S Y M P O S I U M

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP: THEORETICAL ISSUES AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

DAVID A. WALDMAN
RACHEL M. BALVEN
Arizona State University

This article serves as an overview of the articles included in this symposium as well as a consideration of how the topic of responsible leadership can be framed in terms of research directions. Specifically, we focus on how the included articles bring attention to the theoretical divergence within the literature. To help address the variations of responsible leadership theories, we identify five areas in need of further research: (1) responsible leadership processes and outcomes, (2) stakeholder priorities, (3) training and development, (4) globalization and macro-level forces, and (5) measurement and assessment. In our discussion of each area, we elaborate by referring to other articles in the symposium, and we provide examples of specific issues that challenge responsible leadership research and implementation. Additionally, because responsible leadership concerns both the micro and macro levels of analysis, our discussion considers individuals, groups, and organizations.

As the concept of responsible leadership (RL) continues to develop, so do potential issues that need to be addressed and clarified through theory and research. RL represents a concept that exists at the intersection of two existing fields of study: social responsibility and leadership. While much has been written about social responsibility, such as its relationship to firm financial performance (Orlitzky, Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003), much less is known about how actions and decisions on the part of individuals affect, or are affected by, social responsibility. A topic like RL inherently crosses levels of analysis by considering individuals, groups, and organizations as a whole (Christensen, Mackey, & Whetten, 2014; Morgeson, Aguinis, Waldman, & Siegel, 2013). The multilevel nature of RL comes through in this symposium, as the authors recognize several micro and macro issues that are relevant to its study and implementation. Indeed, this multilevel flavor would suggest that as compared to related forms of leadership (e.g., ethical or moral leadership), RL has a unique applicability to the upper echelons of organizations.

Along with this multilevel emphasis, it is not surprising that multiple theoretical frameworks are relevant to RL, and indeed these frameworks can be seen in the articles of this symposium. Examples include agency (Aguilera, Filatotchev, Jackson, & Gospel, 2008; Jensen, 1986), stakeholder (Clarkson, 1995; Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Freeman, 1984; Margolis & Walsh, 2003), institutional (Campbell, 2007; Zucker, 1987), stewardship (Davis, 2005; Donaldson & Davis, 1991), and ethics-based (Brown & Trevirlo, 2006; Jones, Felps, & Bigley, 2007) theories. It is not surprising that such a range of theoretical bases would suggest different potential interpretations of what constitutes responsibility and, thus, how leaders might best approach RL.

Despite the broad domain of RL, processes associated with individuals exerting leadership influence are at its core. This makes it impossible to frame RL without considering individuals in terms of their behaviors and decisions. Although the CEO would seem to be most applicable, other organizational members might also come into play, such as other top management team members, board members, and so forth. Consequently, the domain of RL cannot be thoroughly considered without a focus on individuals. Stated another way, when specifically considering RL, it is not about whether organizations act responsibly, but about how individuals act and make decisions.

In this overview article, we summarize the articles in the special issue. We then use the issues brought forth by these articles as a means of identifying several themes that will help to move theory and research forward in the realm of RL. These include aspects of RL processes and outcomes, RL in a global or macro context, measurement and assessment, training and development, and so forth. Within this review, we particularly highlight the wide scope of RL perspectives within the literature. We conclude with specific suggestions to help guide future research and theory development.

OVERVIEW OF SYMPOSIUM ARTICLES

The articles in this symposium are summarized in Table 1. As shown in the table, their focus and topics span multiple levels and a range of issues

