

Leadership Practices: A Comparison Between Chile And The United States

Leopoldo Arias-Bolzmann, Professor of Marketing, Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez,
larias@uai.cl

Stanley J. Stough, Professor of Management, Southeast Missouri State University,
stough@semo.edu

Chellappan Somarajan, Professor of Accounting and MIS, Southeast Missouri State
University, csomarajan@semo.edu

Leonardo Garcia-Polo, IMBA Graduate, Universidad Adolfo Ibañez, leonardo.garcia-polo2004@mba.uai.cl

Abstract

Leadership is a key element in the successful execution of any strategic plan. It is important to recognize differing perceptions concerning performance of leadership practices across cultures. This study compares leadership practices between the USA and Chile, using the *LPI-Self* questionnaire developed by Kouzes & Posner (1993) as the instrument for data collection. The results of the study show that significant differences do exist among MBA respondents in the respective countries with Chilean respondents scoring higher than USA respondents on all practice dimensions. The results are of value in understanding how leadership differences impact strategic execution within an organization.

Key words: leadership comparison, leadership practices, leadership perception, strategic execution.

Introduction

One of the most significant business trends of the new millennium is the emergence of the stateless corporation and increasing interdependency among economies around the world. Until recently, leaders were able to operate in the relative isolation of domestic markets but today leaders are constantly exposed to different cultures with different lifestyles. This has resulted in the recognition of different management and leadership practices and a growing need to understand the importance of cross-cultural leadership in the implementation of the strategic management process.

The understanding of comparative leadership practices among cultures is paramount to successfully managing global business activities. An era of high change characterized by increased customer focus, strategic alliances, outsourcing, restructuring, technological advances, and economic, social and political transitions require managers to be cognizant of the differing perceptions that exist across countries concerning leadership. An understanding of leadership and differences in leadership practices among cultures leads to increased efficiency and effectiveness in organizational performance.

Leadership, structure, and culture have long been recognized as important ingredients to the successful implementation of strategy (Thompson & Strickland, 1998; Pearce & Robinson, 2003; Hodgetts, Luthans, & Doh, 2006; Deresky, 2006; Lussier & Achua, 2007). Leadership is certainly the driver of both structure and culture and, as a result, is a key to successful strategy implementation.

This study is cross-cultural in nature, not merely because of the interest in international comparison per se, but because it is believed that such comparison is essential to a better understanding of comparative leadership practices between the United States and Chile. This study should help both educational institutions and global business organizations to more effectively teach students and/or manage corporate human resources. In particular, this study provides the management of United States/Chile based organizations with valuable information, which may be helpful in selecting people to fill key leadership positions and increase the probability of successfully executing a strategic plan. This information is of even greater importance because of recent initiatives concerning a free trade zone in the Americas.

Data and Research Method

This study uses the neocharismatic, visionary approach to leadership developed by Kouzes and Posner (1993; 1995) and their **Leadership Practices Inventory-Self** (LPI-Self) instrument (Kouzes & Posner, 1993) for data collection. Kouzes & Posner have identified five leadership practices (actions and/or behaviors) employed by effective leaders:

1. **Challenging the Process** - Leaders search out challenging opportunities and experiment.
2. **Inspiring a Shared Vision** - Leaders envision a future and enlist others to pursue that future.
3. **Enabling Others to Act** - Leaders foster collaboration and empower others.
4. **Modeling the Way** - Leaders set the example and achieve small wins that build commitment.
5. **Encouraging the Heart** - Leaders recognize individual contributions and celebrate accomplishments regularly.

The LPI-Self instrument measures each of the five dimensions of leadership with 6 statements cast on a five-point Likert scale. The higher value on the five-point scale represents greater use of the measured leadership behavior. Each leadership practice could be scored in the range of 6 to 30 points. Extensive testing by Kouzes and Posner (1993) revealed that the instrument exhibits sound psychometric properties.

