

Examining Leadership in Ecuador from an Interdisciplinary Contingency Perspective

Cultural, Social, and Ethical Issues

Key Words: Ecuador, Leadership, Culture

Abstract

This paper explores the foundations upon which modern Ecuadorian leadership culture is based by examining the historical elements of the Ecuadorian leadership cultural system from a contingency perspective, beginning with an overview of the historical context followed by an exploration of leadership and followership within this context. In so doing, it lays a foundation for further examination of leadership culture in Ecuador.

Introduction

One of the major factors that contributes to the success of any organizational venture is the leadership climate in which it takes place. Leadership scholars have long recognized the importance of not only the role of the leader, but also the importance of followers and the context in relation to achieving organizational goals (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Consequently, any examination of organizational efforts in Ecuador should begin with an examination and understanding of the leadership culture in which these efforts take place. This paper explores the foundations upon which modern Ecuadorian leadership culture is based by examining the historical elements of the Ecuadorian leadership cultural system from a contingency perspective, beginning with an overview of the historical context followed by an exploration of leadership and followership within this context.

Contingency Approaches to Leadership

The contingency approaches to leadership emerged as a trend in leadership studies that marked a fundamental shift in the way scholars thought about leadership. Prior to the contingency movement, the focus of leadership studies was centered on the traits, skills, behaviors, and styles of leaders (Ayman, 2004; P. G. Northouse, 2012). However, the failure to identify any given set of traits, skills, etc. that universally predicted leadership effectiveness, led to a realization that the situation or context in which leadership took place could impact the ultimate effectiveness of the leader and require some changes in terms of the leaders approach. Consequently, the contingency approaches shifted the focus of leadership studies away from the leader to the “fit between the leader’s behavior and style and the followers and the situation” (Lussier & Achua, 2007, p. 152). Consequently, scholars who wish to understand leadership, especially within a cultural context, must avoid oversimplification by examining all three facets of the leadership environment (Burke, 1965). A natural starting place

for understanding such situated leadership is with the context in which leadership takes place. Consequently, this article will overview the contextual history of leadership within Ecuador and then explore the approaches to both leadership and followership.

The Context of Leadership in Ecuador

Very little research or literature within the field of leadership has been directed towards the study of leadership specifically within the context of Ecuador. Consequently, it is essential to draw upon multiple disciplinary perspectives to piece together an understanding of the culturally derived approaches to leadership and followership. This requires that one examine the historical context in which leadership took place to better understand the leadership culture. This review will begin with an exploration of the pre-colonial leadership context and proceed to the modern era.

In precolonial Ecuadorian society, indigenous leaders typically presided over a social hierarchy characterized by scattered, relatively small and independent social groups with limited integration, mostly for trade and religious purposes, at a macro-social level (Grieder, 2009; Luciano, 2010; Salomon, 1986; Stothert, 2003). That is not to say that some larger social structures did not exist, but for the most part, "a general dispersal of houses and small settlements prevailed throughout most of the highlands. Common religious devotion brought people from fairly wide areas to worship at central temples or shrines, while needs for defense were met by mountain forest in which the common people found refuge" (Steward & Faron, 1959, p. 58). Thus most leadership took place at the local level where individual caciques presided over local communities made up of individuals with strong kinship relations. Communities in close proximity to one another often shared cultural traditions, worship practices, and traded with other communities which led to some sense of larger cultural structures, nonetheless, these larger structures were rarely consolidated or subjugated in any way to a macro-level political order (Bruhns, 2003; Luciano, 2010; Stemper, 1993). Indeed, conflicts between these communities "were endemic, but no one nation was dominant" (De la Torre & Stiffler, 2008, p. 10). In his analysis of the societies within the Quito area, Salomon (1986) explained:

Quito polities lodged stewardship of strategic resources in chiefs, and vested in chiefs the power to dispossess commoners, confiscate their goods, or severely punish them. . . . Quito collectivities concentrated control of communal and craft production in the upper level, but did not politically control household production. . . . High ranking nobles were exempt from subsistence production, used conspicuous symbols of rank, and regulated social processes of adjudication and marriage. . . . Of the fifteen possible leadership functions [attributed to chiefdoms], Quito lords clearly exercised eleven: ambassadorial affairs, war leadership, village labor administration, controlling trade, leading ceremonies, punishing wrongdoers, settling disputes, enforcing moral norms, sponsoring feasts, storing information, and distributing goods."(p. 138-139).

Just prior to the arrival of the Spanish, these largely separated, but economically, culturally, and religiously integrated societies were largely subjugated to Inca rule.

The Inca invasion and subjugation of Ecuador was somewhat limited in scope and brief in time (De la Torre & Stiffler, 2008) Nonetheless, the cultural impact was significant, as “the system of political organization created by the Inca facilitated the Spanish takeover” (De la Torre & Stiffler, 2008, p. 10).

In response to the initial Inca invasion, some previously distinct, though culturally similar groups, appear to have banded together in mutual defense creating a sense of unified identity that had not exist previously (Hirschkind, 1995). In addition, Inca resettlement practices disoriented former connections and imposed new ones (D'Altroy, 2002; Hurtado, 1985). At the same time, the Inca use of preexisting leadership structures strengthened the role of existing caciques (Salomon, 1986). Furthermore, the Inca hierarchy, which radiated down from the Sapa Inca permeating all aspects of daily life through multiple layers of bureaucracy, imposed a hierarchical structure upon the dispersed, largely politically independent communities that had existed previously (Salomon, 1986; Steward & Faron, 1959). Peasants were required to perform the “mita”, mandatory labor for the benefit of the Inca, and all land and products were considered the property of the king (Hurtado, 1985).

