his paper on ethics in business, Sauser (2005) emphasises the benefit to individuals, organisations, and society of leaders seeing their work as a calling. He links ethical business leadership, Corporate Social Responsibility, and Servant Leadership, and concludes his paper with a compelling quote from

---

hh The White Knight is the expert who single-handedly solves problems. Like the knights of old, this manager or consultant rides in to save the day. While they remain attractive, White Knights are anachronistic in the 21st Century. They are as misguided as they are honourable. White Knights thrive on crises and the respect and admiration they accrue as heroes. While beyond scope, here to elaborate, this creates a vicious cycle involving crisis, expert solution, and disenfranchisement. This is why the wise leader “impales” White Knights. The lesson is not that courage is un-warranted or that chivalry is dead, but that single acts of expertise are unsustainable. The courage, knowledge, and skill of the knight need to be transferred to team members and other stakeholders, boosting their individual capabilities and the overall capacity of the organisation to solve problems or implement needed change. See also Endnote ii.

ii Robbie Williams, “Millennium,” from *The Ego has Landed*, 1998. The authors love this song, with its James Bond theme from *You Only Live Twice.*
King that we repeat here, as it is central to many of the themes we entertain in this paper:

We as a nation have been so enamored by the hero-leader that we have placed immense power in the hands of these executives and many have squandered the trust placed in them. Corporations have collapsed and filed for bankruptcy as a result of unethical actions and self-serving leadership practices. These leaders who have reaped more harm than good in their actions have directly affected our nation’s economy and quality of life. The corporate community is struggling to find leaders committed to the mission and the margin, people and profit, organizational growth and family stability. Leaders with ethical perspectives that are able to gain the trust of the employees, the customers and the community are now in great demand. Structures and organizations are looking for leaders who care for people, rather than...control people, individuals concerned about building community more than being boss, leaders who empower people rather than use people (p. 356).

Rowsell and Berry (1993) argued that leadership was essentially “management of meaning,” focusing an integrative energy towards collective identity and purpose. Since organisations operate in and must adapt to complex, uncertain, and changing conditions, the wise, systemic leader (Rowsell and Berry, 1993) adapts him- or herself, and facilitates adaptive meaning-making amongst stakeholders that may entail dialogue, debate, conflict, and synthesis. The goal is to sustain a sense of integrity and coherence amongst parts of the system (organisational elements and people) while transforming in many respects. Insightfully, these authors note that it is not the leader’s vision and values that are paramount and imposed on employees, but that it is the leader’s role to articulate vision and values already possessed amongst them.

Hinterhuber (1996) stresses that organisational leaders must engage in and foster a culture of ethical reflection; this, he declares, “means that top leadership takes seriously its responsibility for the future of this planet (p. 298).” It is especially important in times of uncertainty, turbulence, and transition, he notes, for all employees and stakeholders to ethically reflect on decisions and courses of action so that everyone understands their necessities and implications, feels involved, and develops a sense of ownership and commitment.

Thomas (2008) suggests that effective leaders use crucible experiences to develop the next generation of outstanding leaders. “Men and women become leaders only after tempering in the harsh crucible of organizational experience” (Allio, 2005; p. 1072). Crucible experiences are transformational (Bennis and Thomas, 2002), experiences “through which an individual comes to a new or altered sense of identity (p. 6). We don’t know if crucible experiences are required of everyone to develop wisdom and maturity, but it is reasonable to assume that hardships, failures, and other “tests” contribute to an individual’s seasoning. Recent literature describes “trigger events” and their significance in authentic leader development (Cooper, et al, 2005). Indeed, Cooper et al, (2005) compare crucible experiences and trigger events, finding them to be closely related. Both crucible experiences and trigger events are aligned with the process leading to transformational learning as discussed by Hays (2008b). Tension, ambiguity, paradox and other stressors serve as catalysts that culminate in a threshold moment, the successful passing through of which results in transformation (transformational learning). Understanding and ability to apply this process offers great promise in leadership development.

Indicators

- Decisions and policies are set based on principles and values.
- Principles and values are manifest in role descriptions and performance agreements, and in performance appraisals and rewards and recognition.
- Individuals at all levels of the organisation are acknowledged for “living” corporate values and principles.
- There is an annual wisdom award for individuals and teams, and a culture of commitment to award (and win) the honour.
- Qualities and values are manifest in corporate statements of vision, purpose, ideals, and objectives.
- Principles and values are stressed in all communiqués, including meetings.
- The executive team is willing and able to assess themselves against corporate values, principles, and priorities, and confident that they are doing well and / or genuinely improving.
- Awards, honours, and recognition are given to employees and other stakeholders who uphold highest ethical and virtuous standards of behaviour as judged by peers. Such awards carry as much prestige and merit as do any awards for performance or productivity.

School of Management, Marketing, and International Business
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**Leader as Integrator**

The 21st Century leader is inclusive and involving (Martin, 2007), and unifying: architect of coherence. He or she helps employees and other stakeholders see:

- where and how the organisation fits in the bigger picture
- where and how they fit in or relate to the organisation and how their attitudes and behaviours contribute to its important mission (Goldsmith, 2006)
- why things are done as they are or should be done differently.

