MODERN TRENDS IN ECUADORIAN LEADERSHIP: EXPLORING CULTURAL CHANGE IN POLITICAL, AGRICULTURAL & BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

Jeffrey L. McClellan, Frostburg State University
Jlmcclellan@frostburg.edu

ABSTRACT

This article examines the cultural history of leadership in Ecuador with an emphasis on leadership in the modern era. Building on the work of McClellan (2016, 2017), which examined leadership in the precolonial and colonial eras, this article looks at how leadership culture has begun to change based on an examination of political leadership, agricultural leadership, and business leadership. While continuation of many of the themes of colonial leadership are evident, particularly in the political arena. There are some significant changes in leadership culture emerging from within the agricultural/indigenous leadership and the business arenas.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership in Ecuador is currently an understudied phenomenon. Only a handful of studies have examined the concept of leadership from a cross national perspective. Nonetheless, there is a need in the leadership literature to delve more deeply into the study of specific nations to better understand how people influence one another to achieve goals. Consequently, this article offers an overview of the interdisciplinary literature on leadership in Ecuador. By taking a historical approach to the study of leadership in Ecuador, this article first overviews the literature related to precolonial and colonial leadership patterns in Ecuador and then examines interdisciplinary contributions to leadership studies in the country in the modern era in the political, agricultural, and business realms.

PRE-COLONIAL LEADERSHIP IN ECUADOR

Prior to the colonization of Ecuador by Spain, Ecuador was inhabited by a multitude of different tribal and agricultural societies that remained largely politically separate because of the geographic and societal structures that surrounded them. In an article based on historical and anthropological sources, McClellan (2017) examined the nature of this leadership based on a cultural analysis rooted in the work of Schein. Schein (1992) suggested that culture existed at three levels: artifacts, values, underlying assumptions. McClellan suggested that leadership culture existed at three similar levels: means of influence, goals of the leader, and sources of power. Sources of power represent the foundational beliefs that cause people to accept others as leaders. Goals are a reflection of what a leader values and means of influence are procedural artifacts. In reviewing the

literature regarding precolonial societies in Ecuador (Bray, 2008; Hurtado, 2010; Luciano, 2010; Salomon, 1986), McClellan found that influence was rooted in kinship and economic networks of influence, paternal heritage and masculinity, wealth, religion, and military strength, and the acquisition of formal positions of power.

Those who emerged as leaders based on these sources generally sought to further increase and maintain their power in relation to each of these areas while providing genuine paternalistic care for their followers. They generally did this through demonstrations of strength and courage, fear-based influence and punishment, redistribution of resources to benefit all, management of strategic relationships, trade, sponsoring of feasts, symbolic leadership via ceremonies, dispute resolution, labor administration, and directing military efforts. In a follow-up article, McClellan (2016) reconceptualized these means of influencing others as involving the use of authoritative decision-making, demonstrations of strength and courage, use of fear and corporal punishment, redistribution of resources, management of strategic relationships, acquisition of resources, and reciprocal relationships. While these precolonial leadership practices represent the cultural roots of leadership in Ecuador, the Incas and Spanish brought with them cultural approaches to leadership that overlayed, contrasted with, and reinforced various aspects of these influence processes.

THE INCA INFLUENCE

The Inca arrived in Ecuador a generation before the Spanish and had an impact on leadership culture in the highlands. Although a foreign colonizer, the Inca have come to be seen to some extent as Ecuadorian, as evidenced by the general perception that the last Inca king is often revered as being Ecuadorian given his birth to an Ecuadorian mother in Quito (Lauderbaugh, 2012). This is likely, at least in part, because of the many similarities between Inca leadership and traditional Indigenous leadership and because of the tendency that the Incas had to rule through local leaders (D'Altroy, 2002). Based on an article exploring the cultural foundations of leadership in Ecuador, McClellan (2016) found that the sources of power in Inca society included: kinship, through the Sapa Inca lineage; divine right, the Inca leaders were seen as divine inheritors of the right to rule; and military prowess, as conquest was seen as a means of consolidating, maintaining, and extending power.

Based on these sources, the goals of leadership generally focused on expansion of the kingdom, maintenance and expansion of authority, and increased wealth. These goals were achieved through influence processes that focused on the use of strong oratory skills, effective bureaucratic organization, redistribution of resources, demonstration of strength and courage, use of preexisting power structures, reciprocal relationships, decisive and authoritative decision-making, and military punishment of opposition and relocation of resistant peoples (McClellan, 2016). Of these practices, the use of preexisting power structures and redistribution of resources likely facilitated the acceptance of Inca leadership culture once any opposition was squelched via conquest and relocation practices. Spanish leadership culture did not align as well.

SPANISH CULTURAL INFLUENCES

At the time of the conquest, Spain's leadership culture represented an amalgamation of catholic (especially the works of Thomas Aquinas), Roman, and renaissance philosophy, such as Machiavelli (Dealy, 1992; McIntosh, 2011). Spanish society was feudalistic and monarchical in nature. Power came from hereditary wealth and centered on the importance of social networks. Although, enlightenment philosophy was influencing social norms in Spain, it would ultimately have little immediate impact on the Spanish Colonies (Behrens, 2009).

As a result, of these cultural foundations, Spanish colonial leadership culture reflected a unique approach known as *cuadillaje*, or rule by strongmen (Spillan et al., 2014). Based on the underlying philosophical virtues of *dignidad*, leisure, grandeur, generosity, manliness, and deception (Dealy, 1992), colonial leadership drew its power from social status and kinship, networks of influence and wealth, positional authority, and charisma (McClellan, 2016). Once in power, leaders sought to maintain authority, increase their power and status, expand their networks, and increase their wealth while demonstrating a paternalistic care for followers and maintaining a lifestyle characterized by leisure. This was achieved through perception management, the use of charismatic interpersonal skills. Reciprocal relationships, consolidation of power, demonstrations of strength and courage, and machismo-based dominance of women and sexual prowess, decisive authoritative decision-making, and redistribution of resources (McClellan, 2016).

