



How is the leadership of the Latin-American youth? Leadership, sex and country

AREA: 4
TYPE: Application

AUTHOR

Juan Rivera-Mata¹

Loyola University,
Sellinger School of
Business, USA
jrivera-mata@loyola.edu

1. Corresponding author:
Loyola University, Sellinger
School of Business, 4501
N.Charles St., Baltimore.
MD.21210, USA

*¿Cómo es el liderazgo de la juventud latinoamericana? Liderazgo, sexo y país
Como está a liderança dos jovens latino-americanos? Liderança, sexo e país*

Many papers studied leadership but not much about leaders in Latin America. We evaluated 427 students from 16 countries in Latin America and Spain participating in the Global Competitiveness Leadership Program of Georgetown University during 2007-2019 period, trying to find if their leadership profile was different from those in Europe and USA. We found their profiles are very similar, without significant differences by country or sex and with high homogeneity in the group, but they could be more characterized as "paternalistic leaders" (Hiller et. col, 2019) maybe due to country and organizational cultures. The results suggest there is a significant similarity among leaders, regardless of their sex or country of origin. Different countries, different sex, similar leadership.

Muchos trabajos ha estudiado el liderazgo pero poco sobre Latinoamérica. Hemos evaluado el liderazgo de 427 jóvenes de 16 países de América Latina y España participantes del Programa de Liderazgo para la Competitividad Global (GCL) de la Universidad de Georgetown en los años 2007-2019, intentando establecer si hay diferencias significativas con el perfil de otros líderes en Europa y Estados Unidos, así como en términos de sexo y país. Hemos encontrado que son similares a otros líderes a nivel mundial, con una alta homogeneidad en el grupo y sin encontrar diferencias significativas por sexo o país, pero pueden ser caracterizados más como "líderes paternalistas" (Hiller et col. 2019). Los resultados sugieren que hay gran similitud entre líderes, independientemente de su sexo o país de origen. Diferentes países, diferente sexo, similar liderazgo.

Há muito escrito sobre liderança, mas pouco sobre a América Latina. Avaliamos a liderança de 427 jovens de 16 países da América Latina e Espanha que participam do Programa de Liderança para Competitividade Global (GCL) da Universidade de Georgetown nos anos de 2007 a 2019, tentando estabelecer se há diferenças significativas com o perfil de outros líderes em todo o mundo, com alta homogeneidade no grupo e sem encontrar diferenças significativas por sexo ou país, mas podem ser caracterizados mais como "líderes paternalistas" (Hiller et col. 2019). Os resultados sugerem que há grande semelhança entre os líderes, independentemente de sexo ou país de origem. Países diferentes, sexo diferente, liderança semelhante.

DOI
10.3232/GCG.2020.V14.N1.01

RECEIVED
12.09.2019

ACCEPTED
08.11.2019

1. Introduction: leaders and leadership

Leadership has been of great appeal since the “Great Man” (Carlyle, 1888) and charisma (Weber, 1946) and went from styles (Lewitt and Lippit, 1938), behavioral (Mayo, 1949), contingencies (Fiedler, 1967), situational (Hershey-Blanchard, 1969) towards skills-competences (Katz, 1977) approaches. Transformational theory (Burns, 1978) brought neo-charismatic orientation (Conger and Kanungo, 1987, 1988) focusing now in goals, not in the leader. XXI Century goes towards shared leadership (Cox et al., 2003), complex (Marion and Uhl-Bien, 2001) relational (Murrell, 1997; Drath, 2001), paternalistic (Hiller et. col, 2019) and digital (Raghuram et. col., 2018). Today “leadership is an act of social influence aimed at clarifying where a collective is going and motivating others to help get there” (Ashford and Sitkin, 2019:456).

Personality, behaviors and relationships of leaders have been evaluated in multiple ways. Two of the tests broadly used are MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Inventory) and FIRO-B (Fundamental Inter-Relational Orientation Behaviors), with many studies in Europe and USA in general population, managers and leaders (Briggs-Myers et al.; OPP, 2009, 2010, 2016), but limited from Latin America (Osborn and Osborn, 1996). We cannot conclude if Latin American leaders are similar or different from managers and leaders in USA and Europe.

KEY WORDS
leadership,
paternalistic, sex,
Latin America.

PALABRAS CLAVE
liderazgo,
paternalista, sex,
Latinoamérica.

PALAVRAS CHAVE
liderança, América
Latina, paternalista,
sexo.

Table 1 - Psychological types and functions MBTI in managers USA and Europe

	USA	Europe	UK	France	Germany	Italy	Holland	Denmark	Norway	Sweden	Spain	Europe (2018)	Spain (2018)
N=	37549	127182	88394	8038	11515	1987	392	13561	915	228	2152	136837	2486
E	53.8%	68.4%	67.1%	64.4%	71.6%	65.7%	74.5%	74.4%	80.3%	75.4%	76.0%	66.0%	72.6%
I	46.2%	31.6%	32.9%	35.6%	28.4%	34.3%	25.5%	25.3%	19.7%	24.6%	24.0%	34.0%	27.4%
S	49.2%	54.0%	52.5%	59.3%	54.1%	56.5%	51.0%	57.6%	67.6%	57.0%	67.6%	51.5%	62.6%
N	50.8%	46.0%	47.5%	40.7%	45.9%	43.5%	49.0%	42.4%	32.3%	43.0%	32.4%	48.5%	37.4%
T	77.3%	75.2%	74.4%	69.6%	80.7%	76.4%	86.2%	75.5%	85.2%	81.1%	90.1%	77.3%	89.4%
F	22.7%	24.8%	25.6%	30.4%	19.3%	23.6%	13.0%	24.5%	14.8%	18.9%	9.9%	22.7%	10.6%
J	68.3%	67.1%	66.7%	65.5%	73.3%	75.3%	58.2%	62.1%	69.2%	61.4%	81.4%	66.5%	76.2%
P	31.7%	32.9%	33.3%	34.5%	26.7%	24.7%	41.8%	37.9%	30.8%	38.6%	18.6%	33.5%	23.8%
1st Type	ISTJ	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	EST	ESTJ
%	17%	22.4%	22%	21%	25%	24%	26%	23%	34%	23%	40%	20.1%	36.2%
nd Type	ESTJ		ISTJ	ISTJ	ISTJ	ENTJ	ISTJ	ENTP	ENTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ	ISTJ	ENTJ
%	15.80%		11%	13%	18%	6%	16%	13%	14%	16%	17%	12.7%	15.2%

