

## **The Role of the Context: Responsible Leadership Development in Latin America**

### **Abstract**

Over the last decades, globalization and technological developments have produced enormous social and economic changes in the world. These changes represent new challenges for leaders and have exposed world problems such as poverty, inequality, environmental spoilage, unethical behavior, and corruption. In this socio-economic context, the phenomenon of Responsible Leadership has emerged. Responsible leaders are individuals with strong moral values who have a strong positive impact on the development, not only of their corporations but also of the society as a whole. In this paper, we reviewed the literature on Responsible Leadership and analyzed the role the context plays in the development of the phenomenon in the Latin American region. We found that the context could play two different roles: (1) the context can act as a pushing force, which promotes the development of the leader in early life stage; or (2) the context can act as a pulling force, which demands the development of the leader in an advanced life stage. With this research, we aim to contribute to Responsible Leadership research by providing insights to understand the role of context in the development of the phenomenon.

*Keywords:* Responsible Leadership, Leadership Development, Latin America, Emerging Economies, Corporate Social Responsibility

### **The Role of the Context: Responsible Leadership Development in Latin America**

Over the last decades, globalization and technological developments have caused enormous social and economic changes in the world. These changes have produced new challenges for leaders and have exposed world problems such as poverty, inequality, environmental spoilage, unethical behavior, and corruption (Pless et al., 2012; Voegtlin et al., 2012; Waldman et al., 2020). In this new socio-economic context, all kinds of leaders have emerged. Irresponsible leaders have been involved in the different economic crisis and business scandals in developed and developing economies (i.e., Lehman Brothers in 2008, the Financial Crisis in 2008, and the Panama Papers Scandal in 2016) all of them causing devastating economic, social, environmental, and moral consequences for people around the world (Harding, 2016). Emerging countries, including those in the Latin American region, are not the exception. Instead, due to the socio-political context, Latin American countries have stimulated the development of a corrupt political class involved in scandals such as the FIFA scandal in 2015 and the Odebrecht scandal in 2017 (Rotberg, 2019). However, leadership with strong moral values has also emerged and has had a positive impact on the development of their corporations and society: Responsible Leadership (henceforth RL). Enhancing the understanding of such Responsible Leadership phenomena in the Latin American context is the focus of our study.

Despite being a relatively new research area, research on RL has increased over the past decades<sup>1</sup>. Scholars have tried to understand, for instance, what is RL (Maak & Pless, 2006; Pless et al., 2014; Waldman, 2010); how does a responsible leader emerge and what are the main actions that characterize RL (Pless, 2007), which are the situations that seem to favor the

---

<sup>1</sup> Examples of this are the Special Issues on the topic from *The Journal of Business Ethics* (Springer, 2011) and *The Academy of Management Perspectives* (Academy of Management, 2014), the sub-theme in the European Organizational Studies Group (EGOS)'s annual meeting in 2015, and the *Academy of Management Specialized Conference* in 2019.

development of responsible leaders (Maak & Pless, 2006; Pless et al., 2011), and how far do the leaders' responsibilities go (Miska & Mendenhall, 2018; Pless et al., 2012; Voegtlin et al., 2012). Despite these efforts, several questions regarding RL remain to be addressed. Most of the research has focused on the understanding of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives (macro-level) in organizations. Much less is known about how these leaders develop at their early or later stages in life (individual-level) (Doh & Quigley, 2014). However, research on RL at the individual-level is crucial because it can provide insights to develop better RL development initiatives in management education and within organizations.

Extant literature on RL is still mostly theoretical and normative (e.g., Doh & Quigley, 2014; Miska & Mendenhall, 2018; Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014; Waldman & Balven, 2014). Waldman and Balven (2014), for example, presented an overview of the divergences within the literature on RL and identified five future areas for research: RL processes and outcomes, RL stakeholder priorities, RL training, and development, RL globalization and macro-level forces, and RL measurement and assessment. Besides, Miska and Mendenhall (2018) reviewed the theoretical foundations and methodological approaches of research on RL. They identified three levels of analysis (micro, meso, and macro) through which research has been developed and concluded that, in the last years, research has moved from micro-level analysis (focused mainly on the leader) to a multi-perspective (focused on leader, organization, and context).

The recent reviews, as well as some other theoretical models (e.g., Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014), revealed that the context in which the leaders interact (social, economic, and political) is crucial to understand the RL phenomenon. However, such studies have mostly focused on the European and North American contexts (Maak, 2007; Maak et al., 2014; Waldman et al., 2006a,b) paying scant attention to RL in emerging economies, such as those in

the Latin American region. Although studies based on the European and North American contexts are relevant (because they allow a broader understanding of the RL phenomenon), those contexts have specific favorable conditions (e.g., strong public institutions, influential social bodies, conditions of equality, and efficient controls against corruption), which are presumed to develop relational and moral characteristics of the responsible leader.

Conversely, if instead, the leader's context is not so favorable -as in the case in developing economies (e.g., those countries in the Latin American region)- what effect will these likely unfavorable contexts have on the leader? And, more specifically, what is the role that the context plays in the development of the RL phenomena in developing economies? In this study, we attempt to address this latter question. To date, few studies have focused on more unfavorable contexts such as those in emerging countries (Maak & Stoetter, 2012; Stahl et al., 2016; Witt & Stahl, 2016). Thus, we believe that analysis in the emerging economies context could shed light on the understanding of the phenomenon in contexts that are not so favorable and could help promote, develop, and understand a leadership phenomenon that our society requires broadly. This research is an attempt to address the understanding of the phenomenon in an emerging region, which represents about 14% of the world's landmass, 8% of the world economy, 8% of the population (Nicholls-Nixon et al., 2011). Also, a region with weak institutions, weak market infrastructures, and high levels of corruption and poverty (Aguinis et al., 2020): the Latin American region (see also Doing Business, 2019; Rendir Cuentas, 2019; The World Bank, 2018).

An analysis of the RL literature on Latin America is critical because these contexts could have adverse conditions (for example, institutional weaknesses) for the development of this organizational phenomenon, and it is more plausible that these adverse conditions will be found

in other developing countries. Many adverse conditions are more likely to promote the development of irresponsible behavior (such as corporate corruption) rather than responsible behavior. Latin America has common contextual characteristics with countries with similar development processes and cultural history, which define them as a region and distinguish them from other emerging economies (e.g., Elvira & Davila, 2005; Nicholls-Nixon et al., 2011).

Understanding RL development in a context such as the Latin American could be fundamental for scholars and practitioners. For scholars, understanding how responsible leadership develops in more unfavorable contexts -such as the Latin American ones- could help: (1) to develop a broader conceptualization of RL that also includes the possible differences between developed and developing economies; (2) to advance a more comprehensive research agenda that also accounts for the contextual characteristics; and (3) to promote empirical research in such likely unfavorable contexts. For practitioners, accurate knowledge of the development of RL in more adverse context could help elaborate better leadership development initiatives within business schools (e.g., service-learning education programs), within organizations (e.g., the Project Ulysses at PricewaterhouseCoopers, see Pless et al., 2011; or the Corporate Service Corps at IBM, see Colvin, 2009), and within leadership multiorganizational initiatives (e.g., the UN Global Compact, “UN Global Compact,” 2020).

As such, this article’s purpose is threefold: (1) to review the existing research on RL that may provide insights to the understanding of the development of the phenomenon even under the challenging conditions of emerging economies; (2) to review the literature on RL in Latin America and analyze the role of the Latin American context in the development of the responsible leaders that may help understand the boundary conditions for RL in particular

contexts; and (3) to provide future directions for the study of the RL phenomenon in emerging economies.

