TRADITIONAL AND POSITIVE MENTAL MAPS FOR LATIN AMERICAN LEADERSHIP: ADAPTING QUINN'S MODEL TO THE LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT

MAPAS MENTALES TRADICIONALES Y POSITIVOS PARA EL LIDERAZGO LATINOAMERICANO: ADAPTANDO EL MODELO DE QUINN AL CONTEXTO LATINOAMERICANO

Jeffrey L. McClellan
Frostburg State University, EEUU
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2032-1720
jlmcclellan@frostburg.edu

Abstract

As external models of leadership — commonly used in Latin America — are not always culturally relevant to the region, this article explores how Robert Quinn's (2015) traditional and positive mental maps for organizational leadership can be adapted for use in the Latin American context. Quinn's model is outlined and discussed and is followed by an exploration of the cultural differences between the U.S. and Latin America that would require adaptation. The author then reviews the research on traditional and alternative approaches to leadership in Latin America and proposes alternative mental maps for the region.

Keywords: Leadership, Latin America, Positive Leadership, Leadership Paradigms.

Resumen

Dado que los modelos externos de liderazgo, comúnmente utilizados en América Latina, no siempre son culturalmente relevantes para la región, este artículo explora cómo los mapas mentales tradicionales y positivos de Robert Quinn (2015) para el liderazgo organizacional pueden adaptarse para su uso en el contexto latinoamericano. El modelo de Quinn se describe y analiza, seguido de una exploración de las diferencias culturales entre los EE. UU. y América Latina que producen la necesidad de adaptación. Luego, el autor revisa la investigación sobre enfoques tradicionales y alternativos del liderazgo en América Latina y propone mapas mentales alternativos para la región.

Palabras clave: Liderazgo, Latinoamérica, Liderazgo Positivo, Paradigmas de Liderazgo.

1. Introduction

Latin American leadership demonstrates a historic pattern of caudillo-style leadership (Coleman, 2006; Hamill, 1992). This style is largely rooted in the unique historical heritage of the region derived from the imposition of Spanish leadership cultural approaches onto indigenous traditions and the unique historic trajectory of each of the nations within the region (Burns & Charlip, 2002; Cervantes, 2021; Chasteen, 2016; Reid, 2007). As a result, the culture of the region has come to demonstrate higher levels of in-group collectivism, high power distance, paternalism, and authoritarian decision-making (Castaño et al., 2015). Combined with historic tendencies towards leaders demonstrating self-serving behavior, limited effectiveness, cultural differences, and corruption (De la Torre, 2007; Grant, 2021; Kryzanek, 1992; Salzman, 2015), this has caused the concept of leadership and its associated paradigms to be portrayed negatively to a great extent. Consequently, some have looked to the outside world for alternative models and approaches to leadership (Irving & McIntosh, 2010; Romero, 2004). Unfortunately, many such models are idealistic, normative, and prescriptive as opposed to being descriptive approaches (McChrystal et al., 2018; Mendenhall, 2018), meaning that they impose culturally derived and largely idealistic ideologies regarding how one should lead on other cultures. Some have even suggested these models are mythical (Bennis, 1999). Furthermore, as they are generally rooted in cultural values and approaches from a western, often masculine American cultural foundation (Laloo, 2022), they are foreign and not necessarily appropriate to the context of Latin America. Consequently, they represent a potential form of cultural imperialism (Blunt & Merrick, 1997). An alternative approach for seeking new models of leadership would be to look within the cultural context for leaders who manifest alternative styles (Behrens, 2010). This article examines what such alternative models might look like by using the bilingual framework developed by Robert Quinn (2015) and adapting it to the Latin American context based on a review of literature examining alternative approaches to leadership within the Latin American context.

2. Quinn's Framework

In Positive Organizational Leadership, Quinn (2015) suggests that effective leaders demonstrate a capacity to navigate between two different leadership paradigms.

As he explains, "Supervisors, managers, and executives have a mental map that guides their choices and actions" (p. 50). This paradigm determines how they view and respond in organizational contexts. Most possess what he calls the "traditional mental map," which emerged from within a US-centric paradigm characterized by a perception of organizations as pyramidal hierarchies of authority where information is tightly controlled and shared on a need-to-know basis. Leadership is based on a military model where influence comes from formal positional authority and involves directing others who are expected to obey. Leaders are viewed as being either task- or relationship -focused, with the latter generally considered friendly but ineffective. Motivation of followers comes from instruction followed by rewards and punishment. Privileges, respect, and honors are provided to those in higher status roles. Change always comes from the top and people are generally seen as self-protective followers who must be controlled and tightly managed to incentivize performance.

