

Strategic Leadership Evolution Under Uncertainty: Developing a Complexity-Based Leadership Framework

Aydin Javanmard¹, Rozita Pashaei^{1*}

1. Department of Marketing Management, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed to develop a complexity-based framework explaining how strategic leadership evolves under conditions of uncertainty in contemporary organizations. This qualitative study used an interpretive research design based on semi-structured interviews with 24 senior managers, strategy directors, organizational development consultants, innovation managers, and executive-level decision-makers working in Tehran-based organizations. Participants were selected through purposive sampling according to their direct involvement in strategic decision-making under unstable market, technological, regulatory, and organizational conditions. Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was reached at the twenty-second interview, followed by two additional interviews to confirm the stability of the categories. Interviews lasted between 45 and 80 minutes and were transcribed verbatim. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis supported by NVivo software. Coding proceeded through open coding, axial comparison, theme refinement, and framework development. Credibility was enhanced through member checking, peer review, prolonged engagement with the data, and maintaining an audit trail. Five main categories emerged from the analysis: anticipatory sensemaking, distributed adaptive decision-making, enabling constraints, strategic experimentation, and relational resilience. The findings showed that strategic leadership under uncertainty evolves from command-and-control planning toward a complexity-based process in which leaders interpret weak signals, mobilize distributed intelligence, create flexible boundaries, support experimentation, and sustain trust across stakeholder networks. Participants emphasized that uncertainty cannot be eliminated through planning alone; rather, it must be navigated through iterative learning, rapid feedback, and adaptive coordination. The proposed framework conceptualizes strategic leadership evolution as a shift from predictive control to adaptive orchestration. Under uncertainty, effective strategic leaders act less as centralized decision-makers and more as system enablers who shape conditions for emergence, learning, and collective adaptation.

Keywords: strategic leadership; uncertainty; complexity leadership theory; adaptive decision-making; qualitative research; organizational resilience; Tehran

✉ *CORRESPONDING AUTHOR'S EMAIL

rozita.pashaei.mkt@gmail.com

“ HOW TO CITE

Javanmard, A. & Pashaei, R. (2025). Strategic Leadership Evolution Under Uncertainty: Developing a Complexity-Based Leadership Framework. *Management Systems Evolution and Leadership Studies*, 2(5), 1-10.

1. Introduction

Uncertainty has become a defining condition of strategic leadership in contemporary organizations. Market instability, technological disruption, geopolitical turbulence, regulatory discontinuity, global crises, and accelerating digital transformation have weakened the assumption that organizational environments can be understood through linear forecasting and controlled through centralized planning. In relatively stable environments, strategic leadership was often conceptualized as the capacity of top executives to formulate vision, allocate resources, design structures, and align organizational members around long-term objectives. However, in environments characterized by ambiguity, interdependence, emergence, and nonlinear change, the role of strategic leadership becomes more complex. Leaders are no longer merely expected to predict the future and impose coherent plans; they are required to interpret evolving patterns, sustain adaptive capacity, enable distributed intelligence, and create organizational conditions through which novel responses can emerge.



Traditional strategic leadership literature has emphasized the role of senior executives in shaping organizational direction, influencing culture, developing human capital, and making decisions that affect long-term performance. Boal and Hooijberg (2000) argued that the essence of strategic leadership involves the capacity to learn, the capacity to change, and managerial wisdom. This view already moved beyond purely heroic or positional interpretations of leadership by stressing cognitive complexity, social intelligence, and behavioral flexibility. Yet the increasing volatility of organizational environments has made these capacities even more central. Strategic leadership under uncertainty requires leaders to hold multiple interpretations simultaneously, tolerate ambiguity, and make decisions without complete information. Therefore, leadership becomes less a matter of applying pre-established solutions and more a matter of enabling organizational systems to learn while acting.

Complexity theory provides a useful theoretical lens for understanding this shift. Organizations can be viewed as complex adaptive systems composed of interacting agents whose behaviors are interdependent, dynamic, and partly unpredictable. In such systems, outcomes are not simply the product of top-down design; they emerge from interactions among individuals, teams, technologies, routines, external pressures, and institutional constraints. Complexity leadership theory argues that leadership should be understood not only as the behavior of formal leaders but also as a dynamic process that enables learning, creativity, and adaptation in complex adaptive systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). This perspective is particularly relevant for strategic leadership under uncertainty because it explains why rigid control, excessive hierarchy, and narrow planning may reduce adaptability when organizations face nonlinear change.