It is worth noting that while some of the elements of Spanish leadership culture were similar to those of Inca and Indigenous cultures, these apparent similarities ultimately created more conflict than alignment. For example, while both cultures appear to advocate for paternalistic care of followers and redistribution of resources, the Spanish approach to this was much less authentic and equitable, and more exploitative and racially biased (Hurtado, 1985, 2010; Lyons, 2006). As a result, Indigenous populations became disenchanted with leadership that did not demonstrate genuine concern for their well-being and largely exploited them (Becker, 2008).

FROM COLONIAL ECUADOR TO THE MODERN ERA

While little formal research exists to specifically address the transformation of leadership culture in Ecuador since the colonial era. Additional non-traditional sources suggest that the patterns of the colonial past predominated, with a few alterations and introductions, up to the modern era. In this section some sources will be examined for insights regarding this development. The first of these sources is a historical examination of presidential leadership in Ecuador. The second is a narrative history of life in the hacienda system that includes descriptions of the leadership structures and processes. The third examines business leadership in Ecuador.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

In his history of Ecuador, Lauderbaugh (2012) focused heavily on the actions of presidents. As a result, he provides a summary view of how political leadership evolved from the colonial era up until the mid-1900s. His writings are particularly relevant to leadership given that in Latin America, political figures tend to represent a dominant archetype for leadership (McIntosh, 2011). Thus political ideals of leadership manifest themselves in the hacienda system, the home, the military, and other aspects of society in Ecuador (Paz & Cepeda, 2010).

After reviewing the first three decades of independent nationhood, Lauderbaugh (2012) identified several trends that significantly influenced later historical developments. Many of these trends deal directly with leadership. These trends included the emergence of bitter conflicts between the liberal and conservative parties that established the tradition of a disloyal opposition in Ecuador constantly seeking to remove the party in power from office. The implications for leadership and leader-follower relations are significant.

Leaders had to constantly battle to retain their positions of power and keep a close eye on followers. Small scale rebellions had to be dealt with swiftly and powerfully to avoid widespread rebellion. Followers and those who aspired to leadership did not support leaders in pursuit of the common good. Instead, it was expected that they would oppose leadership when they disagreed and that they would seek to overthrow leaders when possible. Thus, the existence of a disloyal opposition strengthened the need for expanding networks, maintenance of authority, and paternalistic care taking of followers. Likewise, it reinforced the need to consolidate power, build reciprocal relationships (especially with the military), and punish dissidents using violence and shows of strength.

The second trend that Lauderbaugh (2012) identified was the reinforcement of "caudillismo or the rule by strongmen who are unwilling to relinquish power according to constitutions" (p. 51). By strong men, Lauderbaugh was referring to leaders who created a following based on wealth, status, reciprocal, paternalistic relationships, etc. He further explained that these militaristic *caudillos* "used the army as a base of support" (Lauderbaugh, 2012, p. 51). In addition, their leadership was characterized by personalism, in that the ultimate loyalty of their followers was not based on the follower's alignment with the leader's policies, but rather on loyalty to the leader. Thus, "some men who started out as liberals later became conservatives, but their ultimate loyalty usually rested with the leader they followed" (Lauderbaugh, 2012, p. 51). This loyalty, however, was often tenuous as followers frequently betrayed their leaders when it gave them an opportunity to achieve power themselves. This led to a tendency to engage in self-protective leadership that disregarded constitutional mandates regardless of one's political leanings, as both the ultra-conservative Moreno and the ultra-liberal Alfaro both engaged in dictatorial leadership.

In addition to these early, explicitly stated trends, Lauderbaugh's (2012) work suggests that Ecuadorian presidents tended to be quite visionary and were very much focused on strengthening the nation and responding to the developmental needs of the country. Much of their efforts focused on education, transportation, and improvements to quality of life (i.e., potable water, sewage systems, etc.). Furthermore, many strived to promote honest and effective administration.

Nonetheless, the system was generally rife with corruption, which many presidents did actively promulgate. Furthermore, financial problems were constantly limiting their efforts and military spending and activities were significant as a means of managing, or repressing, the disloyal opposition.

Additional trends identified in Lauderbaugh's (2012) text included: the tendency of many of the Ecuadorian presidents to view themselves as the only person capable of leading the country and the tendency for political leaders to come from the families of former political leaders, thus reinforcing the tendency for leadership to be based on social status, wealth, and family centered networks of influence.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of leadership in Ecuador to emerge in the modern era has been populism. Populism refers to leadership that seeks popular support by appealing to the masses as opposed to depending entirely on one's own network of supporters. While evidence of this approach is clear in the early history of Ecuador (De la Torre, 2007; Paz & Cepeda, 2010), the individual who most exemplified and popularized this approach was Velasco Ibarra. Ibarra was a fiery, charismatic speaker. He refused to align himself with any party and actively sought the support of the people. As Lauderbaugh (2012) explained, Velasco

> launched the first modern political campaign in Ecuador's history by taking his cause directly to the people, personally campaigning throughout the country. . . . Velasco flattered average Ecuadorians with his appeal for their support and he exhorted the crowds to vote for change that only he could bring about (p. 102).

Though his presidencies were generally unproductive and all but one ended in his being removed from office and exiled from the country, his ability to appeal to the people led to landslide victories on 5 separate occasions. As a result, he set a precedent for populist leadership that exists to the present.

