

Acta
Universitatis
Danubius



ÆCONOMICA

Conceptualizing Strategic Leadership: Theories, Themes, and Varying Perspectives

Jay Chishamba¹

Abstract: Objectives: This paper conceptualizes strategic leadership (SL) by exploring foundational theories, central themes, and varying perspectives, emphasizing its role in aligning vision, setting strategic direction, and developing dynamic capabilities required for sustainable competitiveness. **Prior Work:** Building on the intersection of strategy and leadership theories, the paper integrates diverse frameworks addressing gaps in executive leadership literature, with theories like upper echelons, managerial cognition, and the resource-based view being central to the SL discourse. **Approach:** Employing a semi-systematic and integrative literature review, this paper critically examines SL through relevant theories, themes, and leadership perspectives, including top-down, collaborative, and distributed models. **Results:** SL is best operationalized through constructs emphasizing leaders' cognitive abilities to develop mature strategic management processes, including determining direction, adapting to dynamic environments and managing core competencies. **Implications:** This study refines the understanding of SL as leadership "of" organizations rather than "in" organizations, offering insights for academics and strategic leaders on integrating strategic thinking across all levels to enhance strategic outcomes linked to key performance indicators (KPIs). **Value:** The paper presents a multidisciplinary SL framework, bridging theoretical insights and practical gaps, positioning SL as a catalyst for translating organizational strategy into sustainable competitive advantage (SCA).

Keywords: Strategy; Strategic Management; Top Management Teams; Chief Executive Officers; Board of Directors

JEL Classification: M10; M12; M14; M19; L20; D83

¹ PhD, Business Administration Student - Management College of Southern Africa, Durban Central, South Africa, Address: 26 Samora Machel St, South Africa. Corresponding author. jaychishamba@gmail.com.



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY NC) license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

The growing complexity of modern organizational challenges has made SL more crucial than ever (Ater et al., 2023). Despite its recognized importance, SL remains a fragmented concept, with scholars debating its precise definition, scope, and role in fostering organizational adaptability and long-term success (Bonardi et al., 2018; Samimi et al., 2022). In the face of disruptive competition and an increasingly volatile global environment, the demand for leaders who can integrate strategic vision with effective leadership is becoming more urgent to attain sustained competitiveness. This paper contributes to these ongoing debates by conceptualizing SL, examining its core themes, and exploring perspectives on its application in dynamic business environments and building an organisation's strategic agility.

Understanding SL requires a deep grasp of both strategy and leadership. Strategy has garnered significant academic attention, leading to numerous definitions and interpretations of its elements (Menz et al., 2021). However, a standardized definition remains elusive (Bukhari, 2019). Strategic planning plays a pivotal role in sustaining organizational performance, enabling firms to capitalize on opportunities and mitigate risks (Waldman et al., 2004; Neugebauer et al., 2016). Strategy encompasses defining a firm's mission and long-term objectives, analyzing both internal and external environments, and selecting actions to achieve the organization's goals (Hitt et al., 2020). It is often conceptualized as the cognitive process that underpins decision-making to enable the formulation and execution of plans (Guillot, 2003; Samimi et al., 2022). Furthermore, strategy involves positioning the organization within its competitive environment and leveraging its resources and capabilities (Ramos-Rodríguez et al., 2019). Strategy operates across multiple levels such as corporate, business, and functional (Wheelen et al., 2017). Despite the numerous strategic analysis tools, Porter's theory of the firm continues to provide a valuable framework in competitive strategy (Menz et al., 2021; Ahmed et al., 2023).

Leadership, like strategy, is multifaceted and spans across various disciplinary approaches (Obuba, 2022). In organizational contexts, leadership revolves around influencing followers, instilling a shared sense of purpose, and driving the achievement of collective goals (Northouse, 2021). Traditionally, leadership has been explored through the lenses of traits, behaviours, and roles, though recent attention has shifted towards leadership development and effectiveness (Yukl & Gardner, 2020). Leadership is particularly critical in the strategic management process, especially in guiding strategy implementation, monitoring and control (Hsieh & Yik, 2005; Allio, 2013; Day & Liu, 2018). Leaders play multifaceted roles in the strategy execution process, such as strategists, analysts, and motivators (Marx, 2014; Mjaku, 2020). While a leader's vision can inspire and enhance performance (Carmeli et al., 2013; Spasojevic et al., 2019), the extent of leadership's impact on

organizational success varies across different perspectives (Köseoğlu et al., 2009; Fitza, 2017; Safari & Mazdeh, 2018; Hitt et al., 2020).

SL, at its core, represents the integration of strategy and leadership (Singh et al., 2023). It requires leaders to anticipate, envision, and empower their organizations to achieve sustainable success (Ireland & Hitt, 2005; Asif & Basit, 2020; Hitt et al., 2020). The essence of SL lies in shaping the organization's long-term direction, aligning organisational resources with strategic goals, and securing sustainable performance (Wilderom et al., 2012; Vera et al., 2022). SL transcends traditional leadership dynamics, focusing on navigating complex, dynamic environments to achieve long-term organizational objectives (Hitt et al., 2017; Schaedler et al., 2022). Effective SL blends strategic planning with strategic thinking, fostering the adaptability necessary for thriving in competitive environments (Freedman, 2003; Hunitie, 2018). Unlike operational leadership, SL requires a distinct strategic mindset at higher organizational levels (Norzailan et al., 2016; Jaleha & Machuki, 2018). Although strategy and leadership have been extensively studied in isolation, their integration within SL context remains underexplored, especially in today's rapidly evolving business landscape where strategic adaptability, balancing flexibility and strategic control is critical for sustained success (Asif & Basit, 2020; Schaedler et al., 2022).

The following sections discuss the problem statement and then a comprehensive review of the literature, analyzing the evolving theories and approaches that inform the current understanding of SL.

2. Problem Statement

SL theories are often critiqued for their broad, complex and sometimes ambiguous definitions, which contribute to theoretical silos and diverse perspectives (Malewska & Sajdak, 2014; Fernandes et al., 2020; Schaedler et al., 2022). Despite the recognized importance of SL and scholarly efforts to explore its essence, the literature remains fragmented, exhibiting significant limitations and gaps (Samimi et al., 2022; Vera et al., 2022). One notable issue is the lack of clarity regarding how SL is identified and demonstrated within organizational systems, which has inevitably led to divergent conceptualizations and conundrums regarding its impact on strategic outcomes (Boal & Hooijberg, 2000; Cannella et al., 2009; Carter & Greer, 2013; Singh et al., 2023). Some of the critical questions persist about whether SL should be seen as person-centric, position-based, or as an institutional function, and how SL is enacted and held accountable within organizational frameworks (Hambrick & Quigley, 2013; Vogel et al., 2020; Vera et al., 2022).

The absence of comprehensive temporal analysis in SL research limits understanding of how SL perspectives and themes have evolved over time (Tao et al., 2021; Samimi

et al., 2022; White & Borgholthaus, 2022). This temporal deficiency perpetuates theoretical silos due to the complex and context-dependent nature of SL and its interaction with diverse organizational constructs (Vogel et al., 2020; Fernandes et al., 2022). Furthermore, some SL reviews lack methodological rigor, presenting findings in a static or non-dynamic manner without triangulation (Singh et al., 2023; Vera et al., 2022). This results in either a superficial overview of SL themes or a limited evolutionary perspective, thereby constraining the depth and breadth of insights (White & Borgholthaus, 2022; Fernandes et al., 2022). Despite increased scholarly attention to leadership, a universal consensus on SL remains elusive, often impacted by the differing viewpoints and ongoing gaps in the literature (Fernandes et al., 2020).

SL, as a broad concept, has been explored from various angles, yet lacks a unified paradigmatic focus (Finkelstein et al., 2009; Muthimi & Kilika, 2018). Some of the existing descriptions of SL are often criticized for being either overly expansive or reductive, focusing narrowly on the creation of meaning, vision, and organizational objectives, or merely on defining who strategic leaders are, implying that anything they do constitutes SL (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013; Antonakis et al., 2016; Samimi et al., 2022). Some scholarly perspectives also fall into a tautological trap by equating SL with its outcomes, while others offer overly superficial or narrow views, failing to capture the full essence of SL and its impact on organisations (Vera et al., 2022; Singh et al., 2023). For instance, the narrower perspectives often equate SL solely with the management of human and social capital, which is insufficient to condense the broader strategic dimensions of leadership (Hitt & Duane, 2002; Belias et al., 2017; Jaleha & Machuki, 2018; Tipurić, 2022). This restricted scope limits the representativeness and impact of SL research (Zhao & Li, 2019; Varma et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2023).

Based on the preceding context, there is a pressing need for a more comprehensive assessment of SL to address these gaps and limitations in the literature (Lim et al., 2022; Tipurić, 2022). This study bridges these gaps through a critical conceptual analysis of SL noting its multidimensional nature, its temporal evolution, and its practical implications within the dynamic organizational environments.

3. Literature Review

3.1. Perspectives on Strategic Leadership

SL is characterized by a multitude of definitions, theoretical frameworks, and often unclear organisational research boundaries (Schaedler et al., 2022). Rumsey (2013) asserts that a comprehensive understanding of SL requires a focus on the actions undertaken by effective leaders to build strategy-oriented organizations. In this view, strategy serves as a framework for aligning SL activities, offering a cohesive,

forward-looking approach to decision-making (Davies & Davies, 2010; Hitt et al., 2017). SL provides insights into an organization's identity and its current context, guiding leaders in navigating future directions within the competitive landscape (Tipurić, 2022; Farida & Setiawan, 2022). In some instances, the current literature predominantly focuses on the external strategic objectives, often neglecting the internal organizational dynamics, which leaves a significant gap in the SL research (Elenkov et al., 2005; Birasnav & Bienstock, 2019; Fatyandri et al., 2023).