The relevance of complexity leadership is also evident in the distinction between administrative, adaptive, and enabling leadership. Administrative leadership refers to formal managerial authority, planning, coordination, and accountability. Adaptive leadership refers to emergent change, innovation, learning, and informal problem-solving among organizational actors. Enabling leadership connects these two domains by creating the conditions through which adaptive ideas can emerge while remaining sufficiently connected to formal systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). Under uncertainty, the strategic leader's role is therefore not limited to issuing directives. Instead, the leader must manage the tension between stability and change, order and emergence, control and autonomy, and short-term response and long-term renewal.

This shift is closely connected to the broader strategic management literature on dynamic capabilities. Teece et al. (1997) defined dynamic capabilities as the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments. Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) further argued that dynamic capabilities consist of identifiable processes such as strategic decision-making, resource reconfiguration, product development, and alliance formation. From this perspective, strategic leadership under uncertainty involves more than individual judgment; it involves the development of organizational capabilities for sensing, seizing, and transforming. Leaders must help organizations detect environmental signals, interpret their strategic meaning, mobilize resources, and reconfigure structures before existing routines become obsolete.

Sensemaking is another essential mechanism in uncertain environments. Weick et al. (2005) described sensemaking as the process through which ambiguous circumstances are transformed into situations that can be understood and acted upon. In uncertain contexts, leaders often face incomplete, contradictory, or rapidly changing information. Their strategic task is not simply to analyze objective data but to facilitate collective interpretation. Strategic leadership becomes a process of framing uncertainty, naming emerging risks and opportunities, and creating shared narratives that allow organizational members to coordinate action. Without

collective sensemaking, uncertainty may produce paralysis, defensive routines, fragmentation, or conflict among decision-makers.

The Cynefin framework also contributes to understanding strategic decision-making under uncertainty. Snowden and Boone (2007) distinguished between simple, complicated, complex, and chaotic contexts, arguing that different decision contexts require different leadership responses. In complex contexts, cause-and-effect relationships can often be understood only in retrospect, which means that leaders should probe, sense, and respond rather than rely exclusively on analysis and prediction. This insight challenges conventional strategic planning models that assume stable causal relationships and predictable outcomes. For strategic leaders, recognizing the type of uncertainty facing the organization becomes a critical competence. When leaders misclassify complex situations as merely complicated problems, they may overuse expert analysis and formal planning when experimentation and feedback would be more appropriate.

Strategic agility literature similarly emphasizes the importance of responsiveness, leadership unity, and resource fluidity. Doz and Kosonen (2010) proposed that strategic agility depends on meta-capabilities that enable organizations to renew business models and respond to changing environments. Strategic sensitivity allows leaders to perceive early signals of change; leadership unity allows top teams to make rapid collective commitments; and resource fluidity allows organizations to redeploy assets quickly. These capabilities are especially important under uncertainty because organizations often fail not because they lack resources, but because their resources are locked into outdated structures, routines, or assumptions. Therefore, the evolution of strategic leadership must be examined in relation to the organization's ability to release, recombine, and redirect its capabilities.

Recent crisis and uncertainty research also indicates that strategic leadership cannot be reduced to heroic decision-making by CEOs or top executives. Schaedler et al. (2022) reviewed strategic leadership in organizational crises and showed that different strategic actors, including CEOs, top management teams, and boards of directors, play distinctive roles in crisis contexts. This suggests that strategic leadership under uncertainty is distributed across multiple levels of governance and organizational action. It involves not only formal authority but also relational coordination, interpretive alignment, and cross-functional collaboration. A complexity-based view therefore requires attention to networks, interactions, feedback loops, and the social conditions that allow adaptive responses to emerge.

Despite these theoretical developments, there remains a need for empirical qualitative studies that explain how strategic leadership actually evolves in organizations experiencing uncertainty. Much of the existing literature discusses complexity leadership, dynamic capabilities, and strategic agility conceptually, but fewer studies examine how managers and executives interpret the transition from traditional leadership logics to complexity-based practices in real organizational settings. This gap is particularly important in emerging and institutionally volatile environments, where organizations may face simultaneous pressures from economic instability, regulatory uncertainty, technological change, resource constraints, and shifting stakeholder expectations. Tehran-based organizations provide a relevant context for exploring these dynamics because many operate in conditions of market turbulence, institutional complexity, and strategic ambiguity.