Ibarra's populism focused on conveying a set of ideals about leadership that are perhaps best expressed in the content analysis of one of the early speeches given by Ibarra (De la Torre, 1994). In the content analysis, the following moral qualities of Velasco and his followers were identified: "democracy, heroic pueblo (soldiers), the spiritual (the moral), emotion, institutions (suffrage), honorable people, modest citizen, sincerity, morality, and revolution that is transcendental, profound, and truthful" (De la Torre, 1994, p. 706). Additionally, the following themes, which reflect the agenda of populism, were identified in Ibarra's approach. First, he claimed that he was an individual who had suffered much to overcome great challenges, like the people themselves, and, therefore, could represent them and embody their will. Consequently, they needed only to trust in him, and he would lead them. Thus, the idea that the leader embodies the people is a central tenet of populism (De la Torre, 2007) and allows for the leader to impose that will upon the people as if it were their own (Paz & Cepeda, 2010).

Second, political life represents a struggle between good and evil as embodied in the people and the oligarchy. The populist leader represents good. The opposition is evil. Compromise is, therefore, impossible as it is immoral because "those who are not included in the leader's vision of the people [and] their values either belong to the anti-nation or do not exist in these constructs"

(De la Torre, 2007, p. 394). Consequently, "they do not have rights, because those who are against the leader are considered to be enemies of the nation and the people, whose goals and values are those of the leader" (De la Torre, 2007, p. 394).

As a result of these ideals, populism values democratic practices but often tends toward authoritarianism. Nonetheless, in the more fluid, network oriented, participative structures that typify populist campaigns leaders provide a sense of democratic participation that appeals to many followers (De la Torre, 2007; Paz & Cepeda, 2010). Consequently, it represents both a manifestation of the leadership trends that emerged during the precolonial and colonial era and an alteration/addition to these. In sum, populisms main contributions to an Ecuadorian conceptualization of leadership were its paradoxical appeal to democratic ideals, instead of platforms and policies, while practicing authoritarian leadership. In addition, its philosophical, but not necessarily actual, dependence on the common people as a source of personal authority represented a new trend in leadership that, nonetheless, simply reflects the older paradigms and processes of leadership in the colonial era.

HACIENDA LEADERSHIP

A unique lens on Ecuadorian leadership reveals itself in the work of Lyons (2006). He conducted fieldwork in the Chimborazo region of Ecuador to understand the nature of hacienda society in the 1900s. As a part of his work, he explored the authority and social influence structures and processes that characterized both hacienda life and the communities that have taken the place of Hacienda's in modern Ecuador.

As Lyons (2006) explained, when the Spaniards arrived, they implemented an *encomienda* system which effectively gave European elites control over large tracts of land and the labor and lives of the Indigenous people who lived on the land. The primary emergent structure was that of the hacienda. While haciendas represented economic structures, the connection between the haciendas and the political structures of the country were significant as the hacienda owners, in most cases, were the ones who held political authority in the country. As Hurtado (1985) explained "the hacienda was at the center of political power and the *hacendados* became the central focus of political authority" (p. 53). Indeed, Hurtado suggested that the

> protective and oppressive, autocratic, and paternal model of authority inspired by the hacienda system constituted the pattern adhered to by all who participated in a supervisory capacity in all kinds of organizations—government, municipal, commercial, industrial, educational, political, popular—in which the structures of paternalism became overwhelmingly predominate. (p. 54)

Thus, hacienda owners used their wealth and status as *caudillos* or "caciques" to consolidate their authority and dominate the political, social, and economic regions over which they presided.

Lyons' (2006) research provides insights into how leadership was practiced during the late hacienda period and how it evolved with the decline of the hacienda system. The typical hacienda

structure consisted of an owner, a steward, and an overseer. The owner was generally a member of the "white" elite class and typically lived in the city and spent little time directly involved in the work of running the hacienda. In general, this was likely a result of the leisure-oriented values of society. However, Lyons does suggest that the traditional view of landlords as disinterested investors is outdated.

In the case of the hacienda where Lyons (2006) did his research, the owner was the Diocese of Riobamba. Renters typically filled the role of owner. The steward was generally more directly involved and typically lived on the hacienda. He practiced leadership via an overseer who "aided the steward in planning and supervising daily labors" (Lyons, 2006, p. 78). Stewards were typically members of the mestizo class, whereas overseers were often Indigenous.

The owners typically engaged in paternalistic leadership and practiced the previously cited method of punishing through intermediaries. As a result, Lyons (2006) suggested that the owners or landlords practiced paternalistic leadership, in that they displayed "benevolence and [expected] loyalty and obedience [and respect] in return," in ways that were often consistent with the parenting approaches of their society. Indeed, Lyons (2006) drew some guarded comparisons between the way in which landlords and their stewards persuaded and punished their laborers and the way parents did the same with their children. As a result, the owners were generally expected to demonstrate benevolence, generosity, and detached kindness for their "children" while they exacted work and punished them via the overseers and stewards. In addition, they were able to bestow privileges and rewards upon their workers, in exchange for their efforts and respect. Consequently, they were expected to and generally did engage in redistribution of resources, in the form of products and profits, consistent with the traditional practices of the Indigenous people. Nonetheless, redistribution rarely reflected the quantitative and qualitative values of the Indigenous people in a way that reflected their ideals. When the Indigenous people left or critiqued their former landowners, they often faulted them for failure to practice true reciprocity.

It is worth noting that when reciprocity expectations were not met, peasants often resorted to theft as a means of exacting the resources they felt were due to them (Lyons, 2006). The overseers and stewards tended to be more prone to the use of fear and violence as a means of persuasion. However, they were often caught in the difficult space of middle managers who had to keep both the upper-level leaders happy while at the same time not overly offending the people they led.

While the general approach to leadership was as parental figures, one cannot overlook the reality of the exploitative nature of these relationships. Sexual and physical exploitation, whether directly imposed by owners or via there stewards and overseers were common occurrences. Fear was frequently used as a means of influence, as was religious indoctrination. Indeed, Lyons (2006) outlines how the whippings that took place on the hacienda were conceived of as at least partially spiritual in nature. As a result of the contradictory behavior of the owners and their stewards, it is not surprising that they were viewed as both morally deficient and in league with the devil as well as being considered respected "Elders" and "appropriate delegates of God" (Lyons, 2006, p. 236).

