**Responsible Global Leadership: the anatomy and promise of an emerging field**

*Mark E. Mendenhall*

*Christof Miska*

*Günter K. Stahl*

This paper was published in the book *Responsible Global Leadership: Dilemmas, Paradoxes, and Opportunities.* Citation is:

Mendenhall, M.E., Miska, C., Stahl, G.K. (2020). Responsible global leadership: The anatomy and promise of an emerging field. In Mendenhall, M.E., Zilinskaite, M., Stahl, G.K., & Clapp-Smith, R (Eds.). Responsible global leadership: Dilemmas, paradoxes, and opportunities. London: Routledge: 221-232.

Responsible global leadership (RGL) is a nascent field that has emerged in response to 21st century challenges to institutions produced from the confluence of globalization, ongoing and rapid technological advances, major corporate scandals and collapses, world-wide terrorism, socio-political polarization within and between nations, and rapidly changing values across many societies. Another driver is the 'grand challenges' (George, Howard-Greenville, Joshi, & Tihanyi, 2016) facing humanity, such as those posed by climate change, resource depletion, poverty and hunger, restricted access to education, and growing economic insecurity. These problems are accompanied by increased pressure for corporations and their leaders to "contribute to the creation of economic and societal progress in a globally responsible and sustainable way" (GRLI, 2017: 3). The creation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure prosperity for all is a reflection of these developments. This initiative comes at a time when seismic changes in the international political landscape, the rise of anti-globalization sentiments around the globe, and other geopolitical crises pose new challenges for companies, particularly those operating in a global environment (Buckley, Doh, & Benischke, 2017; Horak, Farndale, Brannen, & Collings, 2018; Lenox & Chatterji, 2018).

In response to these challenges, RGL emerged predominantly from the intersection of three research domains: global, global leadership, and responsible leadership. The domain of global operates as the context for the other two domains which are content areas in the wider field of leadership. The purpose of this chapter is to chart the origin sources of RGL and to then discuss research questions that are most suited to be addressed by RGL scholars. We begin by tracing the origin domains of RGL: global, global leadership, and responsible leadership.

**"Global"**

Previous to the turn of the last century, whenever managerial issues dealt with the crossing of borders in any fashion, social scientists studied managers who moved from one country's culture to live and work in another country's culture and labeled this research context variously as "cross-national," "cross-cultural," "intercultural," or most commonly, "international." The first three terms remain in common use by scholars when studying phenomena within contexts wherein two cultures intersect. However, around the beginning of the 21st century the use of the term "international" has given way to the use of the term "global" (Bird & Mendenhall, 2016).

This shift in terminology occurred due to the onset and proliferation of processes associated with globalization in the 1990s, as executives and managers increasingly found themselves having to simultaneously interact with businesspeople and other stakeholders from multiple countries and concurrently lead initiatives across numerous economic, political, and cultural boundaries. The world of business had somehow become more complex and more wide-ranging in nature than before, so much so that the term "international" did not seem to reflect the reality of their experiences. Gradually, the term "global" became used both in the business world and in business schools to capture the context of the 21st century, one that is characterized by high volatility and increased complexity (Bird & Mendenhall, 2016).

While the terminology shifted, rigorous definitional work by scholars to capture the construct of "global" did not ensue; rather, they assumed a shared definition existed amongst them as to what "global" conceptually entailed, and thus there was no impetus for management scholars to pause and consider the question, “What does ‘global’ mean? What are its components and what are the dynamic processes of those components?”