This traditional paradigm likely emerged from the industrial model of organizations and leadership with its exploitative approach to productivity and management that largely shaped the early development of organizational life in the US (Covey, 1989; Rost, 1991). Today's service and information economy, however, has given rise to an alternative paradigm of organizational life and leadership that Quinn (2015) suggested is better suited to the creation of more effective positive organizational environments. This paradigm views organizations as networks of relationships where information should flow liberally and transparently to everyone to increase trust and engagement. Leadership is more about influence, as opposed to authority or position, and occurs at all levels of the organization. Leaders are both task- and person -focused consistent with models of leadership such as adaptive (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002), transformational (Bass & Riggio, 2006), and servant leadership (Greenleaf, 2002). Motivation comes from commitment to a shared purpose with inspiration derived from the alignment of personal and organizational goals and intrinsic rewards that flow from participation in the creative and meaningful work of the organization. Status is largely based on relationships as opposed to positions, and people are valued for their humanity and potential. Ideas for change can come from anyone and be propagated, implemented, and guided by people across all levels of the organization. People are viewed as "engaged contributors."

According to Quinn (2015), leaders who only operate from within the traditional paradigm are "simple minded" (p. 30). They only possess a one-dimensional view of the world of organizations. That view, like speaking a single language, limits their perspective and understanding. In contrast, those who develop and use both mental maps, like those who learn a second language, broaden their worldview, and expand their tools of influence. As he explained, "with the first map, you are able to manage and probably even get to where you need to go, but with both maps, you have options that will make your organization more effective" (p. 30). Such leaders can think and respond in complex ways and produce positive and engaging work environments within the cultural context like that of the United States. However, these paradigms, while potentially powerful in the US context, may not be relevant to the cultural context of Latin America because of cultural differences. Consequently, these maps would require cultural adjustment to be useful in Latin America.

3. Culture in the US and Latin America

The United States and Latin America represent distinct historical and cultural environments (Behrens, 2009). Unlike the US, which experienced two major periods

of industrialization in the late 1800s and mid 1900s that shifted the economy away from agriculture to manufacturing and ultimately towards information and service, Latin America did not experience such significant, punctuated industrial transitions (Burns & Charlip, 2002; Chasteen, 2016; Reid, 2007). Furthermore, the US culture primarily emerged from the influences of northern European nations whose cultural background and experiences in the United States shaped their more individualistic, self-interest-oriented tendencies and efficiency oriented, practical action orientation (Hoppe & Bhagat, 2008); Latin America, however, was settled by Catholic Spaniards whose dominant paradigm was one of wealthy land ownership and exploitative control of others' labor that resulted in a leisure class who dominated and controlled society to maintain their status and privilege (Behrens, 2009; Cervantes, 2021). Guided by a set of ideals that included dignity, leisure, grandeur, generosity, machismo, and deception (Dealy, 1992), Latin America emerged as a society characterized by in-group collectivism, low trust, high power distance, significant corruption and exploitation, low respect for the rule of law, an emphasis on family-run businesses with paternalistic styles of leadership, political instability characterized by disloyal opposition, and exploitative and often corrupt leadership frequently challenged by riotous responses from followers and military interventions (Burkholder & Johnson, 1998; Castano et al., 2013; Chasteen, 2016; Hidalgo, 2012; House et al., 2004; Osland et al., 1999; Romero, 2004; Spillan et al., 2014). These cultural characteristics are very different from those of the US where corruption and exploitation are no less abundant, but have taken different forms and whose culture emphasizes, but does not always honor, individual rights. Additionally, there is a strong tendency towards domination and oppression through legal control and enforcement, an emphasis on large corporations, command and control leadership, lower power distance, and a belief in the capacity to make one's own fortune through hard work and entrepreneurial effort (Hoppe & Bhagat, 2008; Takaki, 2008). Consequently, both the traditional and positive leadership paradigms in Latin America are likely to be very different from those outlined by Quinn (2015).

4. The Traditional Paradigm in Latin America

Whereas the traditional leadership paradigm in the US was forged throughout its history and largely emerged from the command-and-control models that arose during the Industrial Revolution and the post-war era of military personnel transitioning to civilian jobs, the prevailing paradigm for leadership in Latin America arose from the indigenous caciques, conquistadors, and landed gentry approaches that dominated the political and economic environment of the region (Davila & Elvira, 2012; Hoppe & Bhagat, 2008; Kryzanek, 1992; McClellan, 2016; McIntosh, 2011). These forms of strongman leadership were characterized by high power distance and hierarchical, authoritarian, paternalistic leadership (Castaño et al., 2015; Osland et al., 1999). The leader-follower relationship was perceived as a parent-child correlation, characterized by absolute obedience by the child and caretaking by the parent. Within this relationship, access to and control of information were viewed as forms of power which one had to maintain and protect (Romero, 2004) and consequently, were guarded carefully and shared reluctantly. People who needed information remained dependent on their paternalistic benefactor/leader who was both concerned with the tasks related to providing for their own wants and the maintenance of dependent paternalistic relationships. Leadership, consequently, meant having total power over others combined with some responsibility for their well-being, though not necessarily with the moral element common in Eastern Paternalistic leadership cultures or those

of many indigenous groups in Latin America (Irawanto et al., 2013; MacQuarrie, 2007; Salomon, 1986). A charismatic and generous persona, tempered by fierce reprisals against disloyal followers, was necessary. Followers were seen as dutiful children who were motivated by a combination of fear and loyalty resultant from dependency and power. This traditional paradigm has been widely documented in the literature (Behrens, 2010; Castano et al., 2013; Dealy, 1992; Hidalgo, 2012; McClellan, 2022; Osland et al., 1999; Romero, 2004).