Based on what is known about Inca leadership, influence was largely derived from kinship, divine right, and military prowess (D'Altroy, 2002; McIntosh, 2011). The leaders' primary objectives appear to have been to expand the kingdom via military conquest, acquire wealth and resources for personal consumption and redistribution, and to maintain and consolidate power. The ability to do so was based on strong verbal skills, effective bureaucratic organization, redistribution of resources, demonstrations of strength and courage, use of preexisting power structures, reciprocal relationships, decisive and authoritative decision-making, and strict punishment of those in opposition (D'Altroy, 2002; McIntosh, 2011)

As mentioned previously, Inca leadership was relatively short lived and ultimately supplanted by the Spanish via the conquest and colonization of the territory that later became Ecuador. Through both military, cultural, and religious subjugation, the Spanish imposed a system of leadership that both reinforced and supplanted some cultural elements of indigenous and Inca leadership. The Spanish hierarchy replaced the Inca hierarchy in terms of both structure and culture. Culturally, leadership became a product of race and cultural identification, as the whiter and more culturally Hispanic one was, the more likely he would be accepted as a leader (D'Altroy, 2002; McIntosh, 2011). Additionally, the conquistadors' adventurous, sexually exploitative, masculinity gave birth to a machismo culture that still predominates throughout Latin America today. Finally, their approach to leadership was characterized by limited planning, authoritative decision-making, limited concern for royal authority, and distribution of wealth and power among friends and family (Kryzanek, 1992).

As the conquistadors gave way to the colonizers, many of these cultural trends continued with an increased emphasis on the importance of charisma and personalism, (leadership based on dedication and loyalty to the persona of the leader as opposed to the vision, cause, agenda, or party). Furthermore, the cultural values of dignidad, leisure, grandeur, generosity, manliness, and deception (Dealy, 1992), reinforced a leadership culture characterized by an emphasis on perception management, disdain for manual labor on the part of both leaders and followers, charismatic influence, paternalistic leadership that punished followers through intermediaries, machismo, and disregard for laws and regulations that substitute for the direct oversight of the leader.

These leadership traits are best reflected, in the post-colonial era, in the approaches to leadership that were espoused and practice within the hacienda system of the country. As Hurtado (1985) explained 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 the leadership exhibited within the hacienda system both influenced and reflected the broader system of supervisory leadership throughout the country.

According to Lyons (2006) hacienda leadership structures consisted of an owner, a steward, and an overseer. The owner was generally a member of the “white” elite class, 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’s did suggest that the traditional view of landlords as disinterested investors is outdated. Stewards, who were often Mestizo, generally lived on the property and were more directly involved in the day-to-day management of the hacienda. They practiced leadership via an overseer, who was often indigenous, who “aided the steward in planning and supervising daily labors” (p. 78).

Generally speaking, the owners engaged in paternalistic leadership characterized by benevolence and the bestowal of privileges and rewards in exchange for loyalty, obedience, and respect (Lyons, 2006). Thus they treated the indigenous people like children. Punishment, when enacted, was accomplished through intermediaries. Additionally, they were expected to and generally engaged in redistribution of resources, such as products and profits, consistent with but not ideally reflective of, the traditional practices of the indigenous people. In contrast to the benevolent, paternalistic approach of owners, stewards and overseers were generally more fear and violence as part of their leadership repertoire (Lyons, 2006). Having said this,

owners were not paragons of paternalistic virtue as they were not ignorant of and often directed the work of the stewards and overseers. Furthermore, they personally exploited their workers both physically and sexually (Lyons. 2006).

There is also evidence that informal leadership and authority structures existed within these cultural microcosms. Such informal influence networks were characterized by authority relationships based on elder-junior relationships, kinship, and “compadrazgo”. These relationships were hierarchical, though mutually beneficial, relationships in which senior members cared for junior members in exchange for deference, service, and respect (Lyons 2006).

With the decline of the hacienda system; however, these leadership structures gave way to more democratic, representative political structures referred to as “comunas”. These structures were overseen by elected “presidents and other officers” (Lyons, 2006, p. 272) whose authority was limited. Thus, within these structures, leaders are generally expected to assemble and coordinate the work of the community. As 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). Villegas (1999) believes these new political structures are birthing a new form “liderazgo comunitario” or community leadership among some indigenous population in Ecuador. This model suggest that leaders and followers are more equal and that followers empower leaders to act on their behalf to both defend and further their interests.

It is worth noting; however, that this approach is not universal within indigenous communities of the Ecuadorian highlands (Buchelli, 1984). However, it does reveal the syncretic nature of changing leadership paradigms and processes in Ecuador as traditional ideas and processes merge with modern, external concepts and practices to form new leadership structures and approaches within the Ecuadorian context. Indeed, Ecuadorian leadership culture has been influenced significantly by both immigration patterns and the cultural influences of North American leadership practices and ideas.

From the early days of Ecuadorian history, Immigrants represented a source of some novelty in relation to leadership approaches as many immigrants from non-Latin cultures brought a distinct array of leadership cultural components, generally involving lower power distance and less of a leisure orientation, with them that differed from the mainstream approaches of the Hispanic tradition (Hurtado, 2010). These immigrant populations often engaged in entrepreneurial efforts that elevated their economic and political stature, ultimately resulting in their filling many political office throughout the government, including the highest office of president (Lauderbaugh, 2012).