Sample characteristics

The LPI-Self instrument was administered during classes at each venue to sample groups with the following characteristics:

- 110 MBA students in the United States (Southeast Missouri State University and Southern Illinois University-Carbondale); there were 57 (52%) male and 53 (48%) female respondents; 72 (65%) of the respondents were below thirty years old, 30 (27%) between thirty and forty, and 8 (7%) above forty years old. There were 68 (62%) respondents with less than 10 years of work experience, 33 (30%) had between ten and twenty, and 9 (8%) respondents had more than 20 years of work experience. There were 30 (27%) respondents that had less than three functional persons under their responsibility, 17 (15%) had three or four, and 63 (57%) respondents had more than four functional persons under their responsibility.
- 124 MBA students in Chile (Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez) with 107 (86%) male and 17 (14%) female respondents; 16 (13%) of the respondents were below thirty years old, 94 (76%) between thirty and forty, and 14 (11%) above forty years old. There were 73 (59%) respondents with less than 10 years of work experience, 44 (35%) had between ten and twenty, and 7 (6%) respondents had more than 20 years of work experience. There were 79 (64%) respondents that had less than three functional persons under their responsibility, 34 (27%) had three or four, and 11 (9%) respondents had more than four functional persons under their responsibility.

Results

Results are analyzed between the two countries (Chile and United States) and within each country. Between the countries results are presented as: Aggregate Perceptions of MBA Students in the two countries (without a gender distinction); Comparison between all Male MBA Students and all Female MBA Students (without a country distinction); Comparison between United States Female MBA Students and Chilean Female MBA Students; Comparison between United States Male MBA Students and Chilean Male MBA Students; Comparison between United States Male MBA Students and Chilean Female MBA Students; and, Comparisons between Chilean Male MBA Students and United States Female MBA Students.

The results of the perception of MBA students within each country are also compared and contrasted: Comparison between Male and Female Students in United States; Comparison between Male and Female Students in Chile.

1. Comparison between United States and Chile

1.1. Comparison between United States MBA students and Chilean MBA students.

The LPI-Self scores of MBA students in the United States versus MBA students in Chile (See Table 1 - 6), shows that significant statistical differences existed on all the LPI dimensions of “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling Others to Act”, “Modeling the Way”, and “Encouraging the Heart”; with Chilean respondents rating themselves higher than United States respondents in all dimensions. Also the United States respondents showed a larger standard deviation in all the dimensions.

Table 1

Statistics Group

	Country	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean standard error
Challenging the Process	U.S.	110	21.95	3.4332	0.3273
	Chile	124	23.42	3.0686	0.2756

Test for independent samples

		Levene's test for equal variances		T test for equal means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Mean differences	Standard error of the difference	95% Confidence interval for the difference	
								Low		High
Challenging the Process	Assuming Equal variances	2.6140	0.1073	-3.446	232.0	0.001	-1.4648	0.42503	-2.30221	-0.62741
	Not Assuming Equal variances			-3.423	220.222	0.001	-1.4648	0.42789	-2.30809	-0.62152

Table 2

Statistics Group

	Country	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean standard error
Inspiring a Shared Vision	U.S.	110	20.55	4.2049	0.4009
	Chile	124	22.76	3.4790	0.3124

Test for independent samples

		Levene's test for equal variances		T test for equal means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Mean differences	Standard error of the difference	95% Confidence interval for the difference	
								Low		High
Inspiring a Shared Vision	Assuming Equal variances	7.1234	0.0081	-4.402	232.0	0.000	-2.2126	0.50259	-3.20284	-1.22238
	Not Assuming Equal variances			-4.353	212.224	0.000	-2.2126	0.50828	-3.21454	-1.21068

Table 3

Statistics Group

	Country	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean standard error
Enabling Others to Act	U.S.	110	23.56	2.8074	0.2677
	Chile	124	24.96	2.4640	0.2213

Test for independent samples

		Levene's test for equal variances		T test for equal means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Mean differences	Standard error of the difference	95% Confidence interval for the difference	
								Low		High
Enabling Others to Act	Assuming Equal variances	2.3328	0.1280	-4.051	232.0	0.000	-1.3960	0.34460	-2.07498	-0.71710
	Not Assuming Equal variances			-4.020	218.469	0.000	-1.3960	0.34729	-2.08051	-0.71157

Table 4

Statistics Group

	Country	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean standard error
Modeling the Way	U.S.	110	22.48	3.1528	0.3006
	Chile	124	23.33	2.8161	0.2529

Test for independent samples

		Levene's test for equal variances		T test for equal means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (bilateral)	Mean differences	Standard error of the difference	95% Confidence interval for the difference	
									Low	High
Modeling the Way	Assuming Equal variances	1.0522	0.3061	-2.175	232.0	0.031	-0.8488	0.39019	-1.61759	-0.08006
	Not Assuming Equal variances			-2.161	220.160	0.032	-0.8488	0.39283	-1.62302	-0.07463