In addition to the formal structures of the haciendas, informal leadership and authority relationships were also present. These were largely based on elder-junior relationships, kinship, and *compadrazgo*. In general, junior members of society were expected to show respect and

deference to elder members. Family relationships were primary and represented a key means of support and power. Expanded family networks via *compadre* (God-father/mother) relations further extended the power of these networks. These interdependent relational networks were also based on the ideals of generosity and reciprocity. As Lyons (2006) noted

> Reciprocity differs from contractual or market exchange in several ways. First, the transaction is not wholly voluntary- rejecting a gift or failing to reciprocate appropriately risks damaging the relationship. Second, the terms of exchange are not set by an explicit negotiation based on open self-interest. . . . Each side's best interests [are] best served by displaying generosity, hospitality, and consideration for the other. (p. 91)

This places an emphasis on the relationship instead of the transaction itself, which represented an ideal, in the minds of the Indigenous people, for both formal and informal leader-follower interactions. Clearly such relationships were more common in the informal realm than in the formal authority structures of the hacienda where owners tended to view the relationships with followers in more paternalistic, transactional terms.

As land use policies were reformed and the hacienda system gave way to community structures, the Indigenous peoples implemented their own leadership structures which often reflected both their own traditions and those of the political left (Becker, 2008). In the area where Lyons (2006) conducted his research, *comuna's* replaced the administrative structures of the haciendas. *Comuna's* are, in accordance with Ecuadorian law, headed by "presidents and other officers" (p. 272). The authority of these leaders is typically relatively limited, in comparison to the traditional roles of caudillos or caciques. In fact, these roles were compared by Lyons to the historical role of a fiesta sponsor, who gained social status and prestige by sponsoring fiestas for the entire community at great expense. In part, the role of these leaders is to assemble the community and coordinate the work of the same. Regarding this work, Lyons wrote, "the community assembles weekly for a formal meeting, and one day a week, occasionally two, villagers work together in tasks of collective benefit" (p. 272). The leadership roles for overseeing these efforts typically rotate among members.

Villegas (1999) suggests that these new structures and the changing values are creating a new form of leadership among some Indigenous peoples in Ecuador. He calls this form of leadership "liderazgo comunitario" or community leadership. In contrast to the reciprocity based, power-oriented approach to leadership typified in the caudillo or cacique, communitarian leadership is different in form and function. In communitarian leadership, authority is based on a relationship characterized by greater equality between leader and follower. Followers, therefore, empower the leader because he or she is seen as sincerely desiring to represent the will of the people. Consequently, this approach to power does not depends on the use of wealth and power as a means of retaining followers. Nor does it focus on fostering relations of paternalistic dependency. Instead, the focus is on defending and representing the people's interest and using power to achieve the goals of the group, because the leader is a member of the group and his or her interests are aligned with the groups. This alignment is not, however, merely symbolic as in populist leadership. Instead, it is procedural as the leader's role is to work with the group to identify interests, goals, and methods that represent the will of the group. It is worth noting that rotation of power is not uncommon in this model. Nonetheless, this is not likely a universal approach to leadership in

Indigenous communities of the highlands (Buchelli, 1984). However, it does reveal the nature of change in relation to leadership that is occurring in Ecuador.

It is worth mentioning that one of the major items of discussion by Lyons (2006) is how notions of respect have evolved over time. Since the authority structures and the leadership practices of the *hacendados* demanded and enforced respectful follower behavior, though often at the expense of actual respect, the decline of the system has altered the need for such external demonstrations of respect. As a result, many bemoan the loss of respect for authority within formal and informal hierarchical relations. Nonetheless, "a hierarchy of respect spanning the ethnic-boundary is not altogether gone" (Lyons, 2006, p. 288). The same is true for other leader-follower relations.

It is also worth noting that greater involvement and oversight by the government and churches has replaced some of the political and religious authority structures that were previously filled by the *hacendados*. Nonetheless, these structures lack the absolute symbolic and authoritative power that landowners possessed in dealing with issues, which has led to more conflicts that are not as easily resolved as when one man's word was law (Lyons, 2006).

In overviewing the traditional leadership structures outlined by Lyons (2006) and Hurtado (1985) and discussing the changes that have occurred, it is evident that some major differences have emerged in the way leadership is demonstrated among some of the Indigenous people of Ecuador. While the early hacienda system appears to have mirrored the leadership practiced in the political arena as outlined in the model presented previously, the latter forms of leadership represent a significantly different approach to leadership that is characterized by a weakening of individual power, a sharing of decision-making and influence, the democratization of leadership practices, and a focus on community development as opposed to personal status and wealth. If as Hurtado suggested, the hacienda system was the source from which all forms of leadership emerged, it is possible that the trends that characterize leadership in its demise may reflect some future directions for leadership in Ecuador.

BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

The transformation of the hacienda system and its authority structures and processes is not the only source of evidence of change in the way leadership is being practiced and will be practiced in the future. Another area in which change is occurring is that of business.

In 2004, Romero drafted an article in which he discussed the changing nature of leadership in Latin America. He referred to the traditional approach to leadership in Ecuador and Latin America which has been outlined previously as the style of "*el patron*" or "the boss". This style was characterized by paternalistic leadership that "can be described as autocratic and directive" but relationship-oriented and conflict-avoidant (Romero, 2004, p. 30). Basing his description of this approach on the research on leadership in Latin America, he explained that such leaders seldom delegate work or use teams. They tend to engage in "formal top-down communication as the normal mode of communication" (Romero, 2004, p. 30). Furthermore, they are expected to be aggressive and assertive.