While these dominant trends appear to characterize leadership in Latin America, there is evidence that differences in leadership do exist across countries in the region based on national and regional differences in culture (Chhokar et al., 2007; House et al., 2004). For example, Hofstede (1980) found that while power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism were universally high in Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Peru, masculinity scores varied. Brazil, Peru, and Chile, were low in masculinity (on the feminine side) with Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Argentina scoring higher. In the Globe study (House et al, 2004), Bolivia and Costa Rica were perceived to be much lower than most of Latin America in relation to the practice of power distance even though Bolivia valued power distance at higher levels. Other differences emerged but were not as significant. Mexico was the highest in the region in the perceived practice of uncertainty avoidance and institutional collectivism. Ecuador was highest in ingroup collectivism, performance orientation, and humane orientation, while Costa Rica was found to be the highest in power distance. El Salvador led the region in assertiveness and Columbia was at the top in gender egalitarianism. The Globe study also identified differences in leadership ideals between Argentina, Mexico, and Colombia, with Mexico and Colombia demonstrating more similarities in terms of human orientation, directive leadership, negotiation, and conflict management behaviors and Argentina placing more emphasis on power, independence, commitment, and involvement (Castaño et al., 2015; Chhokar et al., 2007)

Additional research studies have found that leadership also differs across the region in terms of emotional intelligence (Zarate & Matviuk, 2012), preferences for authoritarian, persuasive, and consultative styles and behavioral traits (Osland et al., 1998), supportive leadership and team cohesion (Wendt et al., 2009), managerial values (Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002), willingness to rely on subordinates (Vliert & Smith, 2004), and leadership values (Lenartowiczs & Johnson, 2003). Castaño et al. (2015) conducted a comprehensive review of the literature and an in-depth examination of the GLOBE research on preferred leadership styles based on implicit leadership theory data to determine what is different and similar across the region. They found that Latin America is collectively characterized by a preference for a style of benevolent paternalistic leadership, characterized by autocratic decision-making, that involves being a group-oriented, collaborative integrator and administrator. In contrast, followers universally consider leaders who are cynical, vindictive, hostile, dishonest, and indirect as ineffective. At the same time, the following traits and behaviors proved to be valued differently, meaning some valued them more and others valued them less than the mean, across the different countries within the region: intra-group conflict avoider, worldly, domineering, intra-group competitor, willful, self-effacing, habitual, risk taker, class conscious, evasive, autonomous, cunning, micro manager, and provocateur.

It is worth noting that these desirable traits and behaviors of leaders do not necessarily match the reality of leadership in the region, but rather what is viewed as positive and negative among leaders in the region. For example, whereas Ecuador

shares this preference for benevolent paternalism in leadership, there is evidence that in some leadership contexts, the autocratic, but less supportive approach is still common (Vidal et al., 2017), while other contexts are more consistent with these ideals (Ordoñez et al., 2017). This supports the idea that differences in styles exist within cultures, as well as across cultures. In another Ecuadorian study, Espinoza-Solis and Elgoibar (2019) found 5 distinct styles of leadership based on leaders' tendencies to place different amounts of emphasis on transformational, transactional, and passive approaches. They also found that women and more educated people tended to exhibit more transformational leadership as part of their style. So, while the traditional paradigm does appear to continue to influence leadership mental models and practices in the region, just as is the case in the United States, differences do exist across nations and within nations throughout Latin America. These differences represent a rich source of information for developing "positive" mental map for leadership in Latin America.

5. Alternative Models of Leadership

As the literature suggests, there is evidence that traditional paradigms and practices of leadership are changing because of a variety of factors including the increased involvement of women and other groups in leadership positions, the widening globalization of societies, the influence of western managerial and leadership ideas, and overall changing values, (Chhokar et al., 2007; House et al., 2004; Romero, 2004). For example, in their review of the literature, Castaño et al. (2015) found that while paternalism is still the dominant approach to leadership, there is a move away from acceptance of more self-centered, domineering paternalism to a desire for an approach that demonstrates more reciprocity and genuine caring. Consequently, a variety of alternative leadership models has been explored in the literature in recent years. One such example of a successful alternative leadership approach is demonstrated by Ricardo Semler in Brazil (Semler, 1993).

Semler (1993), after inheriting his family business, ultimately reorganized it as a highly democratic workplace characterized by collective decision-making, self-organizing teams, high levels of information sharing, autonomous decision-making (people even established their own salaries), the elimination of hierarchical structures, privileges, and symbols, and the removal of leadership by individuals. He even removed himself as the head of the organization and took a government position where he implemented similar changes. These changes strengthened Semco, and it remains a high performing organization today. While Semler's unique approach to leadership is interesting, more formal research exploring alternative approaches to leadership in the region has been advanced.