Table 5

Statistics Group

	Country	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean standard error
Encouraging the Heart	U.S.	110	23.44	3.9037	0.3722
	Chile	124	24.45	3.4532	0.3101

Test for independent samples

		Levene's test for equal variances		T test for equal means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (bilateral)	Mean differences	Standard error of the difference	95% Confidence interval for the difference	
									Low	High
Encouraging the Heart	Assuming Equal variances	2.2492	0.1350	-2.111	232.0	0.036	-1.0152	0.48092	-1.96278	-0.06772
	Not Assuming Equal variances			-2.096	219.233	0.037	-1.0152	0.48446	-1.97004	-0.06045

The rank-order for the LPI-self scores also shows differences between the United States and Chilean respondents (See Table 6). “Enabling Others to Act” was rated highest in both countries; “Encouraging the Heart” was ranked second in both country samples; “Modeling the Way” was ranked third by U.S. respondents while it was ranked fourth by the Chilean respondents; “Challenging the Process” was ranked third by Chilean respondents while it was ranked fourth by the U.S. respondents; both U.S. and Chilean respondents had “Inspiring a Shared Vision” ranked last.

**Table 6
Comparisons between United States and Chile**

Leadership Practice	United States		Chile		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process	21.95	4	23.42	3	1.47
Inspiring a Shared Vision	20.55	5	22.76	5	2.21
Enabling Others to Act	23.56	1	24.96	1	1.40
Modeling the Way	22.48	3	23.33	4	0.85
Encouraging the Heart	23.44	2	24.45	2	1.01

Table 6 also shows the differences between both means; all the differences are in favor of Chile due to the higher respondent scores; the biggest difference was shown in the lowest ranked dimension for both countries “Inspiring a Shared Vision”; in the highest ranked dimension there is also a relevant difference of 1.40 points.

1.2. Explanation of Differences in Results

Several factors may be responsible for the higher ratings by Chilean respondents on the leadership practices dimensions. Following is a discussion of several potential ideas.

1.2a University Comparisons

One of the first issues addressed was the potential differences between the Chilean MBA program and the United States MBA programs which were used in the study. For example:

1. *Were the universities used in the study comparable academically?*

One reason for the differences in LPI scores may relate to the academic comparability of the three schools used in this study—Universidad Adolfo Ibanez (UAI), Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) and Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC).

According to a September of 2005 *America Economía* ranking of MBA programs, the Universidad Adolfo Ibanez (UAI) was ranked 3rd in Latin American and 2nd in Chile. This would place Universidad Adolfo Ibanez as one of the more prestigious colleges in Latin America. On the other hand, the rankings of Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) and Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC) were more difficult to determine. The *Princeton Review (2006)* did rank Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) among its Top 237 MBA programs (without absolute ranking) and both SEMO and SIUC are accredited by AACSB. Neither American University, however, is listed among the top 50 MBA programs in the United States by a major rating publication.

It could be inferred that the two American Universities will not be attracting the most elite MBA students from the United States while the Chilean University may be attracting a more elite group of MBA students from Chile and surrounding Latin American countries. This could be a factor in the outcomes of the study—why students from Chile scored significantly higher than students from the United States on every LPI dimension. It also raises an interesting question as to whether MBA students from the top 50 U.S.A. programs would score the same as those from SEMO or SIUC, or if they would compare differently.

2. *Do Chilean students value higher education more than United States students? Do Chileans have an opportunity to gain more from having an MBA degree, thus making them more prone to work harder and score better on leadership practices?*

Another reason for differences in results may relate to the value of an MBA degree in each country. At SEMO and SIUC, for example, there are many students that value the MBA degree as something on paper (and credentials) that will help them get a better job and earn more money. Many students go through the *routine* in order to put MBA on a resume in hope of differentiating themselves from millions of other graduates. In contrast, MBA programs in Chile have only started to gain popularity over the last 20 years - this may make demand for educated people more desirable than in the United States. Chile has experienced rapid economic growth during the last seven years and this has created a need for modern business managers. It is possible that the Chilean MBA students have more desire to succeed because they know that the demand for graduates in managerial positions is very high and they will be rewarded soon after graduation. This motivational factor may explain why Chilean students scored higher on all LPI dimensions.