However, Romero (2004) suggested that things were changing in that global and regional trends already appeared to be transforming the way leadership was practiced in Latin America. The first of these trends related to the increased international interaction with MNCs and "developed" countries, which Romero believed would lead to emulation of more foreign leadership styles. The second trend was economic development, which he believed would alter the cultural environment by increasing the individualistic nature of the cultures of Latin America. Finally, he suggested that the increasing abundance of women in leadership roles in Latin America would further alter the leadership culture as women typically possess styles more consistent with what he termed modern leadership. Romero defined modern leadership as leadership that was more participative and supportive, increasingly likely to view workers as responsible, willing to delegate and use teams more often, and more committed to cooperation and collaboration, while remaining conflict avoidant and relationship oriented.

There may be some evidence to suggest that within the world of business and perhaps beyond it, these trends are indeed occurring. First, when one enters a bookstore in Ecuador and reviews the literature on leadership and business, much of what one sees are translated texts from U.S. authors. Second, the educational materials in business programs in Ecuador are largely based on research conducted in the United States and other similar countries. Indeed, the curriculum of the programs appears to be evolving along similar lines as more organizational behavior and managerial theory is becoming part of the curriculum. Women are emerging as recognizable leaders in business and other sectors (Moser, 2009) and appear to reflect some of the approaches of the style outlined by Romero (2004). In fact, the Vistazo edition that identified 100 important leaders in Ecuador listed Isabel Noboa as the top leader (the author recognizes the limited validity of this list, but recognizes the value such a list has as a reflection of and influence on culture) (Vistazo.com).

Despite the existence of such anecdotal evidence, research on business leadership in Ecuador remains limited. The most significant research project to examine Ecuadorian business leadership was the GLOBE Study (House et al., 2004). The global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness program, or GLOBE study, is a multiphasic research program "designed to explore the fascinating and complex effects of culture on leadership, organizational effectiveness, economic competitiveness of societies, and the human condition of members of the societies studied" (House et al., 2004, p. 10). The project incorporated both quantitative and qualitative research methods to better understand leadership in 62 countries. The study focused on identifying the traits and behaviors that were viewed as contributing to or delimiting the practice of outstanding leadership in each society. Thus, the focus was not on the practice of the leadership, but rather perceived leadership ideals, what the GLOBE researchers referred to as culturally endorsed leadership traits or CLTs.

The quantitative data, which will be the focus of this analysis, was acquired by collecting 17,370 surveys from middle managers who worked in organizations in the food processing, financial services, and telecommunications industries. The total number of surveys collected in each country varied from 27 to 1790. The surveys were developed and validated and deemed reliable using appropriate psychometrics processes.

Some important contributions that the GLOBE study made to research on leadership was to identify specific behaviors and characteristics that contribute to leadership throughout much of the

world. Furthermore, the study identified which of these are generally seen as contributing to outstanding leadership and which delimit the same. For example, the GLOBE study identified the following universally positive leadership attributes: trustworthy, just, honest, foresight, plans ahead, encouraging, positive, dynamic, motive arouser, confidence builder, motivational, dependable, intelligent, decisive, effective bargainer, win-win problem solver, administratively skilled, communicative, informed, coordinator, team builder, and excellence-oriented. These were identified as universally positive because they received scores of 4.5 or higher, on the GLOBE seven-point scale, in all of the societies.

In addition to these universally positive leadership attributes, the GLOBE researchers identified a smaller number of universally negative leader attributes. These included: loner, asocial, non-cooperative, irritable, nonexplicit, egocentric, ruthless, and dictatorial. These were inferred to be universally negative based on their receiving a score of 3 or less on the seven-point scale in all 62 societies. There were also 25 culturally contingent variables that varied from society to society. The range of these items was from 1.26 to 6.73. As a result of these initial finding and based on data analysis, primary leadership dimensions were identified by grouping these variables together into themes. These themes were labeled and are referred to as primary CLTs. From these primary CLTs, 6 culturally endorsed implicit leadership dimensions were identified. These dimensions were referred to as secondary CLTs and included charismatic/value based, self-protective, humane-oriented, team-oriented, participative, and autonomous leadership.

In addition to the emphasis placed on leadership, the GLOBE researchers examined ideal and real cultural values to better understand the contexts in which leadership took place. This analysis occurred at both the organizational and societal level. The analysis in this article will focus only on the societal level data. The cultural components examined in the study included uncertainty avoidance, future orientation, power distance, in-group and institutional collectivism, humane orientation, performance orientation, gender egalitarianism, and assertiveness.

In relation to both the leadership and the cultural measure results, the GLOBE researchers identified bands of significance based on calculating the significance levels necessary to suggest that the highest scoring country in one band was significantly different from the highest scoring country in a lower band. While the number of bands varies depending on the range of variation, these bands were labeled as A (the highest), B, C, D, and E (the lowest). Thus, the countries in band B demonstrate significantly lower mean scores than the highest country in band A.

In Ecuador, the GLOBE study collected only 49 surveys from within the combined three industries. This obviously limits the strength of the study and suggests sampling limitations regarding the interpretation of the results. Consequently, the results will be examined in relation to the other research that has been conducted in Ecuador.

Among the GLOBE study societies, Ecuador placed 45th in relation to the practice of uncertainty avoidance with a mean score of 3.68. This placed Ecuador within 2 standard deviations of all countries and within .04 of the mean for Latin American countries. This suggested that in relation to their tendency to "seek orderliness, consistency, structure, formalized procedures, and laws to cover situations in their daily lives" (House et al., 2004, p. 602). Ecuadorians appeared to be

consistent with other Latin American countries but demonstrated significantly lower uncertainty avoidance than most of the countries examined in the GLOBE study generally.

With regards to the valuing of uncertainty avoidance, Ecuador ranked 14th with a mean score of 5.16, in comparison to the 4.62 mean score (.61sd) of all GLOBE countries and 4.98 score (.27sd) in Latin America. As the mean practice score for all societies was 4.16, with a standard deviation of .60, and 3.62 in Latin America, with a standard deviation of .25, Ecuador was lower on average at 3.68 in the practice of uncertainty avoidance than the GLOBE sample, but slightly higher on average than Latin America. In relation to the value score, Ecuador ranked in the A band. Contrariwise, Ecuador fell into Band C for uncertainty avoidance practices.