Osland et al. (1998) specifically examined differences in how female managers approached leadership in Nicaragua and Costa Rica. They found that, in general, these women viewed male leaders as more "autocratic, impersonal, cold, abrupt, and less accessible" (p. 63) and as manifesting an approach to leadership more consistent with the traditional paradigm of leadership in Latin America. In contrast, they saw themselves as "more understanding and concerned about employees, relationship oriented, participative, communicative, flexible, and more likely than men to use positive motivation, teamwork, and a coaching style" (p. 63).

Muller and Rowell (1997) developed a managerial style profile for women managers in Mexico. This profile included encouraging open communication, nonabrasive problem solving, strong sense of self-esteem, support of employees personal as well

as professional problems, delegating and organizing work, and prioritizing staff development.

In a review of the literature on female leaders in Latin America, Bown and McClellan (2017) suggested that the motives, goals, behaviors, and practices of such leaders demonstrated both differences and similarities to the traditional caudillo-style of governance. The motives of many female leaders appeared to be more centered on the well-being of others as opposed to being wholly predicated on power and status. Their goals were more indicative of follower growth, relationship development, and organizational goal achievement instead of the acquisition and retention of power as well as the purely paternalistic care of followers. Finally, their behaviors focused more on encouraging open communication, nonabrasive problem solving, delegation, organization, use of teams, coaching, and applying consultative and persuasive styles (p. 15), even though paternalistic behaviors were concomitantly displayed.

Bown and McClellan's (2017) primary focus, however, was on exploring the leadership culture of indigenous women in the Ecuadorian Andes. Bown's interviews with female indigenous leaders revealed leadership motives derived from encouragement and support from spouses and other community members, resulting in a commitment to collective relationships and community, a perceived calling to effect change, a desire to achieve outcomes that benefited their community, and to honor and remember predecessors and past leaders. Their goals also emphasized group harmony, social change, people-serving problem solving, egalitarian objectives, empowering social relationships, and proving their viability as women leaders. In terms of behaviors, they tended to practice trust building, motivation through conversation, promoting involvement and ownership, the use of truque and prestamanos [exchange of goods and labor], leadership by example, mentoring, coaching, celebrating cultural rituals, and collaborative problem-solving and work within families and the community (p. 16).

The Globe study (House et al., 2004) also suggested some additional changes in the values that underlie implicit leadership within Latin America. Whereas the values at the time of the study seemed to suggest support for the traditional emphasis on autocratic, face-saving, self-centered, bureaucratic leadership, it also indicated a growing preference for visionary, participative, self-sacrificing, collaborative, performance-oriented, and administratively competent leadership.

Another recent study explored the approach to leadership of the Ecuadorian Nobel Peace Prize Nominee, Leonidas Proano. Using a qualitative approach, McClellan (2023) reviewed the speeches and other writings concerning Bishop Proano and described his leadership way of being, thinking, and acting. In terms of his way of being, McClellan found that Proano advocated for leaders who were motivated by loving kindness, and were service- oriented, courageous, and imbued with a strong sense of purpose, commitment, and engagement. These were founded on a set of core values that included truth, justice, liberty, community, fraternity, and peace. Finally, Proano suggested leaders motivate and inspire others with a positive joyful attitude.

Regarding his way of thinking, McClellan (2023) suggested that Proano advocated for leaders to pursue purposeful social change and increased justice as part of an effort to transform society from exploitative to peaceful. The process for doing this involved seeking awareness through direct experience of the reality of the other(s) one wishes to serve, dialogical interaction to promote empathic understanding and strategic action, and collective organizing to create change. This involved developing and demonstrating the following leadership competencies: grounding oneself, building relationships, reflecting, establishing a vision, participating in and facilitating

dialogue, speaking effectively, committing to action, organizing on active, peaceful, communitarian principles, and making space for others as leaders.

Finally, (Bordas, 2007, 2013, 2016) examined how Latino leaders within the US expressed their culturally based approaches to leadership. What she found reflected many of the elements of leadership exhibited by Caudillo style leaders. However, she largely reframed such elements and focused on positive manifestations of these cultural tendencies. She identified ten principles of Latino leadership which consist of personalism (personalismo), conscience (consciencia), destiny (destino), culture (la cultura), "of all colors"/celebration of all, (de colores), collectivism (juntos), forward-looking (adelante), "yes we can" mentality (si se puede), the enjoyment of life (gozar la vida), and faith and hope (fe y esperanza). These principles imply an approach to leadership based on greater authenticity, trust, relationships, participation and collective action, inclusion, self-awareness, purposeful service, vision and unity, resilience, passion, joy, and celebration. Thus, she implied, Latin American cultural values can contribute to leadership behaviors in positive ways. Reviewing this body of alternative models reflects a variety of approaches that nonetheless have some things in common as they relate to Quinn's (2015) framework. A summary of the perspectives gleaned from a content analysis of these articles as they relate to the paradigm framework is included in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Paradigms of Alternative Approaches to Leadership