3. *Do the cultures of each country play a part in how students responded to the leadership practice questions?*

Another factor that may make a difference in perceived performance in the leadership practices dimensions is the cultural background of each country. Chilean culture has a more socialistic view of society which could relate to several dimensions of this study (e.g., “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling Others to Act”, and “Encouraging the Heart”). In the United States, the culture often appears to be more cutthroat with the goal being to outperform your competitor. This may result in lower United States scores on the three aforementioned dimensions in particular.

4. *Does the significant age difference among respondents affect scores based on a maturity level variable?*

Although work experience is relatively consistent in the comparison of each country, age is an important factor to examine. It may be possible that people tend to score higher on the LPI dimensions based on maturity level. In this sample, 76% of the Chilean students fell between the ages of 30 and 40, while only 27% of the United States students fell in this same age bracket. Since these two percentages are so different, this could cause a variation in the scores on all LPI dimensions. This would take into account the fact that age and maturity may result in shifting values.

1.2b. Hofstede Analysis

An analysis of the Geert Hofstede dimensions—power distance (PDI), uncertainty avoidance (UAI), individualism (IDV) and masculinity (MAS)—may also demonstrate why the United States and Chile differ significantly. For example, in three out of four categories, the values of these two nations are completely opposite. The United States is a society based on individualism whereas Chile places more emphasis on collectivism. The United States has a very low power distance while Chile, on the other hand, has a high power distance. The United States has somewhat of a medium ranking for uncertainty avoidance and Chile has a high ranking. Both cultures are considered to value masculinity as opposed to femininity. In addition, with the Chilean population being predominantly Catholic, this leads to a greater belief in absolute truth and that the individual possesses this truth. This may result in a higher self-rating of success on the leadership practices. Contrarily, in the United States there is much greater tolerance for uncertainty, diversity in religion, and a lesser belief in absolute truth. Many of these values could stem from the fact that the United States is a more developed nation than Chile.

Chile is definitely more collectivist than the United States. As such, Chile has closer ties between individuals than in the United States. Chile is also a more homogenous society than the United States. In fact, it may be possible that four of the five leadership practices—“Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling Others to Act”, “Modeling the Way”, and “Encouraging the Heart”—measured in this study may better relate to a society that values collectivism rather than individualism. These leadership practices may represent values of Chilean students to a greater degree than to values of students from the United States. “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, for example, is especially centered on collectivism which could be a major factor as to why United States students scored lower on this dimension. “Enabling Others to Act” is another aspect that collectivism could definitely influence.

Chile also ranks higher on the power distance index than does the United States. Being more tolerant of power distance may result in greater glory and respect being placed on executive leadership. Since the respondents were MBA students, the Chilean elevation in self-ranking of leadership practices may result from respondent feelings of being better educated and more likely to be future leaders. In larger power distance cultures, employees also tend to expect more authoritative leadership. In contrast to the United States, empowerment in Chilean organizations is not as likely because of higher power distance. It must also be remembered that the Chilean top executive world is mostly a *male* business world with minimal diversity. In addition, in Chilean culture it is not common for an individual to “take charge” and bypass the chain of command. In a society such as the United States, it would certainly be more acceptable for a person to “take charge” and use individualism to solve problems rather than seeking assistance from others. All of these factors may result in Chilean respondents rating themselves higher than United States counterparts, because it is *expected* that they have a positive image and project strong performance in reference to leadership practices.

An interesting result was that United States students did not score as high as Chilean students on “Challenging the Process”. Based on Hofstede’s studies, one would presume that the United States values of low power distance, high individualism, and masculinity would have played a factor in giving the United States students a higher score on that dimension. Maybe this is related to the concept that being humble is an important leadership characteristic in the United States (Fineman 1999). Individuals in the United States are often taught to be humble in approach and respectful of others. This may translate into placing a lesser-rating on the LPI dimensions.

A reason that the Chilean students scored higher than United States students on “Modeling the Way” may come from the level of uncertainty avoidance within each country. The Chileans are far more conservative and traditional than the United States and this may lead to a desire to have more stability which would lead to a system of “*Modeling the Way*” rather than pushing for change.

The leadership practice of “Encouraging the Heart” most likely relates to Chilean values through the collectivism dimension. Since both Chile and the United States are masculine by nature, there has to be some other reason for this practice to be scored higher by Chilean respondents than United States counterparts. Since the United States is more individualistic, it may mean that they have less desire to encourage the heart and more desire to be successful no matter what they have to do. This may enter the realm of *ethics*.