The first set of scholars to attempt to define the construct were part of the International Organization Network’s (ION) initiative to translate findings from the international management literature for global managers. During the early stages of this research project, they realized that without a sophisticated understanding of the context they found themselves working in, that managers would be unable to apply the principles that the ION scholars were deriving from the international management literature. Additionally, it became clear to the ION scholars that they themselves held differing conceptions of the of what the construct of global entailed, and at the time (2002-2003) their attempts to gain definitional insights from the extant research proved futile. As a result, the ION team decided to engage in a collective theorizing process to develop a framework for the global construct. They determined that the concept of “global” and its sister appellation, “globalization” are in actuality terms used to reflect “complexity.” Their research project was published as a book in 2004, “The Blackwell Handbook of Global Management: A Guide to Managing Complexity,” (Lane, Maznevski, Mendenhall, & McNett, 2004) and its foundational premise was stated as follows:

> Rather than define globalization as the proportion of trade conducted across national borders, or by some other economic or social measure, we argue that globalization is a manifestation of complexity. Understand its complexity, and you will understand globalization. Understand the processes necessary to deal with complexity, and you will understand what is necessary to globalize an organization. (Lane, Maznevski & Mendenhall, 2004: 4)

Complexity was theorized as being constituted of three interrelated conditions (multiplicity, interdependence, and ambiguity) that are in a constant state of flux. Multiplicity reflects the condition of corporations having to "face many different models for organizing and conducting business" and having to "deal with more organizations, governments, and people" (Lane, et. al., 2004: 9). In other words, operating globally requires not just dealing with more stakeholders but with more stakeholders that also differ fundamentally in terms of mindset, values, culture, and business paradigm. Thus, there is a multiplicity of competitors, customers, governments, NGOs, and also multiplicity within value chain processes (Lane, et. al., 2004).

Interdependence reflects the "easy movement of capital, information, and people" with the result that "distributed units are no longer isolated" (Lane, et. al., 2004: 9). This state of affairs also leads to a necessary increase in interdependent operations that are external to the corporation (i.e., joint-ventures, alliances, outsourcing, within value chain processes, etc.). Further, with heightened sophistication of technology comes the condition of ambiguity, which comes from executives having a plethora of information available to them while at the same time lacking the requisite tools to interpret the meaning of the information/data. Thus, "ambiguity involves not being able to understand and interpret … data in a way that guides action effectively" (Lane, et. al., 2004: 14) which creates a lack of information clarity, equivocality (where it is possible to interpret the same data in different ways), and confusion and uncertainty in ascertaining cause-effect relationships (Lane, et. al., 2004).

The three conditions (multiplicity, interdependence, and ambiguity), are theorized to be interrelated and mutually causal in a nonlinear fashion which causes a multiplier effect that they term, "dynamic complexity," wherein the system produces constant change within itself that is characterized by perpetual motion, continual shifts, and the perception that change is continually occurring at a faster rate" (Lane, et. al., 2004: 17). They term this ongoing rapid rate of change, "flux." In sum, the ION scholars' perspective is that the terms globalization or global are less helpful and overly simplistic in comprehending the actual dynamics of 21st century organizational life and that focusing on dynamic complexity is a more helpful perspective for both research and practice.

In the early 2000s, others began to view the global context in a similar manner as the ION scholars. Operating simultaneously but independently of the ION team, many business leaders borrowed the acronym "VUCA" (volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity) that was originally developed by the Army War College to conceptualize the dynamics of the Cold War era. VUCA seemed to many business writers and executives to reflect the dynamics they were wrestling with in their corporations and effectively captured the conditions of the global context in the early to mid-2000s (Horney, Pasmore, & O'Shea, 2010). Horney et. al., (2010: 33) define the conditions of the global context as follows:

- Volatility: "The nature, speed, volume, magnitude and dynamics of change.
- Uncertainty: "The lack of predictability of issues and events."
- Complexity: "The confounding of issues and the chaos that surround any organization."
- Ambiguity: "The haziness of reality and the mixed meanings of conditions."

The conceptual overlap with the ION scholars' delineation of the global context and the widely accepted VUCA acronym is evident. Currently, VUCA has become the most popular short-hand way to describe the global context of the 21st century among both business leaders and scholars.

This above conceptualizations of the global context influenced a group of scholars who to begin to study leadership in the global context which in turn contributed to their founding of the field of global leadership (Mendenhall, 2018).