Source: OPP (2008, 2009), Spain and Europe 2018 (OPP, 2018)

MBTI was developed by Myers and Myers (1980) based upon the Jung (1937, 1971) personality theory with 4 set of psychological functions and two opposites preferences, generating 16 psychological types (Brigg-Myers et al. 2005). MBTI was validated (Capraro and Capraro, 2002; OPP, 2009 and Rivera-Mata, 2011) and the factor analysis (Sagino, Cooper and Kine, 2000; Capraro and Capraro, 2002; OPP, 2009, Rivera-Mata, 2011) confirmed the model. Among European and USA managers (Table 1) the most frequent types are ESTJ and ENTJ, with frequencies in

JEL CODES:
M14, N36, O3

Intuition above general population and women managers higher Feeling than male but lower than women in general (Ashridge 2004; Hackston 2005; OPP, 2009, 2011; Rivera-Mata, 2011). The higher the organizational level, the lower values of Feeling (OPP, 2009). In Table 1 we observe a high homogeneity (33%-56.9% in 2 types (ESTJ 21.6%-40.2%) in all countries (USA, ISTJ), having limited data from Latin American managers (Osborn and Osborn, 1996) with similar results to Spain.

We found differences in sex in Feeling (women 60%-70%; men 20%-40%) (Briggs-Myers et al, 2005; McDaid et al, 2005; OPP, 2009) but not among managers. Spanish managers (1,313 males, 839 females) have high homogeneity (24.4% ESTJ, 24.1% ENTJ), similar in men (25% ESTJ, 24.4% ENTJ) and women (23.9% ESTJ, 23.9% ENTJ), with statistically significant differences ($p < 0.001$) in sex only Extroversion (female 86%, male 78%), and Feeling but not in Intuition nor Judgement (Rivera-Mata, 2011). OPP (2007) also found significant differences in Feelings between male and female managers but with frequencies below general population. Other study (OPP, 2009) reflect Feeling frequency of 35%, but only 15% in managers, and women having a 70% in general population but only 37% in manager, indicating that organizations filter people to management rejecting those with Feeling, choosing male and female with a preferences for Extroversion (action), Sensing (facts/data) and Judgment (planned/organized). It seems organizations filter for management only women that “fit” their culture (Kanter, 1977). We also agree with Tinsley (2016) believing that the narrative of differences between male and female in leadership maybe is well intentioned, but it seems is not relevant nor effective. We have to change to an organizational culture discussion (Schein, 1992; Kanter, 1997; Rivera-Mata, 2011) to reduce the gender gap in business leadership, in line with the law of growing social differences (Putnam, 1976:33): social elites have characteristics different than the general population and the more relevant the organization, more frequent those characteristics (Coller, 2008:146). Elites theory could be a more effective way to frame the political gender gap.

FIRO-B (Fundamental Inter-Relation Orientation Behaviors) (Schultz, 1967) measures inter-personal relationships needs with 3 variables (Inclusion, Control and Affection) and 2 dimensions (expressed and desired), is validated (Gluck, 1983; Hammer and Schell, 2000, Rivera-Mata, 2011), with 54 questions of growing intensity and acceptance (Gutmann 1974).

Table 2 - Differences male-female in interpersonal relationships (Myers et al., 1998)

	----- Inclusion-----			----- Control-----			----- Affection-----			----- Needs-----		
	EI	DI	TI	EC	DC	TC	EA	DA	TA	EN	DN	TN
Men	3.03	2.22	5.25	2.38	2.63	5.01	29-Mar	4.42	7.71	8.7	9.2	18
(n=1363)												
Women	3.41	2.333	0.74	1.62	2.9	4.52	3.71	4.86	8.57	8.74	10.09	18.8
(N=1574)												
T-Student	-4.61***	1.02	-2.83**	8.89***	3.70***	4.36***	5.12***	5.18***	5.78***	-0.22	-4.17***	2.58**

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 2, from a national representative sample of males and females, partially confirms stereotypical ideas we have regarding sex; men have higher expressed control (EC) (power, influence, leadership) than women and women higher Desired Control (DC) (passive subject of power, influencer, leadership) than men. Also women have more Total Inclusion (TI) and Affection (TA) needs than men. Hammer and

Schnell (2000) with data from 34,460 managers of 17 countries found differences in EC (4,8) and DC (3,08). Myers and col. (1998) in general USA population, found men also have higher EC than women and these more DC and TA and TI. In **Table 3**, we can conclude female managers have statistically significant higher needs of inclusion and affection and the men of control (Rivera-Mata, 2011). This is partially due to the high correlation between Extroversion and Expressed Needs, where there is no statistically significant differences in the desired needs. It seems there are gender differences in the expression of needs but not in those needs. Also there is a higher correlation (Rivera-Mata, 2011) between affection and age than with sex; the higher affection of women managers is due more to be younger than women.

Table 3 - Interpersonal relationships (FIRO) of male and female managers in Spain.