The present study addresses this gap by developing a complexity-based leadership framework grounded in the lived experiences of strategic decision-makers in Tehran. Rather than treating uncertainty as a temporary disturbance to be eliminated, this study conceptualizes uncertainty as a systemic condition that reshapes leadership

assumptions, practices, and capabilities. The study focuses on how leaders interpret uncertainty, how they make strategic decisions when prediction is limited, how they balance control and adaptation, and how they create organizational conditions for resilience and renewal. Accordingly, the aim of this study was to develop a complexity-based framework explaining the evolution of strategic leadership under uncertainty in Tehran-based organizations.

2. Methods and Materials

This study used a qualitative interpretive design to explore how strategic leadership evolves under uncertainty and how leaders construct meaning, make decisions, and enable adaptation in complex organizational environments. A qualitative approach was appropriate because the purpose of the study was not to test predefined hypotheses but to generate a grounded and context-sensitive understanding of leadership practices, experiences, and interpretive patterns. The study was conducted among senior professionals working in Tehran-based organizations that had experienced high levels of environmental uncertainty, including technological change, market instability, regulatory ambiguity, competitive disruption, and organizational restructuring.

The participants consisted of 24 individuals selected through purposive sampling. Inclusion criteria were: having at least seven years of managerial or strategic decision-making experience, direct involvement in organizational strategy or transformation processes, employment or consulting activity in Tehran-based organizations, and willingness to participate in a recorded semi-structured interview. Participants included chief executive officers, senior managers, strategy directors, innovation and digital transformation managers, organizational development consultants, and human resource development managers. The final sample included 15 men and 9 women. Regarding age, 5 participants were between 30 and 39 years old, 11 were between 40 and 49 years old, and 8 were 50 years old or above. In terms of organizational role, 6 participants were CEOs or board-level executives, 7 were senior functional managers, 5 were strategy or business development directors, 3 were innovation or digital transformation managers, and 3 were organizational development or management consultants. Regarding work experience, 4 participants had 7–10 years of managerial experience, 10 had 11–15 years, and 10 had more than 15 years.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. This method was selected because it allowed the researcher to examine common themes across participants while also allowing flexibility to explore emerging insights in depth. The interview protocol included questions about participants' experiences of strategic uncertainty, changes in leadership practices, decision-making under ambiguity, organizational adaptation, use of data and intuition, crisis response, collaboration across levels, and perceived characteristics of effective strategic leaders in complex environments. Examples of interview questions included: "How has uncertainty changed the way strategic decisions are made in your organization?", "What leadership behaviors become more important when the future is difficult to predict?", "How do leaders balance control and flexibility during unstable conditions?", and "What organizational conditions help people respond adaptively to uncertainty?"

Each interview lasted between 45 and 80 minutes. Interviews were conducted in a confidential setting, either face-to-face or through secure online platforms depending on participant availability. All interviews were recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim. Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was achieved. Saturation was reached at the twenty-second interview, when no substantially new codes or categories

were emerging. Two additional interviews were conducted to confirm the stability and completeness of the developed categories. Ethical considerations included informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality of personal and organizational information, and anonymization of interview quotations. Participants were identified using codes such as P1, P2, and P3.

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis supported by NVivo software. The analysis followed an iterative process of familiarization, initial coding, category development, theme refinement, and framework construction. First, all transcripts were read several times to gain an overall understanding of the participants' experiences. Second, meaningful segments of text were coded inductively. Codes were assigned to statements related to uncertainty interpretation, leadership behavior, decision-making, organizational adaptation, communication, experimentation, and resilience. Third, similar codes were compared and grouped into broader subcategories. Fourth, subcategories were reviewed in relation to the research aim and organized into main categories. Finally, the relationships among categories were interpreted to develop a complexity-based leadership framework.

NVivo software was used to organize transcripts, manage codes, compare coded segments, retrieve quotations, and visualize relationships among categories. The software supported systematic analysis but did not replace researcher interpretation. To enhance rigor, the study followed qualitative trustworthiness criteria. Credibility was strengthened through member checking with selected participants, peer review of codes and categories, and repeated comparison between raw data and emerging interpretations. Dependability was supported by documenting analytic decisions and maintaining an audit trail. Confirmability was enhanced through reflexive memo writing and preserving links between quotations, codes, and themes. Transferability was supported by providing detailed descriptions of the research context, participant characteristics, and analytic categories.