TABLE 1
Summaries of Articles Included in This Symposium

Level of analysis	Purpose	Key issues identified	Implications
Stahl and Sully de Luque			
Multilevel	• To synthesize past and current research on RL • To propose a conceptualization of RL that is developed from "do good" and "avoid harm" perspectives	• Whether or not executive leaders have social responsibilities beyond generating wealth • Inconsistencies of previous research in its conceptualizations of RL behavior, as well as antecedents • Recognition that RL involves "do good" as well as "avoid harm" behavior	• RL is an outcome of both individual characteristics and specific contextual factors. • Psychological strength and the moral intensity of the situation are the mechanisms through which RL is attained. • Researchers should be especially cognizant of RL implications from a global perspective as multinational managers deal with challenges that may be different from those of more parochial organizations.
Doh and Quigley			
Multilevel	• To reconcile divergent approaches to RL by developing a theory that accounts for pathways through which responsible leaders are able to influence organizational outcomes	• Multiple approaches to RL exist in the literature, including: (1) RL must incorporate the use of strategic CSR activities for the benefit of shareholders, and (2) RL must incorporate multiple stakeholders when making decisions.	• Responsible leaders can leverage a stakeholder theory to influence others through either a psychological or an informational path. • The psychological path consists of trust, ownership, and commitment. • The informational path consists of boundary-spanning between organizations and key stakeholders, and encouraging functional knowledge and information flow.
Pearce, Wassenaar, and Manz			
Multilevel	• To propose shared leadership as a model to guide the implementation of RL at multiple levels, including societal, organizational, and group levels	• An exclusive focus on hierarchical leadership is insufficient as a means of considering RL. • Although a shared leadership model holds promise, there are challenges in terms of its effective implementation.	• Shared leadership can be a useful approach toward the effective implementation of RL as well as a means to prevent/remedy irresponsible leadership. • A shared leadership model allows for a system of internal checks and balances that may help to lessen irresponsible leadership practices.
Filatotchev and Nakajima			
Organization	• To explore the link between corporate governance and RL, and how this relationship affects CSR activities	• There are many CSR-related issues that have yet to be resolved, or even identified. • The literature is especially lacking in identifying and overcoming these challenges by use of a corporate governance lens.	• An understanding of the complex interplay among leadership behavior, corporate governance mechanisms, and institutional pressures can produce more effective CSR planning and implementation.

pertaining to RL. As such, they represent an eclectic mix of perspectives on this important topic. The first article, by Stahl and Sully de Luque, defines RL as "intentional actions taken by leaders to benefit the stakeholders of the company and/or actions taken to avoid harmful consequences for corporate stakeholders and the larger society." The authors provide a synthesis of prior research that is relevant to RL as a background for introducing a framework that explains managers' propensity to engage in what they term as "do good" versus "avoid harm" socially responsible behaviors. This dichotomy largely reflects prescriptive and proscriptive morality, respectively. The authors argue that "do good" and "avoid harm" behaviors have different psychological bases and antecedents and are therefore conceptually distinct from one another. However, behaviors in both categories are a reflection of the interaction of individual factors (such as personality, affective states, and moral philosophies) and contextual factors (such as situational, organizational, institutional, and supranational).

Specifically, Stahl and Sully de Luque provide a model from which to explore how specific contextual factors can increase the psychological strength and moral intensity of the situations facing managers in their work environments and, thus, either promote or hinder managers' responsible behavior. In emphasizing the ethics-based approach of their paper, the authors posit that this (either positive or negative) augmentation of behavior manifests from both the strength of a situation and the degree of moral intensity of responsibility issues that managers face, which often exist in parallel. Accordingly, the degree to which leaders' individual characteristics affect their propensity to engage in responsible behavior during a managerial predicament is moderated by situational strength. Such predicaments include magnitude of consequences, social consensus, probability of effect, temporal immediacy, proximity, and concentration of effect—all of which may account for why managers may act responsibly in some situations and irresponsible in others.

In addition to this universal application, the authors give special consideration to the global or multinational RL domain. Stahl and Sully de Luque contend that managers in multinational corporations are faced with especially unique challenges and potentially different standards, such as cultural views on bribery, with regard to implementing corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities and responsible behavior. The article concludes with the practical implications of their framework by suggesting that many of the organizational-, situational-, societal-, and supranational-level determinants of managerial behaviors can be achieved by internal forces, such as the appropriate selection, training, and development of leaders, as well as external forces, such as regulatory enforcement, media coverage, and policymaking.

Using stakeholder theory, the article by Doh and Quigley considers multiple levels of analysis to reconcile divergent perspectives of CSR by developing a theory of how responsible leaders influence organizational outcomes. They present psychological and knowledge-based pathways through which leaders display their responsibly oriented actions. These actions may then lead to positive outcomes for both the organization and its stakeholders. The first pathway is the psychological process mechanism, which includes trust, ownership, and commitment as the underpinnings of why responsible leaders with stakeholder priorities can engender positive organizational outcomes. Doh and Quigley posit that at the individual level, higher levels of these qualities, such as increased trust that followers place in their leaders, are likely to have significant benefits to both the organization and the stakeholder(s) involved. At the team level, a psychological boost is achieved by leader inclusiveness, which increases engagement and team learning, as well as shared leadership experience in which trust is prompted between players both internal to and outside of the corporation. And last, at the organizational level, the authors discuss how culture (organizational and global) continues to play a significant role in the relationship between a firm and its stakeholders.