**Global Leadership**

Global leadership emerged as a field in the late 1990s in response to the challenges executives and managers increasingly faced as technological advances exacerbated the already rapid processes of globalization (Mendenhall, 2001). Leadership skills that were adequate for working in domestic contexts no longer were viable for working globally; leaders' skill repertoires were viewed to be inadequate, and scholars began to analyze what the necessary competencies were to lead effectively in the new millennium (Mendenhall, 2001; Bird & Mendenhall, 2016). Since its inception as a field, global leadership scholars have primarily focused on 1) isolating the competencies necessary for effective global leadership, 2) understanding how to accurately assess the competencies associated with global leadership, and 3) learning how to successfully develop those competencies in leaders. As those sub-domains began to solidify, global leadership scholars slowly began to expand their investigative efforts to previously unexplored areas of the phenomenon, such as leading change, knowledge creation and transfer, roles, the interface between global leadership and global team productivity, talent management, theory development, and germane to this book, ethics (Mendenhall, et. al., 2018).

Though VUCA is widely accepted as being descriptive of the global context in which executives operate, global leadership scholars were slow in attempting to delineate the sub-construct of "global" in the global leadership construct. In this, global leadership scholars have mirrored a trend in the larger field of leadership as it is rare for leadership scholars to address context in their research studies (Reiche, Bird, Mendenhall & Osland, 2017; Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivassubramaniam, 2003; Liden & Antonakis, 2009; Porter & McLaughlin, 2006). While scholars of leadership have widely investigated contingencies of leadership, they have largely ignored broader, wider, more fundamental contextual spaces (Reiche, et. al., 2017). In the international realm, the relationship between national culture and leadership practices has been widely investigated, but such cross-national and comparative efforts ignore the multiplicity of factors inherent in a VUCA or global context (e.g., leaders being forced to simultaneously span various types of economic, cultural, time-zone, organizational culture boundaries across multiple locations). Only recently have global leadership scholars begun to consider the question, "what does 'global' in the 'global leadership' construct mean?" The most recent effort to explore the VUCA or global context is subsumed by them in the construct definition below:

> ***Global leadership****:* "The processes and actions through which an individual influences a range of internal and external constituents from national cultures and jurisdictions in a context characterized by significant levels of task and relationship complexity." (Reiche, et. al., 2017: 556).

Given the construct definition of global leadership previously cited above, the ethical complexity leaders face when operating in the global domain is significantly higher than when operating in domestic contexts or even in expatriate contexts. The lack of research on the ethical dimensions of global leadership is a large gap in the field (Maznevski, Stahl, & Mendenhall, 2013). The dilemmas, paradoxes, and opportunities that are inherent in leading in the global context challenges managers as to how they should address these complex issues in responsible and productive ways. In attempts to address this largely unexplored area of global leadership, recently scholars have turned to the field of responsible leadership to provide insight and future directions for research. For in-depth reviews of the field of global leadership, please see Bird & Mendenhall, 2016; Mendenhall, 2019).

**Responsible Leadership.**

Responsible leadership (RL) has been defined as "an orientation or mindset taken by people in executive-level positions toward meeting the needs of a firm's stakeholder(s). As such, it deals with defining those stakeholder(s), assessing the legitimacy of their claims, and determining how those needs, expectations or interests can and should best be served" (Waldman, Siegel & Stahl, 2019: 3). Since most companies today operate in a 'global stakeholder society' (Maak & Pless, 2006, p. 99) where stakeholders are spread across the globe, this poses challenges in the area of corporate responsibility and ethics in a global context, e.g., with regard to workers' rights in global supply chains, issues pertaining to diversity and inclusion, and so on. Stakeholder theory with an ethical lens (Freeman, Wicks, & Parmar, 2004), serves as an important conceptual foundation for RL research, based in large part on business leaders' 'responsibility orientations", virtues, and ethical qualities ( Pless, Maak, & Waldman, 2012). Among those, Maak and Pless (2008, 2009) highlight cosmopolitanism as an essential aspect since it encompasses norms, values, and ideas that are helpful for the governing of relationships among stakeholders in a global context. There are various approaches to the study of RL (e.g., Maak, Pless, & Voegtlin, 2016; Miska, Hilbe, & Mayer, 2014; Pless, Maak, & Waldman, 2012). More recent RL research has started paying closer attention to facets beyond individuals and organizations pertaining to macro-level aspects that form the global context of RL. For example, Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014) argue that in addition to the proximal context, which refers to situational and organizational facets (e.g., ethical climate in organizations or codes of conducts), the distal context, which involves institutional (e.g., legal, cultural) and supranational (e.g., global governance) dynamics have significant influence on RL behavior. In a similar vein, Voegtlin and Pless (2014) consider the role of the UN Global Compact as part of the emerging global corporate social responsibility infrastructure that is relevant for RL research.