Starr-Glass (2017) raises the question of whether SL should be conceptualized as leadership "of", "in", or "through" organizations because SL may overlook the relational aspects of leadership hence blur the lines between strategic management and leadership processes. Bedeian and Hunt (2006) differentiate between leadership "in" organizations, which is more aligned with the psychological dimensions of leadership, and leadership "of" organizations, which is embedded in strategic management practices (Marx, 2014; Adoli & Kilika, 2020). SL is particularly relevant to organizations with mature strategic management processes (Hitt et al., 2020). It involves deliberate, broad-spectrum actions that exert strategic influence, which distinguishes SL from traditional leadership, which emphasize day-to-day management and individual behaviour (Simsek et al., 2018; Samimi et al., 2022; Ater et al., 2023).

SL can be conceptualized around specific strategic capabilities such as anticipating future trends, envisioning strategic possibilities, maintaining strategic adaptability, engaging in strategic thinking, and empowering employees to create dynamic capabilities (Ireland & Hitt, 2005; O'Shannassy, 2021; Singh et al., 2023). However, some scholars argue that SL represents a strategic dimension of broader leadership paradigms, rather than a distinct category of leadership (Pasaribu et al., 2021; Willis et al., 2022; Fernandes et al., 2022). In this context, SL guides an organization's mission and objectives, aligning aspirations with shared goals (Elenkov et al., 2005). It equips organizations with capabilities to seize opportunities and mitigate threats, emphasizing on cognitive abilities and managerial wisdom to adapt in dynamic environments (Boal, 2004; Vera & Crossan, 2004; Sinnaiah et al., 2023).

Rowe and Nejad (2009) emphasize SL's role in communicating shared values and a clear vision to employees. This approach highlights how SL fosters strategic foresight and proactive adaptation, aligning employee actions with communicated vision and strategy (Elenkov et al., 2005; Simsek et al., 2015; Fuertes et al., 2020). Effective SL should inspire executives to make strategic decisions that support both short-term stability and long-term competitive sustainability (Rowe, 2001; O'Shannassy, 2021). For example, empowerment, shared vision development, creativity, and innovation are integral to SL's function (Hamidi, 2009; Abdow, 2015; Alkheyi et al., 2020). SL processes reinforce the organisation's core values and

strategic choices, ensuring continuity as organizations navigate challenges within the operating environment (Knies et al., 2016; Vogel et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2023).

Based on the strategic choice perspective, SL can be examined through the lens of executives as custodians of organizational strategy (Adoli & Kilika, 2020). In this context, SL is understood as the ability to think and act strategically in a dynamic environment (O'Shannassy, 2021). Therefore, a deficiency in SL may lead to organizational drift in strategic direction and loss of focus (Hirschi & Jones, 2009; Fernandes et al., 2022). This strategic perspective evaluates the attributes, actions, and methodologies of executives, along with their impact on the strategic management process (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996; Samimi et al., 2022). SL is also viewed as a set of procedural processes that integrate individuals, technology, work processes, and opportunities, enabling organizations to proactively adjust to competitive environments (Sosik et al., 2005; Adoli & Kilika, 2020; Ater et al., 2023).

SL is sometimes conceptualized as the "art" of value creation, where leaders guide and empower human capital to generate value (Memon et al., 2009; Simsek et al., 2018). This perspective emphasizes the fusion of science, art, and empathy in shaping visionary paths and organizational values (Simsek et al., 2015; Pasaribu et al., 2021; Carvalho et al., 2021). SL helps to instil a compelling vision, foster a sense of purpose, and provide strategic guidance (House & Aditya, 1997; Bhardwaj et al., 2021). However, there is still a need to explore how to execute these activities in the SL process and their importance in achieving strategic outcomes such as SCA (Samimi et al., 2022; Ater et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2023).

SL also involves anticipating, planning, adapting, and collaborating to develop human and social capital for sustained competitiveness (Ireland & Hitt, 2005; Mahdi & Almsafir, 2014). Davies & Davies (2010) suggest that SL mobilizes employees to effectively implement business plans. It integrates internal and external environments, manages complex information processing through building the organisation's absorptive and adaptive capacity within the operating environment (Boal and Hooijberg, 2000; Schaedler et al., 2022; Fatyandri et al., 2023). Ultimately, SL requires managerial wisdom to guide resource management and driving organizational transformation for sustained competitiveness (Crossan et al., 2008; Hirschi & Jones, 2009; O'Shannassy, 2021).

3.2. Strategic Leadership Theories and Themes

3.2.1. Introduction

SL theories focus on the strategic implications of leadership, differentiating this approach from traditional leadership theories that emphasize style and behaviour across all organizational levels (Boal & Schultz, 2007; Carter & Greer, 2013; Jaleha

& Machuki, 2018). While traditional leadership theories encompass leaders at various hierarchical levels, SL pertains specifically to leaders at the highest levels of the organization, particularly Top Management Teams (TMTs) and Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001; Vera & Crossan, 2004; Knies et al., 2016; Singh et al., 2023). SL theories primarily centre around governance and organizational direction, focusing on leaders' responsibilities in defining vision, establishing meaning, and determining purpose (DeChurch et al., 2010; Quigley & Graffin, 2017). The key theories include emergent leadership theories, dispositional attributes and strategic choice theory, stakeholder theory, and external perspectives (Fuertes et al., 2020; Samimi et al., 2022; Tipurić, 2022). Emergent theories highlight the dynamic and adaptive nature of leadership, suggesting that SL emerges in response to complex and changing organizational environments. External perspectives, on the other hand, consider how external factors, such as market conditions and industry dynamics, shape leadership decisions.

3.2.2. Dispositional Features and Strategic Choice Theories on SL

Dispositional features and strategic choice theories explore the influence of executives' individual characteristics, cognition, and decision-making processes on strategic outcomes (Quigley & Graffin, 2017; Gupta et al., 2019). These theories posit that an executive's personality, cognitive orientation, and behavioural tendencies can significantly impact the strategic direction and long-term performance of organizations. The prominent theories within this category include, the Upper Echelons Theory (UET), Managerial Cognition, and Behavioural Decision-Making (Samimi et al., 2022; Singh et al., 2023). Managerial cognition focuses on how cognitive limitations and biases shape strategic decision-making, while behavioural decision-making theories examine the psychological factors that influence strategic choices made by top executives. Together, these frameworks contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how SL operates in practice.

3.2.2.1. Upper echelons theory (UET)

Upper echelons theory (UET) posits that the personal characteristics of TMTs significantly influence their leadership styles, strategic decisions, and, ultimately, organizational outcomes such as sustained performance and competitiveness (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Neely et al., 2020; Bekos & Chari, 2023). UET emphasizes the role of the leader's observable demographic variables such as age, tenure, education, and experience in shaping strategic choices (Hambrick, 2007; Finkelstein et al., 2009; Samimi et al., 2022). Based on the UET, these characteristics which serve as proxies for deeper cognitive and behavioural traits are thought to reflect an executive's values, perceptions, and decision-making tendencies, thereby impacting organizational identity and strategic outcomes (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001; Carpenter et al., 2004; Hambrick, 2018).

Hambrick (2023) further argues that organizations often mirror the behaviours and characteristics of their top managers, as these traits shape strategy execution and influence organizational actions. While early research on UET emphasized the CEO's central role in shaping strategy, recent studies have adopted a more collective and distributed view, that includes the broader TMTs and Board of Directors (BoDs) and how they impact strategic decision-making and strategic outcomes (Quigley & Hambrick, 2017; Ma et al., 2020). This team-based perspective provides a more nuanced understanding of how leadership operates at the upper echelons, highlighting the importance of collaborative and distributed decision-making among top leaders (Georgakakis et al., 2017; Ma & Seidl, 2018; Luciano et al., 2020). In this context, the extent of TMT autonomy can moderate the impact of their individual decisions on organizational outcomes (Elenkov et al., 2005; Bromiley & Rau, 2016; Georgakakis et al., 2022).

However, UET has faced scholarly criticism for its reliance on demographic characteristics as proxies for leadership traits, potentially oversimplifying the complexities of SL (Priem et al., 1999; Carpenter et al., 2004; Neely et al., 2020). UET's assumptions may fall short in dynamic environments where multiple factors beyond TMT characteristics influence the organization's strategic outcomes (Finkelstein et al., 2009; Samimi et al., 2022). For example, although demographic indicators may be useful, they fail to capture the full spectrum of cognitive and behavioural factors that influence decision-making (Finkelstein et al., 2009; Samimi et al., 2022). This reliance on easily measurable variables may prioritize measurement reliability over construct validity, leading to scholarly concerns about the comprehensiveness of UET as a theory of SL (Duursema, 2013; Neely et al., 2020; Bekos & Chari, 2023).

3.2.2.2. Moving beyond UET

While UET provides valuable insights into the impact of TMT characteristics on strategic outcomes, its limitations highlight the need for a more comprehensive approach to understanding SL. Therefore, despite its theoretical insights, UET faces gaps and may potentially become theoretically insular (White & Borgholthaus, 2022; Fatyandri et al., 2023). In this context, integrating insights from managerial cognition and behavioural decision-making theories develops a more holistic framework. These theories can offer deeper insights into the cognitive and psychological processes that shape SL, complementing UET's focus on observable demographic variables. Such an integrated approach would allow scholars to move beyond the constraints of demographic-based analysis and offer a richer, more nuanced understanding of how top executives influence organizational strategy and performance (Hernandez et al., 2011; Quigley & Hambrick, 2015; Fitza, 2017; Bekos & Chari, 2023). This would reflect the growing consensus that SL is a

collective, dynamic process involving multiple organizational actors across different levels (Denis et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2023).