The Leader as Integrator helps people find meaning and purpose with respect to the organisation (Beaubien, 1998; Driscoll and McKee, 2007; Markow and Klenke, 2005), and find themselves and their ideal roles (Cober, Hacker, and Johnston, 1998; Stallard and Pankau, 2008). Meaning-making is a key leadership role (Raelin, 2006b): leaders fulfilling this role help employees get the most out of working together, often finding answers that were always there, inherent strengths that may have been overlooked or neglected.

Inclusiveness is unifying diverse parts into a meaningful whole (Kuczynski and Kuczynski, 2007). Fairholm (1996) went so far as to say that the leader’s primary role is as “whole-maker,” creator of “oneness” and community. The New Leadership is about helping people feel connected—to others, to meaning and purpose, to something higher or more transcendent than a job (Driscoll and McKee, 2007; Markow and Klenke, 2005; Raelin, 2006b). Cober et al (1998) concluded:

> We have come to realize that the spiritual energy essential to produce greatness … must come from the individual’s understanding of a larger purpose for self, an understanding which may be facilitated through self-discovery by organizational leadership (p. 919).

In his paper on transcendental leadership, Cardona (2000) suggests that such leaders bring out the best in their people, achieving “transcendent motivation,” altruistic drives to contribute and make a difference. As Cardona (2000) explains, transcendental motivation is brought about through a certain kind of partnership or collaboration between leaders and followers based on trust, integrity, and meaningful cause that leads to unity. Unity surpasses both uniformity (compliance) and alignment, and leads to greater effort and commitment, as might be evidenced by citizenship behaviour (going above and beyond duty statements). George (1999) expressed it thusly: “Transcendent leadership of an organization…envisions a clear mission of the organization, a mission with purpose and passion, and calls upon the purpose and passion to lead the organization to greater heights to fulfill its mission” (p. 440). For George (1999), a leadership mission defines a higher purpose; such purpose provides vision, passion, and compassion. The Leader as Integrator is passionate about the organisation’s values and culture (Adler, 2007), and makes choices amongst alternatives to the degree that they fit corporately, either now or in the future.

Leadership, Alexander (2006) notes, is the collective activities of all members devoted to purpose and task; it is the result of collective interaction. Leaders as Integrators work assiduously to ensure everyone works together in a coordinated, unified way toward shared purpose, objectives, and rewards.

We are moving increasingly quickly toward global democracy; the leader of tomorrow must encourage and exploit the power of equality and freedom (Slater, 2001). Workplaces are expected to be more democratic, but they will become so only if relationships amongst people at work change and the relationship people have with work changes (Driscoll and McKee, 2007). The Leader as Integrator assures people find their place—a contributing role that is valued, fulfilling, and continues to evolve as individuals themselves develop and have more to offer.

**Indicators**

- The executive communicates consistently, frequently, and effectively with staff and other stakeholders about things that matter: directions, priorities, values, etc.
- Employees or outside observers do not speak of rhetoric or spin in corporate communications, but of reality… truth, good intention, transparency.
- There is a high level of respect for the organisation and what it does and of trust for the organisation’s leadership.
- No one feels isolated or “left behind.”
- Executive communiqués are forthright and as personal as possible. There is high congruity between informal communications and the glossy public affairs ones.
- Everyone knows where they fit. Any employee can explain what he or she does, why, and how it fits into the bigger picture.
- There is a palpable sense of team. There are high levels of collaboration and all manner of working inter-dependently.
- There is a widespread feeling of moving forward together.
**Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder**

Leadership is relationships, write Kouzes and Posner (2001). Elsewhere they have pointed out that success in leading is wholly dependent on the ability to build and sustain productive relationships (Kouzes and Posner, 2006). The future world is inclusion; the leader’s role is to make it happen and get the most out of it (Hélgesen, 2006; Kuczbarski and Kuczbarski, 2007). As Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder, the leader of the 21st Century is master connector and conduit, facilitating and encouraging all staff and other stakeholders to network and collaborate within and without the organisation (Adler, 2007; Ghani, 2006; Martin, 2007) and build and utilise networks (Day and Schoemaker, 2008; Goldsmith, 2006). Here, the 21st Century leader sees opportunities to connect people and ideas that might not normally have cause to come together. The crucial task is to share power and promote shared ownership and collective effort resulting in greater capability and commitment and producing more sustainable solutions. Amongst the thirteen leadership effectiveness behaviours unearthed in Bryman’s (2007) review of the literature are two of relevance here: (a) encouraging open communications and (b) creating positive / collegial work atmosphere.

Summarising their research into leadership and collaboration, Huxham and Vangen (2000) state:

> The last decade has seen a worldwide movement toward collaborative governance, collaborative public service provision, and collaborative approaches to addressing social problems. [Then further] There seems little doubt that public sector management in the 21st century will need to be sophisticated in its understanding of the skills, processes, structures, tools, and technology needed for working across organizational boundaries (p. 1159).

In his paper on systems citizenship, Senge (2006) acknowledges that a key leadership task for the new millennium is building partnerships and collaboration across boundaries. Related challenges include the ability to embrace (and encourage) multiple perspectives and to build shared understanding (Senge, 2006). Sarros (2003; p. 11) asserts that “we are heading into a post-industrial world where the practice of leadership rests on principles of collaboration rather than competition” (emphasis in the original). Ghani (2006) added that the leader-integrator breeds and connects multiple perspectives (bridge-builder) to creative effect and helps everyone discover the leader within themself. We believe these points of particular relevance to the global citizen aspect of the 21st Century. The notion of “everyone as leader” seems especially germane to the idea of good citizenship where personal responsibility and initiative are called for (as opposed to passivity and compliance).