SPAIN MANAGERS	Male (n=428)		Female (n=232)		Total		T-Test
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Expressed Inclusion (EI)	4,39	1,901	5,06	1938	4,63	1,94	0.000 *
Desired Inclusion (DI)	3,52	3,207	4,17	3,323	3,75	3,261	0.140
TOTAL INCLUSION (TI)	7,91	4,48	9,24	4,783	8,37	4,629	0.001 *
Expressed Control (EC)	4,84	2,512	4,59	2,399	4,76	2,474	0.000 *
Desired Control (DC)	2,79	1,919	2,54	1,9	2,7	1,914	0,121
TOTAL CONTROL (TC)	7,63	3,132	7,14	3,107	7,46	3,13	0.054
Espressed Affection (EA)	5,22	2,312	5,84	2,163	5,44	2,278	0.001 *
Desired Affection (DA)	6,3	2,074	6,55	1,951	6,39	2,034	0.135
TOTAL AFFECTION (TA)	11,53	3,857	12,39	3,731	11,3	3,833	0.006

Source: Rivera-Mata 2011 * p 0.05 T-Sudent

Men and women differ in the expression of their needs, but not in the quantity of them (Gardner and Gabriel, 2004). Men have higher EC (power, influence, leadership) and women higher DC, affection and inclusion (Myers et al. 1998). In male and female managers, the expressed control is higher than in men in general population (Hammer and Schnell, 2000). But it seems leadership in organizations brings higher control of managers –much higher than general population- maybe at the cost of having unsatisfied affection needs (Rivera-Mata, 2015). EC have a positive relation (OPP, 2010) with hierarchy. In similar way, there are no statistically between male and female Spanish managers (Rivera-Mata, 2011). Osborn and Osborn (1996) compared managers of USA, Canada, and México and found Mexicans have higher EC (5,6) than USA (4,7) and Canada (4,4), being more expressive (14,6) than those from USA (11) and Canada (11,3). To answer how is the leadership of Latin American youth, we will evaluate the following hypotheses:

H1: The psychological type and personality preferences of the Latin American youth is similar to the leaders of USA and Europe.

H2: The interpersonal relationships of the Latin American youth is similar to those of the leaders in USA and Europe.

H3: There are no statistically significant differences between male and female Latin American young leaders in their psychological type, preferences and interpersonal relationships.

H4: There are no significant differences between young leaders of the different countries of Latin America in their psychological type, psychological preferences and inter-personal relationships.

2. Sample and methodology

We studied 457 participants in the GCL program of Georgetown University (GU). They are young (24-34 years; 51.8% women, 48,2% men) of 18 countries of Latin America, Caribe, Puerto Rico, Portugal and Spain, University graduate and professional and social experience, being accepted –and funded– after a rigorous selection process. Main countries are Colombia (n=67), Ecuador (n=57), Brazil (n=48), Panama (n=34), Mexico (n=29), Peru (n=30), Venezuela (n=28), Chile (n=24), Bolivia (n=23) and Spain (n=23). We want to compare MBTI and FIRO-B from Europe and USA (limited from Latin America), with the sample to see similarities among them and with reference groups. We conducted a descriptive analysis with quantitative variables calculated trend and dispersion (mean, mode, variance, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, significance) and qualitative variable frequency tables (number of cases and percentages). We conducted two variables analysis between dependent and independent variables, contingency tables and the t of Student test for the quantitative (FIRO-B) evaluating the statistical significance, obtaining the confidence intervals (CI 95%). The Chi-Square test was used for the qualitative variables (MBTI type and 4 functions). We established significance if $p < 0.05$, with an strength and confidence interval at 95%. We will review now the results of the hypotheses.

3. Results and discussion

Here after we well analyze the results of the hypotheses:

H1: The psychological type and personality preferences of the Latin American youth is similar to the leaders of USA and Europe.

Table 4 shows the most frequent type is ESTJ (24.9%), as European managers (20.1%-40.2%), Mexicans (36.3%) and second most frequent in USA (15.8%). There is a high homogeneity; two most frequent types are 49.6% of total, as Spain (56.7%-51.4%) and Mexico (64.9%), being lower in Europe (32.7%) and USA (32.8%). There is a lack of diversity in the Hispanic management world and in the sample. Also higher Intuition (N) in the sample (51.2%) than business leaders (32.4%-50.2%) and higher Extroversion (85.4% vs. 66%-76%). We can compare with general population -but with limitations due to using different test, online and we could not find validation studies. The sample is more extroverted than general population (85.4% vs. 50.5%-50.6%), with lower Intuition (54% vs. 67.4%-66.7%), and lower Feeling (20.8% vs. 37.2%-41.9%) and higher (70.7% vs. 55.7%-57%). We found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between the sample and Spanish and Mexican managers, being similar to the USA managers and Europe-2018 (except in the 85.4% Extroversion and lower Intuition).

The hypothesis is partially confirmed. There are some statistically significant differences but also many similarities between the leadership of the sample with leaders in USA and Europe, especially in the high homogeneity in ESTJ/ENTJ and in the functions, except in Extroversion (action orientation).

Table 4 - MBTI in the sample compared with several references groups

	-----Managers/Leaders-----						---General Population---		
	USA	EUROPE	EUROPE 2018	SPAIN	SPAIN 2018	MEXICO	GCL-GU	LATIN AMERICA	SPAIN
N=	37549	127182	136837	2152	2486	1019	437	565657	126202
E	53.8%*	68.4%*	66%*	76,0%*	72.6%*	54.8%*	85.4%	56.6%*	50.5%
I	46.2%*	31.6%*	34%*	24,0%*	27.4%*	45.2%*	14.6%	43.4%*	49.5%
S	49.2%	54.0%*	51.5%	67,6%*	62.6%*	74.9%*	46.0%	33.3%*	32.6%
N	50.8%	46.0%*	48.5%	32,4%*	37.4%*	25.1%*	54.0%	66.7%*	67.4%
T	77.3%	75.2%*	77.3%	90,1%*	89.4%*	98.4%*	79.2%	58.1%*	62.8%
F	22.7%	24.8%*	22.7%	9,9%*	10.6%*	1.6%*	20.8%	41.9%*	37.2%
J	68.3%	67.1%*	66.5%	81,4%*	76.2%*	83.4%*	70.7%	44.3%*	43.0%
P	31.7%	32.9%	33.5%	18,6%*	23.8%*	16.6%*	29.3%	55.7%*	57.0%
Type 1	ISTJ	EST	EST	EST	ESTJ	ESTJ	ESTJ		
%	17%	22.4%	20.1%	40,2%	36.2%	36.3%	24.90%		
Type 2	ESTJ		ISTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ	ISTJ	ENTJ		
%	15.80%		12.7%	16,7%	15.2%	28.9%	24.70%		

Source: Pob Gral: Neris Analytics; USA (Briggs-Myers 2005); USA/Mexico (Osborn, 1996)

Europe (OPP 2009, 2010,2018), Spain (Rivera-Mata, 2011) * p<0.05

H2: The interpersonal relationships of the Latin American youth is similar to those of the leaders in USA and Europe.