3. Findings and Results

The demographic characteristics of the participants indicated that the study included a diverse group of strategic decision-makers with substantial professional experience. Of the 24 participants, 15 were male and 9 were female. Five participants were aged 30–39, 11 were aged 40–49, and 8 were aged 50 or above. In terms of education, 6 participants held a bachelor's degree, 13 held a master's degree, and 5 held a doctoral degree. Six participants were CEOs or board-level executives, 7 were senior functional managers, 5 were strategy or business development directors, 3 were innovation or digital transformation managers, and 3 were organizational development or management consultants. Four participants had 7–10 years of managerial experience, 10 had 11–15 years, and 10 had more than 15 years. The analysis produced five main categories: anticipatory sensemaking, distributed adaptive decision-making, enabling constraints, strategic experimentation, and relational resilience.

Anticipatory sensemaking. The first main category refers to the capacity of strategic leaders to interpret weak signals, construct shared meanings, and transform ambiguity into provisional strategic understanding. Participants explained that uncertainty often appears before it becomes visible in formal reports. Therefore, effective leaders must listen to customers, employees, regulators, suppliers, competitors, and informal networks to detect early patterns. Anticipatory sensemaking involved scanning the environment, questioning assumptions, comparing alternative interpretations, and converting fragmented information into strategic narratives. Participants emphasized that the purpose of sensemaking was not to produce certainty but to create enough shared understanding for coordinated action. One participant stated, "In uncertain conditions, the leader cannot wait until

everything becomes clear. By the time the situation is clear, the opportunity may already be gone” (P7). Another participant explained, “Our most important meetings are not only about numbers; they are about asking what the numbers may be trying to tell us before the trend becomes obvious” (P12). This category shows that strategic leadership evolves from prediction-centered planning toward interpretation-centered navigation.

Distributed adaptive decision-making. The second category reflects the shift from centralized decision authority toward distributed intelligence and adaptive coordination. Participants reported that uncertainty makes it impossible for one leader or one top management team to possess all relevant information. Strategic decisions increasingly require input from multiple organizational levels, especially from employees close to customers, technologies, operations, and market changes. Distributed adaptive decision-making did not mean the absence of leadership; rather, it meant that leaders created mechanisms through which diverse expertise could influence strategic choices. Participants described cross-functional task forces, rapid decision forums, crisis teams, digital dashboards, informal consultation networks, and temporary project groups as mechanisms for distributed decision-making. One participant noted, “The old model was that strategy came from the top and execution went downward. Now, many strategic insights come from the edge of the organization” (P3). Another participant stated, “When uncertainty is high, hierarchy is too slow. We still need accountability, but decisions must be closer to the information” (P18). This category indicates that strategic leadership evolves by combining formal authority with decentralized interpretation and action.

Enabling constraints. The third category refers to the leader’s role in creating boundaries that provide direction without suppressing adaptation. Participants rejected both excessive control and complete freedom. They argued that organizations under uncertainty need simple rules, strategic priorities, ethical boundaries, and decision principles that guide action while leaving room for local adaptation. Enabling constraints included clear strategic intent, limited but meaningful performance indicators, flexible resource rules, explicit risk boundaries, and principles for customer, employee, and stakeholder decisions. These constraints helped prevent chaos while avoiding bureaucratic rigidity. One participant explained, “People do not need a detailed instruction for every situation; they need to know the direction, the limits, and what values should not be violated” (P9). Another participant said, “If everything is controlled, people stop thinking. If nothing is defined, people move in different directions. The leader must create useful boundaries” (P21). This category demonstrates that complexity-based leadership does not eliminate structure; rather, it redesigns structure as an adaptive guide rather than a restrictive mechanism.

Strategic experimentation. The fourth category concerns the use of small-scale experiments, pilot projects, rapid feedback, and iterative learning as strategic responses to uncertainty. Participants emphasized that when outcomes cannot be predicted reliably, leaders should avoid committing all resources to a single large plan. Instead, they should support controlled experimentation, test assumptions, learn from results, and scale successful initiatives. Strategic experimentation was described as a disciplined process rather than random trial and error. It required clear hypotheses, limited investment, defined learning goals, rapid evaluation, and willingness to stop unsuccessful initiatives. One participant stated, “In the past, we tried to design the perfect plan. Now, we design experiments because the environment answers faster than our planning documents” (P5). Another participant explained, “A failed pilot is not a failure if it prevents a much bigger strategic mistake” (P16). This category shows that strategic leadership evolves from plan implementation toward learning-based strategy formation, where action and reflection occur continuously.

