

# Responsible Leadership: Knowledge Status and Future Research Agenda

**Martina Martinovic and Silke Bustamante**

Department of Cooperative Studies, Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[martina.martinovic@hwr-berlin.de](mailto:martina.martinovic@hwr-berlin.de)

[silke.bustamante@hwr-berlin.de](mailto:silke.bustamante@hwr-berlin.de)

**Abstract:** The present review article deals with the highly relevant and rich research field of responsible leadership (RL). It summarizes existing literature using a wide scope of 96 peer-reviewed journal articles and subsequently provides recommendations for future research paths. The current state of knowledge is depicted in relation to five knowledge areas: In the first area, the conceptualisation of RL, works addressing fundamental views on RL, the development of frameworks and the application of specific philosophies or theories are introduced. In the second area, the operationalisation of RL, results of studies dealing with the development of measurement instruments or applying quantitative empirical study designs in order to test specific research questions are presented. The third area, RL antecedents, covers the depiction of empirically investigated antecedent variables pertaining to either a personal or a contextual level. In the fourth area, RL consequences, empirically examined impacts of RL at a micro, meso and macro level are summarised and further works dealing with effects of RL on relationships between other variables discussed. Finally, the fifth area of RL promotion presents works that are empirically testing RL development interventions that take place either in the context of higher education or work. Derived potential lines of research relate to these five areas of knowledge and address identified research gaps of content-related, empirical and methodological nature.

**Keywords:** Responsible Leadership, Conceptualisation, Review Article, State of the Art, Research Agenda

---

## 1. Study Background and Aim

Against the background of serious global sustainability challenges and repeatedly uncovered corporate scandals, business leaders were and are confronted with increasing and new responsibility requirements. This has paved the way for the approach of responsible leadership (RL) (Foldøy et al, 2021), which emphasizes the relationship between leaders and stakeholders and thereby goes beyond leader-subordinate focuses (Shi and Ye, 2016). The construct of RL was introduced into the scientific literature in the early 1990s and began to gain importance worldwide from 2006 onwards with a book titled "Responsible Leadership" edited by Maak and Pless (MacTaggart and Lynham, 2018). Since then it has "emerged as a major theme in academic and practical management discourse" (Stahl and Sully de Luque, 2014, p. 236). The interest in RL has produced a rich research field with numerous publications. Nonetheless, a comprehensive understanding and consensus respective the concept of RL, its antecedents, outcomes and promotion still has to be reached.

Several researchers have conducted literature reviews on the field of RL that support the attempt to bring clarity into these issues. Those include the works of Shi and Ye (2016), Greige Frangieh and Khayr Yaacoub (2017), MacTaggart and Lynham (2018), Miska and Mendenhall (2018), Foldøy et al (2021), Han, Wang and Ni (2022) as well as Tan (2023). Although these reviews are helpful, they have some important limitations respective the literature bases used and content evaluations done: First, the scope of included papers often not exceeds 50 sources, even if more literature is existing. Secondly, the publications covered only extend up to 2022 and if so, include only a very small number of publications from this year. However, several relevant publications appeared in 2022 and subsequent years. Third, while existing reviews cover discussions on the definition of RL, its antecedents and outcomes, a review of the literature about the promotion of RL is essentially missing. Overall, this indicates that a current literature review that counteracts these limitations is needed. The following paper therefore aims to provide a more comprehensive literature review in terms of the scope and timeliness of considered publications as well as inclusion of the area of RL promotion. In addition, it derives recommendations for future research. Within this review, the focus is put mainly on RL in a business context.

## 2. Method

In order to achieve the above formulated research objectives, the following steps were taken: (1) search for existing literature, (2) screening of works for inclusion in a final literature base used to assess the current state of knowledge on RL, (3) examination of studies included in the final base, (4) summarisation of study results, (5) derivation of possible future lines of research.

The final literature base comprises 96 peer-reviewed journal articles written in English language. All publications are referring to the leadership approach of “RL” and are in no case dealing only with related concepts such as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or responsible management. In the development of the literature base, authors were guided by several considerations including the following: First, the publications should be based on an understanding of RL that concerns responsible decisions, actions etc. of individuals. Second, in all knowledge areas highlighted in this review, except for the conceptualisation of RL, the focus should be mainly on empirical works. Third, the publications should generally refer to a business context. All articles included in the literature base, except one theory-building article from 1998, have been published between 2006 and 2024, with approx. two-thirds in the last five and approx. one-third in the last three years.

