

Developing a Strategic Agility Leadership Model for Hypercompetitive Business Environments

Mansour Khalili^{1*}

1. Department of Public Administration, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed to develop a qualitative model of strategic agility leadership for organizations operating in hypercompetitive business environments. This qualitative study was conducted using an inductive thematic approach. The participants were 24 senior managers, founders, strategy directors, digital transformation managers, and organizational development experts working in highly competitive business sectors in Tehran, Iran. Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their direct experience with rapid market change, competitive disruption, digital transformation, and strategic decision-making under uncertainty. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews focused on leadership responses to competitive turbulence, strategic renewal, resource reconfiguration, organizational learning, and decision acceleration. Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was reached at the twenty-first interview, followed by three confirmatory interviews to refine the emerging model. All interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using NVivo software. Data analysis involved open coding, axial coding, constant comparison, memo writing, and theme refinement. The analysis generated four main categories of strategic agility leadership: anticipatory sensemaking, rapid strategic alignment, fluid resource orchestration, and adaptive learning governance. Anticipatory sensemaking refers to leaders' ability to detect weak signals, interpret competitive moves, and convert environmental ambiguity into strategic insight. Rapid strategic alignment describes the capacity to create leadership unity, shorten decision cycles, and mobilize collective commitment around emerging priorities. Fluid resource orchestration reflects the leader's ability to reallocate financial, technological, human, and relational resources across shifting strategic opportunities. Adaptive learning governance refers to institutionalizing experimentation, psychological safety, feedback loops, and post-action learning as mechanisms for continuous renewal. Together, these categories formed a process model in which strategic agility leadership begins with environmental interpretation, moves through collective strategic synchronization, becomes operational through resource mobility, and is sustained by learning-oriented governance. The proposed model suggests that strategic agility in hypercompetitive environments is not merely an organizational capability but a leadership-enabled dynamic process. Leaders strengthen agility by integrating foresight, alignment, resource fluidity, and learning discipline into a coherent strategic response system.

Keywords: Strategic agility; agile leadership; hypercompetition; dynamic capabilities; qualitative research; strategic leadership; organizational adaptation.

✉ *CORRESPONDING AUTHOR'S EMAIL

mansour.khalili.pub@gmail.com

“ HOW TO CITE

Khalili, M. (2026). Developing a Strategic Agility Leadership Model for Hypercompetitive Business Environments. *Management Systems Evolution and Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 30-39.

1. Introduction

Hypercompetitive business environments are characterized by accelerated competitive moves, unstable advantage, intensified technological disruption, shrinking product and service life cycles, and frequent reconfiguration of market boundaries. In such environments, organizations cannot rely exclusively on long-term positional advantages, rigid planning routines, or hierarchical decision processes. D'Aveni (1994) argued that hypercompetition weakens the durability of traditional competitive advantages because firms continuously attack and erode one another's market positions through speed, innovation, timing, pricing, quality improvement, and strategic surprise. This logic has become more visible in contemporary digital markets, where platform-based competition, data-driven business models, global connectivity, and rapid customer preference shifts make



strategic stability increasingly temporary. Consequently, leadership in hypercompetitive contexts must move beyond administrative control and toward continuous renewal, rapid interpretation, and adaptive mobilization.

Strategic agility has emerged as a central concept for understanding how organizations survive and perform under conditions of turbulence. It generally refers to the capacity of an organization to sense environmental change, make timely strategic choices, and reconfigure resources in response to emerging opportunities and threats (Overby et al., 2006; Sambamurthy et al., 2003). Doz and Kosonen (2010) conceptualized strategic agility through three meta-capabilities: strategic sensitivity, leadership unity, and resource fluidity. Strategic sensitivity enables organizations to perceive and interpret weak signals before they become obvious threats. Leadership unity allows senior actors to make collective commitments without being paralyzed by political fragmentation. Resource fluidity enables the rapid redeployment of people, capital, technologies, and organizational attention across changing priorities. This triadic view suggests that agility is not simply operational speed; rather, it is a strategic capacity involving perception, commitment, and mobilization.