1.2c. High versus Low Context Culture

Differences in the perceived ratings among respondents in the United States and Chile may also be the result of the United States being a low context culture and Chile being a high context culture. In high context cultures participants are likely to establish social trust first, value personal relations and goodwill, make agreements on the basis of general trust, and conduct slower and more ritualistic business negotiations (Rodrigues, 2001). By contrast, in low-context cultures participants get down to business quickly, value expertise and performance, like agreements by legalistic contract, and conduct business negotiations as efficiently as possible (Rodrigues, 2001). It may be that high context cultures have a tendency to develop better individual perceptions concerning the practice of exemplary leadership.

1.2d. Trompenaars Analysis

A brief review of Trompenaars (1994) value dimensions may also provide guidance concerning why Chilean MBA students scored significantly higher on the perceived performance of LPI leadership practices than the United States MBA students. Trompenaars value dimensions include obligation, emotional orientation in relationships, involvement in relationships, and legitimization of power and status. One can come to the conclusion that Chile and the United States have differing viewpoints on all of these issues and consistently fall at opposite ends of the spectrum. For example, the United States and Chile differ on Universalism (belief that ideas and practices can be applied without modification around the world) versus Particularism (belief that circumstances determine how ideas and practices can be applied and, as a result, practices cannot be conducted the same everywhere).

The United States is high on universalism while Chile tends toward the particularism end of the continuum. A higher individual LPI score may be correlated with particularism. For example, the Chilean obligation to particularism may have a positive impact (and improve respondent LPI scores), in such areas as "Inspiring a Shared Vision" and "Encouraging the Heart" since they are focused on relativity as opposed to objectivity.

As another example, Trompenaars notes that the United States and Chile differ on the Specific (individuals have a large public space they share with others and a private space they only share with close acquaintances) versus Diffuse (both public and private are guarded because entry into public space also permits entry into private space). The United States is a specific culture while Chile tends to be a diffuse culture. In the United States people may rank themselves lower on the LPI dimensions since this correlates with openness, extroversion, and a strong separation of work and private life. In contrast, a diffuse culture finds individuals to be more indirect and introverted, with work and private life closely linked. Therefore, a higher LPI score may be expected.

The Trompenaars dimension of involvement in relationships is an intriguing one based on the results of this study. United States students would be more direct, confrontational, and extroverted than their Chilean counterparts based on research conclusions. In other words, students from Chile would be the "opposite" of these values. The authors thought the United States students would have a competitive edge in "Challenging the Process". Based on this study, however, it shows that Chileans score higher on "Challenging the Process" dimension. This provides an interesting area for further research.

Lastly, the legitimization of power and status dimension of the Trompenaars study is interesting. The United States students grew up in a society that is based on achievement; higher status based on competency, women and minorities visible at more levels in the workplace, and newcomers gaining respect if they prove themselves. The values of students from Chile would be based more on ascription; status would be based on position, age, and schooling. These values could be a reason why Chileans had significantly higher scores on the dimension of "Inspiring a Shared Vision" and other leadership practices.

1.3. Comparison between all Male MBA students and all Female MBA students

The LPI-self scores of male students were higher than female students on all the dimensions of “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling Others to Act”, “Modeling the Way”, and “Encouraging the Heart”. There was no significant statistical difference between male and female students on the dimension of Challenging the Process (although male respondents did score higher than female respondents). In the other four dimensions there was a statistically significant difference between male and female means (See Table 7).

It is important to mention that in the female sample, the U.S. respondents represent 76% of the total while the Chilean respondents represent only 24%; the relevant participation of the U.S. female could slant the results.

The rank-order of the LPI-self scores is exactly the same for all dimensions between the female and male respondents (See Table 7). “Enabling Others to Act” was rated highest by both genders; “Encouraging the Heart” was considered second in both gender samples; the criteria “Inspiring a Shared Vision” ranked last.

Table 7
Comparisons between Male and Female

Leadership Practice	Male		Female		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process	22.94	4	22.28	4	0.66
Inspiring a Shared Vision *	22.21	5	20.65	5	1.56
Enabling Others to Act *	24.66	1	23.53	1	1.13
Modeling the Way *	23.20	3	22.35	3	0.85
Encouraging the Heart *	24.36	2	23.15	2	1.21

* Statistically significant difference

Table 7 also shows the differences between both means; all the differences are in favor of male gender due to its higher score; the biggest difference was shown in the lesser ranked dimension for both countries, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”; the highest ranked dimension, “Enabling Others to Act,” also had a relevant difference of 1.13 points.