Bromiley & Rau (2016) advocate for a broader approach to UET, suggesting the inclusion of non-demographic variables such as personality traits, attention mechanisms, and cognitive processes. This would probably enhance the theory's capacity to account for the dynamic and multi-faceted nature of SL. When these elements are incorporated, UET could better capture the collective and distributed nature of SL, considering that strategic decisions are influenced not only by individual executives but also by the interactions between various organizational levels (Smith & Tushman, 2005; Ma et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2023).

3.2.2.3. Behavioural Theories on Executive Decision-Making

Behavioural theories delve into how strategic leaders' risk preferences, cognitive biases, heuristics, and social dynamics shape strategic decision-making processes within organizations (Malmendier & Tate, 2005; Krause et al., 2022). These theories underscore that executive behaviours are pivotal in influencing the strategy process and ultimately shape the organization's strategic outcomes (House & Aditya, 1997; Bhattacharyya & Jha, 2018; Tipurić, 2022). Strategic leaders differ in their decision-making tendencies because, some executives exhibit exploratory behaviours that prioritize innovation and risk-taking, while others adopt exploitative strategies focused on minimizing losses (O'Connell & O'Sullivan, 2014; Quigley & Hambrick, 2015). For instance, in high-pressure scenarios, some executives may resort to bounded rationality, where their personal biases and knowledge structures guide strategic decisions, especially under conditions of uncertainty and complexity (Walsh, 1995; Quigley & Graffin, 2017; Schaedler et al., 2022).

The applicability of prospect theory in leadership decision-making illustrates how cognitive biases, such as loss aversion can affect strategic choices, often leading to suboptimal strategic outcomes (Vera et al., 2022). Behavioural theories highlight that not all executives embody effective SL behaviours, and certain negative traits can impair strategic decision-making processes (Boal, 2004; Samimi et al., 2022). Conversely, executives who continuously learn, adapt, and build strong relationships within their organizations foster resilience and adaptability, positively influencing strategic execution (O'Shannassy, 2021; Quansah & Hartz, 2021; Ater et al., 2023). Therefore, the personal attributes of TMTs and CEOs, such as openness, can affect interactions with employees and the successful execution of strategies (Sonenshein & Dholakia, 2012; Herrmann & Nadkarni, 2014; Volpp et al., 2016).

However, behavioural theories also explore the detrimental effects of negative traits embodied by some strategic leaders. For example, executive narcissism, marked by self-centeredness and an inflated sense of self-importance, can undermine sound decision-making and organizational competitiveness, considering that narcissistic leaders often prioritize personal gains over organizational goals (Luciano et al.,

2020; Vera et al., 2022; Ismail et al., 2023). Moreover, overconfident executives may dismiss valuable feedback, reducing adaptability and long-term competitiveness (Chen, 2015; Heavey et al., 2022). Despite the contributions of behavioural theories, they are criticized for their limitations in accounting for contextual factors and for not identifying which leadership behaviours are most effective in specific organisational situations (Sanders & Davey, 2011; Quigley & Graffin, 2017). To address these gaps, contingency theories emphasize the role of situational variables that can moderate leadership effectiveness, highlighting the need for adaptable behaviours in diverse contexts (House & Aditya, 1997; Burkhard et al., 2023). These behavioural perspectives enrich the understanding of how human dynamics influence leaders' strategic decision-making (Malmendier & Tate, 2015; Wowak et al., 2017).

3.2.2.4. Managerial Cognition Theories

Managerial cognition theories focus on the mental processes and cognitive structures that underpin executives' strategic decision-making (Thomas & Porac, 2002; Simon, 2013; Galavan et al., 2018; Samimi et al., 2022). Executives' cognitive frameworks (mental models that shape perception and interpretation) impact their ability to navigate complex strategic issues in the organisation (Walsh, 1995; Hodgkinson & Healey, 2008; Schaedler et al., 2022). The depth and breadth of these mental models significantly influence how executives address crises, manage strategic uncertainty, and streamline decision-making processes (Marcel et al., 2010; Krause et al., 2022). Thus, cognitive frameworks act as lenses through which executives interpret organizational challenges, identify opportunities, and formulate strategic responses (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006; Burkhard et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2023).

Internal organizational dynamics and external conditions or pressures shape the cognitive processes underlying strategic choices, which, in turn, influence followers and overall organizational performance (Samimi et al., 2022). In this context, executives' cognition is shaped by both the leader's individual attributes and environmental factors. Therefore, understanding these mental models provides insights into how strategic leaders interpret and make sense of complex information which is critical for achieving sustained competitiveness (Maitlis & Sonenshein, 2010; Gupta et al., 2019). Within TMTs, shared cognitive frameworks foster strategic alignment and coherence in strategic decision-making, strengthening the collective impact of leadership on organizational outcomes (Souitaris & Maestro, 2010; Dóci et al., 2015). The importance of managerial cognition in shaping SL dynamics highlights that executives' interpretations of external environments and internal capabilities play a critical role in defining organizational direction (Thomas & Porac, 2002; Hambrick, 2007; Bekos & Chari, 2023).

Overall, managerial cognition theories offer a nuanced perspective on SL by delving into the less overt, yet highly influential factors, mental processes that guide

executive behaviour and how they exercise leadership. By emphasizing the collective and individual cognitive frameworks at play within TMTs, these theories provide a comprehensive understanding of how strategic decisions are made and executed and ultimately influence overall competitiveness (Smith & Tushman, 2005; Denis et al., 2017). These cognitive processes dictate how leaders navigate complex organizational scenarios and how they lead.

3.2.3. SL as a Synergistic Combination of Leadership Styles

There is a diverse range of leadership styles that explain how executives influence an organization's strategic management process (Elenkov et al., 2005; O'Shannassy, 2021; Ater et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2023). Some contemporary leadership theories often focus on charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership, highlighting the interpersonal dynamics between leaders and their followers (Waldman et al., 1990; Hitt et al., 2021; Wegge et al., 2022). Within this continuum, SL is conceptualized as a synergistic combination of managerial and visionary styles, a perspective that offers a comprehensive framework for influencing both operational stability and future-oriented growth (Rowe & Nejad, 2009; Vera et al., 2022).

From the visionary leadership perspective, SL emphasizes the leader's ability to anticipate future trends, articulate a compelling vision, demonstrate resilience and adaptability in response to environmental changes (Rowe, 2001; Saher & Ayub, 2020). Visionary leaders are characterized by their willingness to take strategic risks, pursue innovative ventures, and inspire followers to align with the organization's broader vision. These leaders make decisions based on core values, often transcending organizational constraints, fostering a culture of innovation and empowerment (Robinson, 2013; Singh et al., 2023). This leadership style also involves creating a strong organizational identity and leveraging strategic control through socialization, cultivating shared norms and values among employees (Rowe, 2014). In this sense, visionary leadership aligns with the transformational leadership model, which emphasizes inspirational motivation and organizational change (Rowe, 2001; Nahak & Ellitan, 2022).

In contrast, managerial leadership is rooted in preserving organizational stability, focusing on maintaining existing structures and operational processes (Rowe, 2001; Karim et al., 2023). It is grounded in the organization's historical context and culture, similar to transactional leadership, which emphasizes managing day-to-day operations and ensuring adherence to established procedures, rather than driving innovation or creating new value (Nahak & Ellitan, 2022). However, an overemphasis on managerial leadership can risk depleting the organization's long-term potential, as it may limit the organization's ability to adapt to future challenges (Rowe & Nejad, 2009). To mitigate this risk, combining managerial leadership with a visionary approach becomes essential, ensuring a balance between maintaining operational stability and pursuing future growth (Rowe, 2001; Ateş et al., 2020).

Overall, SL is a multifaceted concept because it balances the competing demands of short-term financial stability and long-term sustainability (Rowe, 2001; Dimitrios et al., 2013; Rashid et al., 2016). Rowe (2001) argues that the true strength of SL lies in integrating both managerial and visionary mindsets. This balanced, synergistic approach enhances organizational outcomes by ensuring long-term sustainability while maintaining operational effectiveness (Kearney et al., 2019; Nahak & Ellitan, 2022). In this context, focusing exclusively on visionary leadership without adequate managerial oversight can lead to short-term failures, which in turn compromise long-term success (Rowe & Nejad, 2009; Mahdi & Nassar, 2021). Therefore, a synergistic combination of leadership styles is crucial for effective SL, promoting both organizational resilience and future competitiveness (Ateş et al., 2020).

3.2.4. Stakeholder Relationships Theories (Internal and External Perspectives)

The stakeholder relationships theory in SL plays a pivotal role in understanding how executives foster collaboration through distributed power-sharing across diverse groups and functional units (Samimi et al., 2022). For example, in global corporations, collaborative and inclusive relationships help leaders to navigate complex global environments, adapting strategies to local conditions for greater organizational success (Liu et al., 2018). This collaboration is essential in cultivating partnerships that harness the collective knowledge and creativity within the organization, creating a shared sense of accountability (Fatyandri et al., 2023).