The importance of strategic agility is intensified by the limitations of conventional strategic planning. Traditional strategy models often assume that organizations can analyze relatively stable environments, define clear strategic objectives, allocate resources accordingly, and monitor implementation through formal control systems. However, hypercompetitive markets disrupt this sequence. Strategic assumptions may become obsolete before implementation is complete; competitors may change the rules of the game; and technological discontinuities may create new threats from outside established industry boundaries. Under these conditions, planning remains necessary but insufficient. Organizations need leaders who can combine strategic direction with adaptability, discipline with experimentation, and commitment with revision. This requirement shifts attention from strategy as a fixed plan to strategy as a dynamic leadership process.

Dynamic capabilities theory provides a strong theoretical foundation for this shift. Teece et al. (1997) defined dynamic capabilities as the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences in response to changing environments. Later, Teece (2007) clarified dynamic capabilities through the processes of sensing opportunities and threats, seizing opportunities, and transforming organizational assets and structures. In hypercompetitive environments, these processes are deeply leadership-dependent. Leaders shape what organizations notice, how quickly they interpret signals, which opportunities receive resources, and whether existing routines are preserved or challenged. Therefore, strategic agility leadership can be understood as the leadership expression of dynamic capabilities: it enables the organization to sense, decide, reconfigure, and learn faster than environmental turbulence can erode its relevance.

Leadership theory has also increasingly recognized the need for flexibility and adaptation. Yukl and Mahsud (2010) emphasized that flexible and adaptive leadership is essential because leaders face complex, changing, and often contradictory demands. A leader may need to provide stability and change simultaneously, empower teams while maintaining strategic coherence, and make rapid decisions while preserving participation and trust. Similarly, complexity leadership theory argues that leadership in knowledge-based organizations should not be reduced to formal authority; instead, leadership should enable adaptive outcomes, learning, creativity, and emergent coordination within complex systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). This perspective is particularly relevant for hypercompetitive environments, where no single leader possesses all the information needed to respond effectively. Agility requires distributed intelligence, cross-functional collaboration, and rapid feedback from the organizational periphery.

The leadership challenge is further complicated by the tension between exploitation and exploration. Organizations must exploit existing capabilities to maintain efficiency, quality, and revenue while simultaneously exploring new markets, technologies, and business models. Ambidexterity research suggests that successful organizations develop the ability to pursue both alignment and adaptation (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008). However, ambidexterity does not occur automatically; it requires leaders who can allocate attention across competing time horizons, protect exploratory initiatives from short-term pressures, and prevent operational success from becoming strategic rigidity. In hypercompetitive settings, the inability to balance exploitation and exploration may lead either to reckless experimentation without performance discipline or to operational excellence that becomes obsolete.

Digital transformation has made strategic agility even more critical. Digital technologies create new forms of visibility, connectivity, scalability, and automation, but they also accelerate competitive imitation and market disruption. Sambamurthy et al. (2003) argued that digital options can shape organizational agility by enabling firms to develop richer knowledge, process, and communication capabilities. Yet technology alone does not create agility. Without agile leadership, digital investments may become fragmented tools rather than strategic enablers. Leaders must interpret digital possibilities, connect technology to business model renewal, and ensure that digital capabilities are embedded in decision-making, customer responsiveness, and organizational learning.

Although the literature has provided important theoretical insights into strategic agility, dynamic capabilities, and adaptive leadership, several gaps remain. First, many studies examine agility as an organizational capability without sufficiently explaining how leadership practices generate and sustain it. Second, strategic agility is often discussed at a conceptual level, while fewer studies examine how leaders experience and enact agility in real competitive contexts. Third, the majority of agility models are developed in Western or multinational contexts, while less attention has been given to emerging-market settings such as Tehran, where firms may face not only technological turbulence and competitive pressure but also institutional uncertainty, regulatory change, resource constraints, and market volatility. These contextual conditions make leadership agility both more difficult and more necessary.

