The theme of this year’s Earth Day, celebrated in May 1st, is united action:

The ILO, formerly known as the International Labour Organization, has adapted its name and announces its first body of expert leaders:

The United Nations broadcast the news about the newly elected leaders of what is now called the International Leadership Organization. Due to the sixth global crises within the twenty-first century, the demand for global solutions required the selection of a body of 17 experts, one of each of the UN 17 Sustainability Goals (SDGs). They are all experts, knowledge entrepreneurs, pioneers, and visionaries. They have access to the accumulated knowledge of humanity through their personal network within the scientific community. These SDG Leaders are well known and enjoy an excellent reputation among the global population. Their word carries weight, as before, only religious authorities, such as the Pope, had. No national or regional leader can afford to ignore them.

What is happening right now is what many have dreamed of seeing one day: global action to cocreate a sustainable future for future generations. Exactly the opposite was happening during the COVID-19 crises around 10 years ago. It all started with the collective blame game against China. Then, we saw a fight between nations around being the first to get a vaccine. Similar national and populist behavioral patterns occurred while solving the climate, refugee, or economic crises, all of which really required joint global action instead.

It took a while until the UN recognized that they had to give their SDGs not only nice images and quantitative targets but also a personal face, unlike the European Union whose EU commissioners made classical political appointees by endlessly debating the need for balancing of gender and national backgrounds and by nominating politicians of whom the individual member states wanted to get rid of by offering them a second career away from home.
Here, the UN via the ILO chose a different approach, establishing a genuinely global leadership committee of worldwide expert leaders, based on their knowledge, values, and reputation in order to push forward the implementation of the 17 SDGs on a global scale and giving them a personal face as well as a worldwide voice. In order to make long-term change possible and to develop the necessary global and transformational expertise, these leaders get a maximum of 10 years tenure, but with the possibility to resign within the first six months if they see that the challenge is too great for them or the team is not working as expected. There is also a quality check about the outcomes every two years by the UN General Assembly.

As the General Secretary in her speech mentioned, “Today we don’t just need a set of international labour standards but also a set of international leadership standards. Globalization has enabled us to see the collective ship we are all in: the magnificent planet earth. All the major problems of the world are global, and they cannot be solved without international cooperation. In its absence, issues such as technological advancements could also pose a threat to our future. Such thought-provoking ideas planted a seed of the new ILO, the International Leadership Organization, which has led to this day and this speech. We once again redefined what it means to be human. An ambitious, free, and insatiable explorer. We are the result of the generation that gave science its deserved credibility after centuries of denial and conflict. That generation showed us what it knew then and what it wanted to change for everyone’s sake. Science was showing us that the truth is not harsh; rather, it is consoling and promising when understood correctly.

It seems like we have come a long way, but this is just a minute fraction of time when compared to the beginning of our existence. There is no longer any need for borders; we learned that a long time ago through the unification similar to that of the European Union, or simply every nation before the establishment of states. These experiences helped us accomplish this on a global scale. We have eradicated world hunger using technology. This only became possible after minimizing waste and distributing resources fairly. We knew from the beginning that a disaster such as hunger was only an error in the system and not inherently impossible to solve. We humans trusted our innermost instinct, the exploration instinct, to lead us. We are born explorers, and if we die knowing we didn’t understand everything, that is okay. We pass on the information, as others have done before us. It is fulfilling to know that our predecessor’s dream became ours, and ours will become the next generation’s. Aren’t we today well equipped to realize a humanitarian world that once existed only in the skies of our ancient philosophers’ imagination?” (speech slightly adapted from the winner essay of the Drucker Challenge Essay Award, Managers/Entrepreneurs Category, Safavi (2020, p. 1).