The SDGs are also a relevant element of this global infrastructure – one that has not yet been sufficiently investigated by RL scholars.

Comparative research (Witt & Redding, 2012; Witt & Stahl, 2016) shows that business leaders' responsibility orientations and their perceived importance and salience of various stakeholder needs differ considerably across institutions and cultural contexts. Thus, a 'strong RL core' that encompasses values, character, qualities, and competencies (cf. Maak and Pless's 2006 roles model), is essential for business leaders in dealing with diverse stakeholder expectations in how they should contribute to the tackling of 'societal grand challenges' (George, Howard-Grenville, Joshi, & Tihanyi, 2016). Across countries and societies, these differences are even more pronounced. RL research has thus started examining this global-local paradox (e.g., Filatotchev & Stahl, 2015; Stahl, Miska, Puffer, & McCarthy, 2016) – often with a particular emphasis on diversity, human rights, sustainability, and ethics as key challenges (Stahl, Pless, Maak, & Miska, 2018; Stahl, Pless, & Maak, 2013). This perspective on RL is particularly relevant for global managers who simultaneously operate within and across numerous countries and societies. Miska, Stahl, and Mendenhall (2013) identified different configurations of intercultural competencies relevant for enacting globally consistent, locally adapted, or transnational approaches – with the latter being the most demanding since it requires embracing the global-local paradox. For in-depth reviews of the field of responsible leadership, please see Miska & Mendenhall, 2018, Frangieh and Yaacoub (2017), Marques, Reis, and Gomes (2018) as well as Marques & Gomes (2020).

**The Integration of Global, Global Leadership, and Responsible Leadership into RGL**

The two content areas – global leadership and responsible leadership – share a number of conceptual overlaps, the primary one being an emphasis on the high degree of complexity being a constant condition of the work of executives and managers. While from the global leadership perspective the emphasis is on task and relationship complexity on the part of global leaders, the normative roots of responsible leadership and questions about the moral responsibility of managers highlight the complexity of business-society relationships in the global context. In addition, 'societal grand challenges' usually are universal, in that they are not limited to national territories or single companies, and instead require a systems logic that helps understand the interconnectedness among elements of the phenomena in question (Bansal & Song, 2016), be they of economic, social or ecological nature. Patzer and Voegtlin (2013, p.10), in this regard, emphasize the need that RGL scholarship "… acknowledge the economic needs for effective leadership and the need to retain moral integrity in the light of ethical pluralism."

Little research has thus far specifically used the term RGL or attempted to define its ontological assumptions. Rather, we tend to find a 'borrow-and-integrate' approach where scholars (perhaps sometimes unconsciously) adopt concepts and notions that originated in one of the two domains and apply them in the other. For example, Miska, Stahl, and Mendenhall (2013) tested intercultural competencies as advanced by global leadership research in a responsible leadership setting. Branco (2018) investigated the effect of responsible leadership on expatriates' performance and affective well-being at work – with the expatriation context being one of the areas in which global leadership research is rooted. While global leadership research accentuates heightened ethical complexity for leaders within the global domain (Stahl, et. al., 2018), responsible leadership scholars emphasize a cosmopolitan mindset for executives to advance humanism globally (Maak & Pless, 2009). Under the lens of RGL, leveraging these and other overlaps as well as potential synergies provides valuable opportunities for research in RGL.