Ecuador placed 36th among GLOBE study nations in the practice of future orientation. The countries mean practice score of 3.60 placed them within one standard deviation of the norm for all countries (3.85m/.46sd) and for Latin American countries (3.85m/.28sd). Consequently, Ecuador was relatively average in their emphasis on and concern for the future as opposed to the present. In contrast, Ecuador was among the highest in relation to the valuing of future orientation, they ranked 6th overall with a mean score of 5.94. In comparison to the average for all GLOBE countries Ecuador was within 2 standard deviations of the mean (5.48m..41sd). However, they were within one standard deviation of the Latin American mean (5.75m/.22sd) of Latin American countries. Not surprisingly, Ecuador ranked in band A for valuing of future orientation and band C for practices.

Power distance, which was defined as "the extent to which a community accepts and endorses authority, power differences, and status privileges" (House et al., 2004, p. 513), was also high in Ecuador. Overall, Ecuador ranked 9th in the practice of power distance and fourth in Latin America. The Ecuadorian score of 5.60 was .43 points higher than the mean for all countries (5.17), which is just higher than one standard deviation (.41) above the mean. However, the extent to which power distance is valued within Ecuador was significantly lower. In fact, Ecuador scored 58th among the 62 countries in relation to the valuing of power distance. The overall mean was 2.75 with a standard deviation of .35. Ecuador's score was 2.3, which is just over one standard deviation below this mean. In Latin America, the mean is 2.52 with a standard deviation of .39, which places Ecuador within one standard deviation of the mean. However, only Venezuela scored lower in its valuing of power distance. It is worth noting that the practice of power distance scores within organizations were considerably lower than the differences in society in general within Latin America. Ecuador fell into band A in the practice of power distance and band D in the valuing of power distance.

Institutional collectivism referred to whether or not "institutional practices at the societal level encourage and reward collective action" (House et al., 2004, p. 463). This contrasted with in-group collectivism which examined the "extent to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and interdependence in their families" (House et al., 2004, p. 463). In Ecuador, institutional collectivism received a mean value score of 5.41 (3rd overall) and a practice score of 3.9 (48th overall). The mean scores for all countries value of institutional collectivism were 4.72 with a standard deviation of .49 and 4.25 and .43 respectively for the practice of institutional collectivism. The scores for Latin America were 5.32 (value) and 3.86 (practice). Ecuador ranked in the C band for practices and the A band for value.

The in-group collectivism values score was 6.17 (8th overall and the highest in Latin America) with a practice score of 5.80 (5th overall). In all cases these numbers were higher than the mean scores for all countries and for Latin America. In contrast, in-group collectivism scores for all countries were 5.66 with a standard deviation of .35 (values) and 5.13 with a standard deviation of .73 (practice). In Latin America the in-group value mean was 6.06 and the practice mean was 5.52. Ecuador's scores earned the country an A band ranking in practices and value in this area.

The GLOBE Study researchers defined a humane orientation as characterized by a society that "encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others" (House et al., 2004, p. 569). Among all countries, Ecuador ranked 8th in the practice of humane orientation with a score of 4.65 on the GLOBE 7-point scale, which ranked Ecuador first among all Latin American countries. The Ecuadorian values score in this dimension was, like most countries, higher at 5.26 (47th overall). Compared to the overall mean for the GLOBE countries of 5.42 (.25sd) for values and 4.09 (.47sd) for practice, Ecuador appeared to practice a humane orientation considerably more than the "average" country. Compared to Latin America, the practice mean was 4.03 with a .32 standard deviation with a value mean and standard deviations not provided. Band rankings for Ecuador in relation to practices and values were B and C respectively.

Performance orientation, or the "extent to which a community encourages and rewards innovation, high standards, and performance improvement" (House et al., 2004, p. 239), was an important characteristic of culture. Ecuador ranked 27th (4.20m) among GLOBE countries in the practice of a performance orientation and 9th in the valuing of performance orientation (6.32m). Thus, while they were only slightly higher than the overall mean in practice (4.09m/.47sd) they were considerably higher in valuing this important cultural characteristic (5.94m/.34sd). The reverse was the case in relation to Latin America where Ecuador scored only slightly higher than the mean in valuing (6.24m/.20sd) but somewhat higher in practice (.385m/.28sd). Ecuador ranked A in the value of performance orientation and B in practices.

In addition to the cultural components outlined thus far, the GLOBE study examined the gender egalitarianism of the societies studied. This cultural characteristic focused on the level of gender differentiation that existed in societies. In Ecuador, the practice of gender egalitarianism (3.07m) was lower than most societies (3.37m/.37sd) and Latin America (3.41m/.25sd). In values, however, Ecuador was slightly higher (4.57m) than the "average" GLOBE country (4.51m/.48sd) but quite a bit lower than other Latin American countries (4.77m/.17sd). Ecuador was in band B for practices and values.

Finally, the GLOBE study explored the assertiveness of the 62 nations studied. This component of a society "reflects beliefs as to whether people are or should be encouraged to be assertive, aggressive, and tough" (House et al., 2004, p. 395). In general Ecuador appeared not to value assertiveness, relatively speaking. The score for the country on valuing assertiveness was slightly lower than average at 3.65 in comparison to the overall score of 3.82 (.63sd). The practice score was 4.09, which was only slightly lower than the 4.14 score (.37sd). In comparison to Latin America, the practice score was also lower than that of Latin American nations studied (4.15m/.28sd), but higher in valuing given the lower-than-average score of Latin American in general (3.54m/.32sd). Ecuador found itself in band B in both values and practices on this one as well.