## 2.1 Current State of Knowledge on RL

### 2.1.1 Conceptualisation of RL: What is RL?

Concerning the definition and conceptualisation of RL, various publications of mainly theoretical nature can be identified. These can be classified into three different streams:

The first stream is dealing with *fundamental views on RL*. A differentiation between so-called agent, stakeholder and converging views can be observed (Miska, Hilbe and Mayer, 2014). According to agent views, leaders are only responsible to a company’s shareholders or owners. In accordance with stakeholder views, leaders carry responsibility to a broader set of stakeholders comprising for example also employees, customers and the community (Waldman and Galvin, 2008). Converging views are attempting to reconcile the two former perspectives (Miska, Hilbe and Mayer, 2014). In line with these ideas, different models of RL orientations were introduced: Pless, Maak and Waldman (2012) distinguish four orientations named “traditional economist”, “opportunity seeker”, “integrator” and “idealist”. Waldman, Siegel and Stahl (2020) differentiate between the two orientations “strategist” and “integrator” and Pless et al (2022) show in a case study that the “integrative RL approach” represents the morally superior choice compared to the “instrumental approach”. Prominent definitions of RL include the one of Maak and Pless (2006) as well as the one of Voegtlin (2011). Maak and Pless (2006, p. 112) understand RL as “a social-relational and ethical phenomenon that occurs in interaction between a leader and a broader group of followers, inside and outside the organization”. Voegtlin (2011, p. 59) describes it as following: “Responsible leadership can thus be understood as the awareness and consideration of the consequences of one’s actions for all stakeholders, as well as the exertion of influence by enabling the involvement of affected stakeholders and by engaging in an active stakeholder dialogue. Therein responsible leaders strive to weigh and balance the interests of forwarded claims”. In the literature, there is a debate about how to distinguish RL from other leadership approaches such as ethical or servant leadership. De Klerk and Jooste (2023, p. 628) conclude on this that “RL is predominantly distinctive in terms of its relational focus on, as well as accountability for, active external stakeholder engagement, balancing external stakeholder interests, and building social capital and long-term sustainability of society and the natural environment”.

The second stream of literature helps to build a deeper understanding of RL by developing different *frameworks of RL dimensions, roles, principles, components or practices*. Regarding RL dimensions Agrawal and Bhal (2020), for example, present a model with four dimensions named “moral person”, “moral manager”, “multistakeholder considerations” and “sustainable growth focus”. Concerning RL roles, for example, Voegtlin et al (2020) introduce the three roles of being an “expert”, “facilitator” and “citizen”. With regard to RL principles Maak and Pless (2009), for example, introduce the idea of cosmopolitan leadership principles covering eight aspects ranging from “recognition of equal worth and dignity” over “stakeholder engagement and dialogue” to “sustainability and stewardship”. In terms of components, Lynham and Chermack (2006, p. 81) describe within their theory of RL for performance that “for leadership to be considered responsible, it must demonstrate, and be judged to demonstrate, effectiveness, ethics and endurance”. Finally, regarding RL practices Castañeda García et al (2023) identify five core RL practices for small- and medium-sized enterprises restaurants summarized as “societal orientation”, “ethics”, “stakeholder involvement”, “power-sharing” and “environmental orientation”.

The third stream of publications is enhancing the understanding of RL by viewing the leadership approach through the *lens of within that context largely unutilized specific philosophies or theories*. It includes works using the philosophy of Levinas (Jones, 2014), the Renewed Darwinian Theory (Lawrence and Pirson, 2015) or Catholic social teaching (Marek and Jabłóński, 2021).

### 2.1.2 Operationalisation of RL: How can RL be Measured?

A number of publications explore the topic of the operationalisation of RL. They are either dealing explicitly with the *development* of measurement instruments or *applying* quantitative empirical study designs in order to test specific research questions pertaining to the RL field.

Very few of the reviewed studies focus *explicitly on the development of quantitative measures* to capture RL. Voegtlin (2011) developed a five-item scale of discursive RL including items such as “My direct supervisor considers the consequences of decisions for the affected stakeholders” or “My direct supervisor weighs different stakeholder claims before making a decision” that respondents have to evaluate using a five-point scale. He describes that his instrument covers mainly one dimension of RL, which becomes also obvious when looking at other instruments such as the one of Agrarwal and Bhal (2020). The latter designed an 18-item scale measuring four RL dimensions, that all have to be assessed using a five-point scale. The dimensions of “moral person” and “moral manager” are measured with five items each (e.g. “Shows consistency in words and action” or respectively “Listens to what subordinates have to say”), the dimensions of “multistakeholder considerations” and “sustainable growth focus” with four items each (e.g. “Tries to assess impact on stakeholders before making business decisions” or respectively “Communicates a vision for long-term growth for the organisation”).