This manuscript begins with a brief description of the article selection process. Then, we provide a literature review on RL, RL antecedents, and RL outcomes. Later, we examine the contextual differences between RL in Latin America and the developed countries. Next, we discuss the role of the context in the RL development in Latin America. Finally, we present the conclusions, research limitations, and highlight possible future research directions.

### **Method**

We searched in six different databases (EBSCO, Emerald, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, Springer, and Scopus) for the term "Responsible Leadership" with other terms such as "Corporate Social Responsibility," "Leadership Theory," "Emerging Countries," "Latin America," in the article's title, abstract or keywords. We found 64 scientific articles published mainly in the *Journal of Business Ethics* (25), *Academy of Management Perspectives* (7), and *Organizational Dynamics* (4) from 1990 to 2019. These articles included 43 theoretical articles and 21 empirical articles (qualitative and quantitative) published between 2006 and 2019. In sum, we examined these 64 articles and analyzed the existing RL general approaches.

Of the total of these 64 general articles, we found that only six published articles correspond to research in the Latin American directly or indirectly<sup>2</sup>. This number is of no surprise, given the limited number of leadership studies in the Latin-American region (Castaño et al., 2015; Nicholls-Nixon et al., 2011). Thus, we also included one chapter of a book (Van de Loo, 2006), and a working paper (Castillo, Sánchez, & Duenas, 2019), which are related to RL in

---

<sup>2</sup> Global responsible leadership articles that include examples in Latin American countries are considered indirectly related articles because their main focus is not Latin America. Also, reviews about management research in Latin America that include leadership studies are considered indirectly related articles.

the Latin America context. In order to have a broader perspective about leadership in the Latin American context we also examined an article about focusing on the leadership styles in Latin America (Castaño et al., 2015). Finally, to have an understanding of the differences between the Latin American context and the developed economies, we examined three articles about management research in Latin America (Aguinis et al., 2020; Nicholls-Nixon et al., 2011; Vassolo et al., 2011).

### **General approaches to Responsible Leadership**

RL is an emerging research area that differs from other traditional leadership theories such as Ethical Leadership (Treviño & Brown, 2005), Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 2002), Authentic Leadership (Gardner et al., 2011), and Transformational Leadership (Avolio et al., 1999; Bass, 1985). The main difference from other leadership styles is that RL includes the leader's concern and involvement in value creation, social and environmental issues, sustainability, and positive changes vis-à-vis the different stakeholders inside and outside the organization (Miska & Mendenhall, 2018; Pless et al., 2012). Consequently, RL analyzes the relationship leader-stakeholders (e.g., employees, customers, shareholders, environment, government, and society in general) and not just the relationship between leader-follower as do other traditional leadership theories (Maak & Pless, 2006). This leader-stakeholders relationship implies specific moral and ethical values, new challenges, relationships, and intentions about society and the environment inside and outside of the organization.

Because the concept of "responsibility" may vary between different people, cultures, or regions, there is no unique definition for RL (Pless et al., 2014; Waldman & Galvin, 2008). Such complexity reveals the divergence in theories and current approaches to the phenomenon. Although there is no consensus on the theoretical meaning of RL, in general terms we have

identified three perspectives that give rise to different definitions of RL: (1) the relational perspective which focuses on the values and motivations of the responsible leader towards the stakeholders (Pless et al., 2012; Pless et al., 2011); (2) the Kantian perspective which focuses on the distinction between actions "to do good" and "to do no harm" (Crilly et al., 2011; Miska et al., 2013, 2014; Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014); finally, (3) the global perspective which focuses on the responsibility and obligations of the leader in a global environment (Maak et al., 2014; Gunter K. Stahl et al., 2016; Voegtlin et al., 2012). See Table 1.

-----  
Insert Table 1 about here  
-----

Based on Bass and Steidelmeier's (1999) suggestion to discuss leadership in the context of stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1999; Freeman et al., 2004; Freeman & Auster, 2011; Freeman & Reed, 1983), Maak and Pless (2006) defined RL as a "relational and ethical phenomenon, which occurs in social processes of interaction with those who affect or are affected by leadership and have a stake in the purpose and vision of the leadership relationship." (p. 103). From this perspective, it is the moral character that makes these leaders different and responsible. To hold these characteristics leaders must have moral and relational qualities and act according to their virtues, values, and principles (e.g., integrity, authenticity, justice, respect, care, honesty, humility, and trust) in front of all stakeholders (Maak & Pless, 2006). According to Maak and Pless (2006), RL seeks "to build and cultivate sustainable and trustful relationships to different stakeholders inside and outside the organization and to coordinate their action to achieve common objectives (e.g., triple-bottom-line goals), business sustainability and legitimacy and ultimately to help to realize a good (i.e., ethically sound) and shared business vision." (p. 103). In

their definition, the authors identified nine roles that define the different behaviors of a responsible leader: steward, citizen, servant, visionary, architect, coach, networker, storyteller, and change agent (Maak & Pless, 2006). The first four roles correspond to roles based on values, while the last five roles, to operational roles.

Furthermore, building on previous ideas from Crilly et al. (2011), Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014) defined the RL as "intentional actions taken by leaders to benefit the stakeholders of the company and/or actions taken to avoid harmful consequences for stakeholders and the larger society" (p. 238) (see also Miska et al., 2013, for more on this perspective). We refer to this definition as the Kantian perspective based on the distinction between "perfect duties" and "imperfect duties" of Kantian ethics and rational morality (Kant, 1797, 1991). In this line, Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014) distinguished between the responsible leader's actions to "do good" and those to "avoid harm." The effects of "doing good" follow a prescriptive morality (focused on "what should be done"), which represents actions to achieve social and environmental objectives such as work for community development, activities to improve the environment, and philanthropy. On the other hand, actions "avoiding harm" follow proscriptive morality (focused on "what should not be done"), which represents actions aimed at avoiding detrimental consequences for stakeholders such as ensuring product safety and avoiding discrimination, corruption and environmental pollution (Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014).

Finally, from a global perspective, Pless et al. (2011) defined RL as the leader's actions under a global environment and their responsibilities in a globalized world vis-a-vis stakeholder and the society (see also Stahl et al., 2013, for more on this perspective). This definition acknowledges the importance and particularities of leadership responsibilities in the global context. From this perspective, "leading responsibly in a global environment means, for instance,

ensuring principle-driven and ethically sound behavior both at home and abroad; taking a stance on human rights issues; contributing actively in solving the global environmental crisis; and being responsive to the legitimate expectations of a diverse group of stakeholders" (Pless et al., 2011, p. 240). Pless, Maak, and Stahl (2011) refer to this phenomenon as Responsible Global Leadership<sup>3</sup> (henceforth RGL) and argue that there are four main challenges of globalization (e.g., diversity, ethics, sustainability, and citizenship) and three main approaches the leader can take to overcome these challenges (e.g., the global approach, the local approach, and the transnational approach).

In line with this approach, Stahl et al. (2013) identified the competencies that the leader must acquire to face the decision making of CSR in a global world. For example, for the global approach, the leader should have competencies, such as following universal principles, guidelines, and codes of conduct. For the local approach, the leader should have responsiveness to local conditions and stakeholder sensitivity. Finally, for the transnational approach, the leader should acknowledge both their diverse stakeholders and their potentially conflicting value systems, which, in turn, require the creation of multifaceted CSR responses on the part of global leaders. Along these lines, Pless, Maak, and Waldman (2012) defined four types of responsible leaders and their direct effects concerning global CSR policies: the traditional economist, the opportunity seeker, the integrator, and the idealist. According to these authors, responsible leaders differ in the range of stakeholders they acknowledge and the responsibilities they take toward the stakeholders beyond their shareholders and owners. These behaviors, in turn, define their decisions, actions, and business CSR policies.