**Themes and Key Challenges of Responsible Global Leadership**

The major trends discussed above —globalization and the quest for responsible global leadership— raise two fundamental questions: What are the challenges facing global leaders in the area of social responsibility, and how can leaders address these challenges? Research on RGL indicates there are four fundamental challenges confronting global corporations and their leaders in the area of social responsibility: diversity/inclusion, ethics, sustainability, and human rights (e.g., Stahl, Miska, Puffer, & McCarthy, 2016; Stahl, Pless, Maak, & Miska, 2018). In order to meet the needs and expectations of multiple global and local stakeholders, executives must adopt appropriate strategies to address these key challenges. Next, we will discuss each of the four challenges and provide illustrative examples from the chapters of this volume.

**Diversity/inclusion**

The *diversity/inclusion challenge* implies that global executives should find ways to effectively address the claims, rights, and needs of a diverse set of stakeholders who have conflicting – and oftentimes legitimate – needs and expectations . Thus, executives are faced with the challenge of identifying the right course of action in difficult gray-area situations where various legitimate demands compete – the kind of situations that Badaracco (1997) described as "conflicts of right versus right", "not issues of right versus wrong". For example, it is "right", on the one hand, for a Pakistani employee of a German company to recommend a family member for an open position in the same department where the employee works (considering the employee's cultural background). But it is "right" also for the German boss of this employee to emphatically reject his request, referring to the company's nepotism policies. Such "right versus right" dilemmas are common in culturally diverse environments, and they present some of the toughest choices for global managers, because each side is rooted in their basic, core values.

In chapter 2 of this volume, Reade and Lee highlight the critical role that responsible cosmopolitan leaders play in tackling social dilemmas that arise in ethnically diverse global organizations. Similarly, in chapter 7, Jonsen, Levy, Toegel, and Van Zanten propose that cosmopolitan leaders may be better equipped to foster workplace inclusion that goes beyond administratively focused gender or cultural diversity measures. Based on a concrete case study – PepsiCo under the leadership of former CEO Indra Nooyi – the authors of chapter 1 in this volume, Miska, Economou, and Stahl, describe how responsible global leaders steer their companies toward embracing diversity not only within but also outside the organization, by actively engaging the diverse communities they serve.

**Ethics**

When operating across countries and cultures, executives of global corporations are confronted with thorny ethical dilemmas, for example, different norms regarding corruption, worker rights, and consumer protection. The *ethics challenge* highlights the need for global executives to reinforce and engage in ethically- and legally-sound behavior. In chapter 3 of this volume, Oliveira, Giustiniano and Pina e Cunha argue that (un)ethical leadership decisions cannot be fully understood without thoroughly investigating the intertwined relationship of leader as an invididual and the broader context. The authors suggest that more light should be shed on inwardly directed leadership processes (e.g., self-reflection, self-vigilance, or self-compassion) that happen via the experience of outward changes and, importantly, via attempts to reconcile ethical dilemmas. In chapter 9, Gosovic and Søderberg approach the *ethics challenge* from a meso-level lens, by examening the case of a multinational Swiss pharmaceutical company Ferring. The chapter discusses the challenges faced by the company's Global Ethics Office in their efforts to disemminate the "Ferring philosophy" – including the code of ethics, focus on individual responsibility and Scandinavian approach to moral education – to its overseas subsidiary in China. Meanwhile Chapter 10, by Gruber and Zilinskaite, explores the ethical dimension of RGL in a very different conxtent. The authors address six case studies from the baking sector – an industry that has been shaken by major ethics crises and irresponsible leadership.