The second pathway through which responsible leaders can influence outcomes is knowledge based. Such influences are achieved by boundary spanning between their respective organizations and key stakeholders, and by engaging in activities that encourage knowledge and information to flow in a functional manner within the organization. Responsible leaders who use this pathway put themselves in the best position to capitalize on engagement with external stakeholders who may help to increase awareness and appreciation of important trends the firm would otherwise not have recognized. Thus, stakeholder engagement may prevent leaders from being caught unaware by unforeseen developments stemming from new expectations for their organization.

Doh and Quigley provide recent examples of leaders at Coca-Cola, DuPont, and Walmart to further

illustrate select mechanisms through which the two proposed pathways are manifested. For example, executive leaders at Coca-Cola exhibited elements from both pathways as external signals were translated into the internal information needed to bring about the necessary organizational changes to increase employee sustainability efforts. The authors conclude by encouraging researchers to empirically examine their proposed theoretical pathways as they call for the development of best practices through which leaders can first identify key stakeholders and then manage how knowledge should flow to such stakeholders.

The third article in this symposium, by Pearce, Wassenaar, and Manz, explores the role the shared leadership paradigm has in promoting RL. Consistent with the symposium, the authors use the "do good," "avoid harm," and stakeholder perspectives of RL (Maak & Pless, 2006) rather than a more economic view (McWilliams & Siegel, 2011; Siegel, 2009). The authors begin by defining shared leadership as the relative degree to which official and unofficial leader duties are considered collective obligations. One way to best conceptualize shared leadership is to look at it in direct contrast with the view that leadership should take on a solely top-down hierarchical approach. Thus, shared leadership reflects the notion that there are social actors in an organization who all play a part in the process of leading one another toward productive outcomes (Pearce & Conger, 2002).

Next, Pearce et al. describe four distinct types of leadership influence—directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering (Pearce & Ensley, 2004)—and discuss how these leadership types feed into a more holistic model of responsible shared leadership. The authors then shift into discussing how a lack of shared leadership processes (i.e., a purely hierarchical leadership view) can result in leader irresponsibility. They illustrate this risk by describing the experiences and observations of two of the authors, who lived in Nigeria. Their article details the crisis of irresponsible leadership that has plagued Nigeria for decades, as the land's bounties were squandered by the relatively few people who held power. Furthermore, the authors point out that such irresponsible actions on the part of leaders rarely have serious consequences for the perpetrators and that irresponsibility has effects throughout society.

Despite such a seemingly futile cause, Pearce et al. suggest that there is hope for societies such as Nigeria, as well as lower-level entities such as

organizations, in the form of a shared leadership approach that incorporates responsibility. They propose that shared leadership, as well as transparency, can allow a system of checks and balances on power. In furthering this point, the authors elaborate on specific processes that hierarchical leaders can implement to avoid irresponsible leadership and develop more of a shared RL model. These processes revolve around the appropriate application of different types of shared leadership: rotated, integrated, distributed, and comprehensive (Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2014). The authors conclude by detailing how shared leadership has the potential to facilitate responsibility and prevent/remedy irresponsibility at various levels.

In the last article, Filatotchev and Nakajima develop a multilevel theoretical framework that attempts to bridge the research gaps that currently exist among the role of corporate leaders, CSR activities, and corporate governance mechanisms. Although there has been progress in research pertaining to the challenges facing executive leaders concerning CSR-related activities and policies, the authors argue that these findings have not been assimilated into the corporate governance literature. It is this void that the authors endeavor to fill. By discussing the place that CSR has within agency-grounded corporate governance research, the authors suggest that agency theory posits an emphasis on the shareholder-manager dichotomy, which in turn results in a transactional or "closed system" perspective of the firm. Through this perspective, CSR-related activities chiefly serve to ensure regulatory compliance.

In presenting alternative views, such as stewardship and stakeholder theories, Filatotchev and Nakajima summarize previous work that points toward an understanding of potential links between corporate governance and CSR by way of a more inclusive and detailed analysis of how firm-level governance processes relate to the demands of a wider body of stakeholders. This process of engagement hints at a similar theme of stakeholder inclusion as the Doh and Quigley article. However, Filatotchev and Nakajima argue that such outcomes may be difficult to recognize until a more comprehensive and systematic "open system" framework is developed to better recognize the interactions between corporate governance factors and CSR. Such an approach would shift the focus away from the structural aspects of corporate governance and toward the more organizational aspects of different governance constellations and their impact on CSR policies.