Shared leadership and empowerment is the leadership model of the future; the future organisation is all about effective teamwork and collaboration (Greenberg-Walt and Robertson, 2001). Leadership in the future will be increasingly about leadership throughout the organisation, at all levels (Spreitzer and Cummings, 2001). In elaborating his ideas on learnership, Cooksey (2003) takes a provocative stand with respect to empowerment and shared leadership:

> By gradually dissolving this leader / follower dependency through the evolution and diffusion of the capacity for “learnership,” the diversity of individual capacities, the multiplicity of worldviews and myriad potential interpretations of systemic and contextual feedback can be tapped for future learning in such a way as to eventually erase the distinction between leader and learner. All would lead and all would learn, at different and appropriate times and in different and appropriate ways….(p. 212)

While the need for individual leadership will probably never disappear, calls for democracy and empowerment seem increasingly justified. In their review of the literature, Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) conclude that leadership is increasingly defined not by position or hierarchy, but understood as relationships amongst people. The leader’s role is to compile an integrating vision tapping into the power of the collective (Kouzes and Posner, 2006). We-centric leadership, Glaser and Pilnick (2005) note, is about sharing power; it involves inclusion, support, development, learning, and nourishing that enable and lead to co-leadership and co-creation. On the way there, the 21st Century leader decentralises decision-making, and respects and values staff judgement and ability (Stallard and Pankau, 2008). He or she builds ownership and adaptability amongst people—the idea of one right leader must be done away with (Heifetz, 2006): everybody must develop leadership potential.

---

\[ Day (2001) presents a useful description of networking and its value in his discussion of leadership development strategies. \]

\[kk See previous discussion on the leader-follower relationship in the section on Uncertainty. \]
Indicators

- The executive team periodically examines and “redraws” its business boundaries, geographic, political, and operational.
- Awards and recognition are provided to individuals and teams who “break the box”—who come up with ways of working more collaboratively and exploiting networks, partnerships, and other relationships.
- There are visible and effective Communities of Practice within and across business lines and with industry partners.
- Staff receive on-going / advanced training in “relationship management” and teamwork and collaboration.
- All managers receive training in leading collaborative projects.
- All staff are encouraged to “branch out,” enter into dialogue with staff in other units / locations and with people in other organisations to exchange ideas and cultivate opportunities for collaboration. 10 – 15% of individual work time is set aside for this and an account established to fund visits and other expenses.
- “Competitors” are re-evaluated as “collaborators” and partners.
- Awards and recognition are slanted towards team achievements and other successful collaborative efforts.
- Managers are rewarded and promoted based not on individual achievements but on their outreach initiatives and success in promoting partnering and collaborative efforts amongst their teams.

Toward Renaissance—Unifying The New Leadership

Leaders and leadership have been portrayed and arrayed in many ways by many authors. In the foregoing section we presented eight sets of leadership attributes, a synthesis and categorisation we have developed based on an extensive review of current literatures covering leadership. For reference, the eight categories are summarised here.

There are many facets to the leader of the 21st Century. Each of us will reflect different aspects, having strengths in some areas, while trying to develop in others. It may be idealistic to believe any one human being could be strong across all eight dimensions, something like an Olympian decathlete. Nevertheless, the dimensions provide specific targets to strive for. Some measure of competence in each area would indicate a well-rounded leader, while levels sufficient in each area would predict a healthy organisation which to strive. A measuring device provided in the conclusion can assist individuals and organisations to assess themselves on the eight dimensions of 21st Century leadership.

We do not claim that our leadership representation is the best or the last. There is some greying of the lines between and across our eight dimensions. It was hard for us to always find a precise and distinct fit for the many and varied depictions we have found in the literature. This would especially be the case in an instance where the author described leaders of the future in ways that cut across our categories, as exemplified by:

A transforming leader helps employees see their work as something bigger than themselves, helping them find meaning and purpose by involving and engaging their hearts and minds toward achievement of a worthy goal, ensuring they know where they fit in the organisation and how crucial their contributions are to accomplishment, and creating an environment that supports collaboration, learning and change, and extraordinary performance.\(^2\)

Unequivocal precision and distinctiveness notwithstanding, we are confident that most of the attributes described by authors on emerging forms of leadership have been included in our eight sets. The eight dimensions are distinctive and encompassing enough to provide researchers and practitioners alike a useful way of thinking about leaders and leadership. On the whole, we have leadership that is quite different than that ever previously conceived. We cannot yet know whether or not renaissance leadership will solve global problems substantially better than leadership of the past or lead to an era of enlightenment such as we have never seen. We can with certainty, however, predict that if leadership continues on its current trajectory that the world as we know it will change dramatically.