Furthermore, external academic and practitioner influences shaped the changing leadership cultural context by introducing new theoretical ideas and practical approaches to leadership. Reflective of these influences in the broader context of Latin America, Romero (2004) described the traditional paternalistic, aggressive, autocratic and directive, “el patron” style of the hacienda system as one that is being replaced by a more “modern” approach. He suggested that this change was rooted

in increased international interaction via MNCs and “developed” countries, economic development based on a more individualistic cultural foundation, the increasing role of women in leadership positions within Latin America. Romero believed these changes were driving the emergence of more participative and supportive leadership styles that perceive workers as responsible, incorporate more delegation and team work, promote increased cooperation and collaboration, while still remaining conflict avoidant and relationship oriented.

There is some significant evidence validating Romero’s (2004) claims. First, North American leadership literature translated into Spanish is becoming more common, even predominant, in Ecuador. Second, the educational courses and programs that emphasize leadership and organizational behavior related ideas, most of which are based on external leadership models, are becoming more common in business and psychology programs in Ecuador. Women are taking on increasing roles in leadership within business, education, and politics (Moser, 2009). Indeed, the inclusion of Isabel Noboa as the top leader in Ecuador, suggests that this trend is truly taking shape in the country. This was according to *Vistazo* magazine’s issue, which largely promoted more modern approaches to leadership, identifying the top leaders in the country (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*). Finally, the *Globe* study validates this shift in leadership values as the desired traits of leader and the values of society appear to shifting to align more with the values outlined by Romero. Nonetheless, the size of the sample drawn from Ecuador was insufficient to make any broad generalizations about leadership within the country (House & et al., 2004). Having said this, the current political environment is dominated by a largely popular president who appears to reflect the traditional populist, machismo oriented, aggressive, authoritarian tradition of Romero’s “el patron” style. Thus the context of leadership, while changing, remains very rooted in the traditions of the past. Nonetheless, leadership and followership appear to be evolving within this context, as will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

Leadership in Ecuador

In order to understand leadership both in general and specifically in Ecuador, it is valuable to examine the concept from a philosophical perspective. Philosophy refers to “the code of values and beliefs by which someone lives” (Soccio, 2010). In terms of leadership theory, one might argue that there are basically five philosophies of leadership that represent the underlying beliefs and values of different leaders. These are the characteristic, skill, relationship, position, and process perspectives. Each represents a unique way of viewing leadership based on unique assumptions about what makes a leader effective. These philosophical lens are particularly useful when seeking to understand cultural manifestations of leadership within international contexts. Each will be explored conceptually and in relation to leadership within the historical context of Ecuador.

Those who view and engage in leadership from the trait philosophy suggest there are certain in-born or developed characteristics or traits that one possesses, which make up his or her identity. These traits ultimately determine his or her effectiveness as a leader (Zacarro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004). When engaging in leadership based on this philosophy, individuals strive to foster and develop the right characteristics to lead, or to maximize their strong characteristics and minimize the impacts of any weaknesses (Rath & Conchie, 2008; Zenger & Folkman, 2002).

The characteristics associated with leadership in Ecuador demonstrate some significant consistency across the multiple historical context discussed previously. While little is known of the characteristics of specific indigenous leaders, some characteristics can be derived from the nature of the leadership functions that these leaders performed. For example, to be effective in ambassadorial affairs, settling disputes, enforcing moral norms, punishing wrongdoers, and war leadership, leaders would have needed to demonstrate courage and dominance. Village labor administration, storing information, and distributing goods and controlling trade would likely have require intelligence, generosity, and conscientiousness. To be effective in leading ceremonies and sponsoring feasts, leaders would likely need to draw on charismatic qualities, religious devotion, and generosity. Furthermore, masculinity likely characterized the largely male leadership structures.

In relation to the characteristics attributed to effective leaders within Inca society, more has been written. In his historical examination of the Inca, D'Altroy (2002) suggested that, Inca leaders were characterized by charisma, vigor, courage, generosity, faith and sanctity. Similar traits emerged in the colonial era. As Hurtado (2010), citing the reflections of a colonial Ecuadorian citizen, explained, that the Ecuadorian attitudes in general were characterized by:

Nonchalance, indecisiveness, dismay at the thought of great effort, especially continuous effort; a propensity to restless laziness resulting in more noise than work; preference for fierce, short-lived spurts of work over relaxed, long-lasting effort made in equal doses; waiting to do business until the last minute and always relying on chance and luck, because they do not foresee the most inevitable contingencies, or do not want to. Further on, he added that his fellow countrymen were more instinctive than reflective, slaves to traditions, individualistic, self-centered, 'alien to social discipline, cooperation, [and] solidarity.' He also said that they demonstrated 'aversion to sustained and persevering effort,' admired and sympathized with those 'who spend and sterilely waste their fortune,' expressed a 'kind of disdain' for everything that was 'foresight, order and personal effort,' and acted 'in bad faith with different nuances.' He remarked that such conduct was not to be put past merchants, artisans, members of the military, policemen, politicians, clergymen, officials, Indians, ultimately everyone—no one was exempt from such conduct. Referring to Indians, even though the observation was also valid for whites and mestizos, he repeated what foreign travelers from previous centuries had written: 'they lived in [an] alarming [state of] drunkenness.' (loc 2071-86)

Many of these character traits outlined by Hurtado are closely associated with the five virtues of Dealy (1992). These five virtues, as outlined previously, are “dignidad”, leisure, grandeur, generosity, manliness, and deception.

In the post-colonial era, these characteristics appear to have been simply reinforced and perpetuated, to a large extent, up to the recent past. In the Globe study (House & et al., 2004), the following characteristics were considered essential in identifying effective leaders: charisma, integrity, competence, status consciousness, and internal competitiveness, compassion, and modesty. For the most part these reflect a continuation of many of the characteristics been considered necessary for leadership effectiveness since the pre-colonial era.