3.2.4.1. Internal Relationships Perspective

Strategic leaders must prioritize long-term relationships with internal stakeholders such as employees, directors, and shareholders (Elenkov et al., 2005; Crossan et al., 2008; Nahak & Ellitan, 2022). Through these relationships, SL enables teamwork by bridging gaps between TMTs and employees (Willis et al., 2022). This perspective emphasizes that executives' social interactions significantly influence strategic outcomes (Bonardi et al., 2018). SL, in this context, goes beyond transactional relationships, focusing on positive reciprocity to build commitment, trust, and adaptability (Watts & Blazek, 2024).

The shared leadership approach aligns well with the internal relationships perspective, as it posits that organizational success is closely tied to distributing leadership responsibilities through interpersonal networks (Hambrick & Cannella, 2004; Liu et al., 2018). For example, promoting collaborative leadership fosters a supportive work environment that enhances employee motivation and performance (Norzailan et al., 2016). Through collaboration, trust, and the exchange of information, more informed strategic decisions emerge (Sonmez-Cakir and Adiguzel, 2020). In essence, SL requires competencies that extend beyond the executive's individual capabilities which necessitates a collaborative leadership model that spans both operational and strategic activities (Abu Mostafa et al., 2021; Tipuric, 2022).

In summary, internal relationships perspective suggest that no single executive can single-handedly manage the complexity of SL. In this context, distributing leadership responsibilities among individuals with complementary skills improves SL effectiveness and bolsters organizational competitiveness (Bromiley & Rau, 2016; Georgakakis et al., 2022). The collaborative approach through internal relationships, positively impacts decision-making, organizational culture, employee engagement, and overall performance (Ma & Seidl, 2018). In this context, to maintain competitiveness, executives must proactively develop and sustain effective internal relationships (Buyl et al., 2014; Simsek et al., 2018).

3.2.4.2. External Relationships Perspectives

External stakeholder relationships play a critical role in SL, as they involve both analytical and affective processes (Ackermann & Eden, 2011; Bundy & Pfarrer, 2015). Strategic leaders have the potential to shape stakeholder impressions and judgments in the SL process (Lee et al., 2001; Bonnafous-Boucher & Rendtorff, 2016; Hitt et al., 2017). For example, strategic leaders serve as the public face of the organization, their strategic actions and communications shape external stakeholder perceptions (Gomulya et al., 2017). External relationships can act as mediating or moderating variables in the SL process (Samimi et al., 2022; Vera et al., 2022; Singh et al., 2023). These relationships create a dual perspective in which strategic leaders not only influence but are also influenced by their external environment (Quigley & Graffin, 2017; Fitz, 2017; O'Shannassy, 2021). Therefore, failing to adapt to external changes may lead to a loss of sustained competitiveness (Marx, 2014; Adoli & Kilika, 2020).

The external relationships perspective aligns with dynamic capabilities theory, which emphasizes the need for organizations to adapt to the ever-changing environments (Helfat, 2015; Garg & Eisenhardt, 2017). Strategic leaders must develop dynamic capabilities like opportunity sensing, resource reconfiguration, and organizational learning to navigate the changing business landscapes (Teece, 2018). Furthermore, the resource dependency theory supports the external relationship perspective by highlighting organisation's reliance on external environments for acquiring necessary resources, such as capital and partnerships (Fernandes et al., 2022). In this context, effective external relationship management becomes crucial for securing these resources to support organisational strategy (Ater et al., 2023).

Futhermore, the open systems theory highlights the interaction between an organization's internal processes and its external environment, reinforcing the need for strategic adaptability (Jung & Vakharia, 2019). This underscores the reciprocal influence between organizations and their surrounding operating environment (Berglund & Sandström, 2013; Yang et al., 2022). The external relationships perspective also connects with the signalling theory, which suggests that CEOs' stock ownership, experience, and external directorships influence market

perceptions on the organisation's SL processes (Connelly et al., 2011; Bergh et al., 2014; Ernst et al., 2022). Additionally, institutional theory asserts that organizations are shaped by external institutional forces such as societal expectations and regulations (Scott, 2004; Moré et al., 2016; David et al., 2019). In this context, in exercising SL, strategic leaders must align their actions with these institutional demands (Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2022).

Executives who effectively manage external social capital gain competitiveness by leveraging trust, shared knowledge, and collaborative behaviours (Prusak & Cohen, 2001; Cao et al., 2015; Nuryanto et al., 2020). SL develops meaningful long-term strategic connections with external stakeholders that span the entire value chain to understand their needs and desires, rather than relying solely on transactional interactions (McCallum & O'Connell, 2009; Jaleha & Machuki, 2018). The goodwill created from positive external relationships, especially with key stakeholders like investors and suppliers, help to attract critical resources and support strategic initiatives (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Willis et al., 2022).

4. Methods

This study employed a semi-systematic and integrative literature review, focusing on SL theories, themes, and varying perspectives (Snyder, 2019). This method was selected for its ability to comprehensively synthesize existing research and identify gaps within the SL field (Donthu et al., 2021; Vera et al., 2022). The review covered relevant journal articles and books from the fields of strategy, leadership, SL and strategic management, specifically examining the roles of CEOs, TMTs, and boards of directors (BoDs) in shaping organizational outcomes. A clear inclusion criterion was developed to ensure only studies that are directly relevant to SL theories and its practical applications were included aligning with prior methods (Tao et al., 2021; Samimi et al., 2022). The review followed a systematic process for data collection and analysis, utilizing an inductive categorization approach to code the literature. This enabled the identification of themes that emerged directly from the data, ensuring that the analysis was grounded in the literature rather than guided by preconceived notions.

The evaluation process critically assessed recurring SL themes, and an iterative review helped in the continuous refinement of themes. This method was instrumental in identifying theoretical robustness, contributions, discovery of empirical gaps and limitations, as well as relevance to contemporary SL challenges. This analysis provided a well-rounded view of the literature and allowed for the identification of commonalities, contradictions, and areas in need of further exploration. Additionally, the integration of findings across the reviewed literature enriched the analysis, offering a multi-dimensional perspective on SL. Overall, this structured

synthesis of literature also laid the groundwork for potential future research directions into the evolving dynamics of SL within organizational contexts.

5. Findings

The analysis revealed that SL can be examined from multiple levels - the individual level (Day, 2000; Busenbark et al., 2016; Fitza, 2017), within organizational strategic outcomes (Kurzahls et al., 2020; Cortes & Herrmann, 2021; Fernandes et al., 2022), at the team level (Bromiley & Rau, 2016; Ma et al., 2020), and across upper echelons, including CEO-BoDs and CEO-TMT dynamics (Simsek et al., 2018; Georgakakis et al., 2022; White & Borgholthaus, 2022). Sometimes, scholars focus on the strategic leader's behaviour (Elenkov et al., 2005; Shao, 2022) and leadership styles (Jansen et al., 2009; Lin & McDonough, 2011). Furthermore, some SL studies integrate PESTEL factors (Hoffmann & Meusburger, 2018; Kurzahls et al., 2020; Cortes & Herrmann, 2021), evaluating how external macro-environmental elements influence SL's impact on organizational outcomes (Chin et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2023). These varied approaches underscore SL's complexity and its diverse manifestations within the strategic management process, which necessitates the consideration of multiple external variables to fully understand SL's impact.

Notably, SL effectiveness is context-dependent, varying significantly across industries, organizational size, culture, situational factors and sometimes depending on random effects (Fitza, 2017; Quigley & Graffin, 2017; Schaedler et al., 2022; Rönkkö et al., 2023). The study also identified an ongoing lack of consensus on SL, driven by divergent viewpoints and persistent gaps in the literature (Quigley & Graffin, 2017; Fernandes et al., 2020; Fatyandri et al., 2023). Some approaches overemphasize the roles of executives and CEOs, while underrepresenting the influence of followers and the broader permeation of strategic decision-making throughout the organization (Liu et al., 2018; Vera et al., 2022; Singh et al., 2023). Notably, not all strategic leaders consistently exhibit effective SL (Fitza, 2017). Behavioural theories suggest that executives may fall prey to cognitive biases, bounded rationality, or reliance on heuristics, which can impair their decision-making and strategic effectiveness (Vera et al., 2022).

The critiques of SL's perspectives expose a diverse spectrum of views, ranging from narrow to excessively broad. This ongoing debate reveals the need for a more cohesive assessment to resolve issues such as fragmented insights, incomplete comprehension of SL development, and the absence of an integrated dialogue on SL's research trajectory (Fernandes et al., 2022; White & Borgholthaus, 2022). The perceived fragmentation in SL literature is attributed to its inherent complexity, suggesting that continued scholarly efforts to organize these disparate research silos could lead to significant advancements in SL research (Samimi et al., 2022).

Therefore, development of theories that focus explicitly on SL's multifaceted dimensions could provide a more coherent and comprehensive understanding of SL (Quigley et al., 2022). Such an approach could consolidate findings across the literature and address the longstanding need for integration in this critical area of organizational research (Denis et al., 2010; Fernandes et al., 2022).

6. Discussions and Conclusion

This literature review study enriches the understanding of SL by examining specific underlying principles, diverse perspectives, and leadership styles, alongside their intersection with organisational strategic outcomes (Aberg & Shen, 2020; Chen, 2020; Lim et al., 2022). The analysis underscores that without SL, even the most well-formulated strategies are prone to failure (Capon, 2016; Jaleha & Machuki, 2018; Mjaku, 2020). SL is critical to the successful execution of strategy and is foundational for achieving long-term organizational success (Boal & Schultz, 2007; Rumsey, 2013; Thompson et al., 2018; Menz et al., 2021). In the increasingly complex and competitive business landscape, effective SL is crucial for achieving SCA (Irtaimeh, 2018). Strategic leaders are required to demonstrate adaptability, foresight, and resilience, regardless of their hierarchical position within the organization (Waldman et al., 2001; Rowe, 2009; Fitza, 2017; Quigley & Graffin, 2017).