Table 5 shows values of interpersonal needs compared with management leaders in USA, Canada, Mexico and Spain. Expressed Inclusion (EI) (5.64) is similar to the rest (except Canada) but also high values of Desired Inclusion (DI) (5.7), higher than all reference groups, making Total Inclusion (TI) (11.34) also the highest value among all groups. Expressed Control (EC) (supervision, order, leadership) has high values (5.57), but the Desired Control (DC) (2.42) is the lowest among all groups. The higher the organizational ladder, the higher EC and lower DC (OPP, 2010) ; in this case, the sample is not from a high management group, but fits the profile. Expressed Affection (EA) (5.77) and Desired Affection (DA) (6.44) are the highest of all. High EC and low DC can generate perception of "authoritarian leadership" (Schell and Hammer, 1993). When EC and DC are high, people could be seen as "perfectionist". Finally, like this case, where CE is high and CD low but Expressed Inclusion (EI) and Affection (EA) is high, people could be seen "paternalistic". Paternalistic leadership is conceptualized as the simultaneous enactment of two seemingly paradoxical leadership behaviors: benevolence/caring for others (high EI-EA) and authority/control/power (high EC) (Hiller et. col, 2019:165). Maybe this leadership is more frequent in Latin America –as indicated in the sample-, due to the regional and organizational culture and high presence of family businesses, as it is more prevalent in non-WEIRD (western, educated, rich and democratic) cultures (Ma & Tsui, 2015; Mansur, Sobral & Goldzsmith, 2017; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2018). We can conclude there is a high similarity in the needs of the sample compared with reference groups in USA and Europe, although there also differences, specially the low Desired Control and High Inclusion and Affection. The hypothesis is partially confirmed. Latin American young leaders are very affective and inclusive, "good paternalistic leaders" but "bad followers" (CE).

Table 5 - Relational needs (FIRO-B) of the GCL sample compared with reference groups

FIRO-B	Europe						Managers				GCL-GU
	CEOs	Upper Manag.	Managers	Mid Managers	Superv.	Employee	USA	Canada	Mexico	Spain	
n=	578	1744	2028	1844	893	1046	28708	3798	1019	660	426
Expressed Inclusion (EI)	5.61	5.5	5.55	5.65	5.66	5.71	4.2	3.8	4.4	4.63	5.64
Desired Inclusion (DI)	4.02	4.04	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.27	3.6	2.7	3.5	3.75	5.7
TOTAL INCLUSION (TI)	9.63	9.54	9.57	9.76	9.77	9.98	7.8	6.5	7.9	8.38	11.34
Expressed Control (EC)	6.57	6.49	6.35	6.12	5.86	5.25	4.8	4.4	5.6	4.76	5.57
Desired Control (DC)	4.84	4.81	4.96	5.02	5.05	5.24	3.1	3	2.5	2.7	2.42
TOTAL CONTROL (TC)	11.41	11.3	11.31	11.14	10.91	10.49	7.9	7.4	8.1	7.46	7.99
Expressed Affection (EA)	4.12	4.1	4.03	4.09	4.12	4.44	3.7	3.1	4.6	5.44	5.77
Desired Affection (DA)	4.98	4.92	4.88	4.88	4.99	5.2	5	4.7	5.1	6.39	6.4
TOTAL AFFECTION (TA)	9.1	9.02	8.91	8.97	9.11	9.64	8.7	7.8	9.7	11.83	12.17
Expressed Needs (EN)	16.3	16.09	15.93	15.86	15.64	15.4	12.7	11.3	14.6	14.83	16.98
Desired Needs (DN)	13.84	13.77	13.86	14.01	14.15	14.71	11.7	10.4	11.1	12.84	14.52
TOTAL NEEDS (TN)	30.14	29.86	29.79	29.87	29.79	30.11	24.4	21.7	25.7	27.67	31.5

Source: Europe (OPP, 2010), USA (Myers et col, 1998), Managers USA, Mexico, Canada (Osborn, 1996), Spain(Rivera-Mata, 2011)

H3: There are no statistically significant differences between male and female Latin American young leaders in their psychological type, preferences and interpersonal relationships.

In Table 6 below we indicate the results of the psychological type and functions of the sample, segregated by sex, and compared with male and female groups of general population from UK-USA and male and female managers in Spain. Male and female have high homogeneity (51.1% men; 48.1% women) in the first two types (ESTJ/ENTJ). GCL participants are very similar in their personality –and therefore behaviors-; this probably could be due to the strict selection criteria and process. In psychological functions, men and women in GCL are similar in Extroversion-Introversion, Sensing-Intuition and there are only statistically significant differences in the Thinking-Feeling function, with a higher Feeling in women (24.1% vs.17.5%). Thinking is over-represented in males and Feeling in women (OPP, 2016). Feeling is typical of women (65%-75%), but in female managers population drops to the 15%-25%; Feeling characteristic of women in general population could not be an advantage but a problem for women to move ahead in the leadership business ladder (Rivera-Mata, 2011).