In conclusion, the leadership culture in Ecuador can be summed up, based on the GLOBE Study data, as demonstrating a high emphasis, as characterized by a 5 or higher on the GLOBE 7-point scale, on the valuing of uncertainty avoidance, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, humane-orientation, performance orientation, and future orientation. In practice, however, Ecuador was characterized as high in only power distance and in-group collectivism. In contrast, their values scores were quite low (3.5 or lower) in relation to power distance and assertiveness, while in practice they were also low in gender egalitarianism.

In addition to studying the cultural environment in which leadership takes place, the GLOBE study examined the implicit leadership theories of individuals within these societies. To accomplish this, the researchers surveyed participants regarding their perceptions of the attributes and behaviors of leaders to identify those that contributed to or inhibited outstanding leadership. This was done at two levels the first explored 112 leader attributes and behavior items. These were analyzed using factor analysis, which revealed 21 leadership subscales. The data for these subscales, including comparisons with overall means and Latin American means is provided in Table 1.

TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF MEANS

Leadership Subscale	Ecuador	Rank Overall	Latin America (LA)	LA Diff.	Global Mean	Global Diff.
Performance Oriented	6.64	1	6.23	+.41	6.02	+.62
Autocratic	2.5	38	2.57	-.07	2.65	-.15
Modest	5.46	6	5.11	+.35	4.99	+.47
Charismatic: Self-Sacrificing	5.99	1	5.34	+.65	5.01	+.98
Collaborative Team Orientation	5.99	2	5.74	+.25	5.47	+.52
Decisive	6.29	4	5.81	+.48	5.79	+.50
Diplomatic	5.66	18	5.55	+.11	5.49	+.17
Face-saver	2.57	22	2.89	-.32	2.94	-.47
Charismatic: Visionary	6.50	1	6.12	+.38	6.02	+.48
Humane Oriented	4.71	13	4.54	+.17	4.77	-.06
Integrity	6.79	1	6.26	+.52	6.08	+.69
Bureaucratic	4.30	25	4.22	+.08	3.87	+.43
Administratively Competent	6.35	2	6.04	+.32	5.78	+.57
Self-centered	1.83	56	2.09	-.26	2.19	-.36
Autonomous	3.53	47	3.51	+.01	3.86	-.33
Status Conscious	5.13	9	4.85	+.28	4.33	+.80
Charismatic: Inspirational	6.63	1	6.22	+.40	6.07	+.56
Malevolent	1.39	61	1.69	-.30	1.80	-.41
Team Integrator	6.43	2	6.18	+.25	5.87	+.56
Internally competitive	4.45	10	4.13	+.32	3.99	+46
Participative	5.51	23	5.40	+.11	5.33	+.18

The results of this review of the GLOBE date provide some interesting insights into Ecuadorian leadership. In general, to be perceived as an outstanding leader in Ecuador, individuals needed to be more performance oriented, modest, self-sacrificing, collaboratively team oriented, decisive, visionary, administratively competent, status conscious, inspirational, and internally competitive. Likewise, they should have demonstrated high levels of integrity and been effective team integrators. It is important that they also were perceived as less malevolent and self-centered.

As mentioned previously, once they had collected the data on these 21 subscales, the GLOBE researchers collapsed these into 6 second order culturally endorsed leadership traits (CLT). These included: charismatic/value-based, team oriented, self-protective, participative, humane-oriented, and autonomous leadership. The first order variables included in these second order variables are outlined in table 2.

TABLE 2. CULTURALLY ENDORSED LEADERSHIP TRAITS IN ECUADOR

Second Order CLT Variables	First Order CLT Variables
Charismatic/Value-Based	Charismatic 1: Visionary** Charismatic 2: Inspirational** Charismatic 3: Self-Sacrificing** Integrity** Decisive** Performance Oriented**
Self-Protective	Self-centered* Status Conscious** Conflict Inducer Face Saver Procedural
Humane Orientation	Modest** Humane Orientation
Team Oriented	Team 1: Collaborative team orientation** Team 2: Team Integrator** Diplomatic Malevolent (reverse scored)** Administratively competent**
Participative	Autocratic (reverse scored) Nonparticipative (reverse scored)
Autonomous	Autonomous
Items marked with an ** are those that *appear* to be more significant CLTs in Ecuador than in the GLOBE study generally given the overall ranking and the size of the difference between the Ecuador mean and the general mean (Lack of sufficient access to the data makes this difficult to validate) Items marked with * are those that *appear* to be significantly lower in Ecuador than in the GLOBE study generally	

In relation to each of these second order CLT scores, Ecuador ranked as follows. The country was first in the world in both Charismatic/Values based leadership and Team orientation. The mean

scores on these two variables were 6.46 and 6.26 respectively. These were high even in comparison to the Latin American scores at 5.74 and 5.88 and global scores of 5.83 and 5.76. Ecuador ranked 22nd in self-protective leadership with a score of 3.62 and 22nd in participative leadership at 5.51. These scores were relatively similar to those of the rest of Latin America where the self-protective leadership mean was also 3.62 and the participative mean was 5.42. However, they were higher than the global mean for self-protective (3.46); and participative (5.33) leadership. The humane oriented leadership mean in Ecuador of 5.13 ranked 19th in the world and was higher than the average score in Latin America of 4.85 and the global mean of 4.88. Finally, autonomous leadership in Ecuador ranked 48th in the world (3.53), where the mean was 3.86, but was very consistent with that of the rest of Latin America (3.51m)

Based on these results, we can propose a model for culturally perceived effective business leadership in Ecuador based on implicit leadership theory that involves a modification of the second order categories proposed by the GLOBE researchers for general global use. This model would suggest that for a leader to be perceived as outstanding in Ecuador, they must, first, demonstrate strongly charismatic leadership that is characterized by a visionary, performance oriented, and inspirational style that demonstrates a willingness to be self-sacrificing. They must also be decisive and demonstrate integrity. Second, they must be status conscious, without being self-protective. Third, they should be more modest in their approach to leadership. Fourth, they should be very team oriented with an emphasis on collaboration, integration, and administrative competence that avoids any malevolent actions. Finally. there is no major need for them to be more participative (nor should they be less participative) than other leaders. However, they will likely need to demonstrate less autonomy and more interdependence.