I’d love to change the world—Ten Years After\(^3\)

\(^2\) An aggregate composed by the authors from multiple sources.
\(^3\) Appearing on A Space in Time. Written by Alvin Lee of Ten Years After. Produced by Chris Wright, Chrysalis Music.
Table 3. The Eight Essential Categories of the 21st Century Leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learnership – Leader as Learner and Teacher</th>
<th>Service – Servant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leader of the 21st Century is continuously learning and is committed to helping others learn and develop. Learning remains at the forefront of community focus and organisational activity. Unlearning is a strategic imperative. The 21st Century leader is not master of all she surveys, but is student of all she confronts.</td>
<td>The 21st Century leader is servant and steward first, to the public he or she represents, his or her employees, and other designated key stakeholders. The Servant Leader consistently shows high levels of faith, respect, trust, and compassion to all he or she serves. The 21st Century leader leads from the heart, as well as the head.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Potency</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence and Authenticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A forward-thinker, the 21st Century Leader remains focused on the long-term. He or she has a clear vision of future possibility and helps all stakeholders see the future and the ways and means of fulfilling it. The 21st Century leader spreads energy, excitement, hope, and belief. In service of continuous improvement and transformational change, the leader of the 21st Century is willing and able to transform him- or herself and creates an open and nourishing environment wherein staff and other stakeholders can transform themselves and their work.</td>
<td>21st Century leaders know themselves as well as their people; they represent themselves as they really are and encourage others to “be themselves.” Diversity and individuality are honoured. They are honest and encourage honesty—building and maintaining trust is essential in the networked, virtual, and autonomous world of the 21st Century. They are vulnerable and, most of all, human. They understand their own emotions and accept the emotionality of their staff and other stakeholders. Foremost, they are self-reflective and encourage others to practice reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity for Complexity and Strategic Thought</th>
<th>Leader as Wise, Virtuous, and Ethical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 21st Century leader see the big picture and accepts that everything is inter-related, appreciating that action and inaction have profound social and environmental impacts and implications. He or she understands the nature of dynamic complexity and helps others learn to understand and cope with uncertainty and to become more responsive and adaptive to complex challenges. These leaders resist temptation to solve problems or make decisions alone.</td>
<td>The 21st Century leader sees wisdom as the only salvation for the future (survivability and sustainability); seeks to deepen his or her own wisdom, and develop deep pools of wisdom throughout the organisation. It is not about being clever, successful, or impressive, but doing the right thing for the greater good. 21st Century leaders know their values and motives and conduct all affairs in accordance with a moral code and set of upstanding values and principles. They are the role models for staff and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader as Integrator</th>
<th>Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 21st Century leader is inclusive, involving, and unifying: architect of coherence. He or she helps employees and other stakeholders see:</td>
<td>As Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder, the leader of the 21st Century is master connector and conduit, facilitating and encouraging all staff and other stakeholders to network and collaborate within and without the organisation. Here, the 21st Century leader sees opportunities to connect people and ideas that might not normally have cause to come together. The crucial task is to share power and promote shared ownership and collective effort resulting in greater capability and commitment and producing more sustainable solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ where and how the organisation fits in the bigger picture</td>
<td>■ where and how they fit in or relate to the organisation and how their attitudes and behaviours contribute to its important mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ where and how they fit in or relate to the organisation and how their attitudes and behaviours contribute to its important mission</td>
<td>■ why things are done as they are or should be done differently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the vision of our future shared and touted by leading minds today. Not only does this vision seem worth pursuing, but it may be our best, if not only hope. Whether perceived as an ideal, a pipe-dream, or a necessity, we do not have to look far to find a disparity between the descriptions and expectations of 21st Century leadership and the reality of leadership as it actually is at present. Despite considerable and
compelling agreement that a new leadership is both possible and desirable, we have some distance to travel before we attain it.

**CONCLUSION**

**Retrospective Overview**

We have raised a number of issues in this paper of relevance to industry and community leaders, practitioners involved in leadership development, and management educators and researchers. These include:

1. Four major, interrelated trends of the 21st Century were highlighted that will impact upon organisations and society at large, and provide the context for leaders and leadership in the coming decade: technology, globalisation, diversity, and Knowledge Workers.

2. Organisational and global activity will increasingly be dominated by pervasive uncertainty. A prime task for 21st Century organisations is developing leaders at all levels with a high tolerance for ambiguity (Huber, 2003). Comfort zones must become a thing of the past, and ‘discomfort zones’ will become the new preoccupation.

3. Leading through times changing more quickly than we can observe and interpret them is one of the great leadership challenges of the new millennium. This has significant implications for leading and the development of leadership, and for conceptions of organisation. Our notions of permanence, consistency, and stability must shift to accommodate more organic and dynamic forms (Griffin, 2008). We must learn to be sensing at the farthest reaches of the known and exploit our collective intelligence to interpret and respond to changes before they overcome us.

4. The ability to envisage possible futures is a crucial quality of thinking that leaders will increasingly need in the new millennium. Not only do leaders of the 21st Century need to be visionaries – the best leaders have always been so – they need to take visioning to new levels to conceive of the inconceivable. Never has the seeing everything as connected, and realising that action and inaction have consequences exceeding the immediate present and vicinity. It is management education’s responsibility to educate “the whole person” (Boyatzis and McLeod, 2001).

5. Not only must our leaders be able to anticipate possibilities and discern emerging trends, but they will need to identify those of most concern or opportunity. Moreover, they will need to be consummate communicators, leading others to see future possibilities and to forge visions themselves. Individual eloquence will always be admired and will sometimes be necessary, but the greatest communication challenge and opportunity is dialogue amongst people. The leader’s task is to connect people in meaningful ways and encouraging open exchange.

6. The leader of the 21st Century will have to be able to mobilise people to undertake tasks in uncertain, rapidly-changing environments. While the need to marshal and galvanise people under challenging circumstances in nothing new, how such mobilisation will occur is. This is where the 21st Century leader will bring all his or her assets to bear to encourage and inspire, to involve and engage as leaders in the past have not had to do.

