

“
Many who have made transformational changes have been portrayed as “iron ladies”, for example, Corazon Aquino, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Yingluck Shinawatra & Dilma Vana Rousseff who rose to power through revolution
 ”

Leadership in the 21st Century is marked by innovation, technology and change with a shift from production of goods to the delivery of services and information bringing about demands for different kinds of leadership. China, Japan, Africa, and Latin America, “third world countries” once colonised by Western power for cheap labor and rich resources now seek liberation and self-governance. With their productivity now far outpacing that of “advanced” Western nations and the proliferation of multinational corporations in the global economic market, the 21st Century marks our interdependence and need to cooperate if we are to achieve world peace, create a sustainable environment, eliminate terrorism, and promote global economic and social wellbeing.

This means redefining leadership explained by leadership traits to the multiple social identities that leaders bring. It means valuing and respecting differences across dimensions of diversity, i.e., race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion and disability. It means recognising the privilege that dominant groups experience against the oppression that minority groups face. How do leaders and members remain authentic in such an environment? Can they bring all of their identities to their leadership?”

Diverse leaders coming from minority groups

often must learn the rules of the game and play by them as they enter the power elite. This often shapes their identities and leadership behaviours as they conform to become more like those already in power. We saw this historically as female leaders rose to power; it was their relationship with powerful men that enabled them to break the taboo against female leaders. Dowager Cixi, Empress of China and Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt were two such examples where the social zeitgeist led them to be viewed as invalid and tyrannical leaders who seized power and ascended to power through their alliance with and seduction of powerful men of their times. Despite their major social reforms and military conquests, they are remembered primarily for their “feminine wickedness”, seductress powers, and “iron-willed” characters.

Some of the most powerful female political leaders since continue to be portrayed by these gendered expectations. Many who have made transformational changes have been portrayed as “iron ladies”, for example, Corazon Aquino (Philippines), Ellen Johnson Sirleaf (Liberia), Yingluck Shinawatra (Thailand), Dilma Vana Rousseff (Brazil) who rose to power through revolution and Golda Meir (Israel), Margaret Thatcher (England), Angela Merkel (Germany) who rose to leadership from within the system. Their alternate portrayal as “mothers” or saints reflect society’s ambivalence about strong wom-

en. Racial/ethnic minority leaders similarly are constrained when perceived as “exceptions” to their race when they made an accomplishment, when they are commonly asked “how their group thinks”.

The question is: Does Difference Makes a Difference? The answer is a resounding “Yes” because the privilege held by dominant group members often render them oblivious to or disbelieving of these experiences that those from minority groups face. For example, an African American woman being straight forward and assertive may be perceived as confrontational and intimidating while an Asian American woman being respectful, indirect and modest may be perceived as passive. Female Native American leaders may emphasize “standing beside, rather than behind, their men in an effort to preserve and protect their tribal treaty rights”, but then be faulted for not holding their own as women (Chin & Trimble, 2014, p. 283). We have pilot data on diverse leaders to show that being different often means: (i) being the one and only, (ii) always being the outsider, (iii) having to work twice as hard to be ½ as good, (iv) always having to prove yourself, (v) being challenged on your competence, or (vi) having to be extraordinary. It often means living in two different worlds as they negotiate between different communities.

So what kinds of leaders do we want for the

21st Century? Command and Control types of leadership are probably on their way out. There is simply not one model for a diverse population. The research literature increasingly points to transformational, collaborative and relational oriented leadership styles as models for 21st Century leadership —redefining leadership based on change, relationships and influence.

Transformational leadership is characterised as: visionary, promoting change, inspirational, innovative, and charismatic (Burns, 1978) became popular in the 1980s as US corporations began to experience rapid change internationally and multinational corporations began to flourish. Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen (2003) found female leaders to be more transformational than male leaders. Charisma as a characteristic, however, is problematic because it defines male charisma—i.e., someone with a commanding presence exuding confidence, strength, and a personal magic or appeal that arouses loyalty or enthusiasm. Women’s charisma is often more associated with being warm, nurturing and interpersonal, i.e., about persuasion and smiles.

Collaborative Leadership is characterised as: strategically choosing to cooperate in order to accomplish a shared outcome and accepting responsibility for building or helping to ensure the success of a heterogeneous team (Rubin,