Studies that are not explicitly focussing the development of instruments, but *applying them in order to test specific research questions (related to e.g. RL antecedents or outcomes)*, are mostly using Voegtlin’s (2011) instrument, sometimes with small modifications. Besides, various other instruments are utilized that are either taken from previous works such as Doh, Stumpf and Tymon (2011) or that are developed by the author(s) of a study for own purposes (e.g. Voegtlin et al, 2020).

### 2.1.3 Antecedents of RL: What Influences RL?

In literature, several antecedents of RL have already been identified. Building on the view that RL behaviour is a function of both, the leader as a person and the environment or context in which he or she acts (Stahl and Sully de Luque, 2014), and following previous reviews (Han, Wang and Ni, 2022; Shi and Ye, 2016), these can be classified into *personal* and *contextual* factors. Only a few studies investigated RL antecedents on an empirical level, applying qualitative as well as quantitative designs and using, to a major part, European samples. In summary, these empirical studies show the following:

With regard to *personal factors*, results suggest that RL is positively influenced by the empathy of a leader (Voegtlin et al, 2020) as well as his/her hierarchical position (Voegtlin, 2011). Additionally, Crilly, Schneider and Zollo (2008) found that reasoning styles of leaders (i.e. considerations leaders use as a basis for their reasoning), influence the propensity to act responsible. Besides that, the positive affect of a leader (Crilly, Schneider and Zollo, 2008) and certain value orientations such as universalism (Crilly, Schneider and Zollo; Voegtlin et al, 2020) and benevolence (Crilly, Schneider and Zollo, 2008) were shown to have positive direct and indirect (via reasoning styles) impacts (Crilly, Schneider and Zollo, 2008). Miska, Stahl and Mendenhall (2013) detected specific intercultural competencies as, for example, “cosmopolitanism” and “social flexibility” to influence RL. Furthermore, Pless (2007) identified the role of motivational drivers for RL, which include intrapsychic (need for exploration and assertion, need for attachment and differentiation, sense of enjoyment) as well as normative drivers (need for justice, need for recognition, sense of care). Building on her work, Castillo, Sánchez and Dueñas-Ocampo (2020) finally explored the development of such drivers in more detail.

Regarding *contextual factors*, the role of institutional factors (liberal vs. coordinated market economies) (Witt and Stahl, 2016) as well as of “shared concerns” (environmental and communal, professional, employment and commercial concerns) (Meliou, Ozbilgin and Edwards, 2021) was detected.

Despite the focus of the review on empirical studies, two non-empirical studies developing comprehensive sets of potential antecedents are worth mentioning. First, Stahl and Sully de Luque (2014) have developed a theoretical model on the antecedents of RL, which comprises five different categories of antecedent variables: individual, situational, organisational, institutional and supranational factors. Second, Muff, Liechti and Dyllick (2020) have developed a set of 45 RL competencies that are clustered across five dimensions termed “stakeholder relations”, “ethics and values”, “self-awareness”, “systems thinking” and “change and innovation”.

### 2.1.4 Outcomes of RL: What Does RL Lead to?

With regard to the consequences of RL, numerous outcomes have already been identified in literature. These relate to different levels and can therefore be categorised into different clusters (e.g. Foldøy et al, 2021). In this

review, the following three levels or clusters are differentiated: (1) impacts of RL at the *micro level* refer to impacts on individuals within organisations, such as managers themselves or their subordinates; (2) impacts of RL at the *meso level* describe impacts on organisational units such as teams as well as on entire organisations; (3) impacts of RL at the *macro level* finally refer to impacts on external stakeholders (i.e. outside or beyond the organisation). The empirically tested direct or indirect effects of RL identified in this review are presented below. It should be noted at this point that in most of the studies, further mediating and/or moderating variables were included. However, due to the scope of this paper and for reasons of clarity, these are not discussed here.