7. The effective leader of the 21st Century is whole and leads with heart, head, and soul. Such authenticity and wholeness touch others, those who work for, with, and above him or her, partners, and other stakeholders (Griffin, 2008). The whole person takes a holistic view of the world (English, Fenwick, and Parsons, 2005), seeing everything as connected, and realising that action and inaction have consequences exceeding the immediate present and vicinity. It is management education’s responsibility to educate “the whole person” (Boyatzis and McLeod, 2001).

8. 21st Century leaders are global citizens who embrace diversity, straddle continents, and penetrate complexity, knowing how to make the most of every opportunity that presents itself. These are renaissance persons, well-rounded and always eager to learn more. Schwandt (2005) calls such individuals philosopher-managers and managers as learners, stressing that continuous learning is key to the leader of the future and that “the essence of managerial development should include ‘learning to learn’” (p. 188).

9. Building shared leadership is one of the prime objectives and requisite abilities of the 21st Century leader. This requires the ability to “step aside” and support others to “step up.” Effective 21st Century leaders will lead by “letting go.” Leaders as the elite at the top will give way to a surge of leadership from below and around; the bias toward positional, hierarchical leadership will continue its shift to a lateral, collaborative, collective form of leadership.

10. Prevailing beliefs about and practices of leadership are insufficient to meet the leadership demands of the 21st Century. A groundswell of interest in revolutionary ideas on leaders and leadership spearheaded by forward-thinkers, however, suggests these anachronistic beliefs and
practices can be overcome. Attributes of 21st Century leaders have been distilled into eight sets, as identified in this paper:

- Learnership – Leader as Learner
- Emotional Intelligence and Authenticity
- Leader as Integrator
- Leader as Wise, Virtuous, and Ethical
- Transformational Potency
- Capacity for Complexity and Strategic Thought
- Service / Servant Leadership
- Social Engineer and Relationship-Builder

11. While no one individual will likely master all eight sets of 21st Century leadership competencies, organisations can begin to recruit and select, develop, and promote based on them. If possessed sufficiently, these competencies should predict individual, team, and organisational effectiveness and resilience over the long haul.

12. Since emerging views of leaders and leadership are so different than those conventionally held, and the voices propounding these views so many and convincing, the authors believe that we are experiencing a renaissance in leadership—a transformation in the way we think about leaders and practice leadership. Individuals who possess and are developing the capabilities portrayed here as 21st Century competence sets are renaissance leaders. Those who practice renaissance leadership are transforming their teams, organisations, and communities.

Caveats and Considerations

To develop the eight sets of leadership attributes presented in this paper we have drawn on hundreds of research papers and dozens of books and book chapters. We found overwhelming consistency across authors and topics for the individual competencies we have synthesised into the eight categories. We found no significant disagreement or alternatives. Given our interpretation of the global environment, what these many researchers and scholars have to say regarding leaders and leadership makes a lot of sense to us. What we cannot say is whether or not what we are seeing is an abundant case of idealism and wishing thinking.

Conceptions of the leader of the 21st Century are much different than ever before. Does this reflect a dawning age of enlightenment or a widening schism between theory and practice? We do not know how aligned the notions of leaders and leadership are between emerging depictions and real-world practice. To this end, we would point to an important area of empirical research needed: How embedded in today’s organisations are the attributes thought necessary to 21st Century leadership? Is there evidence that they are being incorporated in leadership development programs, performance management processes, and promotion? Are employees and managers even aware of the emerging competencies? Do they believe they are important? –likely to ever be adopted?

Despite the fact that we obviously see value in people and organisations that embody the eight dimensions of renaissance leadership, we accept that the skills, knowledge, abilities, and attitudes that comprise these capacities are somewhat intangible. There will be many who discount 21st Century leadership attributes purely as they are difficult to measure. Some of the best things in life, however, are hard to define and difficult to grasp, though none the less important. We have tried to make the attributes presented in this paper tangible for readers. Care was taken in discussing the individual competencies in the section titled The New Leadership, and performance indicators were provided for each. We go further in Part II, enumerating development strategies for each leadership competency set.

We believe that most organisations are capable of developing useful measures for each of the 21st Century leadership attributes. In fact, just having the conversation amongst individuals about the characteristics and how they might be demonstrated and measured could become part of a leadership development strategy. As staff discuss and debate the competencies and what behaviours might discriminate appreciably over nominal performance they come to a shared understanding of what’s valued, how its displayed, and how it might be fostered. These aspects are explored further in Part II: New Leadership Development.

In the year 2525, if man is still alive, if woman can survive, they may find…

Concluding Remarks

While it is clear that “times they are a’changin,” for many of us the grip of outmoded and idealised beliefs about leaders and leadership is too strong to allow us to move smoothly and confidently into a present that

\[\text{In the Year 2525, the world-wide smash 1969 hit from Zager and Evans, was written by Rick Evans in 1964. Amongst other ominous tone and allusion, the song foretold mans gradual, but inexorable dehumanisation.}\]
is already far different than anything the human race has before experienced, a present and unfolding future in which we are all leaders in our own right. If we survive the challenges of the new millennium, we have succeeded together; if we fail, we have only ourselves to blame, not some hapless leader in whom we have placed not only our faith and trust, but our responsibility as well. Unfortunately, it is in times of great distress and uncertainty that we turn to leaders. It is then that we are mostly willing to be led. We hope their intelligence, guidance, and resolve will see us through the turmoil. While strong, directive leadership and the dependence it engenders may see us through a particular crisis, it is counterproductive. First, it is unsustainable. Dependence is seldom a healthy condition. Second, it is inadequate in dealing with the complexity of the 21st Century. No hero-saviour is strong or smart enough to solve problems of global significance. [Superhuman heroes are few and far between, and reliance on them unsustainable (see Teo-Dixon and Monin (2007) and references at Endnote ii.) It is only through effective working and leading together that we may have a chance to, yet, save our planet and thrive on it for generations to come.