This study contends that SL should be conceptualized through holistic constructs, emphasizing the leader's cognitive ability to think strategically, envision long-term objectives, and implement plans that drive organizational outcomes. A more nuanced understanding of SL would benefit from recognizing that leadership is not confined to TMTs but is distributed throughout the organization (Liu et al., 2018; Zayed & Nasr, 2023). Existing literature often emphasizes leadership "*of*" organizations, rather than leadership "*in*" organizations, neglecting the broader implications of strategic decision-making processes that pervade various levels of leadership (Vera et al., 2022; Singh et al., 2023). Ultimately, this research advances the argument for a comprehensive understanding of SL, where leadership is examined as both a collective and individual phenomenon, integral to influencing organizational success. It highlights the importance of not only focusing on TMTs but also considering the distribution and flow of SL across different organizational levels. This holistic conceptualization provides a foundation for future research and practical leadership applications within contemporary organizations.

7. Further Research

The field of SL continues to face several fundamental challenges, particularly in exploring the interrelationships among strategic leaders and developing theories that capture the circular, relational dynamics within leadership contexts (Finkelstein et al., 2009; Vera et al., 2022). Samimi et al. (2022) suggests that to address existing gaps in SL research, scholars must explore three key dimensions, namely, the functions of SL (what strategic leaders do); the attributes of SL (why they do it), and the mechanisms and contextual factors that influence how SL is enacted. These questions continuously evolve and are increasingly relevant to contemporary organizations (Tao et al., 2021). One critical area for future exploration is the integration of fragmented insights in SL research. In this context, a coherent research trajectory could be advanced by addressing the lack of constructive dialogue across SL literature silos (Fernandes et al., 2022; White & Borgholthaus, 2022). For example, investigating sequential models that link leadership behaviours to strategic outcomes could offer more clarity in evaluating SL's impact on organisations (Liu et al., 2018). Future research should aim to address these theoretical gaps by incorporating integrated constructs that bridge different SL theories and by simultaneously testing multiple constructs to build a more robust and cohesive body of knowledge (Bromiley & Rau, 2016; Quigley et al., 2022; Fatyandri et al., 2023).

The lack of consistent indicators and the fragmented approach to identifying measurable organizational-level outcomes hinders theoretical and empirical progress (Hitt et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2023). Moving forward, research should focus on developing standardized measures of SL to resolve the ambiguity in defining reliable measures (Simsek et al., 2015; Alkhey et al., 2020). Additionally, research should examine how variables such as industry dynamics, and contextual moderators influence SL processes (Ater et al., 2023). By addressing these gaps, future SL research can offer more integrated frameworks that align with the complex realities of organizational leadership, providing clearer guidance for both academics and industry practitioners.

References

- Abdow, A. I. (2015). The role of strategic leaders in challenging environments. *European Journal of Business Management*, 2(1), 22-35.
- Åberg, C. & Shen, W. (2020). Can board leadership contribute to board dynamic managerial capabilities? An empirical exploration among Norwegian firms. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 24(1), 169-197.
- Abu Mostafa, Y.; Salama, A. A.; Abu Amuna, Y. M. & Aqel, A. (2021). The Role of Strategic Leadership in Activating Time Management Strategies to Enhance Administrative Creativity Skills. *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research (IJAMSR)*, 5(3), 36-48.

- Ackermann, F. & Eden, C. (2011). Strategic Management of Stakeholders: Theory and Practice. *Long Range Planning*, 44(3), 179-196.
- Adler, P. S. & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40.
- Adoli, H. L. & Kilika, J. M. (2020). Conceptualizing the Role of Leadership Strategy in the Context of Strategic Management Process: A Review of Literature. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 3(4), 1598-1623.
- Ahmed, F. U.; Babu, M. M.; Rahman, M. N.; Uddin, M. J. & Dey, B. L. (2023). Strategic orientation, strategic renewal and the international performance of born global firms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*.
- Ahmed, R. R.; Pahi, M. H.; Nadeem, S.; Soomro, R. H.; Parmar, V.; Nasir, F. & Ahmed, F. (2023). How and When Ethics Lead to Organizational Performance: Evidence from South Asian Firms. *Sustainability*, 15(10), 1-29.
- Alkheyi, A. A. S. A.; Khalifa, G. S. A.; Ameen, A.; Hossain, M. S.; Hewedi, M. M. & Nasir, N. S. M. (2020). Strategic leadership practices on team effectiveness: The mediating effect of knowledge sharing in the UAE municipalities. *Academic Leadership*, 21(3), 99-112.
- Allio, R. J. (2013). Leaders and leadership - Many theories but what advice is reliable? *Strategy and Leadership*, 41(1), 4-14.
- Antonakis, J.; Bastardo, N.; Jacquart, P. & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 38(3), 293-319.
- Asif, A. & Basit, A. (2020). Exploring Strategic Leadership in Organizations: A Literature Review. *Governance and Management Review (GMR)*, 5(2), 211-230.
- Ater, M. D.; Ogollah, K.; Awino, Z. B. & Njihia, J. (2023). Strategic Leadership, Knowledge Sharing, and Strategy Implementation among Commercial Banks in South Sudan. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 8(5), 173-180.
- Ateş, N. Y.; Tarakci, M.; Porck, J. P.; van Knippenberg, D. & Groenen, P. J. F. (2020). The Dark Side of Visionary Leadership in Strategy Implementation: Strategic Alignment, Strategic Consensus, and Commitment. *Journal of Management*, 46(5), 637-665.
- Balkundi, P. & Kilduff, M. (2006). The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4), 419-439.
- Bedeian, A. G. & Hunt, J. G. (2006). Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 190-205.
- Bekos, G. & Chari, S. (2023). *Upper Echelons Theory: A review*. In Papagiannidis S. (Ed), TheoryHub Book.
- Belias, D.; Trivellas, P.; Koustelios, A.; Serdaris, P.; Varsanis, K. & Grigoriou, I. (2017). Human Resource Management, Strategic Leadership Development, and the Greek Tourism Sector. In Katsoni, V.; Upadhyaya, A. & Stratigea, A. (Eds.). *Tourism, Culture and Heritage in a Smart Economy*. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics, 239-253.
- Bergh, D. D.; Connelly, B. L.; Ketchen Jr, D. J. & Shannon, L. M. (2014). Signalling Theory and Equilibrium in Strategic Management Research: An Assessment and a Research Agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(8), 1334-1360.

- Berglund, H. & Sandström, C. (2013). Business model innovation from an open systems perspective: structural challenges and managerial solutions. *International Journal of Product Development*, 18(3/4), 274-285.
- Bhardwaj, A.; Mishra, S. & Jain, T. K. (2021). Analysis of strategic leadership for organizational transformation and employee engagement. *Materials today: Proceedings*, 37(2), 161-165.
- Bhattacharyya, S. S. & Jha, S. (2018). Introduction to Leadership Theory and Strategic Leadership. *Strategic Leadership Models and Theories: Indian Perspectives*, Emerald Publishing Limited, 1-5.
- Birasnav, M. & Bienstock, J. (2019). Supply chain integration, advanced manufacturing technology, and strategic leadership: An empirical study. *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, 130(C), 142-157.
- Boal, K. B. (2004). *Strategic leadership, organizational learning and network ties. Strategic leadership on both sides of the Atlantic: Symposium on Strategic Leadership*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Institute for Management Development.
- Boal, K. B. (2004). Strategic leadership. In Goethals, G. R.; Sorenson, G. J. & Burns, J. M. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of leadership*, 1497-1504. Thousand Oaks, Canada: Sage.
- Boal, K. B. & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515-549.
- Boal, K. & Schultz, P. L. (2007). Storytelling, time, and evolution: The role of strategic leadership in complex adaptive systems. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 411-428.
- Bonardi, J. P.; Hitt, M. A.; Vera, D. & Withers, M. C. (2018). Special Issue on Strategic Leadership and Strategic Management. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), VII-VIII.
- Bonafous-Boucher, M. & Rendtorff, J. D. (2016). Stakeholder Theory in Strategic Management. *Stakeholder Theory. SpringerBriefs in Ethics*, 21-39. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Bridoux, F. & Stoelhorst, J. (2022). Stakeholder theory, strategy, and organization: Past, present, and future. *Strategic Organization*, 20(4), 797-809.
- Bromiley, P. & Rau, D. (2016). Missing the point of the practice-based view. *Strategic Organization*, 14(3), 260-269.
- Bromiley, P. & Rau, D. (2016). Social, Behavioral, and Cognitive Influences on Upper Echelons During Strategy Process: A Literature Review. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 174-202.
- Bukhari, S. A. R. (2019). What is strategy? *Research Gate*, 1-6.
- Bundy, J. & Pfarrer, M. D. (2015). A burden of responsibility: The role of social approval at the onset of a crisis. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(3), 345-369.
- Burkhard, B.; Sirén, C.; van Essen, M.; Grichnik, D. & Shepherd, D. A. (2023). Nothing Ventured, Nothing Gained: A Meta-Analysis of CEO Overconfidence, Strategic Risk Taking, and Performance. *Journal of Management*, 49(8), 2629-2666.
- Busenbark, J. R.; Krause, R.; Boivie, S. & Graffin, S. D. (2016). Toward a Configurational Perspective on the CEO: A Review and Synthesis of the Management Literature. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 234-268.
- Buyl, T.; Boone, C. & Hendriks, W. (2014). Top Management Team Members' Decision Influence and Cooperative Behaviour: An Empirical Study in the Information Technology Industry. *British Journal of Management*, 25(2), 285-304.