---

<sup>3</sup> We consider that RGL is the same phenomenon as the RL but approached from a global perspective.

Overall, the RL literature covers theoretical proposals and empirical analysis that focus on the RL antecedents and the RL outcomes over the micro, meso, and macro levels of analysis (Miska & Mendenhall, 2018). In the following sections, we present a more detailed review of these two research paths: the RL antecedents and the RL outcomes.

### **Responsible Leadership Antecedents**

The research on RL antecedents encompasses the foundations, motivations, values, virtues, and ethical principles of the responsible leader to create and develop sustainable relationships over time and to generate value inside and outside the organization (Pless, 2007; Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014).

The influential work of Pless (2007) gave rise to an increased interest in the RL antecedents. In her biographical analysis of Anita Roddick's life (The Body Shop's founder and leader), she explored the relationship between Roddick's actions as a responsible leader and her motivational drivers. Pless (2007) defined three intrapsychic drivers focused on the leader as an individual (the need for exploration and assertion, the need for attachment and affiliation, and the sense of enjoyment) and three normative motivational drivers focused on the leader's relationship with others (the need for justice, the need for recognition, and the sense of care).

Pless (2007) suggested that Roddick's identity comprises "(1) wholeness of values and virtues; (2) wholeness in the sense of being part of something larger than the person [...] and (3) wholeness as a person in the sense of aligning thinking, feeling and acting." (p. 451). According to Pless (2007), RL is intrinsically related to a long-term vision based on values and virtues: a vision that goes far beyond the organization and encompasses economic, social, human, and environmental aspects. As noted by Pless (2007), RL manifests itself in decisive moments that reveal the character, integrity, ethics of the leader, and their interest in serving others. Pless

(2007) argues that RL leaders develop their characteristics during a lifetime. Also, she concluded that the RL is based on strong values that are obtained from life experience, influenced by the personal relationships and interactions with others, and combined with individual virtues such as passion, love, a sense of caring for others, social values, and purpose (Miska & Mendenhall, 2018; Nicola M Pless, 2007).

Another study on the RL antecedents is Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014). Although theoretical, compared to the work of Pless (2007), this work can be considered broader in that it presents RL antecedents at the micro (individual), meso (organizational), and macro (social) levels. Thus, under the premise that RL is a mixture of certain individual characteristics and specific factors of the context in which the leader acts, the authors proposed a theoretical model that includes the personal characteristics influenced by the proximal context and the distal context (e.g., influences of the individual, situational, organizational, institutional, and supranational context on responsible leader behavior). According to Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014), “[t]he basic premise of the model is that responsible leader behavior is a function of both the person and the environment in which that behavior takes place.” (p. 239)

In their model, Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014) identified individual leader characteristics (micro-level) (e.g., personality traits, cognition/reasoning, value/moral philosophy, affective states, and demographics). Then, in the proximal context (meso level), they recognize the influence of the situational context (e.g., the proximity/distance, the social consensus, the probability of effect, and the benefits to the actor); and the organizational context (e.g., CSR approach, the code of conduct, the rewards/sanctions, and the ethical climate). Finally, in the distal context, the authors identify the influence of the institutional context (e.g., the national culture, the legal system, the role of stakeholders, and the industry competition), and the

supranational context (e.g., the NGO activism, the role of media, the global governance, and the UN Global Compact). Based on the above, Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014) proposed that RL is based on a mixture of variables that allows the leader to define their responsibilities and decisions to "do good" or to "avoid harm."

In general, the literature on the RL antecedents started from a more individual (micro), relational, and motivational interest (Pless, 2007). It then evolved towards an analysis at all levels (micro, meso, and macro), which considers that the organizational environment, the culture, and the social, political, and economic context can influence RL (Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014). In conclusion, the antecedents' analysis seeks to understand the characteristics that precede the phenomenon of RL, to identify the competencies of the leader, to understand their development, and to be able to develop responsible leaders.

### **Responsible Leadership Outcomes**

Regarding the outcomes, the existing literature on RL covers the actions and results of the "responsible leader" to create sustainable value for all the stakeholders. These outcomes include actions related to social change, social and environmental issues, and the CSR actions (Doh & Quigley, 2014; Maak et al., 2016; Voegtlin et al., 2012). Voegtlin et al. (2012) proposed a model to analyze the RL outcomes across the multi-level organizational outcomes (e.g., micro, meso, and macro), focusing on the current global challenges. In this vein, the authors defined the macro-level RL outcomes as the interactions between organizations and society, such as legitimacy, trustful stakeholder relationships, and social capital, (2) the meso-level RL outcomes as the interactions within the organization such as ethical culture, CSR character, social entrepreneurship, and performance, and finally (3) the micro-level RL outcomes as the individual and personal interaction with the different agents such as the effects on attitudes and cognitions

(e.g., OCB, motivation, job satisfaction). Voegtlin and colleagues (2012) argued that "responsible leaders must think about the consequences of decisions about all stakeholders and engage in dialogue with all parties by balancing and balancing the different interests." (p. 12). Finally, they concluded that the actions of RL at all levels are essential to face the current challenges of globalization.

Another example of research focused on RL outcomes is Doh and Quigley (2014). Doh and Quigley (2014) proposed two possible ways for the responsible leader to be influential and generate actions and positive impact: (1) the psychological pathway which implies results based on psychology such as the construction of trust, ownership, and commitment; and (2) the knowledge-based pathway based on information and knowledge such as options, creativity, and knowledge sharing. In their study, Doh and Quigley (2014) suggest that Walmart and Coke are organizations that have followed mainly a psychological pathway, where their RL starts at the top level and then cascades down to include the different stakeholders. In contrast, they suggest that DuPont has followed mainly a knowledge-based pathway, where their RL is mostly focused on knowledge sharing. In summary, from the stakeholder perspective, the authors indicated that, through these two pathways, the responsible leader promotes specific results at the individual, group, organizational, and social level, and these are reflected in their CSR actions at a global scale (Doh & Quigley, 2014).

From existing research, one might think that the current literature of the RL outcomes—as well as with the literature of RL antecedents—encompasses the micro, meso and macro levels, and analyzes the influence of the leader's actions in the results and the CSR and policies in the world. The different authors emphasized the importance of these actions to create value and generate sustainability inside and outside the organization, with social, environmental, economic,

and political implications. In conclusion, the study of RL outcomes is increasingly oriented to the macro level of the organization and the CSR actions in a globalized world.

### **Responsible Leadership: How does the Context in Latin American Different from the Context in Developed Economies?**

Until now, we have discussed the different perspectives of the Responsible Leadership literature that is mainly based on approaches from developed economies. However, research suggests that the situational context and the leadership characteristics developing economies, such as Latin America, is different from the context in developed economies (see also Aguinis et al., 2020; Davila & Elvira, 2012; Nicholls-Nixon et al., 2011). As Aguinis et al. (2020) recently argued, management research rooted in developed economies, tend to implicitly assume certain characteristics such as the presence of solid and formal institutions. However, these situational assumptions do not characterize developing economies, such as the countries in Latin America. In Latin America, institutions are less efficient (Aguinis et al., 2020; Nicholls-Nixon et al., 2011). As such, Latin America faces larger institutional voids, weak market infrastructures, inequalities of the income distribution, and political and economic conditions that create problems at providing the broader population with social needs such as healthcare, food, education, infrastructure, and transportation. This context is further influenced by the current Latin American economic instability and political conflict, where political parties impose their agendas influencing how leadership faces their businesses and the general societal problems (Vassolo et al., 2011). Conversely, in more developed economies, business leaders take for granted that those primary services (e.g., healthcare, education, infrastructure, and transportation) are a governmental responsibility. All these differences affect how business leaders behave, their business models, and the strategies they create to overcome these challenging contexts.