At the *micro level*, it can be seen that RL influences a *variety of behavioural as well as other variables of employees or respectively subordinates*. Within this context, positive effects of RL on the helping intention of employees (Liu and Lin, 2018) as well as their project (Yang et al, 2022), organisational (e.g. Freire and Gonçalves, 2021), stakeholder (Agrarwal and Bhal, 2020) and community citizenship behaviour (Voegtlin et al, 2020) were presented. In addition, positive influences on the mainly work-related green/pro-environmental behaviour of employees (e.g. Xiao et al, 2024), their organisational citizenship behaviour for the environment (e.g. Zhao and Zhou, 2019) and their personal low-carbon behaviour (Zhang, Liu and Zhang, 2023) were reported. Promoting effects of RL on employee' creative (Zulfiqar, Khan and Huo, 2023) and innovative behaviour (Dong and Zhong, 2021) as well as their whistleblowing intentions (Akhtar et al, 2021) were shown. Furthermore, positive influences on the performance of employees (e.g. Lin, Huang and Huang, 2020) were identified. Besides these positive relationships, negative influences on subordinates' willingness to engage in unethical pro-organisational behaviour (Cheng, Wei and Lin, 2019) and performance of such behaviour (Cheng et al, 2022) were found. A paradoxical (Zhu et al, 2021) and later U-shaped effect (Zhu and Zhao, 2024) of RL on employees' cyberloafing were detected. In terms of other than behavioural variables, also positive effects of RL on the moral courage of employees (Agrarwal and Bhal, 2020), their duty orientation (Ansong, Agyeiwaa and Gnankob, 2022), work engagement (e.g. Dong and Zhong, 2022), affective organisational commitment (e.g. Voegtlin et al, 2020) and job satisfaction (Voegtlin, 2011) were shown. Finally, negative effects on the turnover intention and turnover behaviour of subordinates (e.g. Doh, Stumpf and Tymon, 2011) were found. Secondly, although much rarer, *outcomes for leaders or managers* were investigated. Within that context, Voegtlin et al (2020) showed that RL is related to positive perceptions of leader effectiveness and attractiveness.

At the *meso level*, positive influences on the performance of teams (e.g. Lin, Ren and Ding, 2024) as well as the workforce (Cyfert et al, 2022) and strategic agility (Chang et al, 2023) were found. Additionally, positive effects on the reputation (Varma, 2021) and attractiveness of the organisation (Voegtlin et al, 2020) as well as its inclusiveness (Bhatti, Irfan and Öztürk, 2023) have been identified. Besides that, positive relationships with the general innovation performance (Castañeda García et al, 2023) as well as green/environmental innovations (e.g. Huo et al, 2022) of organisations were detected. Finally, positive consequences for the whole or parts of the triple-bottom-line performance of organisations have been shown (e.g. Xuecheng et al, 2022).

At the *macro level*, no empirically validated results were detected.

All of the studies included above have dealt with effects of RL on one or more variables. Besides these, in literature also some works can be found that empirically examine the effect of RL on relationships between other variables. In this context, especially the moderating role of RL (either alone or in interaction with further variables) in relationships between CSR and several outcome variables was investigated. While some authors have shown positive effects of RL on relationships between CSR and outcomes such as employee commitment, engagement, organisational citizenship behaviour (Bouichou, Wang and Feroz, 2022) and e.g. green behaviour (He, Morrison and Zhang, 2021), Javed et al (2020a) have found that RL negatively moderates the relationships between CSR and corporate reputation as well as financial performance. Furthermore, Javed et al (2020b) have shown inter alia that specific RL orientations strengthen the relationship between responsible governance and CSR whereas other weaken it. Finally, He, Morrison and Zhang (2019) have identified, besides others, that RL strengthens the positive effect of human resource management on employee well-being.

The majority of the here included empirical works dealing with RL outcomes was characterized by quantitative study designs, especially of cross-sectional nature. In terms of samples underlying the different studies, the large majority was conducted in Asian countries and hereby especially in China and Pakistan. Furthermore, study participants came from several industries whereby manufacturing and hospitality were particularly strong represented.

### 2.1.5 Promotion of RL: How can RL be “Trained”?

Concerning the promotion of RL, the literature offers some important insights on RL development interventions that take place either in the *context of higher education* (e.g. course at a university for its students) or *work* (e.g. program offered by a company for its executives). The review conducted in the framework of this study revealed that the included empirically oriented studies are, in general, describing single interventions and assessing their effectiveness in terms of one or more different learning outcomes. The latter are generally representing aspects relevant to RL such as, for example, RL related knowledge (e.g. Arruda Filho, Hino and Przybylowicz Beuter, 2019; Goryunova, 2021; Pless, Maak and Stahl, 2011), abilities (e.g. Eriksen and Cooper, 2018), competencies (e.g. Muff, Delacoste and Dyllick, 2022; Rook and McManus, 2020), values (e.g. Basson and Steenkamp, 2024), attitudes (e.g. Blakeley and Higgs, 2014) or roles (Sroufe et al, 2015). More specific, the review has revealed the following:

In the *higher education context*, several studies have examined the effectiveness of various interventions offered to students at different levels. At an undergraduate level, the effectiveness of a leadership course at a US College of Business (Muff, Delacoste and Dyllick, 2022), a social innovation workshop at a South African university (Basson and Steenkamp, 2024) and a Global Citizenship Capstone seminar at a US public university (Goryunova, 2021) were identified. Rook and McManus (2020) additionally discussed an undergraduate unit embedding a non-placement work-integrated learning project offered at an Australian university. Besides these studies, Eriksen and Cooper (2018) presented the effectiveness of a MBA course and Sroufe et al (2015) highlighted the outcomes of international study trips for MBA students. Finally, Arruda Filho, Hino and Przybylowicz Beuter (2019) have shown the positive outcomes of a seminar that includes the topic of global RL conducted at a Brazilian business school.