A qualitative approach is therefore appropriate for developing a deeper understanding of strategic agility leadership. Qualitative inquiry allows researchers to capture leaders' lived interpretations, decision logics, tensions, and practical responses in complex environments. Rather than testing predefined variables, qualitative research can generate an empirically grounded model that explains how leaders construct agility through sensemaking, alignment, resource movement, and learning. The Gioia methodology and thematic analysis traditions emphasize systematic coding, inductive category development, and transparent movement from first-order data to higher-order theoretical dimensions (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Gioia et al., 2013). Such an approach is suitable for building a leadership model that is both conceptually meaningful and practically relevant.

In hypercompetitive business environments, strategic agility leadership should be understood not as a personal trait or a general managerial style, but as a dynamic leadership system. This system includes the ability to scan and interpret the external environment, build unity among decision-makers, mobilize resources across organizational boundaries, and institutionalize rapid learning. Leaders who develop these capabilities can help organizations avoid strategic paralysis, reduce response delays, and transform turbulence into renewal opportunities. Conversely, leaders who remain attached to bureaucratic control, slow consensus, and fixed resource allocation may intensify organizational vulnerability.

Therefore, the present study was conducted to develop a strategic agility leadership model for hypercompetitive business environments by exploring the experiences of senior managers, founders, strategy directors, and transformation leaders in Tehran-based organizations.

2. Methods and Materials

This study employed a qualitative, inductive research design to develop a strategic agility leadership model for organizations operating in hypercompetitive business environments. The qualitative approach was selected because the study aimed to explore how leaders interpret competitive turbulence, make strategic decisions under uncertainty, mobilize resources, and sustain organizational adaptation. Rather than testing predetermined hypotheses, the research sought to generate an empirically grounded conceptual model from participants' experiences and interpretations. The study was informed by inductive thematic analysis and grounded theory logic, particularly open coding, constant comparison, memo writing, and progressive abstraction from interview data to higher-order categories.

The participants consisted of 24 senior organizational actors from Tehran, Iran. They included chief executive officers, founders, senior strategy managers, digital transformation managers, business development directors, product leaders, and organizational development experts. Inclusion criteria were having at least eight years of managerial or strategic experience, direct involvement in decision-making during competitive or technological change, and experience in organizations exposed to rapid market shifts. Participants were selected through purposive sampling because the study required information-rich cases with direct experience of strategic agility and hypercompetitive pressure. Sampling continued until theoretical saturation was reached. Saturation was achieved at the twenty-first interview, when no substantially new concepts emerged from the data. Three additional interviews were conducted to confirm, refine, and stabilize the emerging categories.

The final sample included 15 men and 9 women. In terms of age, 6 participants were between 32 and 39 years old, 10 were between 40 and 49 years old, and 8 were between 50 and 58 years old. Regarding educational level, 5 participants held bachelor's degrees, 14 held master's degrees, and 5 held doctoral degrees. In terms of managerial experience, 7 participants had 8–12 years of experience, 11 had 13–20 years of experience, and 6 had more than 20 years of experience. Participants represented firms in technology, fintech, e-commerce, retail platforms, digital services, consulting, and knowledge-based industries. This diversity was intended to capture strategic agility leadership across multiple competitive settings rather than within a single industry.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. The interview protocol was designed to explore participants' experiences of leadership in turbulent and hypercompetitive environments. The main interview questions addressed how leaders identify environmental changes, how they respond to competitive threats, how strategic decisions are accelerated, how resources are reallocated, how teams are aligned around emergent priorities, and how organizations learn from rapid strategic action. Examples of guiding questions included: "How do you recognize that a strategic response is needed?", "What leadership behaviors help the organization respond quickly to competitive moves?", "How do you balance speed and accuracy in strategic decisions?", "How are resources shifted when market priorities change?", and "What mechanisms help your organization learn from failed or successful strategic moves?"

Interviews lasted between 45 and 75 minutes. All interviews were conducted with the participants' informed consent. Participants were assured of confidentiality, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw from the study. With permission, interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed verbatim. Field notes were written after each interview to record contextual impressions, nonverbal emphasis, emerging ideas, and analytical reflections. The interview protocol remained flexible so that important new concepts could be pursued in later interviews. This flexibility strengthened theoretical sensitivity and allowed the data collection process to evolve in response to emerging categories.