Table 6 - Type and psychological functions of sample (sex) and compared with other groups

	GCL-Georgetown		USA		USA	U.K.	Spain	USA		USA	U.K.	Spain
	Men	Women	Women	Women	Women	Female Managers	Men	Men	Men	Male Manager		
N=	217	220	1531	32731	690	839	1478	23240	489	1313		
E	84.8%	85.9%	52.5%*	55.7%*	54.8%*	83.4%*	45.9%*	51.4%*	56.0%	71.2%*		
I	15.2%	14.1%	47.5%*	44.3%*	45.2%*	16.6%*	54.1%*	48.6%*	44.0%	28.8%*		
S	46.5%	45.5%	74.9%*	56.4%*	61.8%*	72.7%*	71.1%*	54.8%*	48.5%	64.4%*		
N	53.5%	54.5%	25.1%*	43.6%*	38.2%*	27.3%*	28.3%*	45.2%*	51.5%	35.6%*		
T	82.5%*	75.9%*	24.5%*	34.6%*	31.7%*	83%*	56.5%*	63.6%*	81.8%	94.7%*		
F	17.5%*	24.1%*	75.5%*	65.4%*	68.3%*	17%*	43.5%*	36.5%*	18.2%	5.3%*		
J	72.4%	69.1%	56.2%*	59.5%*	58.5%*	78.2%	52%*	59.3%*	62.8%	83.5%*		
P	27.6%	30.9%	43.8%*	40.5%*	41.5%*	21.8%	48%*	40.7%*	27.2%	16.5%*		
T1	ENTJ	ESTJ					ESTJ					
%	25.8%	24.5%					43.0%					
T2	ESTJ	ENTJ					ENTJ					
%	25.3%	23.6%					12.3%					

* p<0.05 Source: M/F USA (Briggs-Myers 2005, McAid et col, (2005); Female Managers USA (CAPT 2005). UK (OPP, 2004), M/F Managers Spain (Rivera-Mata, 2011)

Table 7 - Interpersonal needs of GCL sample (sex), compared with reference groups

FIRO-B	MEN (USA)	Male Managers (Spain)	GCL-GU Men	GCL-GU Women	Women (USA)	Female Managers (Spain)
n=	1363	428	198	228	1574	232
Expressed Inclusion (EI)	3.03	4.39	5.58	5.67	3.41	5.06
Desired Inclusion (DI)	2.22	3.52	5.61	5.76	2.33	4.17
TOTAL INCLUSION (TI)	5.25	7.91	11.19	11.43	5.74	9.23
Expressed Control (EC)	2.38	4.84	5.74	5.36	1.62	4.59
Desired Control (DC)	2.63	2.79	2.56	2.27	2.9	2.54
TOTAL CONTROL (TC)	5.01	7.63	8.30*	7.63*	4.52	7.13
Expressed Affection (EA)	3.29	5.22	5.62	5.9	3.71	5.84
Desired Affection (DA)	4.42	6.3	6.26	6.5	4.86	6.55
TOTAL AFFECTION (TA)	7.71	11.52	11.88	12.4	8.57	12.39
Expressed Needs (EN)	8.7	14.45	16.94	16.93	8.74	15.49
Desired Needs (DN)	9.27	12.61	14.43	14.53	10.09	13.26
TOTAL NEEDS (TN)	17.97	27.06	31.37	31.46	18.83	28.75

Source: USA (Myers et col., 1998), Spain (Rivera-Mata, 2011) *p<0.05 T-Student

Table 7 indicates differences of inter-personal relationship needs between men and women in the sample, comparing with general population, and male and female managers in USA and Spain. There are no statistically significant differences in Inclusion and Affection in the sample between men and women, nor in total needs, both expressed and desired. The only statistically significant difference we found in sex was Total Control (TC) but not in each of its elements: Expressed Control (CT) and Desired Control (DC). We believe this is just an statistical effect where the aggregate of 2 difference (EC- DC) with 0.06 significance have a difference significance of 0.01, but we do not have practical relevance. Control is associated with supervision/ command/ leadership (Expressed) and desired (need) of being supervised/commanded/led (Desired) (Schnell and Hammer, 1993). Therefore, we can conclude men and women in the sample do not have any statistically significant differences, but both groups, male and female GCLs have a much higher Control than people with any sex in general population and similar to males and female in managers population. We confirm again that there is high similarity among “leaders” regardless of their sex and they are different, male and female, from general population. Hypothesis H3 is confirmed. Hypothesis H3 is confirmed.

H4: There are no significant differences between young leaders of the different countries of Latin America in their psychological type, preferences and inter-personal relationships needs.

Table 8 shows preferences and types in the sample of several countries. Almost in all the countries evaluated the most frequent types are ESTJ/ENTJ and with high homogeneity (35%-58% in 2 types). We found few statistically significant differences (p<0.05) in J-P. In Argentina and Brazil, where in both counties also ESTJ/ENTJ are the most common types. Therefore, we can confirm the hypothesis almost completely.

Table 8 - MBTI GCLs (countries) compared with general population in Latin America countries

GCL-GU		Argent.	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colom.	Ecuador	Guate.	Mexico	Panam.	Parag.	Peru	Venez.	Spain
N=	414	25	27	48	26	67	47	12	38	34	9	30	28	23
E	82.1%	76%	63%	83%	81%	81%	87%	92%	89%	76%	78%	83%	89%	87%
I	17.9%	24%	37%	17%	19%	19%	13%	8%	11%	24%	22%	17%	11%	13%
S	47.8%	56%	41%	40%	58%	37%	64%	50%	47%	47%	44%	43%	54%	53%
N	51.2%	44%	59%	60%	42%	63%	46%	50%	53%	53%	66%	57%	46%	48%
T	81.4%	84%	93%	75%	77%	85%	83%	75%	74%	79%	89%	83%	82%	83%
F	18.6%	16%	7%	25%	23%	15%	17%	25%	26%	21%	11%	17%	18%	17%
J	71.7%	52%*	89%	52%*	73%	78%	74%	92%	74%	74%	56%	77%	75%	70%
P	18.3%	48%*	11%	48%*	27%	22%	26%	9%	26%	26%	44%	13%	25%	30%
1st Type	ESTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ	ESTJ	ESTJ	ENTJ	ESTJ	ESTJ	ESTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ	ESTJ	ESTJ	ESTJ
2nd Type	ENTJ	ESTJ	STJ	ENTJ	ESFJ	ESTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ	ESTJ	ENTP	ENTJ	ENTJ	ENTJ
% 1+2	49%	44%	52%	35%	42%	55%	57%	58%	47%	44%	44%	53%	54%	52%