Whereas characteristics are relatively stable elements of an individual’s identity that influence one's behavior, skills are learned behaviors that can be exhibited and engaged, in many cases, whether or not one's nature supports the behavior, in order to accomplish a task (P. G. Northouse, 2009). Thus one can engage in the skills of listening, understanding, relating, and responding whether or not one is naturally inquisitive and empathetic.

Within the precolonial environment of Ecuador, the skill set of leaders revolved around political, military, and ritual activities as well as the ability to generously acquire and redistribute resources as a means of building and maintaining relational loyalty (D’Altroy, 2002) . At the same time, leaders were not expected to be technically skilled, given that “indigenous nobility was not expected to engage in manual labor since work constituted the primary form of tribute” (Hurtado, 1985, p. 15). The Inca model of leadership, while similar in its emphasis on skills related to political, military, ritual, and economic redistribution activities (D’Altroy, 2002), placed a much heavier emphasis on the bureaucratic and political skills associated with leading a large empire.

It is as the transition to colonial Spanish leadership emerged that some deviation occurs in terms of skills. According to Dealy (1992), the underlying paradigm of Spanish Colonial society emphasized social ascendancy via the acquisition of loyalty-based relationships and positions of power as opposed to the capitalistic emphasis on wealth accumulation. As he explained, “The Latin everyman,” or “Public Man’ as Dealy called him, “dreams not of winning impersonal deference through faceless material accumulation, as does the capitalist, but of directly earning and receiving esteem” (p. 55). The result is an elitist society structured around relationships in which those who are higher in the hierarchy serve those who are lower. Those who are lower, regardless of where they actually are in the hierarchy must work on behalf of and for the benefit of those who are higher. Consequently, social skills related to status acquisition became of greater importance than those associated with productive endeavors. Consequently, colonial society placed greater emphasis on verbal fluency, relationship building and network expansion, and charismatic perception management (Dealy, 1992; Martz, Fall 1983). Furthermore, in an environment where everyone was looking to ascend the social hierarchy, political intrigue and the ability to recognize and

mitigate its effects became a central skill of leaders within the political environment of both colonial and post-colonial Ecuador (Lauderbaugh, 2012).

While this shift in skill oriented emphasis was significant, the current shift is perhaps even more so. Given the rising globalization of society, the need for Ecuadorian businesses to compete at a global level is shifting this underlying cultural proclivity away from the Public Man of Dealy (1992) to the capitalist mentality of the west. Consequently, the skills demanded of leaders are becoming more consistent with those expected in capitalist countries such as the US. These skills, while not necessarily de-emphasizing the social, relational, and political competencies of the past, envelope more of the technical and conceptual skills of organizational governance, which have not traditionally characterized the work of Latin American leaders, such as strategic planning, team building, coaching, meeting management, etc.

The positional philosophy suggests that leadership is often the result of holding a position, whether formally granted or simply role oriented (McClellan, 2006). This philosophy suggests that the power to influence others is to some extent a result of the legitimate authority that one possesses as a result of holding a position of power (French Jr. & Raven, 2005). The key to engaging in leadership from this perspective involves understanding the dynamics of power associated with the position and maintaining one's status and power (Machiavelli, 1992). Central to this philosophy are notions of the political behavior of leaders, perception management, and role/position maintenance (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; McClellan, 2006; Mintzberg, 1985). From this perspective, leaders are effective to the extent that they do these well.

Given the Public Man philosophy of Dealy (2002), it is clear that positional leadership was an essential component of colonial and post-colonial leadership in Ecuadorian society. Nonetheless, the emphasis on the importance of positional leadership and the acquisition and maintenance of power was also important prior to the colonial period. In pre-colonial indigenous societies, the positional power of caciques was absolute (Hurtado, 1985). There is even evidence that they presided over the giving and taking of spouses (Salomon, 1986).

Inca society was similar, especially at the local level, except that leadership became dependent not only on acceptance and relational recognition given from followers to the leader, but also the support of the ultimate leader, the Sapa Inca, whose power was considered absolute given his deification within society (D'Altroy, 2002). Nonetheless, Inca leaders were not without threats to their authority (D'Altroy, 2002). Indeed, the existence of a class of nobles who required placating and the ability of siblings to challenge the Inca for power, required leaders to exercise force and political maneuvering in the face of challenges to their positional authority.

In the colonial world of Hispanic Ecuador, a similar arrangement existed as positions of power were largely derived from social class, race, and status as well as loyalty to the ultimate authority of the king. Nonetheless, powerful individuals

who gathered large followings and as a result, acquired wealth and power, represented a dominant source of power because the king was far away (Hurtado, 2010). Indeed, it was the existence of these strong men or caudillos that led Simon Bolivar to lament that his vision of a United States of South America was unlikely and that the ultimate dissolution of his Gran Colombia was inevitable (Lauderbaugh, 2012).

In the post-colonial period, the spirit of enlightenment political ideology and the end of divine right authority gave way for the desire to ascend the social hierarchy and attain the ultimate position of power to become a driving force among the upper echelons of the leadership hierarchy. Consequently, in Ecuador, it seems the ultimate ideal was to achieve the position of president and then to consolidate ones power and positional authority, if possible in perpetuity. This explains, to some extent, the not infrequent tendency of presidents to seek opportunities to strengthen the power of the executive office, extend term limits through self-coups or other means, or to attempt to rule through individuals they hoped would serve as puppets to their leadership will (Lauderbaugh, 2012).