Regarding interventions that take place in the *context of work*, especially RL development programmes built around service learning have been empirically investigated. In this context, Pless, Maak and Stahl (2011) evidenced the effectiveness of a programme of PricewaterhouseCoopers called “Project Ulysses”. Furthermore, Blakeley and Higgs (2014) showed positive outcomes of a programme run by a global professional services firm in the UK.

In sum, in terms of the study design of the mentioned empirical works, quantitative and qualitative designs were applied equally often. In addition, the study participants were members of the institutions that offered the development interventions. These institutions differed in terms of their geographical location, with North America being the most frequently represented.

## 3. Potential Future Research Paths

Analysing the current knowledge status on RL as depicted in the previous chapter, reveals the following implications for potential future research: First, in regard to the question how RL can be defined and conceptualised, a plurality of approaches is existent and a clear, unified understanding still has to be reached. Second, up to date there is a lack of established measurement instruments to capture RL comprehensively. Empirical works are based in particular on the scale developed by Voegtlin (2011), which only measures one aspect of RL. The further development of more comprehensive, robust instruments is therefore recommended. Third, with regard to the antecedents of RL, a great need for empirical studies is evident. In the literature review, only eight empirical works compared to over 50 dealing with RL outcomes were identified. Future empirical studies should especially investigate antecedents of the contextual level, relationships between different variables and interactive effects. Previous studies that examine RL antecedents on a theoretical level (e.g. Stahl and Sully de Luque, 2014) as well as current developments (e.g. introduction of Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive in European context) should be taken into account when identifying potential antecedent variables for inquiry. Finally, it is recommended that the studies make greater use of quantitative research methods in order to achieve a higher generalisability of results. Fourth, regarding RL outcomes, a need for studies applying longitudinal or experimental research designs to foster the causality of relationships is evident. In addition, it is recommended that future works are conducted in diverse industries and test effects also in non-Asian contexts to promote the generalisability of results. Content-wise it is recommendable that future studies focus especially on macro level outcomes, micro level outcomes for leaders as well as by now unexplored or unclear (due to existing contradictory results) relationships between various variables (e.g. RL, CSR and performance). Finally, in regard to the promotion of RL, further interventions applying different methods have to be developed and their effectiveness tested empirically in different contexts (e.g. countries, industries, organizations, study programs). Interventions for both, work settings as well as educational settings are thereby

important, as they tackle on the one hand current and on the other hand future leaders. Interestingly, although several of these research paths have also been recommended in previously conducted literature reviews (e.g. Foldøy et al, 2021; Miska and Mendenhall, 2018) and the field has strongly developed within the last years, they still seem to be true and wait for researchers to start their way on it.

#### 4. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to outline the current state of knowledge on the leadership approach of RL and, building on this, to identify relevant lines of research for the future. The descriptions provided show in a structured form the breadth of the RL research field, which has developed considerably in recent years. In addition, they highlight (still) existing gaps with regard to the conceptualisation, operationalisation, antecedents, outcomes and promotion of RL, the closing of which is strongly recommended in view of the high practical relevance of this leadership approach. Although the review is based on a broad sample of 96 studies, it does not claim to be exhaustive. Readers should bear in mind that the results reported relate to the sample analysed and therefore hold only true for the context defined with it. Some of the foci chosen for this sample can be regarded as limitations of the present work that open up avenues for future studies: First, one main focus was set on RL in a business context and therefore, an extension to other areas excluded in the present review represents a promising research endeavour. Second, references other than peer-reviewed journal articles were not taken into the scope of investigation and hence, results could be enriched with findings represented in other kinds of sources. Third, only results pertaining exclusively to RL have been included here, which could be complemented by results stemming from studies researching related concepts such as CSR or responsible management. Despite these limitations and under the consideration that the literature base used potentially does not include all existing publications relevant to the defined context, it can be assumed that the study will contribute to providing the support necessary to enable RL in the future.