1.4. Comparison between U. S. Female MBA students and Chilean Female MBA students.

The LPI-self scores of Chilean female students was higher than U.S. female students on all the dimensions of “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling Others to Act”, “Modeling the Way”, and “Encouraging the Heart”. Because of a small and not statistically representative sample of Chilean female MBA respondents (17), the conclusions may lack statistical sustenance. Since the Chilean female sample is small, the mean standard error is always higher which means that there is a bigger probability of error. There was a significant statistical difference between Chilean female and U.S. female respondents in three of the five dimensions; the two dimensions where there wasn’t a significant statistical difference between both means was in “Challenging the Process” and “Modeling the Way” (See Table 8).

The rank-order for the LPI-self scores differed in some dimensions between the U.S. female and Chilean female respondents (See Table 8). “Enabling Others to Act” was rated the highest in the U.S. sample while in the Chilean sample the dimension “Encouraging the Heart” was ranked the highest; “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was ranked lowest in both country samples.

Table 8
Comparisons between Chilean Females and U.S. Females

Leadership Practice	U.S Female		Chilean		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process	21.93	4	23.47	3	1.54
Inspiring a Shared Vision *	20.07	5	22.59	5	2.52
Enabling Others to Act *	22.98	1	25.35	2	2.37
Modeling the Way	22.09	3	23.24	4	1.15
Encouraging the Heart *	22.19	2	26.35	1	4.16

* Statistically significant difference.

When one observes the differences between both sample means; all of them are in favor of the Chilean Female respondents due to higher scores; the biggest and a very important difference was shown in the criteria “Encouraging the Heart” where Chilean respondents score is 4.16 points above the U.S. respondents; there is also important difference in the dimensions of “Inspiring a Shared Vision” and “Enabling Others to Act”.

1.5. Comparison between U. S. Male MBA students and Chilean Male MBA students.

The LPI-self scores of Chilean male students was significantly higher than U.S. male students in four of the five dimensions: “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling others to Act”, and “Modeling the Way”. There was significant statistical difference between Chilean male’s and U.S. male’s in only two dimensions: “Challenging the Process” and “Inspiring a Shared Vision” (See Table 9).

The rank-order for the LPI-self scores differed in some dimensions between the U.S. Male and Chilean Male respondents (See Table 9). “Encouraging the Heart” was ranked as the highest dimension by U.S. respondents and second ranked in the Chilean sample; while the dimension “Enabling Others to Act” was ranked highest by the Chilean respondents and second in the U.S. sample; “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was ranked last in both countries.

Table 9
Comparisons between Chilean Females and U.S. Females

Leadership Practice	U.S Male		Chilean Male		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process *	21.98	4	23.41	3	1.43
Inspiring a Shared Vision *	21.06	5	22.79	5	1.73
Enabling Others to Act	24.19	2	24.90	1	0.71
Modeling the Way	22.91	3	23.35	4	0.44
Encouraging the Heart	24.77	1	24.15	2	-0.62

* Statistically significant difference.

When one observes the difference between the means of each dimension, the largest difference is shown in “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, followed by “Challenging the Process”. There is a negative difference in “Encouraging the Heart”, because the U.S. respondents scored higher than the Chilean respondents.

1.6. Comparison between U. S. Male MBA Students and Chilean Female MBA Students.

The LPI-self scores of Chilean female students was significantly higher than U.S. male students on all the dimensions of “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling Others to Act”, “Modeling the Way”, and “Encouraging the Heart”. Once again, because of a small and not statistically representative sample of Chilean female MBA respondents (17), the conclusions may not have statistical sustenance. There wasn’t a significant statistical difference, however, between Chilean female and U.S. male means in any of the five dimensions (See Table 10).

The rank-order for the LPI-self scores differed in some dimensions between the U.S. male and Chilean female respondents (See Table 10). “Encouraging the Heart” was rated as the highest in both samples, “Enabling Others to Act” was rated as the second highest in both samples; “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was ranked last in both country samples.