The issue, of course, was that in a society dominated by Public Men, followership is somewhat illusory because the ultimate desire of followers is to take the place of the leader. Hence the existence of an unloyal opposition within the political arena, throughout Ecuadorian history, comes as no surprise (Lauderbaugh, 2012). While this concept will be explored later in relation to followership in Ecuador, its value for positional authority is clear. Leaders must constantly be on the lookout for threats to their authority and they must address opposition quickly and decisively.

One means of holding the opposition at bay is to solicit powerful allies as a means of maintaining one's position. In Ecuador, the two most powerful political allies of any leader have historically been the military and the people themselves. Alienating the military has historically led to the failure of presidents to retain their office. In contrast, those who have successfully maintained the loyalty of the military have often been able to maintain power even in challenging times (Lauderbaugh, 2012).

A second ally that helped leaders to both acquire and maintain authority was the support of the masses. In the past, and even today, massive uprising are an important means of removing leaders from power. This reality likely contributed, at least to some extent, to the emergence of populist leadership within Ecuador; wherein, as Martz (Fall 1983) explained the leader "elicits mass support, builds a reputation as defender of the dispossessed, . . . articulates an ill-defined nationalism, . . . secures the allegiance of marginal urban masses and constructs a party which bears the unmistakable stamp of his own public personality" (p. 23). Having done so, he becomes the self-proclaimed personification of "followers' hopes and aspirations" (p. 24) and thereby maintains followers in a state of dependency. To the extent that this codependent relationship remains salient, the leader's authority is difficult to challenge and the leader is able to maintain his or her position and the authority that

accompanies it. Thus, even the positional philosophy of leadership suggests the need for and the importance of the relational philosophy of leadership.

The relational philosophy of leadership argues that leaders and followers go hand in hand. If leadership is viewed as an influence process, then there must be an influencer and one who is influenced (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014), even if this is not a “linear one-way event, but rather an interactive event” (P. G. Northouse, 2009). The nature of the relationship between the leader and follower is what an individual focuses on when engaging in leadership from this philosophical perspective. Key issues of concern involve trust (Chan, Taylor, & Markham, 2008; Melohn, 1983; Willemys, Gallois, & Callan, 2003), reciprocal caring (Noddings, 2002), commitment (Drury, 2004; Sahon, Behera, & Tripathy, 2010), etc. The idea here is that leaders are effective when they develop effective relationship with those they lead because these relationships represent the foundation of interpersonal influence.

Clearly the importance of social ascendancy, power distance, and a culture of authoritarian, even exploitative, leadership suggest the weakening of the relational nature of leadership. However, it is paradoxically true that, as a result of the Public Man philosophy, in Ecuador the relational component of leadership is both a strength and weakness in that relationships are both central to effective leadership and a challenge to leadership authority.

This was likely less the case in the precolonial indigenous and Incaic societies of Ecuador as the absence of the Hispanic philosophy outlined by Dealy largely explains much of this paradox. Indeed, in these precolonial societies, the guiding ethic was one of relationships based on kinship and mutual obligations (D’Altroy, 2002). Thus, in spite of the hierarchical structure of these societies, sharing and mutual responsibility were central to the maintenance of a functional community. (D’Altroy, 2002). The act of redistribution of resources, service to authority through labor, and kinship relationships formed the foundation for both survival and relational influence. As Hurtado (1985) wrote,

In contrast to the system of distribution of rewards in indigenous society, in which the practice of reciprocity permitted a more equitable sharing of wealth, the economic system implanted by the Spaniards unilaterally channeled all production in such a way as to impoverish the Indians and enrich the whites. (p. 21)

This difference in the reciprocal nature of leaders-follower relations both promoted stronger relational identification with leaders in the pre-colonial period and diminished these in the post-colonial era.

Furthermore, while this indigenous tendency to look to trusted others for mutual support carried over into the colonial and post-colonial eras, the Public Man ideology created a society in which kinship relations, to which people looked for survival and support, were grounded in trust and mutual concern. Whereas, in contrast, political and economic relationships were characterized by a general and mutual lack of trust. Hurtado (2010) cites this as a reason for which very

few business partnerships formed during the colonial period. It also explains the continued predominance of family-run businesses in Ecuador today and the relative importance of God-parent/child relations to this day, as they allow for a means of extending the family relationships beyond the immediate and extended family structure.

Those who engage in leadership from the process perspective are primarily concerned about the means and ends of leadership. The focus is on ensuring that the processes that a leader or group of people sharing leadership takes to define and achieve a vision. This philosophy shifts the focus from the leader to the process, which allows for a greater capacity to view leadership as shared as opposed to embodied within one individual (Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009). This shared leadership approach seems to run counter to the prevailing norms throughout Ecuadorian history. As Hurtado (2010) explained,

Before the arrival of the Spaniards, during the brief Inca period and the era that preceded it, the Indians had lived in authoritarian societies subject to the absolute power of local political leaders (caciques) and sovereigns. They were obliged to provide personal services, pay tribute, and perform all types of work, such as building roads and bearing cargo. Families' needs, including the preservation of life, could only be met through blind obedience and absolute loyalty to those that held power. They did not have land with which they could do as they pleased; rather, land use depended on the will of the person or group to whom they were subordinated. In many social areas, especially the military, which was so important for the conquest of the Andean people (loc 77-84).

In spite of the generally autocratic approach, there is evidence that the Inca allowed for local autonomy at times when loyalty and patronage demands were met (D'Altroy, 2002).