#### References

- Agarwal, S. and Bhal, K.T. (2020) "A Multidimensional Measure of Responsible Leadership: Integrating Strategy and Ethics", *Group & Organization Management*, 45(5), pp 637-673.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601120930140>.
- Akhtar, M.W. et al (2021) "Say No to Wrongdoing: The Serial Mediation Model of Responsible Leadership and Whistleblowing Intentions", *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(5), pp 889-903.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-02-2020-0070>.
- Ansong, A., Agyeiwaa, A.A. and Gnankob, R.I. (2022) "Responsible Leadership, Job Satisfaction and Duty Orientation: Lessons from the Manufacturing Sector in Ghana", *European Business Review*, 34(6), pp 921-935.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-12-2021-0261>.
- Arruda Filho, N.d.P., Hino, M.C. and Przybylowicz Beuter, B.S. (2019) "Including SDGs in the Education of Globally Responsible Leaders", *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 20(5), pp 856-870.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-01-2019-0032>.
- Basson, R. and Steenkamp, G. (2024) "Developing Accounting Students as Responsible Leaders: A Workshop on Social Innovation", *South African Journal of Business Management*, 55(1), a4335.  
<https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v55i1.4335>.
- Bhatti, O.K., Irfan, M. and Öztürk, A.O. (2023) "Influence of Responsible Leadership on Inclusive Organizations: A Mixed-Method Study", *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 12, pp 41-71.
- Blakeley, K. and Higgs, M. (2014) "Responsible Leadership Development – Crucible Experiences and Power Relationships in a Global Professional Services Firm", *Human Resource Development International*, 17(5), pp 560-576.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2014.954192>.
- Bouichou, S.I., Wang, L. and Feroz, H.M.B. (2022) "How Corporate Social Responsibility Perceptions Affect Employees' Positive Behavior in the Hospitality Industry: Moderating Role of Responsible Leadership", *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 19, pp 413-446.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-021-00309-z>.
- Castañeda García, J.A. et al (2023) "Identifying Core 'Responsible Leadership' Practices for SME Restaurants", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(2), pp 419-450.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2021-1194>.
- Castillo, M.M., Sánchez, I.D. and Dueñas-Ocampo, S. (2020) "Leaders do not Emerge from a Vacuum: Toward an Understanding of the Development of Responsible Leadership", *Business and Society Review*, 125, pp 329-348.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12214>.
- Chang, A. et al (2023) "The Influence of Responsible Leadership on Strategic Agility: Cases from the Taiwan Hospitality Industry", *Sustainability*, 15, 2760. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032760>.