Finally, Filatotchev and Nakajima introduce an institutional perspective as another way to explore how both corporate governance and CSR are affected by external pressures for legitimacy. Using an institutional theory stance of corporate governance as an endogenous entity, they suggest that the impact corporate governance strategies have on the firm's choice of CSR policies is highly responsive to various regulative, normative, and cognitive institutional pressures. Thus, the authors conclude by urging that researchers move toward a more contextualized theory of CSR that includes both managerial and board member actions to fully recognize how phenomena like CSR relate to issues of corporate governance.

RESEARCH ISSUES AND THEORETICAL DIVERGENCE

The articles that compose this symposium directly or indirectly raise several issues pertaining to how theory, research, and the practice of RL might move forward. We now turn our attention toward those issues, highlight how the articles in this symposium are relevant, and provide suggestions that might be useful. Specifically, we discuss issues related to divergence in RL theoretical perspectives and how these views may potentially converge to create a more succinct RL paradigm. Although our discussion is directed primarily at researchers, we also consider practical implementation. Table 2 summarizes our discussion, specifically questions posed regarding RL and its implementation. In capturing a wide range of issues, we address five areas: (1) responsible leadership processes and outcomes, (2) stakeholder priorities, (3) training and development, (4) globalization and macro-level forces, and (5) measurement and assessment.

Responsible Leadership Processes and Outcomes

Some basic issues exist regarding what responsible leadership is all about and how it manifests itself in organizations. These issues pertain to how RL is defined, the distinction between responsible and irresponsible leadership practices, the position(s) that are most important in the display of RL, and so forth. For example, Stahl and Sully de Luque (this issue) propose a framework that encompasses both micro and macro perspectives in terms of individual actions that either benefit or avoid harm to stakeholders.

One important question is whether leaders can be responsible and irresponsible at the same time. Stated another way, do responsible and irresponsible leadership reflect opposite ends of the same continuum, or are they reflective of different abstractions altogether? This question is similar to the notion of "doing good" versus "avoiding harm" that is highlighted by Stahl and Sully de Luque (this issue). Perhaps in many cases, leaders exhibit both types of behaviors simultaneously.

In taking a stakeholder perspective, it may be that a leader can be responsible for one stakeholder group but neglectful to others. As Doh and Quigley (this issue) describe, there is a great challenge in the task of prioritizing the potentially limitless number of stakeholders an organization needs to consider. This may result in a leader's putting forth effort into appeasing a particular stakeholder group that he perceives as key to organizational success or just appeals to his values while neglecting another stakeholder group that he perceives to be less important. For example, a leader can exhibit socially responsible behavior by ensuring that her employees are not discriminated against racially. However, this same leader may condone the use of child labor by one of the firm's suppliers.

Irresponsible and responsible leadership may even affect the same stakeholder group. For example, environmental advocacy groups might be especially concerned with an electric utility's use of coal for energy, so the leader develops a plan to create a hydroelectric dam to harness energy from flowing water. However, when the dam is complete, the environmental group still considers the leader irresponsible as it has destroyed an ecosystem of fish and other creatures. Despite differing perspectives on whether leaders can be simultaneously responsible and irresponsible, research representing both viewpoints can proceed concurrently as each perspective presents a different vein of exploration within the RL domain.

A further RL process worthy of research is that of the shared leadership model as detailed by Pearce and colleagues (this issue). By moving away from an exclusive, top-down hierarchical leadership approach toward the implementation of shared leadership, we may be able to prevent the spread of irresponsibility that many societal and business leaders exhibit. Thus, irresponsible leadership may be addressed by establishing a system of checks and balances or transparency that is characteristic of a shared leadership model. However, as Pearce et al.

TABLE 2
Suggested Future Research Questions Relevant to Responsible Leadership and Its Implementation in Organizations

Responsible leadership processes and outcomes
- What are the qualities or traits associated with responsible leadership at the top management team (TMT) level?
- Do alternative forms of responsible leadership lead to more or less corporate social or financial performance at the firm level?
- What is the role of traditional leadership processes (e.g., transformational, servant, or authentic leadership) in CSR formulation and implementation at different organizational levels?
- How do singular and shared/plural forms of leadership coincide to achieve effective responsible leadership processes?
- What is the role of a CSR (or sustainability) department vis-à-vis TMT members in responsible leadership processes?
- What is the connection between responsible and irresponsible leadership practices? Can both coincide within an organization?
- What is the meaning and role of accountability within responsible leadership processes, and what organizational mechanisms and personal qualities are associated with leader accountability?
- Can the "responsible organization" be separated from "responsible leadership"?
- How do informal leaders play an important role in terms of responsibility during times when the current formal leader(s) is perceived as being irresponsible?