1 Management vs. Leadership

Control is not leadership; management is not leadership; leadership is leadership. If you seek to lead, invest at least 50% of your time leading yourself Invest at least 20% leading those with authority over you and 15% leading your peers. If you don’t understand that you work
for your mislabeled ‘subordinates,’ then you know nothing of leadership. You know only tyranny. (Dee W. Hock, Founder and CEO Emeritus, Visa International)

In 2030, the old dichotomy between management and leadership will appear to us in a completely and radically new light (see also Table 1). Management is basically routine work. Therefore, it can be treated like accounting or management control automated and done by machines. In contrast, leadership is, to a high degree, nonroutine, creative, and people-interactive work. In fact, leadership in our new understanding is about cocreating the future. As already mentioned by Peter F. Drucker, you cannot predict the future in an unstable environment. You can only create it. But you cannot do that by definition alone. Due to your personal cognitive limitations, this has to be a process of cocreation.

In 2030, there was also a remarkable change in the measurement of successful leadership. It was no longer measured like in the 2020s by the amount of artificial power someone possesses or the wealth that someone could accumulate in their life but rather by the scale of the movement one had started and led to bring about a global change:

- In the early 2000s, a teenager, Malala Yousafzai, insisted on going to school and her right to education. Not even a murder attempt by the Taliban could dampen her spirit. She survived and not only went to school but also encouraged education in the world for children and girls in particular.
- Similarly and controversially, another teenager, Greta Thunberg, stopped going to school and insisted on saving the earth from overheating. In 1 year, she had

| Table 1 Differences between managers and leaders in 2030 (inspired by Bennis (1989) with own additions) |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Manager                                        | Leader                                                        |
| The manager administers                        | The leader innovates                                          |
| The manager is a copy                          | The leader is an original                                     |
| The manager maintains                          | The leader develops                                           |
| The manager focuses on systems and structure    | The leader focuses on people                                  |
| The manager relies on control                  | The leader inspires trust                                     |
| The manager has a short-range view             | The leader has a long-range perspective                       |
| The manager asks how and when                  | The leader asks what and why                                  |
| Managers have their eyes on the bottom line    | Leaders have their eyes on the horizon                       |
| The manager imitates                           | The leader originates                                         |
| The manager accepts the status quo             | The leader challenges it                                      |
| The manager is the classic good soldier        | The leader is a cocreating team                               |
| The manager does things right                  | The leader does the right thing                               |
| Manager is a job                                | Leader is a role                                              |
| Managers have people who work for them         | Leaders have people who follow them                          |
| Managers focus on best practices               | Leaders focus on next practices                               |
| **By 2030, the job of a manager will to a large degree be automated by AI solutions**       | **The role of a leader cannot be fully automated by AI solutions** |
started a global movement that inspired teenagers from almost all nationalities to proactively claim their future.

- Last, but not least, a third teenager, Felix Finkbeiner, had started an action plan to plant 1 billion trees all around the world. The movement he started eventually turned into the “Stop talking, Start planting” campaign.

Despite the fact that individual human beings can make a huge difference in 2030, it is not the individual human being but the whole movement, the leadership team, who will be the new hero. Every leader will depend heavily on their personal network, the knowledge workers, and experts they know and work with, be it inside or outside the specific organizations. Together with them, they will cocreate the future. This work is inherently creative and requires high capacities of empathy and sensemaking. It will therefore be much harder to replace it by machines than autocratic and bureaucratic management, which is much more routine and rule-based (see also Chap. 10 Güldenberg and Langhof in this book):

In the following chapter, we will describe the five most profound challenges and changes of leadership in 2030.

2 Five Major Leadership Challenges in 2030

- Leading Into the Unknown

In the past, the main task of leadership was optimization, which is managing growth and efficiency. In a relatively stable world, you can manage the known and extrapolate it into the future. To build an extension to a house, you don’t need to tear it down and build a new one. This is no longer possible in a VUCA world, which consists of four elements: volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Achi and Berger 2015; Bennett and Lemoine 2014). In such a world, optimization is not enough and can be dangerous or even deadly, because you may optimize for the wrong circumstances. In such a world, profitable growth is replaced by long-term survival, financial optimization is replaced by holistic resilience, and extrinsic motivation is replaced by intrinsic motivation and meaningful work.