Table 10
Comparisons between Chilean Female and U.S. Male

Leadership Practice	U.S Male		Chilean		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process	21.98	4	23.47	3	1.49
Inspiring a Shared Vision	21.06	5	22.59	5	1.53
Enabling Others to Act	24.19	2	25.35	2	1.16
Modeling the Way	22.91	3	23.24	4	0.33
Encouraging the Heart	24.77	1	26.35	1	1.58

When one observes the difference between both sample means; all of them are in favor of the Chilean Female respondents because of higher scores; the biggest difference was shown in the dimension “Encouraging the Heart”; there is also an important difference in the dimension “Inspiring a Shared Vision” and “Challenging the Process”.

1.7. Comparisons between Chilean Male MBA Students and U. S. Female MBA Students.

The LPI-self scores of Chilean male students was significantly higher than U.S. female students on all the dimensions of “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, “Enabling others to Act”, “Modeling the Way”, and “Encouraging the Heart”. There was a significant statistical difference between the means of all the dimensions comparing Chilean male and U.S. female respondents (See Table 11).

The rank-order for the LPI-self scores differed in some dimensions between the U.S. female and Chilean male respondents (See Table 11). “Enabling Others to Act” was rated the highest in both samples and the dimension of “Encouraging the Heart” was considered second by both Chilean males and U.S. females. “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was ranked last in both country samples.

Table 11
Comparisons between Chilean Male and U.S. Female

Leadership Practice	U.S Female		Chilean Male		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process *	21.93	4	23.41	3	1.48
Inspiring a Shared Vision *	20.07	5	22.79	5	2.71
Enabling Others to Act *	22.98	1	24.90	1	1.19
Modeling the Way *	22.09	3	23.35	4	1.26
Encouraging the Heart *	22.19	2	24.15	2	1.96

* Statistically significant difference.

When one observes the differences between both sample means; all of them are in favor of the Chilean male respondents because of higher valuation; the biggest and a very important difference was shown in the dimension “Inspiring a Shared Vision” although it’s classified as the lowest ranked dimension; there is also large differences in all the other dimensions.

2. Comparison within the United States and Chile

2.1. Comparison within the United States between Male and Female MBA Students.

The LPI-Self scores between United States male and United States female respondents revealed two statistically significant differences (See Table 12). Male respondents reported engaging in the dimensions of “Enabling Others to Act” and “Encouraging the Heart” behavior more significantly than

did their female counterparts. “Challenging the Process”, “Inspiring a Shared Vision”, and “Modeling the Way” were not significantly different for male and female respondents. The rank-order for the LPI-self scores differed in two dimensions between the U.S. female and male respondents (See Table 12). “Enabling Others to Act” and “Encouraging the Heart” were the higher scored dimensions by both genders. “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was ranked last in both samples.

Table 12
Comparisons between U.S. Male and Female

Leadership Practice	U.S. Female		U.S. Male		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process	21.93	4	21.98	4	0.05
Inspiring a Shared Vision	20.07	5	21.06	5	0.99
Enabling Others to Act *	22.98	1	24.19	2	1.21
Modeling the Way	22.09	3	22.91	3	0.82
Encouraging the Heart *	22.19	2	24.77	1	2.58

*Statistically significant difference.

When we observe the differences between both sample means; all of them are in favor of the male respondents because of higher valuation; the most important difference was shown in the criteria “Encouraging the Heart.”

2.2. Comparison within Chile between Male and Female MBA Students.

The LPI-self scores of Chilean female students was higher than male students in all three dimensions of “Challenging the Process”, “Enabling Others to Act”, and “Encouraging the Heart”. There was a significant statistical difference between the means of “Encouraging the Heart.” The other dimensions yielded no statistical difference between the means (See Table 13).

The rank-order for the LPI-self scores differed in two dimensions between the Chilean female and male respondents (See Table 13). “Enabling Others to Act” and “Encouraging the Heart” were the highest scored dimensions by both genders. “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was ranked last by both genders.

Table 13
Comparisons between Chilean Male and Female

Leadership Practice	Chilean Female		Chilean Male		Dif.
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Challenging the Process	23.47	3	23.41	3	0.06
Inspiring a Shared Vision	22.59	5	22.79	5	-0.20
Enabling Others to Act	25.35	2	24.90	1	0.45
Modeling the Way	23.24	4	23.35	4	-0.11
Encouraging the Heart *	26.35	1	24.15	2	2.20

* Statistically significant difference.

Once again, when differences between sample means are examined, there are no significant differences between male and female respondents except in “Encouraging the Heart.” This dimension also exhibited the largest absolute difference at 2.20 and was ranked first by Chilean female respondents.