Stakeholder priorities
- How do responsible leaders appropriately identify relevant stakeholders and align policies/actions that will balance their needs (as suggested by stakeholder theory)?
- How can a leader best tie in shareholder priorities with stakeholder priorities?
- What are the traits, processes, and so forth through which executives balance economic and stakeholder concerns?
- How can leaders utilize their stakeholder network to help in the creation of an organizational climate of responsibility?
- Is there a "butterfly effect" in which an organization helps to serve the needs of one stakeholder, especially one who is a member of its supply chain, thereby positively affecting other stakeholder groups? Are there situations in which being responsible to one group may hurt another?
- How can responsible leadership orientations help organizations to overcome the potential trust gaps that may exist between certain stakeholders, or between stakeholders and the organization?

Training and development
- Can orientations toward responsible leadership be trained or developed, or are the values, beliefs, and mindsets pertaining to responsible leadership more trait-like and non-trainable?
- Is effective responsible leadership training/development dependent on the managerial level of the employee? How should a middle-tier manager's training differ from a TMT member's training when it comes to responsible leadership?
- Do effective development processes differ for profit-based vs. not-for-profit organizations?

Globalization and macro-level forces
- How do leaders help MNCs adjust to having to deal with culturally different perspectives or environments that may offer different views on what CSR is all about?
- How can leaders help integrate governmental policies or regulations pertaining to CSR into the CSR-related actions of their organizations?
- What are the implications for responsible/irresponsible leadership in relation to corruption phenomena, such as kickbacks, bribery, and government favoritism?
- How is shared leadership governed in a multinational realm where the laws, regulations, and norms may differ for leaders in different countries, potentially impeding leaders from executing an equivalent organizational standard of responsible leadership? In such contexts, are differing standards appropriate?
- How do cross-cultural differences in leaders affect the shared leadership dynamic?
- Are there differences in terms of antecedents, outcomes, and so forth with regard to responsible leadership in for-profit organizations versus not-for-profit organizations?

Measurement and assessment
- How is responsible leadership best measured in empirical research?
- How do we measure multilevel relationships between CSR and responsible leadership?
- How can we best use input from appropriate stakeholders when evaluating the actions of a leader, or outcomes?
- How can (or should) the effects of responsible leadership be measured? How might more micro-level outcomes (e.g., identification) be incorporated with more macro-level outcomes (e.g., firm social or financial performance)?
- Regarding shared responsible leadership, how can research parse decisions that may have been more heavily influenced by certain leader(s)?
- How can the effects of prior responsible/irresponsible leaders be differentiated from those of current responsible/irresponsible leaders? That is, how do indefinite time frames come into play in the assessment of responsible/irresponsible leadership?
- What types of questions might qualitative research address to further our understanding of responsible leadership?

detail, there are many unexplored paths as well as differing perspectives regarding how to best implement shared leadership within an RL orientation. They pose several questions: When is it most appropriate to share leadership? How can an organization implement such a model? How can an organization shift between hierarchical and shared leadership to best ensure RL?

Accountability represents an additional issue that is relevant to RL research. Dictionary-based definitions of responsibility inherently include accountability, although theory and research to date have been noticeably absent with regard to this particular issue. What exactly does it mean for leaders to be held accountable to stakeholders, and what organizational or personal qualities of leaders are associated with accountability? If organizational policies stress accountability to particular stakeholders, what consequences might ensue if no leader is held directly accountable, or if the leader attributes failure to meet the needs of stakeholders to external causes? These and related questions pertaining to accountability might prove to be fertile ground for helping to understand responsible leadership processes and their outcomes.

Stakeholder Priorities

As should be evident in the articles included in this symposium, stakeholder theory is perhaps applicable to any viable consideration of RL (see Doh and Quigley, as well as Pearce and colleagues, this issue). For example, although stakeholder theory would suggest that the needs of multiple stakeholder entities should be balanced, how exactly might a responsible leader achieve such an ideal level of harmonization in meeting stakeholder expectations? At an even more basic level, how do responsible leaders appropriately identify "relevant" stakeholders? For instance, a textile firm that currently operates in the United States has leaders who have promoted strong community relations (i.e., the community as a stakeholder) by employing local workers and paying beyond sufficient wages. However, the firm wants to increase profits (i.e., to better serve shareholders) by using suppliers who can provide cheaper labor overseas. In this situation, a responsible leader may balance the various aspects of this transition by first ensuring that current employees do not lose their jobs (or are provided satisfactory severance packages and outplacement services if their employment is no longer financially feasible). Second, the firm and its leader(s) will ensure that offshore suppliers do not use negligent business practices by having poor working conditions.