There is an inherent paradox in the emerging notions of 21st Century leaders and leadership. Much continues to be written about the leader of the future in terms that are outmoded. While the qualities are shifting from conventional understandings of leadership – for example, from autocratic to more facilitative and power-wielding to power-sharing – the focus remains on the leader him- or herself, as a single person or elite minority. Indeed, it has been difficult in this paper to write of 21st Century leadership without connoting this leadership as resident in a particular leader, some one as leader. Yet, what many forward thinkers are calling for and 21st Century challenges might, themselves, require is that everyone demonstrates leadership. This idea is not totally new, and is seen in the empowerment literature (Bartram and Casimir, 2005; Carson and King, 2005; Choi, 2006; Houghton and Yoho, 2005; Özaralli, 2003;) and, more recently, in studies and other works on shared or distributed (distributive) leadership (see Endnote iii).

It strikes us that this movement is unique. At no time in our past has there been such a persuasive call for empowerment or the conditions in place to permit it on a large scale. This is not a utopian pipe-dream or clarion call for socialism. Responsibility shared amongst responsible and able people for organisational or community survival may be what enables us to effectively address the very real problems that beset us today and will befal us tomorrow. This means that people throughout the organisation or within the community possess leadership skills and have both the freedom and sense of responsibility to enact leadership. They are, in fact, leaders or becoming leaders, not just potential leaders (or worse, excluded from leadership opportunities). These ideas are increasingly being explored in works on corporate democracy and citizenship (Choi, 2006; Weymes, 2004). This is not, by the way, multitudes of individuals vying for power over others, but individuals who see what needs to be done, have the initiative and motivation to do something about it, and are ready, willing, and able to work with others to get the job done. This changes everything. Perhaps the greatest challenge looming ahead of us is to develop collective leaders—people who lead with and through others, not over them. This poses a dilemma for leadership development programs that, by nature, take individuals with presumed leadership potential and develop their individual leadership skills—to lead over others, not with them.

It may be debated how soon or to what extent this revolution might happen. The evidence is convincing, however, that a transformation is already happening and is only likely to increase. We are in no way prepared for this leadership shift. Time-honoured traditions of seniority, position-based accountability, and status tied to rank or level, not to mention deeply-entrenched cultural practices are just a sample of the forces moderating against the transition to a more collectivist, collaborative, and distributive leadership. Added to these restraining forces are the habits, skills, and attitudes that currently reside on either side of the divide: those in positions of authority and those not. Those on neither side have much experience or confidence in sharing power, on the one hand, or accessing it on the other, in allowing others to lead or in leading themselves. If the destination is shared power and leadership, the road there is fraught with hurdles and hazards, with all taking it confronting tensions, paradox, and uncertainty—endemic challenges of the 21st Century. Therein lie, perhaps, clues to how we might effectively prepare our future leaders. It will be neither easy nor popular to change the way we teach or do business. But our very survival depends on it.

The way forward cannot be defined or predicted in comforting detail, and even if it could, there would be little time to prepare for it. But advance we must, and in ways we never have previously. The New Millennium demands a new kind of leader and a different leadership. Emerging views of leaders and leadership provide us with a platform of competencies and characteristics believed to be necessary in the early decades of the 21st Century. Taken together, these qualities embody the renaissance leader. Such individuals are already leading a renaissance in the way we think about leadership, people, and organisations. They are
transforming the way we approach our work, our environment, and each other.
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Notes:

1 A range of fascinating studies on gendered leadership is available. Maer (1997) in his coverage of the Challenger debacle presents an informative and compelling overview of the differences between masculine and feminine leadership styles and their implications. In 1995, Alimo-Metcalf presented research that showed gender differences in both leadership and empowerment, finding that, in general, women tend to be more transformational and interactive than men, and rely more on interpersonal skills than organisational structure as their source of power and influence. Additional relevant sources are the following:

a. van Engen, van der Leeden, and Willemsen (2001) highlight that while there exist pervasive “connotations” and stereotypes of leadership as masculine and feminine, research evidence that differences exist above and beyond the stereotypical expectations is scant—a finding supported by their own research. Nevertheless, they speculate that transformational leadership (of special significance to this study) is a feminine leadership style due to its emphasis on consideration and leadership (of special significance to this study) is a feminine leadership style due to its emphasis on consideration and intellectual stimulation. They also summarise research that indicates males and females appear to be sensitive to the leadership style preferences of their organisations as a function of the male-female composition (mix). Both male and female leaders would exhibit more feminine leadership characteristics in organisations with proportionately more females. (Males are characteristically males in male-dominated organisations.)