	Semler (1993)	Osland et al. (1998)	Muller and Rowell (1997)	Bown and McClellan (2017)	(McClellan, 2023)	Bordas (2016)
Organization	Organizations should fulfill human needs		Organizations accomplish goals and support people	Organizations accomplish goals, help others, and benefit community	Organizations should liberate people	Organizations serve the communities' needs
Information	Shared and transparent	Communicate openly	Encourage open communication	Open communication	Generated and shared through dialogue	Shared
Leadership	Generally shared by individuals within team structures	Relationship oriented	People oriented, relational, share power, partici-pative	Collaborative and relational	Shared, em-powering, and communitarian	Relational and shared
Leadership Style	Facilitative and democratic	Coaching style	Interactive, connective, empowering	Lead by example, dialogue, coaching	Facilitative and visionary with democratic organizing.	Personal, forward looking, positive, hopeful, and collectivist

Motivation	Contribute to people's lives	Concern for employees' problems and welfare	Concern for people	Commitment to community and serving others	Liberate people by changing structure of society	Change for betterment of the community
Status	Egalitarian	Treats people equally	Seeks to lessen status differences, respect individuals	Egalitarian and inclusive	Egalitarian and inclusive	Egalitarian and inclusive
Change	Change is driven by people throughout the organiza-tion			Change is driven by community needs and pursued collaboratively	Change should be driven by needs and led by the people or facilitated by leaders	Change is collectivist
People	Are generally good, honest, and fair	Positive view of people	Believe in people and their capacity		People, with God's influence, are good	

6. The Positive Paradigm in Latin America

These models suggest an alternative positive paradigm to that of Quinn, based on the actual approaches of Latin American leaders. This alternative paradigm is characterized - in contrast with the traditional Latin American paradigm - as organized on communitarian principles with a focus on collective service and wellbeing as opposed to organization predicated upon a paternalistic hierarchy. This approach is rooted in the indigenous traditions of the region and reflected in the way many communities are currently organized (Bellini, 2009; Davila & Elvira, 2012; Lyons, 2006; McClellan, 2017). This approach reflects a positive approach to organizing more consistently with the collectivist, communitarian culture of Latin America, as opposed to the more individualist culture of the United States (Hofstede, 2001).

Information dissemination and the infusion of meaning into actions are generated and shared through interpersonal and group dialogical processes. This was a major factor in the approach of Proano and many female leaders, and was reflected in the democratic, teams-based approach of Semler. Leadership is focused on identifying collective needs and organizing the community to meet these needs with a leadership style based on interpersonal relationship building and meaning making, combined with collective organizing. Once again, this approach is very much indicative of the collectivist values of the region. However, the diminished emphasis on hierarchical authority likely results from philosophical trends associated with the ideas of Paulo Freire (1998), who influenced Proano's thinking (Bellini, 2009), religious philosophical ideas (JOC Internationale, 1965; Sands, 2018), syncretic integration of humanistic management theories (Romero, 2004), and uniquely Latin American communist influences (Becker, 2008).

Individual leaders' motivation for and motivation while leading are perceived as being grounded in the pursuit of community well-being and commitment to the people. While their leadership might grant them some level of elevated status, this would likely be used to serve the community and facilitate community processes. Followers would receive honor, respect, and support in exchange for their leadership

efforts. But this would not reflect an intense commitment to paternalism and power distance as in the traditional paradigm.

The positive Latin American paradigm suggests that change occurs as leaders dialogue with individuals to identify needs and then organize people to bring about changes that respond to those needs. Followers are viewed as members of the community who participate in the process of understanding and responding to each other's needs and those of the collective. As such, they do not passively follow powerful and paternalistic leaders, but rather actively participate in collective change processes and ultimately come to lead them. Based on this summary, Figure 2 identifies how these elements of a positive Latin American mental map compare and contrast with a conventional Latin American mental map, as well as the United States-based maps outlined by Quinn (2015).

Figure 2. Comparison of Conventional and Positive Mental Maps in the United States (US) and Latin America (LA)

	Conventional Mental Map- US	Positive Mental Map- US	Conventional Mental Map- LA	Positive Mental Map- LA
Organization	The organization is a pyramid; a hierarchy of positions	The organization is a network of relationships	The organization is a pyramid of patriarchal relation-ships	The organization exists to serve the needs of the people and the community
Information	Information flows to those who need to know	Information flows liberally, greatly enhancing possibility and capacity	Access to information is a form of power that is held tightly	Information is generated and shared dialogically
Leadership	Leadership means a position of authority and directing others	Leadership means influence, regardless of authority or position	Leadership means having total power over others and influencing with charisma	Leadership means identifying people's needs and organizing to meet them
Leadership Style	Leaders are either task focused, or person focused	Leaders can be both task focused and person focused	Leaders demonstrate paternalistic leadership with a focus on task and relationship	Leadership means facilitating, dialoguing, and coaching with the others to bring change
Motivation	Motivation follows instruction, rewards, and punishments	Motivation follows purpose, inspiration, and intrinsic rewards	Motivation follows fear, loyalty, and dependency	Motivation follows the pursuit of community well-being