The interview transcripts were analyzed using NVivo software. Data analysis began with repeated reading of the transcripts to gain familiarity with the data. In the first stage, open coding was conducted line by line to identify meaningful statements related to strategic agility leadership. Codes were kept close to participants' language in order to preserve the empirical grounding of the analysis. In the second stage, similar codes were compared, merged, and organized into subcategories. Constant comparison was used across interviews to identify similarities, differences, patterns, and contradictions. In the third stage, axial coding was used to connect subcategories and identify broader conceptual categories. Finally, selective coding was used to integrate the main categories into a process model of strategic agility leadership.

Several strategies were used to enhance trustworthiness. Credibility was strengthened through prolonged engagement with the data, member checking with selected participants, and peer review of the coding structure. Transferability was supported through thick description of participants, context, and analytical categories. Dependability was enhanced by maintaining an audit trail that included interview protocols, coding decisions, memos, and category revisions. Confirmability was supported through reflexive memo writing and systematic documentation of analytical decisions. These strategies were consistent with established qualitative research standards for naturalistic inquiry and inductive theory development (Gioia et al., 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3. Findings and Results

The demographic characteristics of the participants showed that the sample included experienced leaders from competitive and innovation-oriented organizations in Tehran. Of the 24 participants, 15 were men and 9 were women. Six participants were aged 32–39 years, 10 were aged 40–49 years, and 8 were aged 50–58 years. Regarding education, 5 participants had bachelor's degrees, 14 had master's degrees, and 5 had doctoral degrees. In terms of managerial experience, 7 participants had 8–12 years of experience, 11 had 13–20 years, and 6 had more than 20 years. The participants' organizational roles included 6 chief executive officers or founders, 5 strategy directors, 4 digital transformation managers, 3 business development directors, 3 product or innovation managers, and 3 human resource or organizational development leaders. This distribution indicates that the findings were derived from participants with direct responsibility for strategic decisions, organizational adaptation, and leadership during competitive turbulence.

The analysis produced four main categories: anticipatory sensemaking, rapid strategic alignment, fluid resource orchestration, and adaptive learning governance. These categories explain how leaders develop and sustain strategic agility in hypercompetitive environments. Anticipatory sensemaking appeared in 22 of the 24 interviews and referred to the leader's ability to detect weak signals, interpret ambiguous market changes, and translate environmental turbulence into strategic priorities. Participants emphasized that agile leaders do not wait for

complete information; instead, they build multiple channels for market listening, competitor monitoring, customer feedback, and technological scanning. One participant stated, “In our market, when the numbers finally confirm the threat, it is already late. We have to read small signals before they become official reports” (P07). Another participant explained, “The leader’s job is not only to receive information but to make sense of disconnected signals and tell the organization what deserves attention” (P13). The subcategories of anticipatory sensemaking included weak-signal detection, competitive intelligence, customer-centered interpretation, scenario awareness, and strategic reframing. This category shows that agility begins before action; it begins with the quality and speed of strategic perception.

Rapid strategic alignment was identified in 20 interviews and referred to the capacity of leaders to create shared understanding, reduce decision fragmentation, and mobilize commitment around urgent strategic priorities. Participants repeatedly argued that speed is not achieved merely by asking people to act quickly; it requires alignment among senior decision-makers and cross-functional units. In hypercompetitive environments, delays often result from internal disagreement, unclear authority, or political conflict rather than from lack of information. As one participant noted, “Our biggest competitor is sometimes not outside the company; it is the slow internal negotiation between departments” (P04). Another participant stated, “When the leadership team is not united, every unit waits, protects its own budget, and the market opportunity disappears” (P16). The subcategories of rapid strategic alignment included leadership unity, decision-cycle compression, shared strategic language, cross-functional synchronization, and priority discipline. This category indicates that strategic agility requires collective commitment. Leaders must create enough unity to act without eliminating debate, and enough urgency to move without producing chaos.