- Cannella, B.; Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick, D. C. (2009). *Strategic Leadership: Theory and Research on Executives, Top Management Teams, and Boards*. Strategic Management Series, 1-451 Oxford University Press.
- Cao, Q.; Simsek, Z. & Jansen, J. J. (2015). CEO social capital and entrepreneurial orientation of the firm: Bonding and bridging effects. *Journal of Management*, 41(7), 1957-1981.
- Capon. K. (2016). *Strategy implementation: An experience in learning*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Carmeli, A.; Sheaffer, Z.; Binyamin, G.; Reiter-Palmon, R. & Shimoni, T. (2013). Transformational Leadership and Creative Problem-Solving: The Mediating Role of Psychology Safety and Reflexivity. *Journal of Creative Behaviour*, 48(2), 115-135.
- Carpenter, M. A.; Geletkanycz, M. A. & Sanders, W. G. (2004). Upper echelons research revisited: Antecedents, elements, and consequences of top management team composition. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 749-778.
- Carter, S. M. & Greer, C. R. (2013). Strategic leadership: Values, styles, and organizational performance. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 20(4), 375-393.
- Carvalho, M.; Cabral, I.; Verdasca, J. L. & Alves, J. M. (2021). Strategy and Strategic Leadership in Education: A Scoping Review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 1-10.
- Chen, G. (2015). Initial compensation of new CEOs hired in turnaround situations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(12), 1895-1917.
- Chen, J. (2020). A juggling act: CEO polychronicity and firm innovation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3).
- Chin, M. K.; Zhang, S. X.; Afshar J.A. & Nadkarni, S. (2021). Unpacking political ideology: CEO social and economic ideologies, strategic decision-making processes, and corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(4), 1-48.
- Connelly, B. L.; Certo, S. T.; Ireland, R. D. & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling Theory: A Review and Assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67.
- Cortes, A. F. & Herrmann, P. (2021). Strategic leadership of innovation: A framework for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23(2), 224-243.
- Crossan, M.; Vera, D. & Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent leadership: Strategic leadership in dynamic environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 569-581.
- David, R. J.; Tolbert, P. S. & Boghossian, J. (2019). Institutional Theory in Organization Studies. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.
- Davies, B. & Davies, B. (2010). The Nature and Dimensions of Strategic Leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 38(1). 5-21. In Brundrett, M. (Ed.). *Principles of school leadership*, 73-93. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Day, D. V. & Liu, Z. (2018). What Is Wrong with Leadership Development and What Might Be Done About It? Improving Leadership Research and Practice. In Riggio, R. E. (Ed.). *What's Wrong with Leadership?* 226-240. Routledge.

- DeChurch, L. A.; Hiller, N. J.; Murase, T.; Doty, D. & Salas, E. (2010). Leadership across levels: Levels of leaders and their levels of impact. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 1069-1085.
- Denis, J. L.; Lamothe, L. & Langley, A. (2017). The Dynamics of Collective Leadership and Strategic Change in Pluralistic Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 809-837.
- Denis, J. L.; Langley, A. & Rouleau, L. (2010). The Practice of Leadership in the Messy World of Organizations. *Leadership*, 6(1), 67-88. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Dimitrios, N. K.; Sakas, D. P. & Vlachos, D. S. (2013). Analysis of strategic leadership simulation models in non-profit organizations. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 73, 276-284.
- Dóci, E.; Stouten, J. & Hofmans, J. (2015). The cognitive-behavioural system of leadership: Cognitive antecedents of active and passive leadership behaviours. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(1344), 1- 15.
- Donthu, N.; Kumar, S.; Mukherjee, D.; Pandey, N. & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 285-296.
- Duursema, H. (2013). *Strategic Leadership: Moving Beyond the Leader-Follower Dyad*. ERIM Ph.D. Series Research in Management. Erasmus Research Institute of Management.
- Elenkov, D. S.; Judge, W. & Wright, P. (2005). Strategic Leadership and Executive Innovation Influence: An International Multi-Cluster Comparative Study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(7), 665-682.
- Ernst, B. A.; Banks, G. C.; Loignon, A. C.; Frear, K. A.; Williams, C. E.; Arciniega, L. M.; Gupta, R. K.; Kodydek, G. & Subramanian, D. (2022). Virtual charismatic leadership and signaling theory: A prospective meta-analysis in five countries. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(5).
- Farida, I. & Setiawan, D. (2022). Business strategies and competitive advantage: The role of performance and innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(3), 1-16.
- Fatyandri, A. N.; Siagian, Y. M.; Santosa, W. & Setyawan, A. (2023). Does Strategic Leadership Impact Competitive Advantage, Mediated by Diversification Strategy in the Manufacturing Industry? *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 11(5), 4875-4885.
- Fernandes, C. I.; Veiga, P. M.; Ferreira, J. J.; Rammal, H. G. & Pereira, V. (2022). Assessing strategic leadership in organizations: Using bibliometric data to develop a holistic model. *Journal of Business Research*, 141(C), 646-655.
- Fernandes, C.; Veiga, P.; Ferreira, J. & Raposo, M., (2020). Strategic Leadership: Looking Inside the Box and Moving Out of It. *Academy of Management Review Proceedings*, 20(1).
- Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick, D. (1996). *Strategic Leadership: Top Executives and Their Effects on Organizations*. St. Paul, Minneapolis: West Publishing Company.
- Finkelstein, S.; Hambrick, D. C. & Cannella, A. A. (2009). *Strategic Leadership: Theory and Research on Executives, Top Management Teams, and Boards*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitza, M. (2017). How Much Do Ceos Really Matter? Reaffirming That the Ceo Effect is Mostly Due to Chance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(3), 802-811.
- Freedman, M. (2003). *The Art and Discipline of Strategic Leadership*. 1st ed. McGraw-Hill.
- Fuertes, G.; Alfaro, M.; Vargas, M.; Gutierrez, S.; Ternero, R. & Sabattin, J. (2020). Conceptual Framework for the Strategic Management: A Literature Review—Descriptive. *Journal of Engineering*, 2020(7), 1-21.

- Galavan, R. J.; Sund, K. J. & Hodgkinson, G. P. (2018). Methodological Challenges and Advances in Managerial and Organizational Cognition. In Galavan, R. J.; Sund, K. J. & Hodgkinson, G. P. (Eds.). *New Horizons in Managerial and Organizational Cognition*, 1-22. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Gardner, W. L.; Lowe, K. B.; Meuser, J. D.; Noghani, F.; Gullifor, D. P. & Cogliser, C. C. (2020). The leadership trilogy: A review of the third decade of The Leadership Quarterly. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1).
- Garg, S. & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2017). Unpacking the CEO-board relationship: How strategy making happens in entrepreneurial firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5), 1828-1858.
- Georgakakis, D.; Greve, P. & Ruigrok, W. (2017). Top management team faultlines and firm performance: Examining the CEO-TMT interface. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(6), 741-758.
- Georgakakis, D.; Heyden, M. L. M.; Oehmichen, J. D. R. & Ekanayake, U. I. K. (2022). Four decades of CEO-TMT interface research: A review inspired by role theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3), 1-13.
- Gomulya, D.; Wong, E. M.; Ormiston, M. E. & Boeker, W. (2017). The role of facial appearance on CEO selection after firm misconduct. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(4), 617-635.
- Guillot, W. M. (2003). Strategic Leadership: defining the challenge. *Air and Space Power Journal*, 17(4), 67-76.
- Gupta, A.; Nadkarni, S. & Mariam, M. (2019). Dispositional Sources of Managerial Discretion: CEO Ideology, CEO Personality, and Firm Strategies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(4), 855-893.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An update. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 334-343.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2018). Upper Echelons Theory. In: Augier, M. & Teece, D. J. (Eds.). *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Strategic Management*, 1782-1785. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2023). Upper Echelons Theory Origins, Twists And Turns, And Lessons Learned. In Smith, K. G. & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*, 109-127. Oxford: Oxford Academic.
- Hambrick, D. C. & Cannella, A. A. (2004). CEOs who have COOs: Contingency analysis of an unexplored structural form. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(10), 959-979.
- Hambrick, D. C. & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206.
- Hambrick, D. C. & Quigley, T. J. (2013). Toward more accurate contextualization of the CEO effect on firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(4), 473-491.
- Hambrick, D. C. & Pettigrew, A. (2001). Upper echelons: Donald Hambrick on executives and strategy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(3), 36-44.
- Hamidi, Y. (2009). Strategic Leadership for Effectiveness of Quality Managers in Medical Sciences Universities: What Skills Is Necessary. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 3(3), 2563-2569.
- Heavey C.; Simsek Z.; Fox B. C. & Hersel M. C. (2022). Executive confidence: A multidisciplinary review, synthesis, and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 48(6), 1430-1468.
- Helfat, C. E. & Martin, J. A. (2015). Dynamic managerial capabilities: Review and assessment of managerial impact on strategic change. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1281-1312.