Relational resilience. The fifth category refers to the capacity of leaders to sustain trust, psychological safety, stakeholder commitment, and collective energy during uncertainty. Participants emphasized that uncertainty produces anxiety, defensive behavior, blame, and short-term thinking. Therefore, strategic leaders must maintain relational stability while encouraging adaptive change. Relational resilience included transparent communication, emotional steadiness, stakeholder dialogue, protection of key talent, recognition of employee concerns, and development of trust across organizational boundaries. Participants argued that employees are more willing to adapt when they believe leaders are honest about uncertainty and fair in decision-making. One participant stated, “People can accept difficult changes, but they cannot accept silence, contradiction, or hidden agendas” (P2). Another participant said, “In uncertainty, trust becomes a strategic resource. Without trust, even the best strategy remains on paper” (P14). This category indicates that strategic leadership under uncertainty is not only cognitive and structural but also relational and emotional.

Based on these categories, the proposed complexity-based leadership framework consists of five interconnected dimensions. Anticipatory sensemaking allows leaders to notice and interpret emerging uncertainty. Distributed adaptive decision-making mobilizes organizational intelligence and moves decisions closer to relevant information. Enabling constraints provide direction and coherence without eliminating flexibility. Strategic experimentation transforms uncertainty into structured learning. Relational resilience sustains trust and commitment during adaptive change. Together, these dimensions suggest that strategic leadership evolves from predictive control toward adaptive orchestration. The leader’s role becomes one of shaping conditions for collective intelligence, iterative learning, and emergent strategic renewal.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop a complexity-based framework explaining how strategic leadership evolves under uncertainty. The findings revealed five main categories: anticipatory sensemaking, distributed adaptive decision-making, enabling constraints, strategic experimentation, and relational resilience. Taken together, these categories indicate that strategic leadership under uncertainty shifts from a traditional model of centralized prediction and control toward a complexity-based model of adaptive orchestration. In this model, leaders do not attempt to eliminate uncertainty completely; instead, they create the interpretive, structural, experimental, and relational conditions through which organizations can respond intelligently to uncertainty. This finding supports complexity leadership theory, which conceptualizes leadership as a dynamic process that enables learning, creativity, and adaptive capacity in complex adaptive systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

The first finding, anticipatory sensemaking, shows that strategic leaders under uncertainty must interpret weak signals and construct shared meaning before formal certainty becomes available. This result aligns with Weick et al. (2005), who argued that sensemaking transforms ambiguous circumstances into situations that can guide action. In the present study, participants emphasized that waiting for complete clarity may cause organizations to miss opportunities or respond too late to threats. This finding also supports Snowden and Boone’s (2007) argument that complex contexts require leaders to probe, sense, and respond rather than simply categorize problems through established routines. Anticipatory sensemaking therefore represents a key mechanism through which strategic leaders convert ambiguity into provisional direction. It also extends previous literature by showing

that sensemaking is not only a cognitive process but also a strategic leadership practice involving dialogue, environmental scanning, narrative construction, and collective interpretation.

The second finding, distributed adaptive decision-making, indicates that uncertainty weakens the effectiveness of purely centralized decision models. Participants reported that strategic information is often dispersed across organizational levels and that employees near customers, technologies, and operations may detect changes earlier than top executives. This finding is consistent with complexity leadership theory, which emphasizes the importance of interaction, networks, and emergent adaptation (Lichtenstein et al., 2006; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). It also corresponds with Boal and Hooijberg's (2000) view that strategic leadership depends on learning capacity, change capacity, and social intelligence. Under uncertainty, leaders must not only decide but also design decision architectures that include multiple sources of intelligence. The finding suggests that strategic leadership evolution involves a movement from leader-centered judgment toward system-level intelligence. However, distributed decision-making does not mean abandoning accountability; rather, it requires clear roles, rapid communication, and integration mechanisms that prevent fragmentation.

The third finding, enabling constraints, clarifies how organizations can balance flexibility and coherence under uncertainty. Participants emphasized that adaptive organizations require boundaries, but these boundaries should guide rather than control. This finding strongly aligns with complexity theory, where adaptive systems require both order and freedom. Too much control suppresses emergence, whereas too little structure may produce disorder. Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) described enabling leadership as the function that connects administrative structures with adaptive dynamics. The present study supports this idea by showing that leaders create enabling constraints through strategic intent, decision principles, flexible rules, and ethical boundaries. This finding also contributes to strategic leadership literature by explaining that effective leadership under uncertainty does not simply reduce bureaucracy; it redesigns governance so that people can act autonomously within a coherent strategic frame.