In addition to above, the *ethics challenge* emphasizes the importance of exceeding the minimum compliance standards by engaging in corporate responsibility to gain legitimacy in the markets where the company operates, signal to customers and other stakeholders that they are trustworthy partners, and to serve as a strategic differentiator vis-a-vis local competitors (Doh, Littell & Quigley, 2015). Thus, several scholars have argued that ethical conduct must go beyond compliance and "moral minimalism" (Walzer, 1994) to encompass "positive CSR" or the "doing good" dimension of responsible leadership i.e., the obligation of organizational decision-makers to consider the needs of a broader set of stakeholders and to contribute to societal progress in a responsible and sustainable way (Maak & Pless, 2006; Stahl & Sully de Luque, 2014; Waldman et al., 2019). As an example of "positive CSR", Mirvis, in the chapter 8 of this volume, describes IBM's Corporate Service Corps (CSC). Inspired by the framework of the U.S. Peace Corps, the program sends its employees for one-month service assignments, where they co-create social innovations together with NGOs, social enterprises, or government agencies.

**Sustainability**

The *sustainability challenge* underscores the need for executives to safeguard sustainable development for current and future generations, by contributing to sustainable economic, environmental, and social value. Therefore, addressing sustainability issues requires both a triple-bottom line logic (Elkington, 1997) that reconciles people, profit, and planet, as well as a long-term perspective. This implies that global leaders need to adopt a systems lens (Bansal & Song, 2016) that helps them understand both any direct and indirect consequences their decisions and actions might have. In evaluating these effects, the SDGs represent the various domains that may be positively or negatively affected in this regard.

Voegtlin and Patzer, in their contribution in this book (chapter 11), describe the role responsible leadership plays in conjunction with responsible innovation, in fostering sustainable development. The authors underline the various ways in which responsible global leaders can direct innovation processes toward 'avoiding harm' and 'doing good'. This is also highlighted in chapter 4 by Griffith, Clapp-Smith, Combs, and Ellis, which connects global leader orientations toward responsibility (Pless, Maak, & Waldman, 2012) with firm approaches to environmental sustainability. Their matrix presents a set of leadership orientations that may be classified along the lines of being more or less environmentally responsive.

**Human rights**

The *human-rights or citizenship challenge* embodies the need to recognize, understand, and effectively address issues with respect to equality, social justice, and human-rights protection (Stahl et al., 2016). This goes beyond activities like being a "good citizen" and giving back to local communities, and includes the political engagements of corporations (Scherer, Palazzo, & Matten, 2014; Wettstein, Giuliani, Santangelo, & Stahl, 2019). In particular, in the face of global poverty and hunger, insecurity, gender inequality, forced labor, healthcare challenges, and rising income gaps, there is increased stakeholder pressure on companies to help address these and other pressing issues. Consequently, businesses are expected to operate as political actors (Scherer et al., 2014) and address grand societal challenges (Buckley, Doh, & Benischke, 2017) or 'wicked problems' (Dentoni, Bitzer, & Schouten, 2018) such as those reflected in the SDGs.

Many multinational companies are in direct contact with, and may regularly supervise and audit their first tier suppliers, but human right abuses are often hidden within the second, third, and further tiers, of the supply chain. Puffer, Wesley, Dau, & Moore, in chapter 5 of this volume, develop a typology of firm behavior to describe four archetypal responses to increased pressure for corporate responsibility, including a strong focus on human rights issues, in global supply chains. The chapter provides examples of responsible firms that strive for "cross-stream literacy" (the term coined by the authors) by communicating their expectations into the lower teirs of the supply chain. Similarly, Chapter 6 by Zilinskaite and Hajro addresses human and labor rights protection in MNCs and their supply chains, in the specific context of cross-border labor migration. The authors highlight the importance of global institutional factors and cross-sectoral initiatives, such as the SDGs, in nudging businesses to take the lead in enacting responsible migrant workforce management.

## Closing Thoughts

The four challenges discussed above that firms and leaders face in leading responsibly in the global context (diversity/inclusion; ethics; sustainability; and human rights) potentially can produce a plethora of research studies in the field. But, what are the important "core" questions from which research studies should be derived that would be most efficacious to the development of the RGL literature? We propose that the following questions should be fundamental drivers for the creation of research studies on the part of RGL scholars:

1. What are the behaviors that distinguish responsible global leaders from other leaders and what are the causal variables that underlie those behaviors?
2. What is the nature and constitution of ethical dilemmas, paradoxes, tradeoffs and opportunities that are inherent in the global context of leading? And, how can (or should)

leaders make sense of paradoxes in global contexts and mediate seeming paradoxes and reconcile tradeoffs?