GENERAL POPULATION	L.A.	Argent.	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colom.	Ecuador	Guate.	Mexico	Panam.	Parag.	Peru	Venez.	Spain
	565657	45998	3735	240928	27204	30189	10942	10021	149144	10040	3978	18045	15433	126202
E	56.6%	59.1%	50.2%	59.9%	60.9%	52.6%	52.2%	54.8%	52.8%	50.6%	56.1%	51.0%	52.2%	50.5%
I	43.4%	40.9%	49.8%	40.1%	39.1%	47.4%	47.8%	45.2%	47.2%	49.4%	43.9%	49.0%	47.8%	49.5%
S	33.3%	30.8%	34.7%	31.0%	30.7%	36.1%	37.6%	38.0%	36.6%	37.6%	32.6%	35.1%	34.1%	32.6%
N	66.7%	69.2%	65.3%	69.0%	69.3%	63.9%	62.4%	62.0%	63.4%	62.4%	67.4%	64.9%	65.9%	67.4%
T	58.1%	58.2%	66.3%	59.1%	58.6%	57.3%	58.6%	58.7%	56.4%	59.6%	54.0%	58.0%	55.1%	62.8%
F	41.9%	41.8%	33.7%	40.9%	41.4%	42.7%	41.4%	41.3%	43.6%	40.4%	46.0%	42.0%	44.9%	37.2%
J	44.3%	42.5%	45.2%	43.7%	42.9%	46.7%	43.8%	46.7%	45.2%	44.2%	42.6%	43.9%	46.3%	43.0%
P	55.7%	57.5%	54.8%	56.3%	57.1%	53.3%	56.2%	53.3%	54.8%	55.8%	57.4%	56.1%	53.7%	57.0%

Source: www.16personalities.com using Neris Type Explorer, Nerys Analytics

Table 8 shows the preferences of general population in several Latin America countries, using a test similar to MBTI (Neris Type Explorer, online, not validated); general population of Latin America the preferences are Extroversion (56,6%), Intuition (66.7%) Thinking (58.1%) and Perception (55.7%), similar to those in Spain, but with higher Extroversion (59.1% vs. 50,5%) and with similar frequencies in identical preferences in all Latin American countries indicated. We do not have data segregated by sex. Like in Tables 6 and 7, we observe a very high similarity among male and female leaders, different from the general population.

Table 9 indicates values of inter-personal relationship needs by country, with similarities and some differences. In Total Needs (TN) only Ecuador (28.56) and Uruguay (37.00) from the 12 countries show statistically significant differences (p<0.05). Besides that, there are some differences (Argentina DC, México EI, Ecuador DC, Spain EA). Therefore, in psychological types, psychological functions and well as inter-personal relationship needs, we can confirm that there are no significant differences among the different countries in Latin America in the sample, although we found some minor statistically significant (p<0.005) differences.

Table 9 - Inter-personal needs (FIRO-B) from the GCL sample (by country)

	N	EI	DI	EC	DC	EA	DA	TI	TC	TA	TE	TD	TN
Argentina	23	5.83	5.00	5.91	3.30*	5.22	6.22	10.83	9.35	11.13	16.96	14.52	31.48
vs GCL		4%	-12%	6%	37%	-9%	-3%	-4%	14%	-6%	0%	0%	0%
Bolivia	23	5.26	6.39	6.43	2.09	5.26	6.22	11.65	8.43	11.65	16.96	14.70	31.65
vs GCL		-7%	12%	16%	-14%	-9%	-3%	3%	3%	-2%	0%	1%	1%
Brazil	47	5.64	6.02	5.79	2.91	5.70	5.81	11.66	8.91	11.47	17.13	14.74	31.87
vs GCL		0%	6%	4%	21%	-1%	-9%	3%	9%	-3%	1%	2%	1%
Chile	24	5.54	4.04	5.63	2.58	6.42	6.58	9.58	8.25	12.71	17.58	13.21	30.79
vs GCL		-2%	-29%	1%	7%	11%	3%	-15%	1%	7%	4%	-9%	-2%
Colombia	65	5.48	5.20	5.08	2.38	5.63	6.49	10.68	7.92	11.82	16.18	14.08	30.26
vs GCL		-3%	-9%	-9%	-1%	-2%	2%	-6%	-3%	0%	-5%	-3%	-4%
Ecuador	41	5.20	5.39	5.29	1.63*	4.90*	6.15	10.59	6.90	10.93	14.78*	13.17	28.56*
vs GCL		-8%	-5%	-5%	-32%	-15%	-4%	-6%	-16%	-8%	-13%	-9%	-9%
Spain	19	5.89	7.05	5.05	2.42	6.63*	7.00	12.95	7.79	13.00	17.58	16.47*	34.05
vs GCL		5%	24%	-9%	0%	9%	10%	14%	-5%	10%	4%	14%	8%
Mexico	34	6.24*	6.09	6.09	2.59	6.24	6.91	12.32	9.15*	12.26	18.55*	15.59	34.15
vs GCL		11%	7%	9%	7%	8%	8%	9%	12%	4%	9%	8%	9%
Panama	34	5.68	5.82	4.82	2.68	5.56	6.38	11.50	7.76	11.68	16.06	14.88	30.94
vs GCL		1%	2%	-13%	11%	-3%	0%	2%	-5%	-1%	-5%	3%	-2%
Peru	27	5.41	5.37	5.11	2.15	6.04	6.41	10.78	7.44	12.07	16.56	13.93	30.48
vs GCL		-4%	-6%	-8%	-11%	5%	0%	-5%	-9%	2%	-2%	-4%	-3%
Uruguay	7	6.86*	7.29	6.00	2.29	6.71	7.86*	14.14*	8.29	14.57*	19.57	17.43	37.00*
vs GCL		22%	28%	8%	-6%	17%	23%	25%	1%	23%	15%	20%	18%
Venezuela	27	5.93	6.15	6.19	2.67	6.33	7.00	12.07	9.07	12.81	18.44	15.81	34.26
vs GCL		5%	8%	11%	10%	10%	10%	7%	11%	8%	9%	9%	9%
GCL	##	5.63	5.69	5.56	2.42	5.76	6.39	11.32	8.19	11.85	16.95	14.50	31.45
* p<0.05	Max	5.20	4.04	4.82	1.63*	4.90*	5.81	9.58	6.90	10.93	14.78*	13.21	28.56*
	Min.	6.86*	6.39	6.43	3.30	6.63*	7.86*	14.14*	9.15*	14.57*	18.55*	16.47*	37.00*

4. Limitations, conclusions and recommendations

We do not know much leadership; better theorizing is required (Asford and Sitkin, 2019:458). Society and leadership is changing at a higher speed than our ability to understand it. We still use models based on individual "leaders" occupying positions of authority or power and, theoretically; we are still in the 'Great Man' (and now woman) theory of the XIX Century. We are still conceptualizing leadership as an individual factor and not as a collective influence (Ashford and Sitkin, 2019).