However, far less is known about leaders in these contexts compared to leaders in developed economies.

From a leadership perspective, one of the first empirical studies to understand the behavioral differences among countries, including Latin American countries, came from the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) Project (House et al., 2004). In this study, the authors showed how culture affects how leaders behave and how they perceive their leaders. Using the empirical data from the GLOBE project (House et al., 2004), Waldman et al. (2006) analyzed the cultural and leadership predictors of CSR values of top management. Waldman et al. (2006) developed theoretical and empirical associations between CSR decision making and three cultural dimensions of the GLOBE project: institutional-level collectivism, in-group collectivism, and power distance. In this study, the authors found evidence to suggest that there are demographic, economic, and cultural factors (e.g., institutional collectivism and power distance) that predict the development of CSR leadership, whose actions are based on relationships with the internal and external organizational stakeholders.

With regards to developed countries, Waldman et al. (2006) noted that, due to the cultural and socio-economical characteristics, their leaders tend to have an instrumentalist perspective where their actions are focused primarily on generating value and economic benefits for their organization. In general, responsible leaders in developed economies tend to consider that the government or public organizations must address social concerns (Waldman et al., 2006). In line with this approach, literature in developed economies has followed two different perspectives, often conflicting. One perspective that considers that RL should focus mainly on the shareholders, and another that considers RL must involve multiple stakeholders (Waldman & Siegel, 2008) recently referred to as strategist orientation (serving mainly the interest of the

shareholders) and integrator orientation (serving the interest of diverse stakeholder (Waldman et al., 2020).

In contrast, regarding Latin America, Waldman et al. (2006) suggested that, in developing countries such as those in Latin America, leaders tend to perceive that government agencies are less efficient in dealing with social problems, so they might feel more responsibility towards the community and more motivation to generate social change. These findings are in line with other studies using the GLOBE project, regarding RL in other countries (e.g., Asian countries). Witt and Stahl (2016), for example, compared three Asian and two western countries and found that the differences in the institutional contexts implied different understandings about the leaders' responsibilities toward society. As Witt and Stahl (2016) noted, "variations in leaders' responsibility orientations... are not so much about actors playing the same game by different rules, but about business leaders in different societies playing entirely different games or having fundamentally different assumptions about the deeper purposes behind the game" (p. 634). In their research, Witt and Stahl (2016) suggested that the human approach (humane orientation) of each culture can explain or influence the predisposition towards responsible behavior of the leader (understanding the human approach as the degree to which society promotes and encourages individuals to be fair, altruistic, generous and committed to others).

An example of these contextual differences in Latin America can be seen in the theoretical study of Davila and Elvira (2012). Davila and Elvira (2012) study the psychological, sociological, and historical perspectives behind leadership styles in Latin America. In their study, they present a theoretical background that might help to understand the historical and psychological antecedents to the phenomenon in Latin America. According to the authors (2012), leadership in Latin America is historically rooted in a paternalistic leadership style that is

“based on social bonds via the relationship of reciprocity.” (p. 550). It is this paternalistic leadership style that shapes how leaders create relations and behave with their employees. In that sense, given this paternalistic leadership context, with institutional weaknesses and governments that continuously struggle to address socio-economical concerns, leaders might try to compensate their employees, showing social responsibility and responsible leadership.

In their research, Davila and Elvira (2012) labeled the leadership style focused on stakeholders in Latin America, a “humanistic leadership.” According to them, such humanistic leadership is associated with transformational leadership as it considers the stakeholder not a resource of the organization but rather as another human being. In conclusion, Davila and Elvira (2012) emphasize the importance of the relationship leader-employees in the region and suggested that leadership in the region is historically based on the social relationship with diverse organizational stakeholders. Besides that, the authors acknowledge that in Latin America there is a disposition towards the community based on trust, respect, and reciprocity (e.g., if organizations receive resources from the community, then the community should receive reciprocal resources from the organizations), which requires organizations and leaders to be responsible and to develop more CSR programs and policies.

More recently, using data from the GLOBE project, Castaño et al. (2015) compared the expectations for organizational leadership styles in eleven Latin American Countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela). Castaño et al. (2015) found that—regardless of some differences (e.g., preferences for risk-taking styles) among countries—most Latin American countries prefer a charismatic, value-based, person, and team-oriented leadership styles. These leaders emphasize close personal relationships and care for subordinates (one key stakeholder for organizations) and support

previous qualitative findings by Davila and Elvira (2012) about paternalistic and humanistic leadership.

Following the latter approaches, if leaders in Latin America tend to be more paternalistic and humanistic (Castaño et al., 2015; Davila & Elvira, 2012), one could suggest that the leaders in the region are more responsible for the multiple stakeholders than in other regions? This is not likely true. As previously stated, instead, also due to the socio-political context, Latin American countries have also encouraged corrupt leadership involved in scandals such as the FIFA scandal in 2015 and the Odebrecht scandal in 2017 (Rotberg, 2019). Then, what is the role that the Latin American context plays in the development of RL? How do the responsible leaders develop in such adverse contextual conditions? We will address these questions in the following section.

### **The Role of The Latin American Context in the Responsible Leadership Development**

By analyzing the studies that target the RL in Latin American, we found that the context seems to play two different but essential roles. In some cases, the Latin American context appears to be the enabler of a proactive RL. In these cases, the context act as pushing force and promotes the development of responsible leaders. In other cases, the Latin American context seems to be the enabler of a reactive (rather than proactive) RL. In these cases, the context act as a pulling force where the context is a scenario that requires or needs help, and the organizational leaders are called to contribute to the social, economic, and environmental development.

### **The Context as a Pushing Force in the Responsible Leadership Development**

According to the research focused on the RL in Latin American, in some cases, the context seems to play the role of pushing force in the development of the phenomenon. RL emerges because the context in which the leader grew up, and their personal experiences, contributes to the developing of their moral character and builds their sense of responsibility

towards society. Thus, in this perspective, the context seems to contribute to the leaders, developing their abilities to make decisions and to build sustainable, responsible relationships with their different stakeholders.

### ***What does the Extant Literature Say?***

Research has shown the importance of the proximal context in the development of the moral, ethical, and relational character of the responsible leaders. On the other hand, this research has suggested that the historical, social, economic, and political conditions could "awaken" the leader's responsibility toward society and the context in which their organizations operate.

Drawing upon the RL roles model of Maak and Pless (2006), Maak and Steotter (2012) identified in Martin Burt, five RL relational roles developed throughout his life. The leader as a steward: leading with integrity, guarding the values and resources of the organization, and facilitating responsible organizational change. The leader as a servant: empowering and helping the poor to become leaders. The leader as a change agent: generating social change and serving others. The leader as a citizen: taking a stakeholder approach from the beginning. Finally, the leader as a visionary: seeking solutions to social problems and thinking about the future (Maak & Pless, 2006).

In this case study, from an early age, it seems that the responsible leader develops an understanding and sensitivity to the social problems of his country: Paraguay. This sensitivity is somehow inherited and strengthened by the influence of close role models in his life, such as his grandmother (an activist for the women's rights in the United Nations). Burt grew up in an economically favored family in Paraguay, which allowed him to have access to top-quality international education. This fact seems to have granted him a critical look at the world's socio-

economic environment and social problems, inside and outside his home country. One could suppose that his education provided him with the tools and allowed him to develop specific characteristics to generate value and social impact, as well as to address social problems—such as poverty and lack of education—from his organization.