- Leading the Knowledgeable

In the past, the best expert in one task would sooner or later in their career end up in a leadership position. The leader was the best expert, and knowledge meant power. In a knowledge economy, this is no longer true. Experts are no longer willing to step into leadership roles because they risk losing their expertise while being busy in leading other people. This has led to a separation between professional and management careers, making leaders heavily dependent on their experts to fulfill their primary responsibility: to be effective and make the right decision.
• Leading Four Generations

For the first time in history, leaders will have to lead four generations at the same time (see also chapter People@Work): Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z, all with very different values, motives, and expectations in regard to their work-life and leadership. In addition, leadership itself will consist of these four generations, which have to work smoothly together to fulfill their leadership responsibilities. This requires a deep understanding of the underlying needs and demands of each of these generations. It will also replace the old principle of seniority: Taking over a leadership position is no longer based on your age but on your empathy and your ability to create a productive human community of four generations.

• Leading Diversity

In the past, leaders were responsible mainly toward their shareholders. Today and in the future, this responsibility will shift toward a more diverse set of groups, the stakeholders. Leaders are no longer responsible only toward their owners and financers but toward their employees, customers, suppliers, and society at large. Therefore, besides the four generations, leaders have to deal successfully with diverse and often contradictory expectations. In a more and more globalized and polarized world, it is vital to bring people with very different skills, cultural backgrounds, mindsets, values, capabilities, and nationalities together in a productive way. This requires an open mindset and the capability of deep listening. Diversity also plays a major role in digital transformation and digital leadership (see next chapter Güldenberg and Langhof).

• Leading Transformation

In the past, when something fundamental changed in the environment, leaders were often replaced by someone else, more fitting in the new situation. A leader well known for being good at managing a crisis was replaced in better times by someone who had a reputation for being good at driving growth only to be replaced again during the next crises. Today, this model has come to an end, as the average term for leaders has dramatically decreased from well over 10 years some decades ago to just about 5 years nowadays. Professional reorientation in top management becomes the rule, not the exception. This goes in line with the regular occurrence of a new global crisis every 5 years. In contrast, the tenure of CEOs in successful companies is, on average, 15 years (Ignatius 2019). Leading the next significant transformations, therefore, should become the task of every future leader. This requires a new set of leadership capabilities, and change management in 2030 will become an essential part of every leadership curriculum.
3 The New Leadership Priorities in 2030

In the past, the leader was typically considered as the strong autocratic person, most likely male in front of the organization or a group of people. He led by power, the power of his position, his age, his wealth, or his charisma. Still, some success stories of successful leaders in our times follow this kind of pattern when you look at the examples of Steve Jobs, Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, and Jack Welch. But will these strong leaders be accepted in the future?

In our view, the leader of the future has to work on five dimensions which are vital in order to get the attention of their followers:

3.1 From Leading Others Toward Leading Yourself

- New Delhi, India, in the 1930s:
  A worried mother embarks on a long and arduous journey. She wants to meet the famous moral teacher Mahatma Gandhi. She has high hopes of meeting the spiritual leader. Her sugar-obsessed son should definitely change his bad eating habits and eat fewer sweets. When she finally met Gandhi, she received a sobering answer. Gandhi is said to have told her, “Unfortunately, I cannot talk to him now. Please bring your son back in a few weeks. I will talk to him then.” Although the mother was naturally disappointed and sad, she came back to Gandhi a few weeks later. This time, Gandhi took the time to talk to her son, and indeed, the conversation was successful. The son even agreed to refrain from excessive consumption of sweets in the future. The mother, who was deeply impressed by Gandhi’s compassion and wisdom, expressed her gratitude to him. One thing she wanted to know, why had Gandhi not wanted to speak to her son at the first meeting? Gandhi replied, “Well, two weeks ago, I ate a lot of sugar myself. I first had to go this way myself to explain to him that he should not eat sugar” (based on Edwards 2017).