Additionally, when leaders are able to meet stakeholder expectations, there can be a "butterfly effect" in which other stakeholders also receive a positive benefit from the actions of the organization toward the intended stakeholder. RL is highly dependent on the interplay between an organization's leaders and its stakeholders (Waldman, 2014). Because an organization's network of stakeholders is highly interconnected, leaders who are able to recognize the shared value their business creates may be better organized to handle their core stakeholders as a unified group rather than as separate entities (Freeman, Wicks, & Parmar, 2004). Unfortunately, in some cases one stakeholder group maybe in direct opposition to another stakeholder group's needs. The challenge for responsible leaders is to try to avoid any negative repercussions that could affect one stakeholder group because of bringing about positive outcomes for another stakeholder group. Perhaps the most effective responsible leaders are able to identify such issues before they happen, and thus prepare for future actions or explanations that may be demanded of them from the adversely affected group(s).

Training and Development

There has been much debate in past research about whether individuals can be trained to become good leaders and even responsible leaders (Ashkanasy, Windsor, & Trevirlo, 2006; Fleishman, 1953; House & Aditya, 1997). Regardless of the debate, leadership research and consulting have focused on development programs that can shape the effectiveness of people in leadership positions. One such program, called Project Ulysses, serves as an integrated service-learning program in which individuals travel abroad to spend time working with NGOs, entrepreneurs, and other small organizations in underdeveloped countries. A long-term, post-program survey provided evidence that this experience enhanced RL qualities in the participants. Thus, the study serves as an example of an approach to how RL qualities can be learned outside of a formal training setting (Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011).

It should be noted that Project Ulysses and other such programs generally operate by training employees from the same organization. This leads one to wonder how such training might affect leaders who are the only ones from their companies to participate in service-learning programs. If only one individual from a firm is granted the opportunity for such an experience, the rest of the organization might not reap the desired benefits of moving toward more responsible behavior from their leaders. That is, when only one key player in the firm has "seen the light" when it comes to making changes toward a more responsible existence, the burden

may be on that person to create an environment in which he can share his experience with other leaders of the organization. Thus, others may be able to live the experience vicariously through the actual participant (Bandura, 1977) and possibly adopt more responsible leadership qualities. In this manner, the participant can contribute to the greater goal of having a whole organization of responsible leaders by telling her story in a way that inspires others.

This process reflects on both the psychological and information pathways in which RL can affect an organization, as proposed by Doh and Quigley (this issue). Leader inclusiveness, which is the extent to which a leader can indicate by words or actions an invitation and appreciation for others' contributions (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), suggests that the participant is signaling, through participation in the project, his commitment to being socially responsible, thus proceeding through the psychological pathway through which RL behavior may be achieved. Likewise, the informational pathway is being used as the participant then transfers her experience to other organizational members via knowledge and information flow. We need research to evaluate whether this potential transferring of the benefits of service-learning programs to others is actually realized, as well as to test the full breadth of how the psychological and informational pathways can benefit an organization and its leaders.

Globalization and Macro-Level Forces

Although the topic of RL has garnered increased attention and has a host of conceptualizations as to what it means to be a responsible leader (Waldman, 2014), we know little about the topic at the global level. For example, in multinational firms or firms with a high degree of international diversity in top management teams, there can be wide differences in perspectives regarding practices and decisions associated with RL. This diversity and these differences could present challenges for attempts at shared RL among an internal collection of leaders of a specific firm. To further complicate this issue, for leaders in a multinational firm, the laws and regulations may vary depending on where they are physically located, leading to unique challenges in implementing an organizational standard for RL. Factors such as differing cultural norms (e.g., norms pertaining to corruption; see Pearce and colleagues, this issue), employment laws, and environmental

regulations serve to complicate any pursuit of a shared RL model. Thus, it behooves researchers to examine the balance between holding all leaders to the same standards and adjusting the meaning of "responsible" to a specific cultural or societal context. Such research would not only contribute to leadership literature but would have important practical applications for multinational organizations using a shared leadership paradigm (see Pearce et al., this issue).