According to Maak and Steotter (2012: 414), “While his family background helps to explain his motivation to fight poverty, it is still surprising to see that Martin decided as early 15 to dedicate his professional life to the enhancement of civil society. In other words, it was a combination of frustration with the oppression and profound interest in promoting quality and liberty that led to the decision, indicating the relationship between the political context and Martin Burt’s’ personal history”. Based on their research, one could suggest that the context that surrounded Burt somehow explains his motivation to help and prevent poverty in his country and to address the social needs of the most vulnerable community from an early age. According to Maak and Steotter (2012), the success of the Fundación Paraguaya could be mainly awarded to the RL behavior of its founder and the qualities that he developed throughout his life.

In another case study, Van de Loo (2006) analyzed the RL of Fabio Barbosa, CEO of the Brazilian subsidiary of ABN AMRO Bank, a large international bank with over 3000 branches operating in almost 60 countries. Using in-depth interviews with about thirty people, observations, and published material, the author examines the life experiences of Barbosa, the origins of his vision, and how he developed himself as a responsible leader. In the case of Barbosa, the leader seems to understand his role as a socially responsible leader in the banking industry. According to Van de Loo (2006: 173), “For Fabio Barbosa, social responsibility is a stance that is part of everything you do. It impacts the relationships with all stakeholders involved, such as shareholders, clients, employees, suppliers, as well as the society at large”.

In the study, the author identified critical elements that developed Barbosa's leadership from an early age. The context in which Barbosa grew up seems to promote his further leadership style and responsibility. Barbosa grew up in an upper-middle-class Brazilian family and had access to top-quality international education. This international exposure seems to have developed his awareness about the social-economic problems of his country that have then turned out to be essential for his vision and mission as a leader at ABN AMRO Bank: "He felt that with his education and experience, he wanted to use to make a contribution to his home country" (2006: 178). The author argues that his RL is the result of a combination of factors that include values, competencies, and skills which are developed through social education and learning from role models over lifetime and career. In this line, Van de Loo (2006) gives specific attention to the Barbosa's family role models (father and grandfather) and organizational role models in his development as a responsible leader. In his case, it is clear that the fundamental values driving Barbosa's leadership are deeply rooted in his personality. During his childhood, these values were planted in him like seeds, allowing him to use and live them later on in the work environment.

More recently, Castillo, Sánchez and Dueñas-Ocampo (2019) analyze the case of Carlos Cavelier, who is the owner and "Dream Coordinator" of Alquería S.A., the third-largest dairy company in Colombia. The authors combine the ideas about RL (Maak & Pless, 2006; Pless, 2007), the psychological development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Magnusson & Stattin, 2006), and moral development (Kohlberg, 1981) to analyze the development of the motivational drivers of Cavelier as a responsible leader throughout his life. As in the case of Roddick (Nicola M Pless, 2007), Castillo et al. (2019) found in Cavelier motivational drivers such as the need for exploration and affirmation, the need for attachment and affiliation, the need for justice, the need

for recognition and the sense of care, which seem to explain his RL roles as steward, citizen, servant, visionary, coach, architect, storyteller, and change agent.

In their study, Castillo et al. (2019) highlight that the Colombian (Latin American) socio-economical context is an environment in which the development of responsible leaders would not seem to be easy due to both formal and informal institutional weaknesses that promote irresponsible behaviors. Furthermore, the authors indicate the importance of analyzing the development of leaders with strong moral development in difficult socio-economical contexts such as Cavalier, who is interested in contributing to the development of the most forgotten stakeholders of his organization: the peasants, the shopkeepers, and the Colombian children.

Castillo et al. (2019) argued the social context, in which Cavalier grew up, seem to have contributed to his RL behavior. According to them, the proximal environment or microsystem (family and school) and the coherence between the values promoted by his family and those promoted by his school (mesosystems) represented an optimal environment. It was crucial in the development of the RL drivers in Cavalier. Besides that, the authors emphasized that the rural context (distal environment), in which Cavalier grew up, surrounded by peasant families (who did not enjoy their privileges) was also essential in his development of values such as respect, solidarity, equality, freedom, justice, and service.

Thus, Castillo et al. (2019) sustain that the context or parenting environment seems to matter in the development of responsible leaders. In the case of Cavalier (1) a proximal environment (represented by his micro and mesosystem) characterized by the coherence/consistency in the development of values and role models, which contributed to his moral development, and (2) a distal context (represented by his exo and macrosystems) characterized by the existence of social and economic needs, which demanded and tested (in a

real way) his values and moral development. Therefore, the authors emphasized the importance of the context for the cognitive and moral development of the leader's character and, consequently, of his responsible behavior.

### ***Common Characteristics of the Context as a Pushing Force***

We found similar contextual characteristics in the leadership development of Martin Burt (Nicaragua), Carlos Cavelier (Colombia), and Fabio Barbosa (Brazil). In all cases, the leaders were raised in a more economically advantageous context (compared to the social and economic context of their countries) and educated with high-quality international training: Burt with a master in public policy, Carlos with a master in public administration, and Fabio with a master in business administration. Perhaps it was this type of education that precisely makes them understand the importance of specific initiatives (such as the micro-credits) and to carry out such kinds of initiatives in their organizations.

At the same time, the leaders entered the national politics at some point: Burt as minister and mayor, and Carlos as a member of the Nuevo Liberalismo party and as a congressman. However, at some point, they discovered that they could contribute more to society from their respective organizations: Martin with Fundación Paraguaya, Carlos with Alquería, and Fabio with ABN AMRO Bank. The three of them developed a strong moral character and a sense of service, carry out projects with common sense to help the community in their countries, a type of stakeholder often forgotten by the business sector. Despite cultural differences in the three countries, it seems clear that the Latin American context played an essential role in the understanding of the societal problems and their developments as responsible leaders.

In this vein, the ideas of Waldman et al. (2006), regarding the differences of RL among countries and regions, seem to find support in the specific cases of Martin Burt in Paraguay

(Maak & Stoetter, 2012), Fabio Barbosa in Brasil (Van de Loo, 2006), and Carlos Cavelier in Colombia (Castillo et al., 2019). The three leaders fit the idea that in developing countries, such as Latin America, where government agencies are perceived as less efficient dealing with social problems, leaders can develop a sense of greater responsibility to their community (stakeholders) and, therefore, to act as responsible leaders.

The examples show that in the cases of these Latin American leaders, the proximal context was crucial for the development of responsible leaders. In these cases, the particularities of the leader context motivate the leaders to operate as responsible leaders. Contrary to the popular notion that adverse conditions will develop irresponsible leaders, in their cases, it is social, economic, and political conditions that promote the leader's responsibility toward society and their stakeholders.

### **The Context as a Pulling Force in the Responsible Leadership Development**

According to the research that is focused on the RL in Latin American, in some cases, the context seems to act as a pulling force in the development of the RL. By a pulling force, we mean that the context seems to demand the attention of responsible leaders, so it acts as an enabler of a reactive (rather than a facilitator of a proactive RL). Therefore, the phenomenon of RL emerges because the leader assumes the responsibility to contribute to a society that demands development.

### ***What does the Extant Literature Say?***

Research has shown that the context act as a receiver of RL initiatives. Thus, it is through RL that organizations contribute to these contexts to overcome the complicated social, economic, material, and environmental conditions that characterize them. The latter is conceptually different from the context as pushing force where the context enables a proactive RL behavior.

Instead, the context acts as a pulling force and demands the RL. Therefore, leaders in powerful positions and with the resources (e.g., leaders from multinational companies working in developing economies) offer help to a range of stakeholders in Latin America.