Leadership always begins with self-leadership: According to Dee Hock (1999), only those who can lead themselves will be capable of leading others effectively. This is particularly true for knowledge workers, who do not like to be managed by orders and rules. Drucker (1999) says that, in general, leadership styles can be acquired. However, this also means that leading knowledge workers needs to be learned intensively and systematically through evidence-based theory, personal reflection, and practical experience. Leadership styles and especially self-leadership are not innate, although there may be people of varying talent out there. The first thing about leadership styles is the optimal execution of one’s tasks (Senge 1990, 2003).

Each great transformation in organizations therefore begins with the recognition and the transformation of one’s mental models. This is indeed a factor that makes the implementation of change in an organization so difficult (Göpel 2016; Schneidewind 2018). We have a fatal tendency to first try and make others change their behavior without realizing that we need to begin by changing our mindset and behavior. If we
want to create trust, if we’re going to succeed, then we must start with ourselves. Self-leadership will become the most important capability in a digital economy because you have to manage processes of unlearning your old mindsets and learning new leadership skills (Klammer and Güldenberg 2019).

Most change processes are doomed to fail right from the beginning because of the notion that one can bring about a change in the organization without any changes in one’s thinking. Particularly harmful is the notion that this change can be implemented without any change in the mindset and personality of the leaders themselves. An example of this would be the belief that change can be brought about merely by investing in new digital technologies or by roping in external consultants who advise on how to drive one’s employees to change. Change programs that are rolled out in organizations are usually not able to address the critical question: Do the current management executives, their competences, and their style of leadership fit the vision of the organization in the future?

Individual change and individual learning, especially on the management side, is a prerequisite in order to achieve organizational change and learning. Although an increasing number of leaders are taking this personal aspect into account, the implementation of this insight in the prevailing leadership practice is still quite far from reality.

The perceived threats to one’s position, the cultural prejudices, and the barriers which prevent the awareness and acceptance of one’s shortcomings are still prevalent among today’s leaders. With that in mind, it would be just to say that we have a leadership crisis in today’s times, and we can see it everywhere in the form of the dwindling trust of employees in their leaders. On the other hand, more and more leaders have realized their personal responsibility to learn and ask the right questions. For instance, a member of the board recently confessed to his colleagues that every day he strives hard to remain human while he executes his duties as a leader.

3.2 From One-Size-Fits-All Toward Situational Leadership (Improvisation Is the New Leadership Paradigm)

Hawthorne, North America, in the 2030s: A biotech supplier based in North America was in a deep crisis. Great uncertainty spread throughout the workforce. So, the two managing directors came up with an unusual, almost foolhardy plan, perhaps their last chance for the biotech supplier in the crisis:

They shut down all online communication, approached every single employee personally, and developed individual plans with and for each employee. These individual plans included the personal needs and goals of each employee. “Our main task was to listen above all else,” said the Managing Director, who had made it his duty to have lunch with a different employee every day. The plan was daring and extraordinary since for more than 10 years digital and virtual had been the standard approach. But in the end, it surprisingly worked. The productivity of the employees increased considerably, which has been not the case during the last 10 years. The profits of the company also increased in the medium term.
As one of the two leaders noted, “Giving personal attention and listening makes the difference. Whether it is a general feeling of uncertainty, fear, increasing complexity, or the unreliability of modern technology; digitalization brings with it countless challenges. Given the dramatic changes brought about by digitization, it is important that we listen and respond to the concerns of our employees” (based on Christ 2014).

Knowledge workers are different, and they require different leadership styles and answers. The future leader has to improvise and act situationally. What works in one situation does not fit at all to another situation. Think, for example, on the kind of innovation you want to reach: Should it be radical or incremental? Both would require utterly different leadership approaches in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.