Fluid resource orchestration emerged in 21 interviews and described the leader’s ability to shift resources quickly toward emerging threats and opportunities. Participants emphasized that many organizations can recognize market change but fail to respond because their resources are locked into annual budgets, fixed structures, legacy projects, or departmental ownership. Agile leaders were described as those who can release resources from declining priorities and redirect them toward strategically important opportunities. One participant explained, “Agility became real for us only when we stopped treating the budget as frozen. Strategy changed every quarter, but our resource system was annual; that contradiction was killing us” (P02). Another participant said, “The question is not whether we have resources. The question is whether we can move them before the opportunity closes” (P19). The subcategories of this category included resource redeployment, modular team formation, talent mobility, digital capability leverage, portfolio reprioritization, and partnership activation. Fluid resource orchestration therefore represents the operational core of strategic agility leadership: leaders convert strategic insight and alignment into actual organizational movement.

Adaptive learning governance appeared in 19 interviews and referred to mechanisms through which leaders institutionalize experimentation, feedback, reflection, and continuous renewal. Participants argued that hypercompetitive environments make failure unavoidable, but the difference between agile and non-agile organizations lies in how quickly they learn. Agile leaders create governance systems that allow experimentation without irresponsibility, speed without blindness, and autonomy without fragmentation. One participant stated, “We do not punish every failed experiment, but we punish not learning from it. The real waste is repeating the same mistake with a new name” (P11). Another participant said, “After every major move, we ask what the market taught us. Sometimes the answer changes the next decision more than the original plan” (P22). The subcategories

of adaptive learning governance included controlled experimentation, psychological safety, after-action review, feedback-loop acceleration, error transparency, and learning-based accountability. This category demonstrates that strategic agility is sustained through learning discipline. Without learning governance, fast action may become impulsive action; with learning governance, speed becomes cumulative intelligence.

Based on these four categories, the proposed strategic agility leadership model can be described as a dynamic process. First, leaders engage in anticipatory sensemaking by scanning and interpreting competitive signals. Second, they establish rapid strategic alignment by creating shared priorities and leadership unity. Third, they enact fluid resource orchestration by reallocating resources, restructuring teams, and activating digital or external capabilities. Fourth, they sustain adaptive learning governance by institutionalizing experimentation, feedback, and reflective correction. The model suggests that strategic agility leadership is not a linear one-time response but a recursive cycle. Learning outcomes from one strategic move feed back into sensemaking, refine future alignment, and improve the speed and accuracy of resource orchestration.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop a strategic agility leadership model for hypercompetitive business environments. The findings revealed four main categories: anticipatory sensemaking, rapid strategic alignment, fluid resource orchestration, and adaptive learning governance. Together, these categories indicate that strategic agility leadership is a dynamic capability enacted through leadership practices rather than a general organizational slogan. This finding aligns with dynamic capabilities theory, which emphasizes the ability to sense, seize, and transform in changing environments (Teece, 2007; Teece et al., 1997). The model developed in this study extends this logic by showing how leaders operationalize these capabilities in practice. Anticipatory sensemaking corresponds to sensing, rapid strategic alignment supports seizing, fluid resource orchestration enables transformation, and adaptive learning governance ensures that the organization continuously updates its routines. In this sense, strategic agility leadership can be interpreted as the human and social mechanism through which dynamic capabilities become actionable.

The first category, anticipatory sensemaking, showed that agile leaders are distinguished by their ability to detect weak signals, interpret ambiguity, and convert fragmented information into strategic meaning. This result is consistent with the literature on strategic sensitivity, which identifies environmental perception and openness to external signals as core components of strategic agility (Doz & Kosonen, 2010). It also aligns with research on enterprise agility, where sensing environmental change is considered a precondition for timely response (Overby et al., 2006). In hypercompetitive environments, leaders cannot rely only on formal reports because formal indicators often lag behind market reality. Instead, they need broader intelligence systems that include customer feedback, competitor behavior, technological trends, informal networks, frontline observations, and scenario thinking. The finding also supports Weick and Sutcliffe's (2007) emphasis on mindful organizing, particularly the need to notice early signs of unexpected change. Therefore, anticipatory sensemaking is not passive observation; it is an active leadership practice that shapes what the organization notices and how it interprets uncertainty.