- Cheng, K., Wei, F. and Lin, Y. (2019) "The Trickle-Down Effect of Responsible Leadership on Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior: The Moderating Role of Leader-Follower Value Congruence", *Journal of Business Research*, 102, pp 34-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.044>.
- Cheng, K. et al (2022) "Standing in Customers' Shoes: How Responsible Leadership Inhibits Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior", *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1019734. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1019734>.
- Crilly, D., Schneider, S.C. and Zollo, M. (2008) "Psychological Antecedents to Socially Responsible Behavior", *European Management Review*, 5(3), pp 175-190. <https://doi.org/10.1057/emr.2008.15>.
- Cyfert, S. et al (2022) "The Power of Moving Fast: Responsible Leadership, Psychological Empowerment and Workforce Agility in Energy Sector Firms", *Heliyon*, 8, e11188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11188>.
- De Klerk, J.J. and Jooste, M. (2023) "Responsible Leadership and its Place in the Leadership Domain: A Meaning-Based Systematic Review", *Business and Society Review*, 128(4), pp 606-634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12331>.
- Doh, J.P., Stumpf, S.A. and Tymon Jr., W.G. (2011) "Responsible Leadership Helps Retain Talent in India", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98, pp 85-100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1018-3>.
- Dong, W. and Zhong, L. (2021) "Responsible Leadership Fuels Innovative Behavior: The Mediating Roles of Socially Responsible Human Resource Management and Organizational Pride", *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 787833. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.787833>.
- Dong, W. and Zhong, L. (2022) "How and When Responsible Leadership Facilitates Work Engagement: A Moderated Mediation Model", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 37(6), pp 545-558. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2021-0366>.
- Eriksen, M. and Cooper, K. (2018) "On Developing Responsible Leaders", *Journal of Management Development*, 37(6), pp 470-479. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-12-2016-0283>.
- Foldøy, S. et al (2021) "Responsibility Beyond the Board Room? A Systematic Review of Responsible Leadership: Operationalizations, Antecedents and Outcomes", *Sustainability*, 13, 10298. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810298>.
- Freire, C. and Gonçalves, J. (2021) "The Relationship Between Responsible Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Hospitality Industry", *Sustainability*, 13, 4705. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094705>.
- Goryunova, E. (2021) "Developing Responsible Leaders", *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 18(1), pp 23-35.
- Greige Frangieh, C. and Khayr Yaacoub, H. (2017) "A Systematic Literature Review of Responsible Leadership. Challenges, Outcomes and Practices", *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 8(2), pp 281-299. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-01-2017-0004>.
- Han, Z., Wang, D. and Ni, M. (2022) "A Review of the Responsible Leadership Research and its Prospect from the Vision of China", *Academic Journal of Business & Management*, 4(7), pp 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.25236/AJBM.2022.040705>.
- He, J., Morrison, A.M. and Zhang, H. (2019) "Improving Millennial Employee Well-Being and Task Performance in the Hospitality Industry: The Interactive Effects of HRM and Responsible Leadership", *Sustainability*, 11, 4410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11164410>.
- He, J., Morrison, A.M. and Zhang, H. (2021) "Being Sustainable: The Three-Way Interactive Effects of CSR, Green Human Resource Management, and Responsible Leadership on Employee Green Behavior and Task Performance", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28(3), pp 1043-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2104>.
- Huo, C. et al (2022) "Linking Responsible Leadership and Green Innovation: The Role of Knowledge Sharing and Leader-Member Exchange", *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 10, 945817. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.945817>.
- Javed, M. et al (2020a) "The Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility on Corporate Reputation and Firm Financial Performance: Moderating Role of Responsible Leadership", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(3), pp 1395-1409. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1892>.
- Javed, M. et al (2020b) "A Stakeholder-Centric Paradigm Bids Well for the 'Business Case' – An Investigation through Moderated-Mediation Model", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(6), pp 2563-2577. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1976>.
- Jones, J. (2014) "Leadership Lessons From Levinas: Revisiting Responsible Leadership", *Leadership and the Humanities*, 2(1), pp 44-63.
- Lawrence, P. R. and Pирson, M. (2015) "Economic and Humanistic Narratives of Leadership in the age of Globality: Toward a Renewed Darwinian Theory of Leadership", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, pp 383-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2090-2>.
- Lin, C.-P., Huang, H.-T. and Huang, T. Y. (2020) "The Effects of Responsible Leadership and Knowledge Sharing on Job Performance among Knowledge Workers", *Personnel Review*, 49(9), pp 1879-1896. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-12-2018-0527>.
- Lin, F., Ren, X. and Ding, G. (2024) "How Responsible Leadership Improves Stakeholder Collective Performance in Construction Projects: The Empirical Research from China", *Project Management Journal*, 55(3), pp 264-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728231208097>.
- Liu, C. M. and Lin, C. P. (2018) "Assessing the Effects of Responsible Leadership and Ethical Conflict on Behavioral Intention", *Review of Managerial Science*, 12, pp 1003-1024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-017-0236-1>.