Conclusions

From the sample characteristics

1. The U.S. MBA student respondents are fairly evenly distributed between genders. In the Chilean case, however, it can be concluded that the process of female introduction into post graduate education is not yet mature because only 14% of the respondents were female (in the 2002

educational census, 52.5% of the Chilean university students were male, while 47.5% were female).

2. U.S. respondents started post graduate studies earlier than the Chilean respondents, because 65% were below thirty years old; while only 13% of the Chilean respondents were in the same range of age; 76% of Chilean respondents were between thirty and forty years old.
3. Decision empowerment is more developed in the U.S. sample (17% had less than three persons under their responsibility, and 57% had more than four), while in the Chilean sample the decision power is concentrated in a few persons (64% had less than three persons under their responsibility, and 11% had more than four).

From the LPI-self analysis one can see all the scores of each sample in the Table 14.

4. In all the samples the dimension with the lowest ranking was "Inspiring a Shared Vision." There is not a correlation between this dimension and the demographic data. This shows that it's a general position not determined by age or experience; U.S. females show the lowest score in this dimension.
5. Chilean MBA Students scored higher in all dimensions in the aggregate and also when comparing genders; showing a superior perception about the leadership abilities.
6. Males scored "Encouraging the Heart" as the highest ranked dimension, while females scored it as a second ranked dimension after "Enabling Others to Act". This result is very important because it could reveal that females practice leadership by using constant collaboration and support, whereas the males do it by using recognition of others, but with an environment of support based on experience and knowledge superiority.
7. U.S. females scored the lowest in all the dimensions, followed by the U.S. male, the Chilean female and then the Chilean male.
8. In the aggregate, the highest ranked dimension was "Enabling Others to Act" followed by "Encouraging the Heart", "Modeling the Way", "Challenging the Process", and, lastly, "Inspiring a Shared Vision".

Management Implications

Because leadership behavior can be changed and is a learnable behavior, the study of leadership practices is valuable to all organizations and all cultures. Education and training concerning the similarities and dissimilarities in leadership practices is valuable for all countries engaged in global business. Perceived differences in leadership practices may dictate the amount of time, energy, and cost commitments necessary for educational training and development programs.

There are numerous management implications that flow from this comparative leadership study. Among these implications are the following:

1. Leadership and understanding differences in leadership practices are an important component of successful strategy implementation. Being aware of differing perceptions concerning leadership practices is important in establishing organizational direction, creating change, and guiding a team across cultures.
2. An analysis of leadership feedback presents an opportunity to engage in conversation with groups (both within organizations and across cultures) concerning the importance of being *different* and practicing diversity. It should provide a preliminary indication of what leadership practices need to be *improved* within each individual, work unit and organization.
3. Leadership feedback creates a cross-cultural discussion concerning the nature of different leadership practices and improves understanding of the leadership *quotient* in strategic implementation and organizational success.

4. Developing an awareness of international leadership differences is an excellent place to begin an analysis of leadership strengths and weaknesses within organizations and across country clusters. An understanding of cross-cultural leadership differences should help in discussions concerning motivational approaches used with employees; the level of organizational performance attained; the use of expatriates, country locals, or third-country personnel in the host country; as well as global controls and the type of structure necessary for global governance.
5. Perceived differences in leadership practices between men and women are important in implementing efficient and effective work units (both within organizations and across cultures). The question: *Does gender matter?* It is important to all students of leadership.

References

- Deresky, H. (2006). *International Management: Managing Across Borders and Cultures*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Fineman, Howard (1999). It is very important for America to be humble, *Newsweek*, November 22, p. 40.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture=s Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture=s Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hodgetts, R. M; Luthans, F. and Doh, J.P. (2006). *International Management: Culture, Strategy, and Behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1992). *Psychometric Properties of the Leadership Practices Inventory*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1993). *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): A Self-Assessment and Analysis*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1995). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Keep Getting Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lussier, R.N. and Achua, C.F. (2007). *Leadership: Theory, Application, Skill Development*. Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Pearce, J.A. and Robinson, R.B. (2003). *Strategic Management: Formulation, Implementation, and Control*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Rodrigues, C. (2001). *International Management*, Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Thompson, A.A. and Strickland, A.J. (1998). *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*. New York, NY: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding The Waves Of Culture*. New York, NY: Irwin.