During the colonial and post-colonial era, this autocratic approach to leadership largely continued. As Romero (2004) explained in relation to leadership within the broader region, the traditional "el patron" model of leadership is one that is "autocratic, rarely delegates or uses teams, normally communicates using a formal top-down approach, avoids conflict, and is relationship oriented, assertive, and aggressive" (Romero, 2004). This is consistent with the high power distance common within the region (Hofstede, 1980). Multiple studies have validated these assertions within Latin America, especially in relation to highly directive leadership with limited participation (Dorfman et al., 1997; Stephens & Greer, 1995; Van Emmerik, Jawahar, & Stone, 2005). Consistent with this research, in Ecuador, in the post-colonial era, it has not been uncommon for populist leaders to take responsibility for developing processes and then taking the credit for success if those processes work (Martz, Fall 1983). As discussed previously, there is evidence that these trends are changing in the region (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz, & Dorfman, 1999; Hidalgo, 2012; McIntosh & Irving, 2010; Romero, 2004) and within Ecuador (Lalander & Gustafsson, 2008) which could result in a more shared approach to procedural leadership.

The single source approach to process development and limited research in relation to actual procedural approaches used by leaders makes it challenging to generalize regarding the actual nature of the processes used. Nonetheless, these processes were largely paternalistic in nature. One excellent example of this is the way in which political leaders used the church and missionary efforts as a means of civilizing and controlling the indigenous population. In the late 1700's, during the presidency of Garcia Moreno, an effort was made to establish a theocratic governance structure among the Napo Runa of the Amazon region. The Jesuits who implemented this structure believed in and based their efforts on "three major premises: the 'moralizing' nature of agriculture, the 'civilizing' capacity of religion, and the concept that the Indians were 'perpetual children' requiring the severe, but paternalistic protection of the missionaries" (Muratorio, 2008, p. 92). In doing so, they used forced conversion and labor as a means of attempting to subjugate the indigenous people of the region. Interestingly their efforts were ultimately a failure.

Another example is the United Fruit Companies approach to organizing. In order to increase their control over workers while also responding to employee needs, they created the infrastructure for the community and organized and managed the social lives of the employees. These included athletic teams, social clubs, and even a union, all of which were controlled by the company. They also organized a police force to maintain order. Ultimately, all of these structures and processes were developed as an expression of paternalistic leadership. As (Stiffler, 2008) explained,

Although some of the company's methods of control, such as the police force, limitations placed on the movement of single women, and the regulation of fiestas, were clearly repressive, most were of a more paternalistic nature and actively created the image of the company as a benevolent father. (p. 241)

Consequently, the paternalistic style of leadership was very much a guiding paradigm for designing the structured Fruit Company's hacienda. So, while it is possible to say that autocratic, paternalistic leadership guided the creation of many leadership processes, this is an area that definitely merits further research and analysis.

Examining Followership

The third component of the contingency framework is the follower. In recent years, the importance of followers and followership has received increasing attention within the field of leadership studies. As a result, various models have been developed that provide support for understanding followership and analyzing its manifestation within the Ecuadorian cultural environment (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Among the most popular models of followership are those developed by Kelley (1992) and Chaleff (1995), both of which are two factor models resulting in four or five follower styles or approaches.

Kelley's (1992) model focuses on the extent to which followers demonstrate an active versus a passive approach to following and their level of independence and critical versus uncritical responsiveness to leaders. Leader high in independence and activity are considered exemplary followers. Those high in independence and low in activity are referred to as alienated. Whereas those low in independence and high in activity are deemed conformists. Those that are low in both areas are referred to as passive. The fifth approach is that of the pragmatic follower who is moderate in both areas and adapts his or her followership to the situation and the leader.

In contrast, Chaleff's (1995) model used the factors of support and challenge. Those high in both were called partners; whereas those low in both were referred to as resources. Individuals high in challenge, but low in support were deemed implementers. Whereas those with the opposite tendencies were referred to as individualists.

These two models provide a means of evaluating followership based on the extent to which a follower (1) generally supports his or her leaders in the pursuit of goals (2) is willing to challenge leaders when they disagree or have concerns (Chaleff, 1995; Robert E Kelley, 1998) (3) is actively engaged (Robert Earl Kelley, 1992). This approach can be expanded based on the conceptual work of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) who proposed that the following behavioral approaches to followership: proactivity, initiative taking, obedience, resistance, upward influence, voice, dissent, feedback seeking, and advising. However, the focus here will be on understanding followership in relation to the Kelly and Chaleff models even though evidence of the relevance of Uhl-Bien et al.'s work will also be evident.

Unfortunately, very little research has been done to explore the issue of followership in Latin America. Indeed, the only study to date suggested significant variation in expectations of followers across national boundaries (Holzinger, Medcol, & Dunham, 2006). Furthermore, virtually nothing has been done in Ecuador. Nonetheless, there is much in the literature with regards to the way in which followers have historically responded to leaders. Based on what has been discussed previously, it is clear that the precolonial societies of Ecuador were very hierarchical societies that encouraged followership that involved a high level of obedience and engagement (Hurtado, 2010). In terms of their ability to challenge leaders, this appears to have been somewhat limited as followers in both Ecuadorian and Inca societies were expected to be passive and subservient (Hurtado, 1985). However, the existence of a "contentious aristocracy" within the Inca empire suggests that some level of challenge existed, no matter how limited it may have been (D'Altroy, 2002). In addition, there are clear examples of organized communities that fought fiercely against the subjugation of the Inca.

In spite of the relatively authority-compliance relationship between leaders and followers, there was clearly a reciprocal nature to leadership as leaders were expected to redistribute resources and care for the needs of followers in

exchange for their active engagement. However, this did not limit the reality that power and the ability to control and punish followers was nearly absolute (Salomon, 1986).