This is especially true in times of crisis. At the beginning of the 2020s, we are now experiencing the fourth major crisis (terrorist attacks, financial, migrants, pandemic), and there is no reason to assume that this mode of permanent crises will change until 2030. On the contrary, the next crises are just waiting around the corner, and there are a couple of candidates for it: climate, economic conflict, social riots, inequality, fundamentalism and populism, blackouts, and most probably some yet unknown ones as well.

Situational leadership cannot prepare for everything coming, but one thing is certain: It has to react fast and effectively to deal with such crisis situation and to protect lives and jobs. This can only be done by changing our previous success paths, those concentrated on the optimization of costs and maximization of profits rather than toward building more resilience into our political and economic systems and therefore increases its chances for survival. In short, situational leadership replaces short-minded by long-term thinking and one way by multiple ways. In the end, nothing is without alternatives.

3.3 From Shareholder Toward Stakeholder Leadership

“The purpose of a company is to engage all its stakeholders in shared and sustained value creation. In creating such value, a company serves not only its shareholders but all its stakeholders—employees, customers, suppliers, local communities, and society at large. The best way to understand and harmonize the divergent interests of all stakeholders is through a shared commitment to policies and decisions that strengthen the long-term prosperity of a company.

A company is more than an economic unit generating wealth. It fulfills human and societal aspirations as part of the broader social system. Performance must be measured not only on the return to shareholders but also on how it achieves its environmental, social, and good governance objectives. Executive remuneration should reflect stakeholder responsibility.

A company that has a multinational scope of activities not only serves all those stakeholders who are directly engaged, but acts itself as a stakeholder—together with governments and civil society—of our global future. Corporate global citizenship requires a company to harness its core competencies, its entrepreneurship,
skills and relevant resources in collaborative efforts with other companies and stakeholders to improve the state of the world” WEF (2020).

Knowledge workers are looking for purpose and meaning in their work. The future leader has to give meaningful answers for that search of purpose. It is no longer enough to incentivize extrinsically and run the company by pure numbers, which are completely meaningless. At the height of Shareholder Value Management in the late 1990s, more and more employees felt disconnected and disengaged (De Vulpian 2005). They saw no fit between their personal objectives, what they wanted to achieve in their lives, and the company objectives. The result was disengagement and a dramatic loss of commitment. If one cannot fulfill her or his personal objectives within an organization, one is concentrating more and more on activities outside of the organization leading to a disadvantage of what is being achieved within the organization and an enormous waste of human energy. That is the main disadvantage of Shareholder Value Management.

Stakeholder management provides that meaning and creates this shared value (Porter and Kramer 2011; Porter et al. 2012) which thereby focuses human energy. In order to be successful, it requires a shift in leaders’ measures, time horizon, and priorities. Whereas Shareholder Management seemed to be comfortable and easy, it entails a tragedy in itself once stated by William Edwards Deming and very visible through several incidents during the last years: “Management by numerical goal is an attempt to manage without knowledge of what to do, and in fact usually management by fear. If management sets only quantitative targets and makes people’s jobs depend on meeting them, they will likely meet the targets—even if they have to destroy the enterprise to do it” (Deming 1982, p. 76).

Therefore, in turbulent times, it is even in the best interest of shareholders if a company changes toward Stakeholder Leadership: “As we approach a period of significant capital reallocation, companies have a responsibility—and an economic imperative—to give shareholders a clear picture of their preparedness. And in the future, greater transparency on questions of sustainability will be a persistently important component of every company’s ability to attract capital. It will help investors assess which companies are serving their stakeholders effectively, reshaping the flow of capital accordingly. But the goal cannot be transparency for transparency’s sake. Disclosure should be a means to achieving a more sustainable and inclusive capitalism. Companies must be deliberate and committed to embracing purpose and serving all stakeholders—your shareholders, customers, employees, and the communities where you operate. In doing so, your company will enjoy greater long-term prosperity, as will investors, workers, and society as a whole” (Larry Fink Chairman and CEO Blackrock, 2020).