We know even less about women and leadership. Many studies follow fashions, political pressures and trends and limit our ability to diagnose better the problem of the reduced access of women to

leadership positions. We can hardly find the right answers and design social, political, business and personal policies that could effectively diagnose, reduce and eventually eliminate the leadership gender gap. Maybe we should reframe the leadership gender gap as ineffective practices of promotion and leadership development differences in the organizations and we should focus in having a gender-blind meritocracy in organizations. Also elite theory, better that organizational leadership theories regarding sex differences could be more effective to understand why women do not achieve equal power in the political and business world.

The sample is limited, in population, country, age distribution and lack of national representative samples to compare. The sample, young (24-34) Latin American was compared with data from managers (we assumed much older) in USA and Europe. We did not evaluate age where we previously found (Rivera-Mata, 2011) that age was a more relevant variable than sex to understand leadership differences between men and women. We did not evaluate differences of sexual or religious orientation, nor even economic level. The statistical method was a simple descriptive approach; with other hypotheses and methods (correlations, regressions, etc.) maybe could have reached different or more rich and specific conclusions.

How is the leadership of the Latin American youth? Based upon the theoretical review and empirical analysis we can conclude the Latin American young leaders are very similar to those in USA and Europe. Both men and women, and without significant differences among them, are focus on action (not so much in reflection), centered in analyzing –and communicating- with facts and data (less with models and trends/possibilities), who take decisions in an “objective (task) way (but very little in a subjective, centered in the persons/relationships) and they like planning and organizing (but less so changes). They are very similar in sex and different from males and females if their countries; they are “leaders”. In interpersonal relationships they are –regardless of their sex- very “relational” (inclusive/affective) and they want to control and not to be controlled, what can make them very effective but with possible conflicts with others –specially with peer “leaders”. Good leaders, bad followers, but they, male and female, could be characterized as “paternalistic leaders” (Hiller et col. 2019) due to their high Expressed Control, Affection and Inclusion. One clear feature of the group is the high homogeneity, or lack of diversity, regardless the 50/50 in sex and 16 countries) and consequently of their leadership. In comparative terms we have seen this homogeneity among themselves, regardless of sex and country, but they are very different from general population, as managers in USA and Europe. Leaders share same characteristics, different from the general population Different sex and country, similar leadership.

Based upon the conclusion we can make some recommendations. Increase studies of Latin American youth and number of variables (sex, age, sexual orientation, countries, economical level, etc.) as well as longitudinal studies to see changes over time. For the GCL-GU program we would recommend to increase diversity –in real terms of personality and not only based upon country/sex/sexual orientation-; the age range could enrich the group with broader perspectives (at the cost of group homogeneity/affinity) avoiding the problem of endogeneity in leadership programs ((Reyes et col. 2019), and limiting the risk of “groupthink” (Turner and Pratkanis, 1998) where the group, rejects a way of thinking different from the one of the dominant group and increasing the effectiveness of these young leaders to face present and future challenges of the region and the world.

References

- Ashford, A.J. & Sitkin, S.B. (2019), *From problems to progress: a dialogue on prevailing issues in leadership research*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Nr. 30, pp.454-460
- Ashbridge (2004), "MBTI Research into distribution of type". Ashbridge Management School. England www.ashbridge.org.uk
- Briggs-Myers, I. (2005), "MBTI Manual" 3rd Edition, CPP, California
- Burns, J. M. (1978), "Leadership". Harper & Row. Oxford.
- Capraro, R.M., & Capraro, M. (2002), "Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Score Reliability Across Studies: a Meta-Analytic Reliability Generalization Study", *Educational and Psychological Measurement* Nr. 62.
- Carlyle, T. (1888), "On heroes, hero-worship and the heroic in History", Stokes & Brother, New York.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1987), "Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizations". *Academy of Management Review* 12: 637-647.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1998) "Charismatic leadership in organizations", Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Coller, X. (2008), "El sesgo social de las élites políticas. El caso de la España de las autonomías (1980-2005)". *Revista de Estudios Políticos*, 141: 135-149.
- Cox, C.L.; Pearce, C.L., & Perry, M.L. (2003), "Toward a model of shared leadership and distributed influence in the innovation process: How shared leadership can enhance new product development team dynamics and effectiveness". In: "Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership", edited by Pearce, C. L. and A. J. Conger. Sage. Thousand Oaks, California.
- Drath, W. (2011), "The Deep Blue Sea: Rethinking the Source of Leadership", Jossey-Bass Publishers and Center for Creative Leadership, San Francisco.
- Eagly, A.H. (1995), "The science and politics of comparing women and men", *American Psychologist*, Vol, 50, pp.: 145-158
- Eagly, A.H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001), "The leadership styles of women and men", *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol.57.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B.T. (1990), "Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, American Psychological Association Vol.108, pag.: 233-256.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967), "A theory of leadership effectiveness", McGraw-Hall, New York.
- Gardner, W. L., & S. Gabriel (2004), "Gender differences in relational and collective inter-dependence". In: "The Psychology of Gender" edited by Eagly, A. H., A. E. Beall and R. J. Sternberg, The Guildford Press, New York.
- Gluck, G. A. (1983), "Psychometric Properties of the FIRO-B: A Guide to Research", CPP, Palo Alto, California
- Guttman, L. (1974), "The basis for scalogram analysis". In: "Scaling: A sourcebook for behavioral Scientists", edited by Maranell, Aldine, G.M., Chicago.
- Hackston, J. (2005), "French MBTI step I data supplement", OPP Ltd., Oxford.
- Hammer, A. L. and E. R. Schnell (2000), "FIRO-B Technical Guide", CPP, Palo Alto, California.
- Heifetz, R. (1994), "Leadership without easy answers". Harvard University Press. London.
- Hiller, N.J., Sin, H., Ponnappalli, A.R., & Ozgen, S. (2019) *Benevolence and authority as WEIRD unfamiliar: A multi-language meta-analysis of paternalistic leadership behaviors from 152 studies*. *The Leadership Quarterly* Nr. 30. Pp. 165-184