Status	People get privileges based on status categories	People are valued regardless of their status category	High status people get special privileges and do not have to work or abide by social/legal norms	Egalitarian and Inclusive
Change	Change is conceived at the top and is driven down the sys-tem	Change may emerge and/or be driven from anywhere in the organization	Change is conceived at the top and driven down the system	Change is driven through dialogue and collective action facilitated by leaders
People	Self-protective followers	Engaged Contributors	Children dutifully, if not fearfully, following parents	Members of a community who work together to meet needs

7. Implications for Practice in Business Leadership

As explained previously, Quinn's (2015) model suggests that to be effective, leaders need to be able to function within the traditional leadership culture in the US while concomitantly recognizing when and how to adapt their leadership to emerging cultural values to both align with and lead change relative to leadership culture. This bilingual approach (though also a model external to the region) is highly relevant in Latin America where the research suggests that leadership values are in transition (Hidalgo, 2012; Romero, 2004). Consequently, leaders who wish to use this model might consider the following approach. Begin by establishing credibility by initially acting in ways that are consistent with the traditional paradigm. Research suggests that "behavior that is reflective of collective values will be more acceptable" to followers within a given cultural context (Mustafa, 2015, p. 1).

This is what Semler did at Semco. He initially used a very hierarchical approach to establish the vison for and drive democratic change in the organization (Semler, 1993). This might initially involve leading the change in leadership culture from the top down through the structure of the organization by bringing upper-level leaders on board first to model collective behaviors and approaches and then cascading change through the organization. As a leader is establishing this clear sense of direction for the organization, it would also be important to demonstrate authentic, paternalistic concern for followers. Thus, the leader would likely benefit from seeking input from members of the organization in large group meetings regarding their needs and concerns and engaging in initial symbolic and practical activities to demonstrate a greater commitment and responsiveness to these. This would be done in an effort to foreshadow deeper efforts to dialogue and organize throughout the organization in ways consistent with the positive paradigm.

As this large-scale organizational action is taking place, the leader would likely need to begin shifting the approach to leadership within the executive team to a more dialogical approach by discussing the needs, challenges, and goals of key stakeholders

and then prompting them to reflect upon how well the organization is currently responding to such concerns. This would potentially involve these leaders entering into similar conversations with their own subordinates in order to raise awareness. These dialogues would likely follow the model laid out by Proano of empathically entering the experience of one's followers and other stakeholders to comprehend more accurately their reality (Bellini, 2009).

At first, there may be some reluctance to engage in this way, especially if leaders are unwilling to connect with and enter into their follower's reality. For Proano, doing so meant literally entering into the world of the indigenous poor and striving to experience their challenges in authentic ways that built trust. Once this trust is established, the leader would then dialogue with the followers regarding the issues they face, the visions they wish to realize, and their ideas about how to accomplish them. Then the leaders would organize the followers into collective communities of action and provide them with the resources and support they need to achieve their visions, goals, and plans through processes of collective learning. As the process unfolds, the approach would have to shift from the top-down, paternalistic approach to a more communitarian organizing approach that is consistent with values-based networking leadership that emphasizes a collaborative learning process (Stricker et al., 2018). However, this would likely need to be done in ways that are consistent with cultural norms and values as opposed to just being based on external models and approaches.

Obviously, within an organizational context, this must all be subject to the mission and priorities of the organization, which is where the balance between the traditional and positive mental maps becomes important. Leaders need to ensure that the organization is achieving its organizational mission within the hierarchy of the organization. Followers cannot simply organize to achieve their own priorities. Thus, the leader will likely need to use their authority to ensure that all stakeholders are participating in the dialogical processes to which collective organizing is directed while ensuring responsiveness to these needs. As this is done, leaders would be best to look to models of leadership practices, such as those outlined above, for guidance while engaging in their own reflective action-oriented efforts to adapt these approaches to their own organizational realities through collective learning processes (Stricker, et al. 2018). In this way, they can not only draw on relevant internal models, but can also develop new ones through their own efforts.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, there is much to be gained from studying alternative approaches within the context of Latin America and then using these to develop and leverage culturally situated paradigms to guide leadership and managerial practice within the region. The nations of Latin America, though each unique in many aspects of their history and culture, share many common cultural characteristics and traditions in relation to leadership paradigms and practices. However, these paradigms are changing and shifting, and alternative models of leadership are being examined from within the region. These alternative models represent a source of viable leadership thinking that is not dependent on the acceptance and use of leadership models developed within a cultural context from outside the region. Thus, they avoid the risks of cultural colonialism.

Applying the traditional and alternative models of leadership derived from the

literature on Leadership in Latin America and applying these to Quinn's for traditional and positive paradigms framework for leadership, this article has conceptualized what such paradigms of leadership might look like within the cultural context of Latin America. These paradigms provide guidance regarding alternative ways of thinking and acting in leadership that may be employed to strengthen leadership effectiveness within the region. However, the paradigms and models addressed in this article do not represent a conclusion regarding what these paradigms could or should look like. Instead, they represent a starting point. Much more work is needed. While there are similarities across Latin America, there are also significant differences. Furthermore, there are many more alternative approaches to leadership likely being practiced across the vast and varied physical and cultural geography of the region that, if examined, would have much to offer as culturally situated and relevant guidance on effective leadership. It is hoped that this article will encourage further internal exploration and, perhaps, less emphasis on research regarding and use of externally derived models. Latin America is a rich field of exploration for the discovery and creation of leadership paradigms, models, and practices.