In colonial Ecuador, the dynamics were more complex. The far more racially and social stratified society of Colonial Ecuador led to variations in expectations regarding leadership and followership. Across class/racial boundaries, followers were expected to demonstrate high levels of obedience with little to no challenge to authority. As Hurtado (2002) explained,

People acquired their status on the day of their birth and kept it throughout their life. Ownership of the *obrajes* and *haciendas*, which were the most important commercial activities, was reserved for Spaniards and Creoles, as were political and religious positions of authority and privileged access to education. Furthermore, worldly treasures, economic activities, and representational functions were not accessible to the men and women of color who made up the indigenous, black, mestizo, and mulatto peoples. They, on the other hand, were obliged to pay tribute to and to work for their masters in conditions of servitude or slavery (loc 96-110).

Interestingly, while it was expected that indigenous followers would demonstrate high levels of obedience and passivity (low challenge and high support), they were not expected to be particularly active. Indeed, they were often characterized as lazy, which is likely as much a result of an indigenous will to challenge authority through passive-aggressive withholding of effort (Lyons, 2006). Furthermore, the extent to which they were apparently supportive and non-challenge oriented is debatable as they would often find subtle ways of resisting and even challenging their leaders (Lyons, 2006; Muratorio, 2008). In addition, indigenous people did engage in political demonstrations and uprising both during the colonial and post-colonial era (De la Torre & Stiffler, 2008; Meisch, 2002).

Within the colonial mestizo and Spanish societies, followership was even more challenging as all members of society sought to raise their own status through social maneuvering and status seeking behaviors, such as the pursuit of leisure and choice of dress, through the delegation of work to lower classes. Indeed, one spectator's description of colonial Ecuadorians suggested that they were characterized by:

Nonchalance, indecisiveness, dismay at the thought of great effort, especially continuous effort; a propensity to restless laziness resulting in more noise than work; preference for fierce, short-lived spurts of work over relaxed, long-lasting effort made in equal doses; waiting to do business until the last minute and always relying on chance and luck, because they do not foresee the most inevitable contingencies, or do not want to. (Hurtado, 2002, loc. 2071-86)

In contrast to this generally low level of engagement, followers were expected to demonstrate a high level of deference and obedience to those whose class and social rank exceeded their own. Thus implying a low level of challenge and a high level of support. In spite of this general demand for deference to authority in the presence of ones superiors, the concept of obedience when not under the immediate supervision of others was not nearly as valued. Indeed, Ecuador developed, like much of Latin America, a limited respect for rule of law and a high culture norm in support of the cunning ability of followers to violate the will of rulers and get away with doing so because of their lack of immediate oversight. Thus, "laws were enforced only rarely and the whites were accustomed to living in defiance of the law" (Hurtado, 1985, p. 16).

Finally, the existence of a disloyal opposition within the culture, led to a general willingness to challenge the authority of superiors outside of one's one family and political network in order to ascend the social hierarchy. Thus followership promoted both challenge and support and passivity as well as activity. In many respects this paradoxical approach to followership is likely indicative of the environment today, though little research has been done to examine to what extent followership culture has changed over the years.

Conclusion

In spite of the relatively limited literature on leadership in Ecuador, much can be gained from exploring interdisciplinary literature for an understanding of the leadership cultural heritage of the country. The contingency based examination of Ecuadorian culture reveals insights into the contributions that history has made to the modern context in which leadership takes place as well as the philosophies and practices of leaders. Nonetheless, there is a need for additional research. As Behrens (2009) explains, there has been a tendency to examine Latin American leadership through an external philosophical lens that tends to cast a negative light on the leadership styles and approaches of the region. Furthermore, the over emphasis on political leadership has likely led to a very limited perspective regarding the true breadth of leader and follower approaches and practices within what is a truly diverse country. As a result, while this paper provides a solid foundation for additional research, it also suggests a significant need for a more comprehensive and in-depth exploration of the potential variations that likely exist in relation to the approaches to leadership and followership within such a diverse and vibrant cultural environment as Ecuador.

References

- Ayman, R. (2004). Situational and Contingency Approches to Leadership. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 148-170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Behrens, A. (2009). *Culture and management in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruhns, K. O. (2003). Social and cultural development in the Ecuadorian highlands and eastern lowlands during the formative. In J. S. Raymond & R. L. Burger (Eds.), *Archaeology of formative Ecuador* (pp. 125-174). Dumbarton Oaks research Library and Collection: Washington D.C. .
- Buchelli, R. V. (1984). Concentraciones de poder: 'Caciquismo' en una comunidad andina *Antropologia* (Vol. 3, pp. 114-126). Quito: PUCE.
- Burke, W. W. (1965). Leadership behavior as a function of the leader, the follower, and the situation. *Journal of Personality*, 33(1), 60-81.
- Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Chan, Y. H., Taylor, R. R., & Markham, S. (2008). The role of subordinates' trust in a social exchange driven empowerment process. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(4), 444-467.
- D'Altroy, T. N. (2002). *The Incas*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- De la Torre, C., & Stiffler, S. (Eds.). (2008). *The Ecuador Reader: History, Culture, and Politics*. Duke University Press: London.
- Dealy, G. C. (1992). *The Latin Americans: Spirit and Ethos*. Boulder Colorado: Westview Press.
- DenHartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transfromational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-256.
- Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. H., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in western and Asian countries: Commonalties and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), 233-274.
- Drury, S. (2004, August). *Servant leadership and organizational commitment: Emperical findings and workplace implications*. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- French Jr., J. R. P., & Raven, B. (2005). The Bases of Social Power. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 319-328). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Grieder, T. (2009). *The art and archaeology of Challuabamba, Ecuador* (1st ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(1), 124-134.
- Hidalgo, J. S. (2012). Latin America: In search of collaborative approaches to leadership. In H. Owen (Ed.), *New thinking on leadership: A global perspective* (pp. 101-110). London ; Philadelphia: Kogan Page.
- Hirschkind, L. (1995). History of the indian population of Canar. *Colonial Latin American Historical Review*, 4(3), 311-342.
- Hofstede, G. H. (1980). Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.