- Hernandez, M.; Eberly, M. B.; Avolio, B. J. & Johnson, M. D. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1165-1185.
- Herrmann, P. & Nadkarni, S. (2014). Managing strategic change: The duality of CEO personality. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(9), 1318-1342.
- Hirschi, G. & Jones, M. (2009). Affects of strategic leadership on business success: A cross-cultural analysis from a resource-based view. *MIBES Transactions*, 3(1), 1-18.
- Hitt, M. A. & Duane, R. (2002). The Essence of Strategic Leadership: Managing Human and Social Capital. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 3-14.
- Hitt, M. A.; Arregle, J. L. & Holmes, R. M. (2021). Strategic Management Theory in a Post-Pandemic and Non-Ergodic World. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(1), 259-264.
- Hitt, M. A.; Haynes, K. T. & Serpa, R. (2010). Strategic leadership for the 21st century. *Business Horizons*, 53(5), 437-444.
- Hitt, M. A.; Ireland, R. D. & Hoskisson, R. D. (2017). *Strategic Management Competitiveness and Globalization: Concepts and Cases*. 12th ed. Boston, Massachusetts: Cengage Learning.
- Hitt, M. A.; Ireland, R. E. & Hoskisson, R. D. (2020). *Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization, concepts, and cases*. 13th ed. Boston, Massachusetts: Cengage Learning.
- Hodgkinson, G. P. & Healey, M. P. (2008). Cognition in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 387-417.
- Hoffmann, W. H. & Meusburger, L. (2018). How CEO values and TMT diversity jointly influence the corporate strategy making process. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 70 (2), 149-187.
- House, R. J. & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-473.
- Hsieh, T. & Yik, S. (2005). Leadership as the starting point of strategy. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 1(1), 67-76.
- Hunitie, M. (2018). Impact of strategic leadership on strategic competitive advantage through strategic thinking and strategic planning: a bi-meditational research. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 19(1), 322-330.
- Ireland, R. D. & Hitt, M. A. (2005). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(4), 63-77.
- Irtaimeh, H. J. (2018). Impact of strategic leadership competencies in organizations: Applied study on Al Manaseer group for industrial and trading. *Modern Applied Science*, 12(11), 169-180.
- Ismail, R. A.; Zaki, O. & Abou-El-Sood, H. (2023). Executives' narcissism and decision making: reviewing 20 years of accounting literature. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, 5(2), 120-143.
- Jaleha, A. A. & Machuki, V. N. (2018). Strategic Leadership and Organizational Performance: A Critical Review of Literature. *European Scientific Journal*, 14(35), 124-149.
- Jansen, J. J.; Vera, D. & Crossan, M. (2009). Strategic Leadership for Exploration and Exploitation: The Moderating Role of Environmental Dynamism. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(1), 5-18.
- Jooste, C. & Fourie, B. (2009). The role of strategic leadership in effective strategy implementation: perceptions of South African strategic leaders. *South African Business Review*, 13(3), 51-68.

Jung, Y. & Vakharia, N. (2019). Open Systems Theory for Arts and Cultural Organizations: Linking Structure and Performance. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 49(4), 257-273.

Karim, A.; Agus, A.; Nurnilasari, N.; Widiantari, D.; Fikriyah, F.; Rosadah, R. A.; Syarifudin, A.; Triono, W.; Lesmi, K. & Nurkholis, N. (2023). A study on managerial leadership in education: A systematic literature review. *Heliyon*, 9(6).

Kearney, E.; Shemla, M.; van Knippenberg, D. & Scholz, F. A. (2019). A paradox perspective on the interactive effects of visionary and empowering leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 155(1), 20-30.

Knies, E.; Jacobsen, C. & Tummers, L. G. (2016). Leadership and Organizational Performance: State of the Art and Research Agenda. In Storey, J.; Denis, J. L.; Hartley, J. & P. Hart (Eds.). *Routledge Companion to Leadership*, 404-418. London: Routledge.

Köseoğlu, M. A.; Baraca, M. & Karayormuk, K. (2009). A Study on the Causes of Strategies Failing to Succeed. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 3(2), 77-91.

Krause, R.; Roh, J. & Whitler, K. A. (2022). The Top Management Team: Conceptualization, Operationalization and a Roadmap for Scholarship. *Journal of Management*, 48(6), 1548-1601.

Kurzahls, C.; Graf-Vlachy, L. & König, A. (2020). Strategic leadership and technological innovation: A comprehensive review and research agenda. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 28(6), 437-464.

Lee, C.; Lee, K. & Pennin, J. M. (2001). Internal capabilities, external networks, and performance: a study on technology-based ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6/7), 615-640.

Lim, W. M.; Kumar, S. & Ali, F. (2022). Advancing knowledge through literature reviews: “What”, ‘why’, and ‘how to contribute’. *The Service Industries Journal*, 42 (7-8), 481-513.

Lin, H. & McDonough, E.F. III, (2011). Investigating the Role of Leadership and Organizational Culture in Fostering Innovation Ambidexterity. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 58(3), 497-509.

Liu, D.; Fisher, G. & Chen, G. (2018). CEO attributes and firm performance: A sequential mediation process model. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 789-816.

Luciano, M. M.; Nahrgang, J. D. & Shropshire, C. (2020). Strategic leadership systems: Viewing top management teams and boards of directors from a multiteam systems perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 45(3), 675-701.

Ma, S. & Seidl, D. (2018). New CEOs and their collaborators: Divergence and convergence between the strategic leadership constellation and the top management team. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(3), 606-638.

Ma, S.; Kor, Y. Y. & Seidl, D. (2020). CEO advice seeking: An integrative framework and future research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 46(6), 771-805.

Mahdi, O. R. & Nassar, I. A. (2021). The Business Model of Sustainable Competitive Advantage through Strategic Leadership Capabilities and Knowledge Management Processes to Overcome COVID-19 Pandemic. *Sustainability MDPI*, 13(17), 1-27.

Mahdi, O. R. & Almsafir, M. K. (2014). The role of strategic leadership in building sustainable competitive advantage in the academic environment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 129(5), 289-296.

- Maitlis, S. & Sonenshein, S. (2010). Sensemaking in crisis and change: Inspiration and insights from Weick (1988). *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(3), 551-580.
- Malewska, K. & Sajdak, M. (2014). The intuitive manager and the concept of strategic leadership. *Management, Sciendo*, 18(2), 44-58.
- Malmendier, U. & Tate, G. (2015). Behavioral CEOs: The Role of Managerial Overconfidence. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(4), 37-60.
- Marcel, J. J.; Barr, P. S. & Duhaime, I. M. (2010). The influence of executive cognition on competitive dynamics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(2), 115-138.
- Marx, T. G. (2014). The Leader as Chief Strategist. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(1), 75-92.
- McCallum, S. & O'Connell, D. (2009). Social capital and leadership development: Building stronger leadership through enhanced relational skills. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 30(2), 152-166.
- Memon, M. A.; Mangi, R. A. & Rohra, C. L. (2009). Human capital a source of competitive advantage, ideas for strategic leadership. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 3(4), 4182-4189.
- Menz, M.; Kunisch, S.; Birkinshaw, J.; Collis, D. J.; Foss, N. J.; Hoskisson, R. E. & Prescott, J. E. (2021). Corporate Strategy and the Theory of the Firm in the Digital Age. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(7), 1695-1720.
- Mjaku, G. (2020). Strategic Management and Strategic Leadership. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 10(8), 914-918.
- Moré, R. P. O.; Telles, R. & Marinho, S. V. (2016). Institutional Theory of Strategic Capacity and Competitive Advantage: Theoretical View of the Information Technology Industry in Brazil. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research*, 7(3), 671-679.
- Morrill, R. L. (2020). *Strategic Leadership: Integrating Strategy and Leadership in Colleges and Universities*. ACE/Praeger Series on Higher Education. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Muthimi, J. K. & Kilika, J. M. (2018). Leadership Strategy, Behavioural Focus and Firm Performance: A Review of Literature. *International Business Research*, 11(11), 143-163.
- Nahak, M. & Ellitan, L. (2022). The Role of Strategic Leadership in Supporting Strategic Planning and Increasing Organizational Competitiveness. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 6(3), 1441-1446.
- Neely, B. H.; Lovelace, J. B.; Cowen, A. P. & Hiller, N. J. (2020). Metacritiques of Upper Echelons Theory: Verdicts and Recommendations for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 46(6), 1029-1062.
- Neugebauer, F.; Figge, F. & Hahn, T. (2016). Planned or emergent strategy making? Exploring the formation of corporate sustainability strategies. *Business strategy and the environment*, 25(5), 323-336.
- Northouse, P. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 9th ed. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Norzailan, Z.; Yusof, S. M. & Othman, R. (2016). Developing Strategic Leadership Competencies. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 4(1), 66-71.
- O'Connell, V. & O'Sullivan, D. (2014). The influence of lead indicator strength on the use of nonfinancial measures in performance management: Evidence from CEO compensation schemes. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(6), 826-844.