Confidentiality and privacy statement

No names have been used to identify individuals in this article. All content and figures are original to this work with sources cited where other's work has been used.

Declaration of conflict of interest

There are no conflicts of interest associated with this work.

References

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). L. Erlbaum Associates.

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

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

Behrens, A. (2010). Charisma, paternalism, and business leadership in Latin America. *Thunderbird International Business review,* 52(1), 21-29. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.20307

Bellini, P. L. (Ed.). (2009). *Palabras de liberacion: Discursos y homilias de Monsenor Leonidas Proano* 1985-1987. ABYA-YALA.

Bennis, W. (1999). The end of leadership: Exemplary leadership is impossible without full inclusion, initiatives, and cooperation of followers. *Organizational Dynamics,* 28(1), 71-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)80008-X

Blunt, P., & Merrick, L. J. (1997). Exploring the limits of western leadership theory in East Asia and Africa. *Personnel Review,* 26(1/2), 6-23. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483489710157760

Bordas, J. (2007). *Salsa, soul, and spirit: Leadership for a multicultural age* (1st ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Bordas, J. (2013). *The power of latino leadership: Culture, inclusion, and contribution.* Berrett-Koehler.

Bordas, J. (2016). Leadership lessons from communities of color: Stewardship and collective action. In K. L. Guthrie, T. B. Jones, & L. Osteen (Eds.), *Developing culturally intelligent leadership* (Vol. 152, pp. 60-74). Jossey Bass.

Bown, C., & McClellan, J. L. (2017). Culturally situated leadership in the Ecuadorian Andes. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 11(3), 6-20. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21532

Burkholder, M. A., & Johnson, L. l. (1998). *Colonial Latin America* (3 ed.). Oxford University Press.

Burns, E. B., & Charlip, J. A. (2002). *Latin America: A concise interpretive history* (7 ed.). Prentice Hall.

Castano, N., de Luque, M. S., Wernsing, T., Ogliastri, E., Gabel, R., Robles-Flores, J. A., & Fuchs, R. M. (2013). Leadership in Latin America: Insights into complexities across societies BALAS Annual Conference, Universidad ESAN, Lima, Peru. http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p639350_index.html

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 [Article]. Journal of World Business, 50(3), 584-597. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2014.12.002

Cervantes, F. (2021). Conquistadores: A new history of Spanish discovery and conquest (First North American edition. ed.). Viking.

Chasteen, J. C. (2016). Born in blood & fire: A concise history of Latin America (Fourth edition. ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.

Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F. C., & House, R. J. (Eds.). (2007). Culture and leadership across the world: The globe book of in-depth studies of 25 societies. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coleman, R. S. (2006). From caudillo to collaborative leader: A culturally influenced derailment in emergent leadership in an Ecuadorian denomination [Dissertation, Asbury Theological Seminary]. Wilmore, KY.

Covey, S. R. (1989). The seven habits of highly effective people. Simon and Schuster.

Davila, A., & Elvira, M. M. (2012). Humanistic leadership: Lessons from Latin America. Journal of World Business, 47, 548-554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.008

De la Torre, C. (2007). The resurgence of radical populism in Latin America. Constellations, 14(3), 384-397. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8675.2007.00453.x

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

Espinoza-Solis, E., & Elgoibar, P. (2019). Leadership patterns in Ecuadorian managers: The impact of gender and education. Revista Inclusiones, 6(Especial), 178-197. https://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/2445/145399

Friere, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage (P. Clarke, Trans.). Rowman & Littlefield.

Grant, W. (2021). ¡Populista!: The rise of Latin America's 21st century strongman. Head of Zeus Ltd.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness (25th Anniversary ed.). Paulist Press.

Hamill, H. M. (Ed.). (1992). Caudillos: Dictators in Spanish America. University of Oklahoma Press.

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading. Harvard Business School Press.

Hidalgo, J. S. (2012). Latin America: In search of collaborative approaches to leadership. In H. Owen (Ed.), *New thinking on leadership: A global perspective* (pp. 101-110). Kogan Page.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics,* 9(1), 42-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(80)90013-3

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations.* Sage Publicatios.

Hoppe, M. H., & Bhagat, R. S. (2008). Leadership in the United States of America: The leader as cultural hero. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck, & R. J. House. (Eds.), *Culture and leadership across the world* (pp. 475-544). New York.

House et al., Robert J. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The globe study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications.

Irawanto, D. W., Ramsey, P. L., & Tweed, D. M. (2013). The paternalistic relationship: Authenticity and credibility as a source of healthy relationships. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership,* 6(1), 1-11. https://scholar.valpo.edu/jvbl/vol6/iss1/5

Irving, J., & McIntosh, T. (2010). Investigating the value and hindrance to servant leadership in the Latin American context: Initial findings from peruvian leaders. *Journal of Internaitonal Business and Cultural Studies,* 2(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1.1.1076.9847

JOC Internationale. (1965). *The enquiry method.* Retrieved July 27, 2022, from https://www.josephcardijn.com/en/item/2826

Kryzanek, J. S. (1992). *Leaders, leadership, and U.S. Policy in Latin America*. Westview Press.