3. What are the anticipated or realized outcomes of RGL and how can they be assessed and measured?
4. How are RGL and sustainable development connected, and what are the research and practical implications of these relationships?
5. How can RGL help achieve the UN SDGs?
6. What paradigms, theories or models from disciplines outside of the field of management can/should be used to inform the theoretical domain of RGL?
7. With both opportunities and challenges created by globalization, how do leaders balance the advantages of globalization with its inevitable costs?

Our hope is that our chapter – and the entire book itself – will provide an impetus for scholars currently working in the field of international management and other disciplines to develop ancillary research streams that focus on RGL in their predominant areas of research focus. We acknowledge the professional risk that this entails for younger scholars as academe has a strong tendency to reward research that is done only in established fields that employs traditional methodologies and is published in well-recognized journals that, in turn, usually are reticent to publish research that is exploratory and envelope-extending in nature (Mendenhall & Hippler, forthcoming). For more senior scholars, passion for their long-established research streams makes it difficult for them to add to them projects that involve having to learn an entirely new literature of a poorly-understood phenomenon. And, no matter one's length of tenure in one's career, working in a new, emergent field is not likely – at least in the short-term future – to generate numerous citations in Google Scholar, Web of Science, or Scopus (Mendenhall & Hippler, forthcoming).

Yet, this is a field that calls out for scholars to join it because to not do so would amount to an abrogation of academe's corporate social responsibility to humankind. This may seem a rash statement, but RGL is needed in order to both understand – and educate leaders how to expertly navigate – the moral complexity that exists inter-organizationally in the age of globalization. In this vein, we end on a note of hope – scholars are indeed beginning to heed the call. For example, the Academy of Management recently organized a specialized conference on responsible leadership in rising economies in 2019. Held at Bled, Slovenia, 181 papers were accepted for presentation in 61 concurrent sessions along with 15 Professional Development Workshops. Authors and presenters represented over 50 countries. Thus, the literature of RGL is steadily growing, and it is important that it does so in order that knowledge that can be beneficial to those who hold positions of global responsibility can be shared with them so that they can carry out their mandates, fulfill their roles, and lead their organizations in more responsible, moral, and humane ways.

**References**


Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3): 261–295.

Bird, A., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2016). From cross-cultural management to global leadership: Evolution and adaptation. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1): 115-126

Branco, M. M. (2018). *The influence of responsible leadership on expatriates' performance: the mediating role of affective well-being at work and the moderating role of cross-cultural adjustment.* Retrieved from https://iconline.ipleiria.pt/handle/10400.8/3708

Caligiuri, P., & Thoroughgood, C. (2015). Developing responsible global leaders through corporate-sponsored international volunteerism programs. Organizational Dynamics, 44: 138-145.

Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford, UK: Capstone.

Filatotchev, I., & Stahl, G. K. (2015). Towards transnational CSR: Corporate social responsibility approaches and governance solutions for multinational corporations. *Organizational Dynamics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.02.006

Frangieh, C. G., & Yaacoub, H. K. (2017). A systematic literature review of responsible leadership: Challenges, outcomes and practices. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, *8*(2), 281–299.

Freeman, R. E., Wicks, A. C., & Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder theory and" The Corporate objective revisited." *Organization Science*, 364–369.

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and Tackling Societal Grand Challenges through Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 1880–1895. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.4007

Horney, N., Pasmore, B., & O'Shea, T. (2010). Leadership agility: A business imperative for a VUCA world. *People & Strategy*, 33(4): 32-38.

Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M.L., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2004). Hercules meets Buddha. In Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M., Mendenhall, M.E., & McNett, J. (eds). *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 3-25.

Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M., Mendenhall, M.E., & McNett, J. (Eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Liden, R. C., & Antonakis, J. (2009). Considering context in psychological leadership research. *Human Relations,* 62(11): 1587–1605.