b. Irby, et al, 2002, argue that a post-modernist theory of leadership (synergetic) that incorporates masculine and feminine leadership qualities is needed to overcome insufficiencies in the dominant masculine approaches to understanding leadership, insufficiencies that impact and / or do not account fully for theory and theory-building and leadership development. Existing theories perpetuate stereotypes, the glass ceiling for women, and marginalise the minority of women in leadership positions.

c. Regine and Lewin (2003) suggest that women have an invisible edge in complex organisations. The edge comes from thinking and behavioural styles more prevalent in women: holistic thinking, building relationships, nurturing, empathy, egalitarian and consensus-seeing, compassionate—skills and behaviours more aligned with the nature of complex adaptive systems, systems they refer to as “feminine.” The invisible part of the edge is that these very characteristics are subtle and, thus, many effective women managers and their efforts may be overlooked and undervalued. They do note that these traits may comprise “third possibility leadership,” characterising men and women who paradoxically have and make use of both male and female assets. Regine and Lewin (2003) also discuss the “hero myth” (see Endnote 2) explaining that it is often leaders who are humble and quiet that achieve sustainable results, not the “bigger than life” types showcased in the media.

d. Ludeman and Erlandson (2006) write that the “alpha” male drive for dominance that once ensured survival of the toughest is becoming maladaptive. Brains are needed more than brawn. Females are seen as more inclusive and consultative, while men continue to be directive and task-oriented.

e. See also Rosenthal (1998) cited elsewhere in this work with respect to “integrative leadership.”

f. Manz and Sims (1991) began to dispel the myth of heroic leadership almost two decades ago. They asserted that true leadership comes from within. A leader is best when he or she can help others become leaders, to lead themselves. They distinguish a fading view of leaders as “strong men,” “transactors,” and visionary-charismatic leaders, all who remain the source of power and direction, from “SuperLeaders” who focus on followers and develop participative, high-performance cultures. The key, they say, “...is a boundless optimism about the potential of ordinary people to accomplish extraordinary things” (p. 33). Other commentators on heroic and mythical leadership include:

a. Taylor (1997) compares the traditional view of leadership with its arrogance, swagger, command (orders), and demand for compliance with punishment for breach with the new view of a humble leadership characterised by reticence, temperance, modesty, and unassuming nature with orientations toward others that are caring and respectful.

b. Badaracco (2002) stresses that leaders throughout the organisation (and by extension society) are not the heroic, charismatic individuals we continue to applaud, but people with modesty and restraint, who “do the right thing.”

c. In The Myth of Leadership: Creating Leaderless Organizations, Nielsen (2004) distinguishes “rank-based” thinking and organising (a military hierarchy paradigm akin to corporate positional leadership), with “peer-based.” The dichotomy is essentially: power-hunger, command and control, ego feeding, elitist, oppressive and creativity stifling, on the one hand, and influencing, collaborating, sharing, equality, respect, and promoting creativity and innovation, on the other.

d. Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) contrast traditional, hierarchical and emerging views of leadership. They note that the emerging forms of leadership may be superior as the nature of the world in which we live is changing. Their research found that emerging views of leadership remain rhetoric, and that if organisations are seeking to become more participative and empowering, the mindsets of those occupying positions of power must first change.

e. George and McLean (2007) suggest that the leader as hero is alive and well. They note that many successful leaders have been caught in a hero stage characterised by what they call “the five perils”: being an imposter, rationalising; glory seeking; playing the loner; shooting star. These are all immature behaviours intended to disguise or ignore the leader’s humanity; they limit potential and effectiveness and possibly derail career attainment. The hero stage must be passed through and transcended to become an authentic leader. Clearly, some “leaders” never evolve out of the hero stage.

f. Sinclair (2007) writes that leadership surrounds us and is within us; we need not look for the one heroic leader. We do, however, need to look within: through discovering our real nature and enacting it (our values, motives) we can become authentic leaders.

g. Cowie (2008) most recent maintains that “the Great Man Theory of Leadership is dead.” (We believe that Great Man notions of leader may be dying and may need to “pass over,” but vestiges of Great Man belief and practice will remain around for some time to come.) She notes that “ordinary heroes” – those with deep awareness of self, who lead with humility as well as courage, amongst other laudable traits – are the kinds of leaders we need today. They build capability through building relationships and attending to the needs of all stakeholders.

h. Also see Crevani, Lindgren, and Packendorff (2007), cited in Endnote 4 with respect to shared leadership, for a great overview / comparison of traditional-hero and post-heroic leadership.

ii There is a rich body of literature on shared leadership (also referred to as distributed or distributive leadership). Some useful sources include: Crevani, Lindgren, and Packendorff (2007), Pearce and Manz (2005), and Spillane (2005). A classic on the subject, it might have been Manz and Sims (1991) who popularised the concept in their “SuperLeadership” article in Organizational Dynamics.

a. Crevani, Lindgren, and Packendorff (2007) describe shared leadership as a post-heroic, collective leadership phenomenon, a collaborative process amongst individuals. Their research identified compelling reasons for shared leadership and found that while it is fairly pervasive informally, few organisations have moved formally toward shared leadership models.
b. Pearce and Manz (2005) suggest that “self-leadership” and “shared leadership” are the silver bullets of a new leadership era. They play with the notion that “leadership as we know it” is dead, but fall short of advocating a major leadership overhaul. They do articulate, however, factors to consider in determining whether or not to move to greater self- and shared leadership—what they describe as empowerment. These include: urgency, employee commitment, creativity, interdependence, and complexity.

c. Spillane (2005) stresses that traditional, positional-hierarchical leadership predicated on one leader is based on faulty premises. We infer that it is also unviable in the fast-paced, complex environment in which we work. In Spillane’s view, distributed leadership is about interactive practice, what people do and how and why they do it, rather than individual leaders or their roles and functions. It is less about individual actions and more about interactions amongst individuals.