Laloo, E. (2022). Ubuntu leadership: An explication of an afrocentric leadership style. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership,* 15(2). https://doi.org/10.22543/1948-0733.1383

Lenartowicz, T., & Johnson, J. (2002). Comparing managerial values in twelve Latin American Countries: An exploratory study. *Management International Review,* 42, 279-307. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40835925

Lenartowiczs, T., & Johnson, J. (2003). A cross-national assessment of the Latin America values managers: Contrasting hues shades of gray. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 34, 266-281. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400032

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

MacQuarrie, K. (2007). *The last days of the Incas*. Simon & Schuster.

McChrystal, S. A., Eggers, J., & Mangone, J. (2018). *Leaders: Myth and reality*. Portfolio/Penguin,.

McClellan, J. (2022). Post pandemic leadership in Latin America: Responding to wicked problems using adaptive leadership in organizational contexts. *Estudios de Administración,* 29(1), 52-65. https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-0816.2022.65372

McClellan, J. L. (2016). Exploring the cultural foundations of leadership in Ecuador. *Journal of International Business Disciplines,* 11(1), 20-35. https://doi.org/10.4337/lath.2017.01.01

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

McClellan, J. L. (2023). Modeling the leadership of Leonidas Proaño: An alternative model to the traditional caudillo style of leadership in Latin America. *International Leadership Journal*, 15(1), 3-34. http://internationalleadershipjournal.com/

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

Mendenhall, M. E. (2018). Leadership and the birth of global leadership. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. S. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, M. J. Stevens, M. L. Maznevski, & G. K. Stahl (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development* (3 ed., pp. 3-27). Routledge.

Muller, H. J., & Rowell, M. (1997). Mexican women managers: An emerging profile. *Human Resource Management,* 36(4), 423-435. https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1998.11656734

Mustafa, G. (2015). The emergence of leader-society value congruence: A cross-cultural perspective. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership,* 8(2), 1-20. https://scholar.valpo.edu/jvbl/vol8/iss2/5

Ordoñez, M. U., Bustamante, M. A., & Campo, R. M. (2017). Factores de liderazgo en la fiebre del oro en la region sur del Ecuador. *Informacion Technologica,* 28(3), 147-156. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07642017000300016

Osland, J. S., Franco, S. D., & Osland, A. (1999). Organizational implications of Latin American culture: Lessons for the expatriate manager. *Journal of Management Inquiry,* 8(2), 219-234. https://doi.org/10.1177/105649269982018

Osland, J. S., Snyder, M. M., & Hunter, L. H. (1998). A comparative study of managerial styles among female executives in Nicaragua and Costa rica. *International Studies of Management and Organizations,* 28(2), 54-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/0020882 5.1998.11656734

Quinn, R. E. (2015). *The positive organization: Breaking free from conventional cultures, constraints*, and beliefs (First Edition. ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Reid, M. (2007). *Forgotten continent : The battle for Latin America's soul.* Yale University Press.

Romero, E. (2004). Latin American leadership: El patron y el lider moderno. *Cross Cultural Management,* 11(3), 25-37. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527600410797828

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* Praeger.

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

Salzman, R. (2015). News media consumption and political behavior in Latin America. *Journal of Politics in Latin America,* 7(2), 71-98. https://doi. org/10.1177/1866802x1500700203

Sands, J. (2018). Introducing Cardinal Cardijn's see–judge–act as an interdisciplinary method to move theory into practice. *Religions,* 9, 129. https://doi.org/10.3390/ rel9040129

Semler, R. (1993). *Maverick: The success story behind the world's most unusual workplace.* Warner Books.

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

Stricker, A., Westhauer, T., Sheets, T., Hawkins-Scribner, T., Calongne, C., & Truman, B. (2018). Values-based network leadership in an interconnected world. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 11(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/1022543/0733.111.1210

Takaki, R. T. (2008). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America* (1st rev. ed.). Back Bay Books/Little, Brown, and Co.

Vidal, G. G., Campdesuner, R. P., Rodrıguez, A. S., & Vivar, R. M. (2017). Contingency theory to study leadership styles of small businesses owner-managers at Santo Domingo, Ecuador. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management,* 9, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979017743172

Vliert, E. V. d., & Smith, P. B. (2004). Leader reliance on subordinates across nations that differ in development and climate. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 15, 381-403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.008

Wendt, H., Euwema, M. C., & van Emmerik, I. J. H. (2009). Leadership and team cohesiveness across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 20, 358-370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.005

Zarate, R. A., & Matviuk, S. (2012). La inteligencia emocional de los lideres latino americanos: Comparacion entre Chile y Colombia. *REAL*, 1(1), 43-50. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/real/homevol1no1.htm