3.4 From Autocratic Toward Servant Leadership

Knowledge workers are independent as they know what to do best. They don’t require directives, but they expect attention, appreciation, and respect. This is best shown by the expectations of one of the leading orchestras worldwide, the Vienna
Philharmonic. Asked what they expect from the management board they stated, that they should visit their performances because that shows their respect and appreciation of their work, but they should never tell them if they performed well because that is not their business at all. Such performance evaluation should be left to the professionals in the field of music, like colleagues or music critics. Now, transfer this experience to other businesses like the design department of a car manufacturer or the management of a research institution.

In these environments, future leaders should see themselves more like gardeners: They help their knowledge workers grow, but they should never drive them to growth. Future leaders wouldn’t be able to do so as they no longer possess the necessary expert knowledge, which could lead to wrong management decisions with very adverse side effects on the motivation and commitment of their experts. This could ultimately lead to the destruction of the whole company.

Servant leadership as a modern leadership philosophy was coined by the American management consultant Robert Greenleaf (1970), Greenleaf et al. (2002), who, in turn, was inspired by Hermann Hesse’s (1956) novel *Journey to the East*. In his original essay, Greenleaf (1970) describes servant leadership as follows:

The servant-leader is servant first. . . It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions (Greenleaf 1970).

The central notion of servant leadership involves a strict focus on the followers’ interests and needs (Langhof and Güldenberg 2020b; Liden et al. 2014). Hence, servant leadership stands in contrast to other leadership styles (such as authoritarian leadership), where the followers serve their organization or their leader (Langhof et al. 2020).

In the modern literature of servant leadership, one can identify three main principles of servant leadership: uncompromising service, selflessness, and the willingness to help other people to grow (see also Table 2).

3.5 From Ego-centric Toward Shared (Global) Leadership

No institution can possibly survive if it needs geniuses or supermen to manage it. It must be organized in such a way as to be able to get along under a leadership composed of average human beings. No institution can endure if it is under one-man rule. Industrial dictatorship like any other dictatorship threatens the survival of the institution in the event—an inevitable event—of the dictators death (Peter Drucker 1946, p. 26).

When asked in advance of the World Economic Forum in Davos, where the founder Klaus Schwab sees the greatest challenge for leadership today, his answer was simple and powerful at the same time: egoism, which he wrote in big letters on a piece of paper. His famous interviewer Richard Quest from CNN seemed to be surprised and asked him for an explanation. Klaus Schwab replied:
What we are seeing in the world is a king of increased egoism; it is a polarization of views. When you can’t cope with change, you feel overwhelmed and you look for a simple solution, he said (Reid 2016).

Simple answers, simple solutions, simple rules, and simple leadership all suffer from the same problem: They are fast and wrong because they do not take into account the complexity that is out there and necessary to master it successfully: The greater the variety of a leadership system, the more it can master the variety of its environment, also known as Ashby’s law; it is one of the key insights of cybernetics, the scientific study of control, and communication in the animal and the machine (Wiener 1948).

So, it is not a coincidence that collaboration is the key element of knowledge work. In order to achieve it, leadership has to be shared. Gibb already (1954, p. 884) mentioned that shared:

Leadership is a group quality... a set of functions which must be carried out by the group. This concept of ‘distributed leadership’ is an important one. If there are leadership functions which must be performed in any group, and if these functions may be ‘focused’ or ‘distributed’, then leaders will be identifiable both in terms of the frequency and in terms of the multiplicity or patterns of functions performed.

Von Krogh et al. (2012) defines shared leadership as a dichotomy between centralized and distributed leadership:

| Table 2 | Are you a servant leader? (source: Langhof and Güldenberg 2020a) |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Questions you can ask yourself | Description                                                                 |
| Are you asking the right questions? | “reflecting the leader’s competency in solving work problems and understanding the organization’s goals” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
| Are you empowering others? | “assessing the degree to which the leader entrusts followers with responsibility, autonomy, and decision-making influence” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
| Are you helping subordinates grow and succeed? | “capturing the extent to which the leader helps followers reach their full potential and succeed in their careers” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
| Are you putting subordinates first? | “assessing the degree to which the leader prioritizes meeting the needs of followers before tending to his or her own needs” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
| Are you caring? | “the degree to which the leader cares about followers’ personal problems and well-being” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
| Are you creating value for your community? | “the leader’s involvement in helping the community surrounding the organization as well as encouraging followers to be active in the community” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
| Are you behaving ethically? | “being honest, trustworthy, and serving as a model of integrity” (Liden et al. 2015, p. 255) |
In centralized leadership, leaders are selected according to predefined criteria of what constitutes effective leadership in knowledge creation. For example, (...) leaders would be chosen on the basis of their ability to formulate a strategic direction in the organization (...). In a distributed model, leadership needs to be ‘stretched’ over situations and individuals who are leaders and followers (...), and is therefore characterized by concerted activities rather than aggregated individual activities. Distributed leadership seeks to diffuse personal growth and development among participants so that they may take on leadership and followership in a peer structure (...). Developing these skills is not simply a question of instruction and the teaching of rule-based behavior (...). Rather, the practice of care, helping behavior, mentoring, guidance, and teaching-by-doing between peers will develop individuals’ distributed leadership skills (...). Because they are removed from specific situations and processes of local knowledge creation, central, upper-echelon leaders cannot substitute for peers in diffusing these skills among participants.

Shared leadership is the anchor and focal point of the other four leadership styles (see also Fig. 1). Executed correctly, they lead to shared leadership. Without shared leadership, the joint cocreation of the future is not possible. If successfully established, it can be used to create a long-lasting strategic competitive advantage for the organization and a high potential for attracting talents.

### The New Roles Leaders Have to Enact in 2030

Today, executives are increasingly realizing that fundamental change cannot be managed from the top. This fundamental change is, however, necessary to successfully transform organizations from the industrial age into the digital age. We can, therefore, see successful organizations in today’s world gaining competitive advantage by changing their entire leadership system. Less individualistic and more collective, i.e., development of new knowledge and sharing it, lead to sustained growth.

The consequences that this development will have for the theory and practice of leadership should not be underestimated. In a digital society, we first need to change the mindset of our leaders, who are until today looked upon as lone heroes at the top, influencing and controlling the whole organization. Top-down instructions, even if they are actually implemented, foster an atmosphere of fear, mistrust, and internal competition, which in turn reduces the willingness to work as a team and learn...
together. Directives coming from the top are followed but do not help employee retention or identification with the company. Only real identification forms the basis for the courage, the power of imagination, the patience, and the consequence which are required to boost learning processes in the organization.

Precisely for these reasons, leadership in the future has to be distributed to various members and groups of the organization who are collectively responsible for shaping the future of the company:

- Servant leaders are aware of their responsibility toward employees and the organization as a whole and therefore strive to serve both—the employees and the overall goal of the organization. Usually, they are members of the top management team of an organization, who mentor the local line leaders and function as their thinking and sparring partners. These members of the management are also responsible for supporting cultural change by being aware of their influence as role models and conducting themselves accordingly. Moreover, they invest in the learning infrastructure of the organization and simultaneously try to overcome learning barriers.
- Community leaders are people who often have very little authority or no in the organization, e.g., counselors, experts, controllers, or workers. These people link employees and ideas and thus help to detect new opportunities at the right time. They are a source of inspiration and encourage an excellent working atmosphere and commitment.
- Learning leaders, instead of giving all the answers, ask the right questions. In particular, they make the employees and the organization aware of the limitations of the existing models of thought and work on enhancing these models. They are usually specialists with comprehensive basic responsibilities at the bottom of the organization, e.g., business unit heads who implement new product ideas and innovations.
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In future organizations, these leadership roles are essential and interdependent. Alone, none of them are in a position to create an environment that is attractive for knowledge workers, which can encourage learning, and which can contribute to the generation and transfer of new ideas and new knowledge. And all three are to be considered and recognized as leaders, even if not officially. Together, with their different roles, they form shared leadership in our future organizations.