Relatedly, Filatotchev and Nakajima (this issue) deal with the potential effects of the institutional context on RL. They note that previous studies have largely failed to take into account the role of a firm's institutional environment with regard to the link between corporate governance factors and organizational CSR strategy. While not considering either corporate governance or board members per se, Stahl and Sully de Luque (this issue) echo a similar theme. We concur and suggest that future research pay attention to RL within various institutional contexts.

Stahl and Sully de Luque (this issue) delve further into the global perspective of RL by discussing how the supranational context has a significant influence on RL behavior. An example they give pertains to the different ways that companies and their leaders enforce the UN Global Compact (UNGC), a United Nations initiative that encourages businesses to adopt sustainable and socially responsible policies. Although case analyses have suggested that some companies have implemented the UNGC (Woo, 2010), there is also evidence of its slow and uneven adoption (Baumann-Pauly, Wickert, Spence, & Scherer, 2013). Perhaps societal or cultural differences affect leaders in their attempts to implement the UNGC. In short, the UNGC may provide an important mechanism (e.g., relevant data) for researchers to address RL in a global context.

Measurement and Assessment

Measurement is an obvious research issue for any domain, including RL. Measures have been developed to assess a range of leadership concepts, including those that have at least some conceptual overlap with RL, such as transformational (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1997), ethical (e.g., Brown, Trevirio, & Harrison, 2005), and servant (e.g., Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008) leadership. As is evident from the articles in this symposium, one potentially distinguishing aspect of future RL measurement is the need to assess leaders at more strategic levels.

This focus implies an emphasis on actions and decisions oriented to the internal organization as well as external constituents. In contrast, existing leadership measures focus on the internal organization and especially behaviors toward individuals and small groups. Furthermore, it is apparent from the work of Pless, Maak, and Waldman (2012) and that of Stahl and Sully de Luque (this issue) that multiple orientations or dimensions of RL can be conceived and, thus, measured.

Taking these issues into account, several questions come to mind. Can a measure of RL be developed that displays discriminant validity in comparison with existing leadership measures? In addition to responses from internal followers, will measures of RL inherently require input from stakeholders beyond organizational boundaries? And how can RL be assessed in more qualitative terms? These and other measurement issues will need to be addressed in future RL research.

As Waldman (2011) argued, it maybe possible to derive an RL measure that could have broader applications without the "baggage" of approaches to the measurement and research on ethical leadership. Specifically, existing measures of ethical leadership (e.g., Brown et al., 2005) are rather subjective due to inherent information processing constructions of what people perceive to be ethical behavior based on personal biases that may come from religion, culture, or personal experience. It is possible that considerations of RL may overcome such limitations. In addition, the application of ethical leadership measurement beyond small group levels has been problematic (Brown & Trevifio, 2006), and as noted above, the assessment of RL may prove to be more relevant at strategic levels of management (Waldman, 2011).

CONCLUSIONS

The articles in the current symposium provide ideas for how to move forward with theory and research in the area of responsible leadership. In this symposium we see a range of perspectives, including both micro and macro approaches to the phenomenon. As we have pointed out, one of the issues that gets at the heart of RL processes is the divergence of economic/strategic versus more

stakeholder-based views of RL. However, we believe that these perspectives can converge by better understanding and dealing with the seeming conflict between satisfying the concerns of owners/shareholders and those of other stakeholders (Smith & Lewis, 2011). Often, researchers and practitioners who adopt the stakeholder perspective neglect the fact that key stakeholders include shareholders. By contrast, those who adopt a more economic/strategic perspective make assumptions that there must be trade-offs between satisfying the needs of owners/shareholders and considering others stakeholders of the firm. We propose that a paradox management approach would assume that, over time, there is no inherent conflict in these views of RL, and that a firm may be able to simultaneously pursue multiple goals that would benefit a range of stakeholders, including owners/shareholders.

In light of our suggestions, we caution theorists and researchers to avoid the temptation to immediately put forth normative approaches, whereby a stated model of RL is proclaimed to be the "way forward" for both researchers and practitioners. As shown by Pless and colleagues (2012) and reinforced by Doh and Quigley (this issue), there can be multiple ways of conceiving of RL. Indeed, the precise meaning of effective RL remains controversial (Waldman & Siegel, 2008). Given the nascent stage of both theory and research, we concur with Stahl and Sully de Luque (this issue) that descriptive approaches may thus be more appropriate to specify and determine the antecedents and consequences of alternative approaches to RL.