ⅴ a. In his work with students, Banning (2003) found that tolerance for ambiguity can be developed through the use of the case method. He also notes the strategic importance of possessing and learning tolerance for ambiguity, citing a range of research that demonstrates its business performance relevance including decision-making and decision confidence, entrepreneurialism, negotiations, coping with change, and propensity to form alliances.

b. Day and Schoemaker (2008) found that tolerance for ambiguity and embrace of paradox were key aspects of vigilant leaders’ capacity for strategic foresight.

c. Hunter (2006) links resilience, tolerance for ambiguity, and charismatic leadership arguing that these three characteristics together help leaders contend with crises. She summarises research that indicates that tolerance for ambiguity is a positive or optimistic orientation (half glass full) rather than a negative, pessimistic (half glass empty) one. Leaders who view uncertain or even crisis situations as desirable in some way (such as seeing them as opportunities to learn) – that is more than less tolerant – are more likely to respond to the situation or threat in a more positive and optimistic, proactive, and effective way, hence, more likely to succeed—to make the most of the situation. Tolerant responses are less likely to be pessimistic, reactive, defensive, hesitant or equivocating. The latter (intolerant responses) are prone to failure or make to worst of a bad situation.

d. Parry and Wharton (2007) concur with research conducted since the 1960s that demonstrates the positive nature of tolerance for ambiguity and a range of organisationally relevant qualities, such as complex problem-solving, relationship skills, performance under conditions of risk, and open-mindedness. In research very relevant to our current study, Parry and Wharton (2007) found significant differences across cohorts of MBA students. They note that differences ultimately result in lower levels of dissatisfaction with the educational experience amongst students with less tolerance for ambiguity, while arguing nevertheless that ambiguity should be endorsed in the classroom, as developing tolerance for ambiguity is linked to a number of desirable outcomes, including creativity, critical thinking, and autonomy.

ⅴ The authors believe that Servant Leadership has established itself beyond “fringe” status. Though not mainstream (as is the case with transformational leadership), Servant Leadership has a dedicated (and distinguished), if small following, and, while the term, itself, is not often used, the principles and values behind Servant Leadership appear in many sources describing enlightened leaders motivated by and appealing to higher purpose, that is, transcending profit motive. Such leaders demonstrate high commitment to community, stewardship, healing, and personal and organisation growth, learning, and development (see Hays, 2008a, for an exposition of the dimensions of Servant Leadership in their application in the higher education context). According the Greenleaf (as reiterated in the 25th Anniversary Edition of his famous book, Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness – 2002), leadership is about serving first. Laub (1999) stressed that Servant Leadership is...an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader. Servant leadership promotes the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership for the good of those led, and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual, the total organization, and those served by the organization (p. 83).

Covey (2002) notes that there has been growing interest in Servant Leadership since its introduction by Robert Greenleaf in 1977, and a corresponding increase in its impact on individuals, organisations, education, and community. Based on their research, Russell and Stone (2002) inform us that there have been increasing efforts to prove the validity of Servant Leadership and considerable practical and theoretical development has occurred.

Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) compared Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership finding them to be very similar on a range of dimensions including respect, vision, influence, modeling, trust, integrity, and delegation. Both emphasise individualized appreciation and consideration of followers. Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) presented research on an instrument they developed to measure Servant Leadership. Beginning with seven dimensions based on Patterson’s Servant Leadership Theory, they ultimately found five distinct factors that could be reliably measured: empowerment, love, humility, trust, and vision. Joseph and Winston (2005) found that servant leadership has the potential to impact positively on organisational performance through the building of trust in the manager and organisation that Servant leadership promotes. All is not rosy, however, for Servant Leadership. In her feminist analysis, Eicher-Catt (2005) argues that contrary to some suppositions Servant Leadership is not gender-neutral or demonstrative of typically feminine behaviours such as empathy, vulnerability, or compassion (see Endnote 2), is something of a myth and, worse, perpetuates androgynous patriarchal norms.

While any leadership could be (unwittingly) self-serving or perpetuate the status quo, we have to believe that the wisdom of Servant Leaders (see Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006) combined with intention to do the right thing for the greatest good all things considered (see Hays, 2007) would prevail. Servant Leaders would make better choices more often than not, and would readily change course when evidence suggest injustice or disservice is being done.

More recently, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) conducted research striving to test the validity of scales for various dimensions of Servant Leadership. They found strong evidence for five Servant Leadership factors (from a potential eleven): altruism, emotional healing, persuasiveness, wisdom, and stewardship; and established credibility for the inventory they used. And, most recently, Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008) report on development and validation of the Servant Leadership Behaviour Scale that is based on their new model characterized by service orientation, holistic outlook, and moral-spiritual emphasis.

Note also that The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership published Focus on Leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st Century in 2002. Edited by Larry Spears and Michele Lawrence, the book contains 25 monographs from some of the great names in leadership (Stephen Covey, Max DePree, Warren Bennis, Danah Zohar, and Margaret Wheatley, amongst others).
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