- O'Shannassy, T. (2021). The Challenges of Strategic Leadership in Organizations. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 27(2), 235-238.
- Obuba, M. (2022). Leadership Strategy and Organizational Outcomes: A Review of Literature. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 11(2), 111-139.
- Olaka, H.; Lewa, P. & Kiriri, P. (2018). Strategic leadership and strategy implementation in commercial banks in Kenya. Kenya Bankers Association Centre for Research on Financial Markets and Policy Working Paper Series, 27.
- Pasaribu, F.; Bulan, T. R. N.; Muzakir, M. & Pratama, K. (2021). Impact of Strategic Leadership and Organizational Innovation on Strategic Management: Mediation Role of IT Capability. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 24(2), 354-368.
- Priem, R. L.; Lyon, D. W. & Dess, G. G. (1999). Inherent limitations of demographic proxies in top management team heterogeneity research. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 935-953.
- Prusak, L. & Cohen, D. (2001). How to invest in social capital. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(6), 86-93.
- Quansah, E. & Hartz, D. E. (2021). Strategic adaptation: Leadership lessons for small business survival and success. *American Journal of Business*, 36(3/4), 190-207.
- Quigley, T. J. & Graffin, S. D. (2017). Reaffirming the CEO effect is significant and much larger than chance: A comment on Fitza (2014). *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(3), 793-801.
- Quigley, T. J. & Hambrick, D. C. (2015). Has the "CEO effect" increased in recent decades? A new explanation for the great rise in America's attention to corporate leaders. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(6), 821-830.
- Quigley, T. J.; Chirico, F. & Baù, M. (2022). Does the CEO Effect on Performance Differ in Private Versus Public Firms? *Strategic Organization*, 20(3), 652-673.
- Ramos-Rodriguez, A. R.; Medina-Garrido, J. A. & Ruiz-Navarro, J. (2019). Why not now? Intended timing in entrepreneurial intentions. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 15(4), 1221-1246.
- Rashid, I. M. A.; Samah, I. H. A.; Razali, R.; Sham, M. F.; Karim, N. A.; Basri, H. H & Zahari, M. K. (2016). The importance of perceived leadership elements in strategic planning at public university. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39(2016), 422-426.
- Robinson, N. (2013). *The Effect of Visionary Leadership, Entrepreneurship, and Managerial Capabilities on the Implementation of Business Strategies and Their Impact on Company Performance. Study on the Export-Oriented Garment Industry in West Java.*
- Rönkkö, M.; Maheshwari, P. & Schmidt, J. (2023). The CEO effect and performance variation over time. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 34(5).
- Rowe, G. & Nejad, M. H. (2009). Strategic leadership: short-term stability and long-term viability. *Ivey Business Journal*, 73(5), 6-11.
- Rowe, W. G. (2014). Is Nonprofit Leadership Different from Business or Government Leadership? *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, 4(2), 86-91.
- Rowe, W. (2001). Creating Wealth in Organizations: The Role of Strategic Leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(1), 81-94.
- Rumsey, M. G. (2013). *The Oxford handbook of leadership*. Oxford University Press.

- Safari, M. & Mazdeh, Z. M. (2018). A Conceptual Framework of Strategy Cascading in Mission-Based Organizations: A State-of-the-Art Review and Practical Template. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 83, 1-10.
- Saher, A. & Ayub, U. (2020). Visionary Leadership and Organizational Change: Mediating Role of Trust in the Leader. *Paradigms*, 14(2), 8-17.
- Samimi, M.; Cortes, A. F.; Anderson, M. H. & Herrmann, P. (2022). What is strategic leadership? Developing a framework for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3).
- Sanders, T. J. & Davey, K. S. (2011). Out of the leadership theory jungle: a proposed meta-model of strategic leadership. *Proceedings of the Academy of Strategic Management*, 10(1), 41-46.
- Schaedler, I.; Graf-Vlachy, L. & König, A. (2022). Strategic leadership in organizational crises: A review and research agenda. *Long Range Planning*, 55(2), 1-28.
- Scott, W. R. (2004). Institutional theory: Contributing to a theoretical research program. In Smith, K. G. & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). *Great minds in management: The process of theory development*, 460-484. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shao, L. (2022). A Review of the Research on the Mechanism of Strategic Leadership at the Organizational Level. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 70-89.
- Simon, H. A. (2013). *Administrative Behaviour: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations*, 4th edition. New York: Free Press - A Division of Simon and Schuster, Inc.
- Simsek, Z.; Heavey, C. & Fox, B. C. (2018). Interfaces of Strategic Leaders: A Conceptual Framework, Review, and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 44(1), 280-324.
- Simsek, Z.; Jansen, J.; Minichilli, A. & Escriba-Esteve, A. (2015). Strategic leadership and leaders in entrepreneurial contexts: A nexus for innovation and impact missed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(4), 463-478.
- Singh, A.; Lim, W. M.; Jha, S.; Kumar, S. & Ciasullo, M. V. (2023). The state of the art of strategic leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 158(1), 1-17.
- Sinnaiah, T.; Adam, S. & Mahadi, B. (2023). A strategic management process: the role of decision-making style and organisational performance. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 15(1), 37-50.
- Smith, W. K. & Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 522-536.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339.
- Sonenshein, S. & Dholakia, U. (2012). Explaining Employee Engagement with Strategic Change Implementation: A Meaning-Making Approach. *Organization Science*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Sonmez Cakir, F. & Adiguzel, Z. (2020). Analysis of Leader Effectiveness in Organization and Knowledge Sharing Behavior on Employees and Organization. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 1-14.
- Sosik, J. J.; Jung, D. I.; Berson, Y.; Dionne, S. D. & Jaussi, K. S. (2005). Making all the right connections: The strategic leadership of top executives in high-tech organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(1), 47-61.

- Souitaris, V. & Maestro, B. M. (2010). Polychronicity in top management teams: The impact on strategic decision processes and performance of new technology ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(6), 652-678.
- Spasojevic, B.; Lohmann, G. & Scott, N. (2019). Leadership and governance in air route development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 78(C).
- Starr-Glass, D. (2017). The Conundrums of Strategic Leadership: Leading of Organizations, in Organizations, or through Organizations? *Encyclopaedia of Strategic Leadership and Management*, 1758-1768.
- Tao, Y.; He, J.; Wang, Y. F. & Ke, H. (2021). Strategic Leadership: A Bibliometric Analysis on Current Status and Emerging Trends. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 10(4), 439-458.
- Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40-49.
- Thomas, H. & Porac, J. F. (2002). Managing cognition and strategy: Issues, trends, and future directions. *Handbook of Strategic Management*, 165-181.
- Thompson, A. A.; Strickland, A. J.; Gamble, J. E. & Gao, Z. (2018). *Crafting and executing strategy: the quest for competitive advantage—concepts and cases*, 21st edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Tipurić, D. (2022). The Rise of Strategic Leadership: A Critical Perspective. *The Enactment of Strategic Leadership*, Chapter 3, pp. 55-92. Springer.
- Tipurić, D. (2022). Configurations of Strategic Leadership. *The Enactment of Strategic Leadership*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Knippenberg, D. & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic—transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1-60.
- Varma, A.; Kumar, S.; Lim, W. M. & Pandey, N. (2023). Personnel Review at age 50: a retrospective using bibliometric analysis. *Personnel Review*, 52(4), 1291-1320.
- Vera, D. & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 222-240.
- Vera, D.; Bonardi, J. P.; Hitt, M. A. & Withers, M. C. (2022). Extending the boundaries of strategic leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3), 1-10.
- Vogel, B.; Reichard, R. J.; Batistič, S. & Černe, M. (2021). A bibliometric review of the leadership development field: how we got here, where we are, and where we are headed. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(5), 1-46.
- Volpp Sierra, J. C. & Banzato, C. R. (2016). Implications of Theory and Research on Strategic Leadership: A Critical Review. *Revista Ibero Americana de Estrategia*, 15(3), 119-131.
- Waldman, D. A.; Bass, B. M. & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behaviour: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and Organization Studies*, 15(4), 381-394.
- Waldman, D. A.; Javidan, M. & Varella, P. (2004). Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 355-380.
- Waldman, D. A.; Ramirez, G. G.; House, R. J. & Puranam, P. (2001). Does Leadership Matter? CEO Leadership Attributes and Profitability Under Conditions of Perceived Environmental Uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 134-143.

- Walsh, J. P. (1995). Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organization Science*, 6(3), 280-321.
- Watts, G. W. & Blazek, L. (2024). Leadership development flaws. In Watts, G. W. & Blazek, L. *Becoming a strategic leader: Capitalize on the power of your personality*, 11-15. American Psychological Association.
- Wegge, J.; Jungbauer, K. L. & Shemla, M. (2022). When inspiration does not fit the bill: Charismatic leadership reduces performance in a team crisis for followers high in self-direction. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 28(6), 1201-1218.
- Wheelen, T. L.; Hunger, J. D.; Hoffman, A. N. & Bamford, C. E. (2017). *Strategic management and business policy*. Pearson
- White, J. V. & Borgholthaus, C. J. (2022). Who's in charge here? A bibliometric analysis of upper echelons research. *Journal of Business Research*, 139(C), 1012-1025.
- Wilderom, C. P.; Van Den Berg, P. T. & Wiersma, U. J. (2012). A longitudinal study of the effects of charismatic leadership and organizational culture on objective and perceived corporate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 835-848.
- Willis, A. C. O.; Kinyua, G. M. & Muchemi, A. W. (2022). Strategic Leadership as an Antecedent of Competitive Advantage: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, 10(1), 18-33.
- Wowak, A. J.; Gomez-Mejia, L. R. & Steinbach, A. L. (2017). Inducements and motives at the top: A holistic perspective on the drivers of executive behaviour. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 669-702.
- Yang, D.; Battulga, A. & Rhee, M. (2022). An Open System Understanding of Product Innovation: Attention Allocation, External Information Sources, and Absorptive Capacity. *Systems*, 10(5), 172.
- Yukl, G. A. & Gardner, W. L. (2020). *Leadership in organizations*. 9th Edition. Harlow: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Zayed, A. & Nasr, R. (2023). Analyzing the expected role of strategic leadership and supportive culture in executing business strategies: The mediating role of employee engagement. *The Academic Journal of Contemporary Commercial Research*, 3(2), 18-42.
- Zhao, H. & Li, C. (2019). A computerized approach to understanding leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(4).