Mària and Lozano (2010), for example, analyzed the main leadership traits that responsible leaders, which allow them—in a globalized world—to address social inclusion and to create economic and social value. In their research, the authors focus on the outcome of social inclusion, using the lenses of RL and the Work of Translation (a sociological theory developed by Santos), and illustrate the comparison with two different cases: one in Nicaragua and the other in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The authors used the theoretical basis of RL developed by Maak and Pless (2006) and examined the roles and virtues of Sinforiano Cáceres, who is the leader of the National Federation of Agricultural and Agroindustrial Cooperatives (FENACCOOP) in Nicaragua, focusing on his role as a builder of ethical and sustainable relationships with the different stakeholders.

Although this study focuses on the work of two leaders, the emphasis of the research is different from the literature that shows the context as an enabler of a proactive RL. This study, instead, focuses on the (valuable) work that the leader does in a context that needs this type of leadership. Thus, in this case, the authors did not analyze whether the problematic conditions (social, economic and political) contributed to Cáceres's leadership development nor the specific characteristics of the leader's context, as did the authors whose research confer a pushing role to the context in the development of the RL.

In their research, Mària and Lozano (2010) found in Cáceres five different RL traits that are essential to address social inclusion problems. First, the ability to guide his attention between his organization and the society. Second, the ability to articulate the interests of external

stakeholders (e.g., political parties, private organizations) and internal interests (members of the FENACCOOP cooperative). Third, proactive work to promote social inclusion and prevent the marginalization of some groups. Fourth, the creativity to generate new forms of work, and self-confidence to develop and strengthen the dialogue between stakeholders. Fifth, active work to promote spaces of interaction between different stakeholders.

Mària and Lozano (2010) concluded that, in developing countries such as the Latin American ones, responsible leaders need to invite stakeholders to share their experiences, to commit themselves to their stakeholder's concerns, to develop trust and dialogue (inside and outside their organizations), and to have respect for the dignity and human rights of individuals to combat social exclusion. The authors emphasize the importance of exposing cases such as that of Cáceres, who serves as an example to inspire RL in national and multinational private organizations in Latin America and the world.

In another study of Latin American leadership, Davila, Rodriguez-Lluesma and Elvira (2013: 183) analyzed the work of global leaders from the perspective of stakeholders. They stated that their "humanistic focus extends beyond the boundaries of the usual view of leadership as a set of traits, behaviors, or goal-oriented exchanges, to encompass the complexity of social relationships in which leaders develop, as well as the 'moral work' that leaders need to perform, to honor their (sometimes conflicting) responsibilities toward different stakeholders.

To illustrate the type of humanist (or responsible) leadership in Latin America, the authors cited several illustrative cases, such as Ternium, a leading steel company in Latin America that is actively committed to developing its employees and local communities through of initiatives in health, education, art, culture, environment, sport, and social integration. They also explore examples of some multinationals (e.g., Santander, Telefonica, Nestlé, or FEMSA)

that have decentralized their NGOs to operate according to local needs, allowing foundations to achieve goals beyond the business and implement much broader CSR practices in the countries of Latin America. Thus, according to Davila et al. (2013), global leadership requires identifying stakeholders and managing relationships with them horizontally, that is, as equals, to generate trust and legitimacy, and thus to be able to understand their needs.

For Davila et al. (2013) “[t]he stakeholder perspective has specifically helped us identify key contextual elements in the Latin American region, including the role of the enterprise as a social institution that contributes to human and social development, the value granted to the person within collectivistic societies, and the pragmatic character of governmental public policies related to employee management.” (p. 186). In this respect, the authors developed ideas very similar to those of Maak and Pless (2006) and those that also apply to the Latin American context. In conclusion, the authors stated that responsible leaders of global organizations must behave as agents of the global good (citizens of the world) and should positively use their power and privileges to help society.

On the other hand, Stahl et al. (2016) discussed the GRL challenges of western organizations and their corporate CSR policies in emerging countries such as Latin America. In their study, the authors state that the GRL is a response to the global economic crisis and is also the result of a call by NGOs, communities, and other external actors for corporations to self-regulate and to play an active role as global citizens. According to the authors, the global leaders of western multinationals are generally familiar with strong judicial institutions and systems and not with the weak institutional contexts found in emerging contexts. In that sense, working in emerging contexts means that responsible global leaders move out of their comfort zone and make complex decisions.

Stahl et al. (2016) identify three approaches that can be taken by responsible global leaders in Western multinational enterprises (MNEs) doing business in emerging economies: (1) the global leadership approach, (2) the transnational approach, and (3) the local approach. From each approach, Stahl et al. (2016) expose the shortcomings and virtues of leaders of multinational organizations in their actions in emerging countries and provide concrete examples. For instance, the Newmont Mining Corporation had to rethink its relationship with local communities and to do business in Peru, due to the health problems generated by a community from the mercury spill in the area. For Stahl et al. (2016: 89), "when analyzing the three approaches in the context of emerging economies, it is important to recognize that they are not homogeneous and therefore require the distinction of their idiosyncratic institutional characteristics from the global leaders." Finally, the authors conclude that multinational organizations should develop RL with the skills needed to lead responsibly under challenging contexts, such as in emerging economies.

### ***Common Characteristics of the Context as a Pulling Force***

The research highlights how the context can be the receiver of RL initiatives that address common socio-economical voids found in developing economies. Thus, it is through RL that organizations contribute to these contexts to overcome the complicated social, economic, material, and environmental conditions that characterize them. Much of this research is focused on the actions that mainly western multinational organizations undertake in their subsidiaries in Latin America.

Under this perspective, the research identifies the challenges, capabilities, and approaches that leaders who occupy privileged positions in multinationals must have to exhibit a RL style that allows them, through the CSR actions of their companies, to contribute to the improvement

of the conditions of those regions underdeveloped and characterized by the problematic conditions that face socially and economically. Table 2 presents an overview of the role of the context in RL development in Latin America.

-----  
Insert Table 2 about here  
-----

### **Differences in the RL development in Developing and Developed Economies**

Now, let us turn into an important question, does the contexts in developing economies influences differently RL development than in developed economies? Our analysis suggests that the RL development varies in several forms. We do not suggest either that the leaders in developed countries cannot have access or experiences in developing economies that will promote their moral and relational character and cultivate their responsible leadership. We do not suggest that there are other ways in which leaders in developed economies can build their responsible leadership at an early or later stage in life. However, what we suggest is that the contextual conditions in developing countries such as Latin America are different. Therefore, it is the firsthand experience of the leaders in developing countries and their proximal environment that forges their moral character in a different way.

Our results are in line with research regarding the development of global responsible leaders through service-learning programs (Pless et al., 2011). In their study, Pless et al. (2011) analyze a leadership developing program from a multinational organization. During the program, leaders are sent to developing economies to work in cross-sector partnerships with NGOs, social entrepreneurs, or international organizations. Pless et al. (2011) found that leaders who participated in the program developed a “responsible mindset, ethical literacy, cultural

intelligence, global mind-set, self-development, and community building” (p. 237). This study suggests, as well as our analysis, the importance of firsthand experience in the leader understanding of the societal challenges and the organizational responsibilities in society. In this line, as well, business education research has suggested the importance of today service-learning programs for their students where students travel to developing economies to offer their work in turn of an experience that will develop their moral, ethical and leadership character (Godfrey et al., 2005).

### **Future Research Directions**

Fortunately, globalization, communication, and technology has revealed different stakeholder's concerns across the world. Today, organizations are able to learn from other regions and to address problems in innovative and globalized ways across sectors, countries, and industries. There is certainly a lot for leaders in developing countries to learn from leaders in developed countries as it is for leaders developed countries to learn from leaders in developing ones.