- Jung, C. G. (1937), "Tipos psicológicos" (R. de la Serna, Trad.). Chile: Letras. (Original work published in 1917).
- Jung, C. G. (1976), « Psychological Types », Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Katz, R. (1974), "Skills of an effective administrator", *Harvard Business Review*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Lewin, K., & Lippitt, R. (1938), "An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: a preliminary note". *Sociometry* 1.
- Ma, L., & Tsui, A. S. (2015). *Traditional Chinese philosophies and contemporary leadership*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(1), 13–24.
- MaCDAid, G.P.; McCaulley, M.H., & Kainz, R.I. (2005), "Atlas of Type Tables", Centre for Applications of Psychological Types, CAPT Inc., Florida.
- Mansur, J., Sobral, F., & Goldszmidt, R. (2017). *Shades of paternalistic leadership across cultures*. *Journal of World Business*, 52(5), 702–713.
- Marion, R.U., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001), "Leadership in complex organizations", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12: 389–418.
- McCaulley, M.H., & Martin, C. (1995), "Career Assessment and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator", Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, California.
- Murrell, K. L. (1997), "Emergent theories of leadership for the next century: Towards relational concepts". *Organization Development Journal*, 15, nr.3: 35–42.
- Myers, I. B.; McCaulley, M. H.; Quink, N. L., & Hammer, N. L. (1998), "MBTI Manual: A Guide to the Development and the Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator". Consulting Psychologists Press. Palo Alto, California.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P.B. (1980) "Gifts Differing: Understanding Personality Type", Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- OPP (2009), "MBTI-Step I. European Data Supplement" OPP Ltd., Eisfeld Hall, Oxford, England.
- OPP (2010), "FIRO-B European Data Supplement", OPP Ltd., Eisfeld Gall, Oxford, England.
- OPP (2016), "MBTI-Step I. European Data Supplement". OPP Ltd., Eisfeld Hall, Oxford, England.
- Osborn, D., & Osborn, D. (1996), "MBTI, FIRO-B and NAFTA: Psychological profiles of not so distant neighbors", *Journal of Psychological Type*, Vol. 36
- Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). *Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research*. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 566–593.
- Putman, Robert D. (1976), "The Comparative Study of Political Elites", Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Psychological Type Research Unit (2000) www.capt.org
- Raghuram, S., Hill, N.S., Gibbs, J.L., & Maruping L.M. (2018) *Virtual work: bridging research clusters*. *Academy of Management Annals*.
- Reyes, D.L., Dinh, J., Lacerenza, C.N., Marlow, S.L., Joseph, D.L., & Salas, E. (2019), *The state of higher education leadership development program evaluation: A meta-analysis, critical review and recommendations*, *The Leadership Quarterly*, nr. 30, pp. 1–15.

Rivera-Mata, J. (2011), "Liderazgo, sexo y género: comportamientos y relaciones de directivos y directivas españolas", *Doctoral dissertation. Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla.*

Rivera-Mata, J. (2013), "Mujer, liderazgo y sociedad en America Latina". *Universidad del Pacifico, Lima.*

Rivera-Mata, J. (2015), "Women in Spanish Businesses. What is more Important for Leadership: Sex, Age or Company?" *Presentación Congreso International Leadership Association, Barcelona.*

Saggino, A., Cooper, C. & Kline, P. (2000), "A confirmatory analysis of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator". *Personality and Individual Differences 30: 3-9.*

Schnell, E. R. (2000), "Participating in Teams: Using Your FIRO-B® Results to Improve Interpersonal Effectiveness", *CPP, Palo Alto, California.*

Schnell, E.R., & Hammer, A.L. (1997), "Integrating FIRO-B with the MBTI: Relationships, Case Examples and Interpretations Strategies". In: "Developing Leaders: Research and Applications in Psychological Type and Leadership Development", edited by C. Fitzgerald y Linda K. Kirby, *Davies-Black Publishing, Palo Alto, California.*

Schein, E. H. (1992), "Organizational culture and leadership", *Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco*

Schnell, E.R., & Hammer, A.L. (1993), "Introduction to FIRO-B in Organizations", *Consulting Psychologist Press, Palo Alto, California.*

Schultz, W.C. (1967), "The FIRO Scales", *Consulting Psychologists, Palo Alto, California.*

Schultz, W.C. (1978), "The FIRO Awareness Scales Manual", *CPP, Palo Alto, California.*

Schutz, W.C. (1992), "Beyond FIRO-B. Three New Theory Derived Measures. Element B: Behavior, Element F: Feelings, Element S: Self", *Psychological Reports, June, Vol. 70 pp.: 915-937.*

Tinsley, C (2016), "Presentación en Harvard-Georgetown Gender and Work Symposium", *Harvard University, Cambridge, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pifyt1drhTM&t=87s>*

Thompson, H. (1998), "Using the FIRO-B and the MBTI". *Bulletin of Psychological Type, 21, 4, 18-20.*

Thompson, H. and Schutz, W. (2000), "FIRO Element B Organizational Interpretive Report", *High Performing Systems, Inc., Watkinsville, Georgia.*

Thompson, H. (2000), "FIRO-B Element B and Psychological Type", *Bulletin of Psychological Type, Vol.23, Nr.2, 18-22*

Turner, M.E., & Pratkanis, A. R. (1998), "Twenty-Five Years of Groupthink Theory and Research; Lessons from the Evaluation of Theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol, 73 Nos 2/3, pp. 105-115.*

Weber, M. (1946), "From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology", *Comps. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. Oxford University Press. New York.*

.....