Marques, T., & Gomes, J. 2020. Responsible leadership and/versus responsible management. In O. Laasch, D. Jamali, R. E. Freeman, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), The Research Handbook of Responsible Management. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Marques, T., Reis, N., & Gomes, J. F. (2018). Responsible leadership research: a bibliometric review. *BAR-Brazilian Administration Review*, *15*(1).

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. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society–A relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *66*(1), 99–115.

Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2008). Responsible leadership in a globalized world: a cosmopolitan perspective. In *Handbook of research on global corporate citizenship*. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ioh&AN=3792753&site=ehost-live

Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2009). Business Leaders as Citizens of the World. Advancing Humanism on a Global Scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *88*(3), 537–550. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0122-0

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

Maznevski, M., Stahl, G.K., & Mendenhall, M. (2013). Towards an integration of global leadership practice and scholarship: Repairing disconnects and heightening mutual understanding. *European Journal of Management,* 7(5): 493-499.

Mendenhall, M.E. (2019). Global leadership. In Ricky Griffin (ed.). *Oxford Bibliographies in Management.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mendenhall, M.E.  (2001). New perspectives on expatriate adjustment and its relationship to global leadership development. In Mendenhall, M.E., Kühlmann, T., & Stahl, G.K. (eds.) *Developing global business leaders:  Policies, processes, and innovations*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books, 1-16.

Mendenhall, M.E., & Hippler, T. (forthcoming). On paradigm tolerance in cross-cultural management research. In B. Szkudlarek, J. Osland, D. Caprar & L. Romani (eds.). *SAGE handbook of contemporary cross-cultural management.*

Mendenhall, M.E., Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Oddou, G.R., Maznevski, M.L., Stevens, M.J., & Stahl, G.K. (Eds.) (2018). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development.* (3rd edition) London: Routledge.

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.

Miska, C., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2018). Responsible leadership: A mapping of extant research and future directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(1): 117-134.

Miska, C., Stahl, G. K., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2013). Intercultural Competencies as Antecedents of Responsible Global Leadership. *European Journal of International Management*, *7*(5), 550–569.

Patzer, M., & Voegtlin, C. (2013). Leadership ethics and organizational change: Sketching the field. In *Organizational change, leadership and ethics* (pp. 25-50). Routledge.

Pless, N. (2007). Understanding Responsible Leadership: Role Identity and Motivational Drivers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *74*(4), 437–456. https://doi.org/Article

Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2011). Responsible Leadership: Pathways to the Future. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1114-4

Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Waldman, D. A. (2012). Different approaches toward doing the right thing: Mapping the responsibility orientations of leaders. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*(4), 51–65.

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.

Porter, L.W., & McLaughlin, G.B. 2006. Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6): 559–576.

Reiche, B.S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M.E., & Osland, J.S. (2017) Contextualizing leadership: A typology global leadership roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48: 552-572.

Stahl, G. 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, G. K., Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2013). Responsible Global Leadership. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, M. L. Maznevski, M. Stevens, & G. K. Stahl (Eds.), *Global Leadership: Research, Practice, and Development* (2nd ed., pp. 240–259). Routledge.

Stahl, G. K., Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Miska, C. (2018). Responsible Global Leadership. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, M. J. Stevens, M. L. Maznevski, & G. K. Stahl (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, Practice, and Development* (Vol. 3). Routledge.

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

Voegtlin, C., & Pless, N. M. (2014). Global Governance: CSR and the Role of the UN Global Compact. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *122*(2), 179–191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2214-8

Waldman, D.A., Siegel, D.S., & Stahl, G.K. (forthcoming). *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies.* Accessed at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335484794_Defining_the_Socially_Responsible_Leader_Revisiting_Issues_in_Responsible_Leadership

Witt, M. A., & Redding, G. (2012). The spirits of corporate social responsibility: Senior executive perceptions of the role of the firm in society in Germany, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea and the USA. *Socio-Economic Review*, *10*(1), 109–134.

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.