We further conclude that as suggested at the outset of this overview article, it is impossible to consider responsible leadership without simultaneously considering individual leaders—either as singular leaders or more collectively through a shared leadership model. So while one may speak of the "responsible organization," to consider responsible leadership per se, researchers will need to frame their thinking at least to some degree within existing leadership concepts and theory. Thus, with an eye toward the future, we can look forward to when RL more clearly has its place within the greater study of leadership processes in organizations. We hope that the readers of this symposium are able to apply the ideas presented here in striving to answer questions of interest in the responsible leadership domain.

REFERENCES

Aguilera, R., Filatotchev, I., Jackson, G., & Gospel, H. (2008). An organizational approach to comparative corporate governance: Costs, contingencies, and complementarities. *Organization Science*, 19, 475–492.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Windsor, C. A., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Bad apples in bad barrels revisited: Cognitive moral

development, just world beliefs, rewards, and ethical decision-making. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *16*, 449–473.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1997). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Mindgarden.

Baumann-Pauly, D., Wickert, C., Spence, L., & Scherer, A. G. (2013). Organizing corporate social responsibility in small and large firms: Size matters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *115*, 693–705.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 595–616.

Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*, 117–134.

Campbell, J. L. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, *82*, 946–967.

Carmeli, A., Gilat, G., & Waldman, D. A. (2007). The role of perceived organizational performance in organizational identification, adjustment, and job performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *44*, 972–992.

Christensen, L. J., Mackey, A., & Whetten, D. (2014). Taking responsibility for corporate social responsibility: The role of leaders in creating, implementing, sustaining, or avoiding socially responsible firm behaviors. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(2), 164–178.

Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 92–117.

Davis, G. F. (2005). New directions in corporate governance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *31*, 143–162.

Donaldson, L., & Davis, J. H. (1991). Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholder returns. *Australian Journal of Management*, *16*, 49–64.

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 65–91.

Fleishman, E. A. (1953). Leadership climate, human relations training, and supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *6*, 205–222.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Freeman, R. E., Wicks, A. C., & Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder theory and "The corporate objective revisited.". *Organization Science*, *15*, 364–369.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, *23*, 409–473.

Jensen, M. C. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *The American Economic Review*, *76*, 323–329.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multilevel assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 161–177.

Maak, T., & Pless, N. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society—a relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *66*, 99–115.

Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*, 268–305.

McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. S. (2011). Creating and capturing value, strategic corporate social responsibility, resource-based theory, and sustainably competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *37*, 1480–1495.

Morgeson, F. P., Aguinis, H., Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. S. (2013). Extending corporate social responsibility research to the human resource management and organizational behavior domains: A look to the future. *Personnel Psychology*, *66*, 805–824.

Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*, 941–966.

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, *24*, 403–411.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2002). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, C. L., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). A reciprocal and longitudinal investigation of the innovation process: The central role of shared vision in product and process innovation teams (PPITs). *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 259–278.

Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2014). *Share, don't take the lead*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. K. (2011). Developing responsible global leaders through international service-learning programs: The Ulysses experience. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *10*, 237–260.

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.

Siegel, D. S. (2009). Green management matters only if it yields more green: An economic/strategic perspective. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *23*(3), 5–16.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*, 381–403.

Sully de Luque, M. F., Washburn, N., Waldman, D. A., & House, R. (2008). Unrequited profit: How stakeholder and economic values relate to subordinates' perceptions of leadership and firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *53*, 626–654.

Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multilevel outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *105*, 1–16.

Waldman, D. A. (2011). Moving forward with the concept of responsible leadership: Three caveats to guide theory and research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*, 75–83.

Waldman, D. A. (2014). Bridging the domains of leadership and corporate social responsibility. In D. Day, (Ed.), *Handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 541–557). New York: Oxford University Press.

Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. (2008). Denning the socially responsible leader. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 117–131.

Woo, C. Y. (2010). Implementing the United Nations Global Compact. In A. Rasche & G. Kell. (Eds.), *The United Nations Global Compact: Achievements, trends and challenges* (pp. 115–143). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *13*, 443–464.

———————— ∧∧ ————————

David A. Waldman (waldman@asu.edu) is a professor in the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University. His research interests include responsible leadership and the neuroscience of leadership. He currently sits on six editorial review boards and is a fellow of the American Psychological Association and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Rachel M. Balven (rbalven@asu.edu) is currently a doctoral student in the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University. Her research interests include leadership, organizational influences on moral behavior and decision-making, and corporate social responsibility.

———————— ∧∧ ————————