- Holzinger, I., Medcol, T., & Dunham, R. B. (2006). *Leader and follower prototypes in an international context: Exploratory study of Asia and South America*. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Banff, Alberta.
- House, R. J., & et al. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Hurtado, O. (1985). *Political power in Ecuador* (N. D. Mills Jr., Trans.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press
- Hurtado, O. (2010). *Portrait of a nation: Culture and progress in Ecuador* (B. Sipe, Trans. English-language ed.). New York: Madison Books.
- Kelley, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow, and followers who lead themselves* (1st ed.). New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Kelley, R. E. (1998). Followership in a leadership world. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on Leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership* (pp. 170-184). New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., & Associates. (2009). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kryzanek, J. S. (1992). *Leaders, leadership, and U. S. Policy in Latin America*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lalander, R., & Gustafsson, M.-T. (2008). Movimiento indigena y liderazgo local en la sierra ecuatoriana: Actores politicos o proceso social. *Provincia, 19*, 57-90.
- Lauderbaugh, G. (2012). *The history of Ecuador*. Denver, CO: Greenwood.
- Luciano, S. O. (2010). *Las antiguas sociedades precolombinas del Ecuador: Unrecorrido por la Sala de Arqueologia del Museo Nacional de Ecuador* Quito, Ecuador: Banco Central de Ecuador.
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2007). *Leadership: Theory, application, skill development* (4 ed.). Mason, Ohio: Thomson/SouthWestern.
- Lyons, B. J. (2006). *Remembering the hacienda: Religion, authority, and social change in highland Ecuador* (1st ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Machiavelli, N. (1992). *The prince* (N. H. Thompson, Trans. Unabridged. ed.). New York: Dover Publications.
- Martz, J. D. (Fall 1983). Populist leadership and the party caudillo: Ecuador and the CFP, 1962-81. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 22-49.
- McClellan, J. L. (2006). *Transcendent Servant Leadership*. Paper presented at the UVSC Summer University, Orem, UT.
- McIntosh, T. (2011). *Leadership Peruvian Style: How Peruvians Define and Practice Leadership*. Bloomington, IN: iUniverse.
- McIntosh, T., & Irving, J. (2010). Evaluating the instrumento de contribucion al liderazgo de siervo (ICLS) for reliability in Latin America. *The Journal of Virtues and Leadership*, 1(1), 30-49.
- Meisch, L. (2002). *Andean entrepreneurs : Otavalo merchants and musicians in the global arena* (1st ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Melohn, T. H. (1983). How to build employee trust and productivity. *Harvard Business Review*, 61(1), 56-61.
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organization as political arena. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 133-153.
- Moser, C. O. N. (2009). *Ordinary families, extraordinary lives : Assets and poverty reduction in Guayaquil, 1978-2004*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

- Muratorio, B. (2008). The state, missionaries, and native consciousness in the upper Amazon, 1767-1896. In C. De la Torre & S. Stiffler (Eds.), *The Ecuador Reader: History, Culture, and Politics* (pp. 86-97). Duke University Press: London.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at home: Caring and social policy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Northouse, P. G. (2009). *Introduction to Leadership: Concepts and Practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5 ed.). London: Sage.
- Rath, T., & Conchie, B. (2008). *Strengths based leadership: Great leaders, teams, and why people follow*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Romero, E. (2004). Latin American leadership: El patron y el lider moderno. *Cross Cultural Management*, 11(3), 25-37.
- Sahon, C. K., Behera, N., & Tripathy, S. K. (2010). Employee empowerment and individual commitment: An analysis from integrative review of research. *Employment Relations Record*, 10(1), 40-56.
- Salomon, F. (1986). *Native lords of Quito in the age of the Incas: The political economy of north Andean chiefdoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soccio, D. J. (2010). *Archetypes of wisdom: An introduction to philosophy* (7 ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Stemper, D. M. (1993). *La persistencia de los cacicazgos prehispánicos en el río Daule, Costa del Ecuador* (J. Camacho, Trans. Vol. 7). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Stephens, G. K., & Greer, C. R. (1995). Doing business in Mexico: Understanding cultural differences. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24, 39-55.
- Steward, J. H., & Faron, L. C. (1959). *Native peoples of South America*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stiffler, S. (2008). The United Fruit Company's legacy in Ecuador. In C. De la Torre & S. Stiffler (Eds.), *The Ecuador Reader: History, Culture, and Politics* (pp. 239-249). Duke University Press: London.
- Stohtert, K. E. (2003). Expression of ideology in the formative period of Ecuador. In J. S. Raymond & R. L. Burger (Eds.), *Archaeology of formative Ecuador* (pp. 337-421). Dumbarton Oaks research Library and Collection: Washington D.C. .
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. C. (2014). Followership Theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 83-104.
- Van Emmerik, H., Jawahar, I. M., & Stone, T. H. (2005). Association among altruism, burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Work and Stress*, 19(1), 93-100.
- 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 from <http://www.vistazo.com/100empresas/lideres.php>
- Willemyns, M., Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (2003). Trust me, I'm your boss: trust and power in supervisor-supervisee communication. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(1), 117-127.
- Zacarro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leaders traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zenger, J. H., & Folkman, J. (2002). *The Extraordinary leader: Turning good managers into great leaders*. San Francisco: McGraw Hill.