This ideal business leader stands in sharp contrast to the traditional model of leadership outlined earlier in this article and reflects many of the elements of modern leadership outlined by Romero (2004). At the same time, the ideal vs. current practice scores for Ecuador suggest that the transition to this ideal is still in progress. Once again, however, the limited scope of this research suggests caution in accepting this data at face value. Currently, a second GLOBE study is underway that will likely provide more up to date and more rich date regarding the status of business leadership in Ecuador. However, there is evidence of a call for alternative models of leadership in business in Ecuador based on models and approaches in the international leadership literature (Lasio, 2008).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Ecuador has a long and distinct historical leadership culture that is undergoing some significant transformation in the modern era. Early Indigenous models of leadership rooted in an authoritative, but seemingly authentic, paternalism and defined by redistribution of resources to benefit the community were overlaid by the Incas similar but more militant hierarchical structure. These were ultimately washed over by Spanish Colonial leadership culture, which demonstrated a façade of similar elements but practiced a much more, exploitative, racist, self-serving paternalism. In the modern era, however, some significant changes seem to be taking place in the business arena and among the Indigenous populations with regards to leadership culture that are bringing about

more participative styles. Changes also appear to have taken place in the political arena. However, these seem to be more a continuation of the old ways than indications of true reform. Consequently, leadership culture in Ecuador is likely becoming more diverse. What the ultimate results of these changes will be has yet to be determined. However, the implications for the study of leadership in Ecuador are significant. The diversity outlined herein likely only scratches the surface regarding the true diversity of leadership approaches within the country. Greater research should examine how different populations approach leadership within Ecuadorian society. Then these models can be examined based on their impacts and outcomes. The result may well be the emergence of truly Ecuadorian models of leadership that can then be used to further strengthen the leadership culture from within as opposed to allowing external models to dominate the leadership discussion.

REFERENCES

Becker, M. (2008). *Indians and leftists in the making of ecuador's modern indigenous movements*. Duke University Press.

Behrens, A. (2009). *Culture and management in the Americas*. Stanford University Press.

Bray, T. (2008). Ecuador's pre-columbian past. In C. De La Torre & S. Striffler (Eds.), *The Ecuador reader: History, culture, and politics* (pp. 15-26). Duke University Press.

Buchelli, R. V. (1984). Concentraciones de poder: 'Caciquismo' en una communidad andina. In *Antropologia* (Vol. 3, pp. 114-126). PUCE.

D'Altroy, T. N. (2002). *The Incas*. Blackwell.

De la Torre, C. (1994). Velasco ibarra and 'la revolucion gloriosa': The social production of a populist leader in ecuador in the 1940s. *Latin American Studies*, *26*, 683-711.

De la Torre, C. (2007). The resurgence of radical populism in latin america. *Constellations*, *14*(3), 384-397.

Dealy, G. C. (1992). *The Latin Americans: Spirit and ethos*. Westview Press.

House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. J., & Sully de Luque, M. F. (2014). *Strategic leadership across cultures: The globe study of CEO leadership behavior and effectiveness in 24 countries*. Sage Publications.

Hurtado, O. (1985). *Political power in Ecuador* (N. D. Mills Jr., Trans.). Westview Press.

Hurtado, O. (2010). *Portrait of a nation: Culture and progress in Ecuador* (B. Sipe, Trans.; English-language ed.). Madison Books.

Lasio, V. (2008). Un sistema de liderazgo: Adios a los superheroes! *Debates*, *12*(1), 12-13.

Lauderbaugh, G. (2012). *The history of Ecuador*. Greenwood.

Luciano, S. O. (2010). *Las antiguas sociedades precolombinas del Ecuador: Unrecorrido por la sala de arqueologia del museo nacional de Ecuador.* Banco Central de Ecuador.

Lyons, B. J. (2006). *Remembering the hacienda: Religion, authority, and social change in highland Ecuador* (1st ed.). University of Texas Press.

McClellan, J. L. (2016). Exploring the cultural foundations of leadership in Ecuador. *Journal of International Business Disciplines*, *11*(1), 20-35.

McClellan, J. L. (2017). Precolonial indigenous leadership: Exploring the foundations of leadership culture in Ecuador. *Leadership and the Humanities*, *5*(1), 5. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4337/lath.2017.01.01

McIntosh, T. (2011). *Leadership Peruvian style: How Peruvians define and practice leadership*. iUniverse.

Moser, C. O. N. (2009). *Ordinary families, extraordinary lives : Assets and poverty reduction in Guayaquil, 1978-2004*. Brookings Institution Press.

Paz, J. J., & Cepeda, M. (2010). Caudillos y populismos en el Ecuador. *Polemika*, *1*(3), 72-81.

Romero, E. (2004). Latin American leadership: El patron y el lider moderno. *Cross Cultural Management*, *11*(3), 25-37.

Salomon, F. (1986). *Native lords of quito in the age of the Incas: The political economy of north Andean chiefdoms*. Cambridge University Press.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). Jossey Bass.

Spillan, J. E., Virzi, N., & Garita, M. (2014). *Doing business in Latin America: Challenges and opportunities*. Routledge.

Villegas, L. F. B. (1999). Aunque me cueste la vida: Movilizacion, etnicidad y liderazgo comunitario en ecuador. *Nueva Antropologia*, *17*(56), 63-79.

Vistazo.com. *Las cien empresas y lideres*. Retrieved September 9 from http://www.vistazo.com/100empresas/lideres.php

Volume 17, Number 1

May 2022