- Lynham, S.A. and Chermack, T.J. (2006) "Responsible Leadership for Performance: A Theoretical Model and Hypotheses", *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(4), pp 73-88.
- Maak, T. and Pless, N.M. (2006) "Responsible Leadership in a Stakeholder Society – A Relational Perspective", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, pp 99-115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9047-z>.
- Maak, T. and Pless, N.M. (2009) "Business Leaders as Citizens of the World. Advancing Humanism on a Global Scale", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88, pp 537-550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0122-0>.
- MacTaggart, R.W. and Lynham, S.A. (2018) "An Integrative Literature Review of Responsible Leadership: Knowns, Unknowns, and Implications", *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 15(3), pp 56-69. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v15i3.1246>.
- Marek, A. and Jablónski, A. (2021) "Care of the Common Good as a Responsibility of Business Leaders. Catholic Social Teaching Perspective", *Religions*, 12, 125. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12020125>.
- Meliou, E., Ozbilgin, M. and Edwards, T. (2021) "How does Responsible Leadership Emerge? An Emergentist Perspective", *European Management Review*, 18(4), pp 521-534. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12488>.
- Miska, C., Hilbe, C. and Mayer, S. (2014) "Reconciling Different Views on Responsible Leadership: A Rationality-Based Approach", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125, pp 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1923-8>.
- Miska, C. and Mendenhall, M.E. (2018) "Responsible Leadership: A Mapping of Extant Research and Future Directions", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, pp 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2999-0>.
- Miska, C., Stahl, G.K. and Mendenhall, M.E. (2013) "Intercultural Competencies as Antecedents of Responsible Global Leadership", *European Journal of International Management*, 7(5), pp 550-569.
- Muff, K., Delacoste, C. and Dyllick, T. (2022) "Responsible Leadership Competencies in Leaders Around the World: Assessing Stakeholder Engagement, Ethics and Values, Systems Thinking and Innovation Competencies in Leaders Around the World", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(1), pp 273-292. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2216>.
- Muff, K., Liechti, A. and Dyllick, T. (2020) "How to Apply Responsible Leadership Theory in Practice: A Competency Tool to Collaborate on the Sustainable Development Goals", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(5), pp 2254-2274. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1962>.
- Pless, N.M. (2007) "Understanding Responsible Leadership: Role Identity and Motivational Drivers. The Case of Dame Anita Roddick, Founder of the Body Shop", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, pp 437-456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9518-x>.
- Pless, N.M., Maak, T. and Stahl, G.K. (2011) "Developing Responsible Global Leaders through International Service-Learning Programs: The Ulysses Experience", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(2), pp 237-260.
- Pless, N.M., Maak, T. and Waldman, D.A. (2012) "Different Approaches Toward Doing the Right Thing: Mapping the Responsibility Orientations of Leaders", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), pp 51-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0028>.
- Pless, N.M. et al (2022) "Responsible Leadership and the Reflective CEO: Resolving Stakeholder Conflict by Imagining What Could be done", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180, pp 313-337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04865-6>.
- Rook, L. and McManus, L. (2020) "Responding to COVID-19: Enriching Students' Responsible Leadership through an Online Work-Integrated Learning Project", *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 21(5), pp 601-616.
- Shi, Y. and Ye, M. (2016) "Responsible Leadership: Review and Prospects", *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 6, pp 877-884. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2016.68083>.
- Sroufe, R. et al (2015) "Aligning the PRME: How Study Abroad Nurtures Responsible Leadership", *Journal of Management Education*, 39(2), pp 244-275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105256291456079>.
- Stahl, G.K. and 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), pp 235-254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0126>.
- Tan, K.-L. (2023) "Responsible Leadership - A Brief Review of Literature", *Journal of Responsible Tourism Management*, 3(1), pp 44-55. <https://doi.org/10.47263/jrtm.03-01-04>.
- Varma, T.M. (2021) "Responsible Leadership and Reputation Management During a Crisis: The Cases of Delta and United Airlines", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 173, pp 29-45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04554-w>.
- Voegtlin, C. (2011) "Development of a Scale Measuring Discursive Responsible Leadership", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98, pp 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1020-9>.
- Voegtlin, C. et al (2020) "Theoretical Development and Empirical Examination of a Three-Roles Model of Responsible Leadership", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167, pp 411-431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04155-2>.
- Waldman, D. A. and Galvin, B. M. (2008) "Alternative Perspectives of Responsible Leadership", *Organizational Dynamics*, 37(4), pp 327-341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2008.07.001>.
- Waldman, D.A., Siegel, D.S. and Stahl, G.K. (2020) "Defining the Socially Responsible Leader: Revisiting Issues in Responsible Leadership", *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(1), pp 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819872201>.
- Witt, M.A. and Stahl, G.K. (2016) "Foundations of Responsible Leadership: Asian Versus Western Executive Responsibility Orientations Toward Key Stakeholders", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(3), pp 623-638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2534-8>.



- Xiao, Y. et al (2024) "Leading with Purpose: Unraveling the Impact of Responsible Leadership on Employee Green Behavior in the Workplace", *Heliyon*, 10(9), e30096. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30096>.
- Xuecheng, W. et al (2022) "Responsible Leadership and Sustainable Development in East Asia Economic Group: Application of Social Exchange Theory", *Sustainability*, 14, 6020. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106020>.
- Yang, Y. et al (2022) "Responsible Leadership and Project Citizenship Behavior: A Cross-Level Investigation", *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 960290. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.960290>.
- Zhang, Y., Liu, X. and Zhang, X. (2023) "How Responsible Leadership Shapes Followers' Low-Carbon Behavior: A Dual-Mediation Model", *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1086504. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1086504>.
- Zhao, H. and Zhou, Q. (2019) "Exploring the Impact of Responsible Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment: A Leadership Identity Perspective", *Sustainability*, 11(4), 944. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11040944>.
- Zhu, J. and Zhao, J. (2024) "The U-Shaped Effect of Responsible Leadership on Employees' Cyberloafing", *South African Journal of Business Management*, 55(1), a4210. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v55i1.4210>.
- Zhu, J. et al (2021) "The Paradoxical Effect of Responsible Leadership on Employee Cyberloafing: A Moderated Mediation Model", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 32(4), pp 597-624. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21432>.
- Zulfiqar, S., Khan, Z. and Huo, C. (2023) "Uncovering the Effect of Responsible Leadership on Employee Creative Behaviour: From the Perspective of Knowledge-Based Pathway", *Kybernetes*, 52(11), pp 5503-5529. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-03-2022-0447>.