The fourth finding, strategic experimentation, demonstrates that uncertainty changes the logic of strategy formation. Participants described experimentation, pilot projects, rapid feedback, and iterative learning as essential practices when prediction is unreliable. This finding aligns with dynamic capabilities theory, which emphasizes sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring resources in rapidly changing environments (Teece et al., 1997). It also supports Eisenhardt and Martin's (2000) view that dynamic capabilities include identifiable processes such as strategic decision-making and resource reconfiguration. In uncertain environments, experimentation allows organizations to test assumptions before making large commitments. The finding also corresponds with the Cynefin framework, which recommends probing and sensing in complex contexts (Snowden & Boone, 2007). Strategic experimentation therefore functions as a bridge between uncertainty and learning: it allows leaders to act without pretending that they can fully predict the consequences of action.

The fifth finding, relational resilience, reveals that complexity-based strategic leadership is not only analytical and structural but also relational. Participants consistently emphasized trust, transparent communication, emotional steadiness, and stakeholder commitment. This finding is important because uncertainty often generates anxiety, resistance, blame, and defensive routines. Relational resilience enables organizations to continue learning and adapting despite stress. This result aligns with strategic crisis leadership research, which shows that strategic leaders play important roles in crisis interpretation, coordination, and stakeholder management (Schaedler et al., 2022). It also complements strategic agility literature, particularly Doz and Kosonen's (2010) emphasis on

leadership unity as a condition for rapid renewal. In the present study, relational resilience was not simply a “soft” leadership quality; it was a strategic capability that sustained cooperation when formal plans were unstable.

The integrated framework developed in this study suggests that strategic leadership evolution under uncertainty occurs through the interaction of five dimensions. Anticipatory sensemaking provides interpretive awareness. Distributed adaptive decision-making mobilizes dispersed intelligence. Enabling constraints provide coherence. Strategic experimentation produces learning. Relational resilience sustains trust and collective commitment. These dimensions are mutually reinforcing. For example, experimentation without relational resilience may create fear of failure. Distributed decision-making without enabling constraints may create fragmentation. Sensemaking without experimentation may remain abstract. Enabling constraints without distributed intelligence may become another form of top-down control. Therefore, the framework should be understood as a systemic configuration rather than a list of separate leadership behaviors.

This study contributes to the literature in several ways. First, it extends strategic leadership theory by showing that strategic leadership under uncertainty is not limited to vision formulation, decision authority, or resource allocation. It involves the orchestration of adaptive conditions across cognitive, structural, experimental, and relational domains. Second, it contributes to complexity leadership theory by applying its assumptions to strategic leadership evolution in an uncertain organizational context. Third, it provides empirical qualitative evidence from Tehran-based organizations, a context in which uncertainty is often intensified by economic, institutional, technological, and market pressures. Fourth, it integrates complexity leadership, dynamic capabilities, sensemaking, and strategic agility into a single framework that can guide future empirical research and managerial practice.

The findings also have implications for understanding the limitations of conventional strategic planning. Participants did not reject planning altogether; rather, they rejected rigid planning that assumes environmental stability. Under uncertainty, planning must become more iterative, participatory, and learning-oriented. Leaders still need strategic direction, but that direction should be flexible enough to evolve as new information emerges. This interpretation is consistent with Doz and Kosonen’s (2010) concept of strategic agility and with Teece et al.’s (1997) dynamic capabilities framework. The study therefore suggests that the future of strategic leadership lies not in replacing strategy with improvisation but in integrating strategic intent with adaptive learning.

Ethical Considerations

All procedures performed in this study were under the ethical standards.

Acknowledgments

Authors thank all who helped us through this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

References

- Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515–549. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(00\)00057-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6)
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 370–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.006>
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200010/11\)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E)
- Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151>
- Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(6), 831–850. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2247>
- Lichtenstein, B. B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A., Orton, J. D., & Schreiber, C. (2006). Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, 8(4), 2–12.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Schaedler, L., Graf-Vlachy, L., & König, A. (2022). Strategic leadership in organizational crises: A review and research agenda. *Long Range Planning*, 55(2), 102156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2021.102156>
- Snowden, D. J., & Boone, M. E. (2007). A leader's framework for decision making. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(11), 68–76.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 298–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002>
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133>