We believe that future research could focus on developing more empirical cases of responsible leaders in Latin America, considering not only the level of micro (individual) analysis but also the meso (organizational) and macro (institutional) and level. With this type of analysis, one could, for example, understand better what characteristics the proximal and distal context needs to play an active and positive in the development of responsible leaders. Also, it would be essential to delve deeper into what are the responsibilities of (responsible) leaders in the Latin American context? How far do Latin American leaders reach out to stakeholders? Should responsible leaders fill social, economic, and environmental disregarded by states such as overcoming poverty, illiteracy, or ensuring the care and conservation of the environment? This

understanding is important for the development of responsible leaders at different life stages within universities and within organizations.

Our society needs RL in both developed and developing economies who could address the challenges that are not addressed by formal institutions and governments. Social innovators and social entrepreneurs are also interested in providing societal solutions to these types of challenges. Therefore, another research direction could be the development of a be a common understanding between the research on RL and the research in social innovation and social entrepreneurship. understand the similarities and differences between responsible leaders and social entrepreneurs, how they develop their character, their networks, their concerns toward society.

### **Conclusions**

In this paper, we review the extant literature on RL, focusing on the literature in the Latin American context. We analyzed the role of the context in the RL development. We found that the context could play two different roles. First, the context can act as a pushing force where the context plays a formative role and promotes the development and development of the leader. Furthermore, the context can act as a pulling force where the leader assumes the responsibility to contribute to a society that needs it.

Although the RL is a relatively new area of study, the growth and relevance of the research area are undeniable, specifically for the development of emerging countries, which struggle daily with their social injustices and difficulties. Much of the research has been developed in the United States and Europe and has focused on analyzing, on the one hand, the antecedents of the RL (e.g., values, drivers) and, on the other hand, the consequences (e.g., CSR policies). Some other research has focused on the RL itself, emphasizing the roles or behaviors facing the different stakeholders of the organization.

Given that several investigations on RL have emphasized the importance of the context in which RL takes place, our objective was to elaborate a review of the literature on RL in the Latin American context. We contend that the social, economic, and institutional context of Latin American countries could be challenging to the development of responsible leaders and the presence of their actions.

Like any research, our review work is not exempt from certain limitations. For example, this study was limited mainly to research published in scientific databases and, thus, to top academic journals. Unfortunately, the publication of scientific articles on RL in Latin America is relatively scarce compared to literature in the United States, Europe, or other emerging regions such as Asia. Although there may be other types of RL academic articles (e.g., articles published locally in university journals), there is generally relatively little research on leadership in the region. An example that some valuable articles might have been out of our sample is the work Castillo et al. (2019) which was obtained from an international academic event. The above, perhaps more than a limitation, is an essential point of our work because the low number of articles allowed us to make an exhaustive analysis and review of the approaches recorded in each work. Our objective in developing the research was to call attention to study a phenomenon as particular and relevant as the RL in a social, economic, and institutional context that would seem to defy its development.

We believe that for emerging countries such as those in Latin America, it is essential that more and more responsible leaders develop every day as they represent a way to create sustainable value in the communities and to develop the society. However, it is also up to future research to analyze the real effect that these types of initiatives have on the real improvement of the social and material conditions of the least developed countries. It is to be established, for

example, under what conditions (regarding business networks and public-private alliances) that initiatives have a real impact on the contexts that take place. We hope that our review of the literature will be the first step to begin to pave those essential avenues of research.

### References

Aguinis, H., Villamor, I., Lazzarini, S. G., Vassolo, R. S., Amorós, J. E., & Allen, D. G. (2020).

Conducting Management Research in Latin America: Why and What's in It for You?

*Journal of Management*, XX(X), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320901581>

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of

transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire.

*Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441–462.

<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. In *Organizational Dynamics* (Vol. 13, Issue

3, pp. 26–40). Elsevier Science. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(85\)90028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2)

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational

Leadership Behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–217.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00016-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8)

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The Bioecological Model of Human Development.

In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology* (6th ed., pp. 793–

828). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.21307/ijssis-2019-101>

Castaño, N., Sully de Luque, M. F., Wernsing, T., Ogliastri, E., Shemueli, R. G., Fuchs, R. M., &

Robles-Flores, J. A. (2015). El Jefe: Differences in expected leadership behaviors across

Latin American countries. *Journal of World Business*, 50(3), 584–597.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2014.12.002>

Castillo, M. M., Sanchez, I. D., & Duenas, S. (2019). *Responsible Leadership : Drivers and Behaviors of an Organizational Leader in an Emerging Country* (Vol. 5).

Colvin, G. (2009). *How to build great leaders*. Fortune Magazine.

[https://archive.fortune.com/2009/11/19/news/companies/leadership\\_companies\\_colvin.fortune/index.htm](https://archive.fortune.com/2009/11/19/news/companies/leadership_companies_colvin.fortune/index.htm)

Crilly, D., Schneider, S. C., & Zollo, M. (2011). Psychological Antecedents to Socially Responsible Behavior. *Ssrn*, 175–190. <https://doi.org/10.1057/emr.2008.15>

Davila, A., & Elvira, M. M. (2012). Humanistic leadership: Lessons from Latin America.

*Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 548–554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.008>

Davila, A., Rodriguez-Lluesma, C., & Elvira, M. M. (2013). Global leadership, citizenship and stakeholder management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 42(3), 183–190.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2013.06.003>

Doh, J. P., & Quigley, N. R. (2014). Responsible Leadership and Stakeholder Management: Influence Pathways and Organizational Outcomes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(3), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2014.0013>

Doing Business. (2019). *Ease of Doing Business rankings*.

<https://www.doingbusiness.org/en/rankings>

Elvira, M. M., & Davila, A. (2005). Special research issue on human resource management in Latin America. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(12), 2164–

2172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500358539>

Freeman, R. E. (1999). Divergent Stakeholder Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 233–236. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.1893932>

Freeman, R. E., & Auster, E. R. (2011). Values, Authenticity, and Responsible Leadership.

*Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(SUPPL.1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1022-7>

Freeman, R. E., & Reed, D. (1983). Stockholders and Stakeholders: A New Perspective on Corporate Governanc. *California Management Review*, 25(3), 88–106.

<https://doi.org/10.5897/ajmr2014.7057>

Freeman, R. E., Wicks, A. C., & Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder Theory and The Corporate Objective Revisited Stakeholder Theory and “ The Corporate Objective Revisited .”

*Organization Science*, 15(3), 364–369. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0066>

Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1120–1145.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.007>

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices.

*Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1), 75–91.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2005.16132558>

Godfrey, P. C., Illes, L. M., & Berry, G. R. (2005). Creating breadth in business education through service-learning. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(3), 309–323.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2005.18122420>

Greenleaf, R. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.

Harding, L. (2016). What are the Panama Papers? A guide to history’s biggest data leak. *The Guardian*, 5.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage publications.

- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Harvard Business Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. Harper & Row.
- Maak, T. (2007). Responsible leadership, stakeholder engagement, and the emergence of social capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4), 329–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9510-5>
- Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society - A relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1), 99–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9047-z>
- Maak, T., Pless, N. M., & Borecká, M. (2014). Developing responsible global leaders. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 8, 339–364. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1535-120320140000008023>
- Maak, T., Pless, N. M., & Voegtlin, C. (2016). Business Statesman or Shareholder Advocate? CEO Responsible Leadership Styles and the Micro-Foundations of Political CSR. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(3), 463–493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12195>
- Maak, T., & Stoetter, N. (2012). Social entrepreneurs as responsible leaders: ‘Fundación Paraguaya’ and the case of Martin Burt. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 413–430.
- Magnusson, D., & Stattin, H. (2006). The Person in Context: A Holistic-Interactionistic Approach. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology* (6th ed., pp. 400–464). Wiley.
- Mària, J. F., & Lozano, J. M. (2010). Responsible Leaders for Inclusive Globalization: Cases in Nicaragua and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(SUPPL. 1), 93–111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0628-5>

- Miska, C., Hilbe, C., & Mayer, S. (2014). Reconciling Different Views on Responsible Leadership: A Rationality-Based Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*(2), 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1923-8>
- Miska, C., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2018). Responsible Leadership : A Mapping of Extant Research and Future Directions. *Journal of Business Ethics, 148*(1), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2999-0>
- Miska, C., Stahl, G. K., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2013). Intercultural competencies as antecedents of responsible global leadership. *European J. of International Management, 7*(5), 550. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2013.056477>
- Nicholls-Nixon, C. L., Castilla, J. A. D., Garcia, J. S., & Pesquera, M. R. (2011). Latin america management research: Review, synthesis, and extension. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1178–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311403151>
- Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Waldman, D. A. (2012). Different Approaches Toward Doing the Right Thing: Mapping the Responsibility Orientations of Leaders. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 26*(4), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0028>
- Pless, Nicola M., Maak, T., & Siegel, D. S. (2014). Responsible leadership. *Responsible Leadership, 28*(3), 221–223. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203002247>
- Pless, Nicola M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. K. (2011). Developing responsible global leaders through international service-learning programs: The Ulysses experience. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 10*(2), 237–260. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2011.62798932>
- Pless, Nicola M. (2007). Understanding responsible leadership: Role identity and motivational drivers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 74*(4), 437–456.

Rendir Cuentas. (2019). *Indice de Percepción de Corrupción 2019*.

<http://www.rendircuentas.org/noticia/indice-percepcion-la-corrupcion-2019/>

Rotberg, R. I. (2019). The Corruption of Latin America. In *Corruption in Latin America* (pp. 1–25). Springer.

Stahl, G. K., & Sully de Luque, M. (2014). Antecedents of Responsible Leader Behavior: A Research Synthesis, Conceptual Framework, and Agenda for Future Research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(3), 235–254. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0126>

Stahl, Gunter K., Miska, C., Puffer, S. M., & McCarthy, D. J. (2016). Responsible global leadership in emerging markets. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 9, 79–106. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1535-120320160000009005>

Stahl, Günter K., Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2013). Responsible global leadership. In *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development* (pp. 240–259). Routledge.

The World Bank. (2018). *Decline of Global Extreme Poverty Continues but Has Slowed: World Bank*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2018/09/19/decline-of-global-extreme-poverty-continues-but-has-slowed-world-bank>

Treviño, L. K., & Brown, M. E. (2005). in Influencing Unethical Behavior in the Workplace. In *Managing Organizational Deviance* (pp. 69–87).

*UN Global Compact*. (2020). <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc>

Van de Loo, E. (2006). Responsible leadership at ABN AMRO Real: the case of Fabio Barbosa. In T. Maak & N. M. Pless (Eds.), *Responsible Leadership* (pp. 190–202). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203002247-21>

Vassolo, R. S., De Castro, J. O., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2011). Managing in Latin America: Common Issues and a Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(4), 22–

36. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483386874.n4>

Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible Leadership in Global Business: A New Approach to Leadership and Its Multi-Level Outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *105*(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0952-4>

Waldman, D. A., & Balven, R. M. (2014). Responsible Leadership: Theoretical Issues and Research Directions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(3), 224–234. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2014.0016>

Waldman, David A. (2010). Being a Responsible Leader. *Facial Plastic Surgery Clinics of North America*, *18*(4), 471–479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsc.2010.06.002>

Waldman, David A., & Galvin, B. M. (2008). Alternative Perspectives of Responsible Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *37*(4), 327–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2008.07.001>

Waldman, David A., & Siegel, D. (2008). Defining the socially responsible leader. *Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(1), 117–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.008>

Waldman, David A., Siegel, D. S., & Javidan, M. (2006). Components of CEO transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*(8), 1703–1725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00642.x>

Waldman, David A., Siegel, D. S., & Stahl, G. K. (2020). Defining the Socially Responsible Leader: Revisiting Issues in Responsible Leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *27*(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819872201>

Waldman, David A., Sully de Luque, M., Washburn, N., House, R. J., Adetoun, B., Barrasa, A., Bobina, M., Bodur, M., Chen, Y. J., Debbarma, S., Dorfman, P., Dzuwichu, R. R., Evcimen, I., Fu, P., Grachev, M., Duarte, R. G., Gupta, V., Den Hartog, D. N., De Hoogh, A. H. B.,

... Wilderom, C. P. M. (2006). Cultural and leadership predictors of corporate social responsibility values of top management: A GLOBE study of 15 countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 823–837.

<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400230>

Witt, M. A., & Stahl, G. K. (2016). Foundations of Responsible Leadership: Asian Versus Western Executive Responsibility Orientations Toward Key Stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(3), 623–638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2534-8>

## APPENDIX A

Table 1

## Responsible Leadership General Theoretical Perspectives

Perspective	Responsible Leadership Definition	Main Focus	References
Relational Perspective	"relational and ethical phenomenon, which occurs in social processes of interaction with those who affect or are affected by leadership and have a stake in the purpose and vision of the leadership relationship" (Maak & Pless, 2006, p. 103).	Values and motivations of the responsible leader towards the stakeholders	(Pless et al., 2012; Pless et al., 2014)
Kantian Perspective	"intentional actions were taken by leaders to benefit the stakeholders of the company and actions taken to avoid harmful consequences for stakeholders and the larger society." (Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014, p. 238).	The distinction between actions "to do good" and "to do no harm	(Crilly et al., 2011; Miska et al., 2013, 2014; Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014)
Global Perspective	"leading responsibly in a global environment means, for instance, ensuring principle-driven and ethically sound behavior both at home and abroad; taking a stance on human rights issues; contributing inactive ways to solving the global environmental crisis; and being responsive to the legitimate expectations of a diverse group of stakeholders" (Pless et al., 2011, p. 240).	Responsibility and obligations of the leader in a global environment	(Maak et al., 2014; Stahl et al., 2016; Stahl et al., 2013; Voegtlin et al., 2012)

**Table 2**

**Overview of the Roles of the Context in the Responsible Leadership Development in Latin America**

Role of the Context	Characteristics
Pushing Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The context has a critical factor in RL development and development</li> <li>• The proximal context (e.g., the family background and role models) is essential in the development of the responsible leaders and allow them to develop their moral character and values.</li> <li>• The distal context (e.g., Latin-American) is essential in the development of the responsible leaders and allow them to understand the societal problems and need (e.g., poverty, education, and unemployment)</li> <li>• Educational learning (high-level training) and life experiences (international travel) are critical factors in their leadership development.</li> <li>• The paternalistic and humanistic leadership styles in Latin America are vital to understanding the responsible leadership development and development.</li> </ul>
Pulling Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The context demands RL development and development.</li> <li>• The leaders are called to be agents of social justice and economic development to address societal issues in emerging contexts characterized by weak institutions, political instability, and a shaky rule of law.</li> <li>• Responsible leaders in developing countries commit to different stakeholders, build trust with communities, and address problems that are not adequately addressed by governments such as education and poverty.</li> <li>• The globalizing process stimulates the development of global leaders, which influence public policies, develop responsible private organizations, collaborate with international institutions for social change, and act responsibly in socially and economically unstable contexts.</li> </ul>