5 Competences a Leader Will Need in 2030: Learning Instead of Knowing

1. The Learning Leader

Lifelong learning and continuous training are necessary for leaders in order to remain effective. However, to keep learning something new and to stay abreast of the latest knowledge in their field of work should also be a personal desire of future leaders. Continuous leadership training should match the requirements of the company and the leader. Besides technical and specialized knowledge, social competence and the ability to communicate effectively and to work in a team are of primary importance to future leaders. The continuous training programs arranged by the company must also include imparting and fostering these soft skills (see also Chap. 14 in this book).

2. The Multicultural Leader

The world is not flat. Therefore, future leaders need to understand cultural differences and appreciate them as entrepreneurial opportunities instead of risks or threats. The time of nationalistic leaders belongs to the past. You cannot learn culture in textbooks and classrooms. You have to experience it. Therefore, future leaders will have to step out of their comfort zone by opening up to learning journeys and new cultural experiences.

3. The Intergenerational Leader

The future leader will have to lead four generations simultaneously. This has never happened before, and never before has it been as critical as today due to technological change. A leader of the past usually had a personal network within his age group. Because of the seniority principle, this worked quite fine. In 2030, that won’t work anymore because there are four generations at work with very different approaches toward work and life.

4. The Human Leader

The biggest problem for people in the age of work 4.0 will be self-exploitation. Social ratings, like the Chinese social credit system and social pressure, like growing
inequalities, is forcing people into keeping up with technology standards and increasing consumption, even if they don’t have the time, means, or qualification to do so, leading to even more significant problems, like personal privacy issues, social burnout, or even illegal behavior. The future leader has to deal with these challenges, meaning that he or she is forced to make decisions that are not purely economically driven but also social and ethical. This will have profound consequences for the education of future leaders.

5. The Wise Leader

The significant impact of the COVID-19 crises at the beginning of the 2020s means that our society will never be the same as it used to be. In such an unpredictable and uncontrollable environment, leadership with practical wisdom to make judgments based on the “common good” is becoming decisive for our own future and destiny (Nonaka and Takeuchi 2011). In times of pandemics, social inequality, and climate change, it is not only a question of success or failure; it will become, in some cases, even a question of life or death. Wise leadership is based on altruistic behavior, sympathy with people, things, and surroundings “now and here” (Nonaka and Koizumi 2020). It is based on what the Greek philosopher Aristotle called “phronesis,” not a technique, but an intellectual virtue, ability to determine and undertake the best action in a specific situation to serve the common good (Nonaka and Toyama 2007).

Key Insights for Leaders and Leadership in 2030

- Knowledge workers will require new leaders in 2030 as old principles of leadership and leadership styles will no longer work for them. In the book, we propose a new 5S model of leadership (self, situational, stakeholder, servant, shared) that will fit much better to the requirements of a new leader in 2030 to make them more effective toward the knowledge worker to make her/him more productive.
- Traditional leadership functions, like performance measurement, incentivizing, or management control, will be increasingly replaced by AI solutions. Modern leaders have to concentrate on the innovative and creative tasks of leadership that cannot be replaced by machines. The main task of modern leadership is to cocreate the future of the organization in an unpredictable and turbulent world.
- New leaders in 2030 have to change their self-perception from the leadership generations of the past. The leader of the future does not know everything better than their followers but is the one creating a movement toward change and is asking the right questions. This requires curiosity and lifelong learning skills from the leader.

(continued)
• New leaders in 2030 have to develop intergenerational and multicultural competences. Never before have they had to work with so many different cultures and generations at the same time.
• As a consequence of this, seniority principles in promotion do not matter anymore. It is not the oldest and most experienced who makes a good leader, but the one who can connect and build a strong personal network.
• Last, but not least, self-leadership will become even more critical than in the past. In a world where attention is a scarce resource, managing focus and attention of oneself and employees is the decisive factor in getting things done.
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