The second category, rapid strategic alignment, demonstrated that agility depends on the ability to create leadership unity and collective commitment under time pressure. This finding strongly supports Doz and

Kosonen's (2010) argument that leadership unity is one of the central meta-capabilities of strategic agility. Hypercompetitive conditions often intensify internal fragmentation because departments defend their priorities, budgets, and interpretations of market change. When senior leaders lack a shared strategic language, organizations may respond slowly even when they possess adequate resources and information. The present findings show that agile leaders reduce this delay by compressing decision cycles, clarifying priorities, and creating cross-functional synchronization. This result also aligns with adaptive leadership research, which emphasizes the importance of flexible responses to complex and changing demands (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). However, the findings add that flexibility alone is insufficient unless leaders also create alignment. Excessive flexibility without alignment may generate scattered initiatives, while excessive alignment without flexibility may produce rigid consensus. Strategic agility leadership therefore requires disciplined flexibility.

The third category, fluid resource orchestration, revealed that agility becomes visible when leaders can move resources quickly across changing strategic priorities. This result is consistent with the resource fluidity component of the strategic agility framework (Doz & Kosonen, 2010). It also supports dynamic capabilities theory, especially the idea that firms must reconfigure assets and competences to respond to changing environments (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece et al., 1997). Participants emphasized that many organizations are capable of recognizing threats but remain unable to act because resources are trapped in fixed annual budgets, departmental silos, legacy projects, or bureaucratic approval systems. This finding indicates that agility is constrained not only by cognition but also by resource architecture. Leaders must therefore design flexible budgeting systems, modular teams, talent mobility mechanisms, and portfolio review routines. The result also aligns with research on digital options, which suggests that information technologies can support agility by enhancing reach, richness, and reconfigurability (Sambamurthy et al., 2003). However, the findings indicate that digital capability must be combined with leadership authority and strategic prioritization; otherwise, technology may increase activity without producing strategic movement.

The fourth category, adaptive learning governance, showed that strategic agility is sustained through experimentation, feedback, psychological safety, and learning-based accountability. This finding aligns with complexity leadership theory, which emphasizes enabling conditions for adaptation, learning, and emergent innovation in complex systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). It also supports organizational resilience research, which suggests that organizations need mechanisms for learning from unexpected events and maintaining performance under uncertainty (Hamel & Välikangas, 2003; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). In this study, participants did not define agility as uncontrolled speed. Instead, they described effective agility as disciplined experimentation. Leaders allowed teams to test assumptions, but they also required evidence, reflection, and correction. This distinction is important because hypercompetitive environments can pressure firms into reactive behavior. Without learning governance, rapid action may become strategic impulsiveness. With learning governance, each action becomes a source of organizational intelligence. Therefore, agile leadership requires not only the courage to move quickly but also the discipline to learn quickly.

The integrated model developed in this study contributes to the literature by connecting strategic agility, dynamic capabilities, and leadership behavior into a unified process. Previous studies have often treated strategic agility as an organizational capability or strategic orientation. The present findings show that agility is also a leadership system composed of interpretive, relational, resource-based, and learning-oriented practices. The model suggests that leaders first shape strategic attention, then create collective commitment, then mobilize

resources, and finally institutionalize learning. This process view is important because it prevents a simplistic understanding of agility as speed alone. Speed without sensemaking may result in poor choices; sensemaking without alignment may result in paralysis; alignment without resource mobility may result in symbolic commitment; and resource mobility without learning may result in repeated mistakes. Strategic agility leadership therefore requires integration across all four categories.

The findings also have contextual significance. Tehran-based firms operating in hypercompetitive sectors often face simultaneous market, technological, institutional, and resource uncertainties. In such contexts, agility is not only a competitive advantage but also a survival capability. Leaders must respond to customer shifts, digital disruption, regulatory changes, currency fluctuations, talent constraints, and competitor moves. This complexity may explain why participants emphasized practical mechanisms such as flexible budgeting, informal intelligence networks, cross-functional teams, and rapid feedback loops. These findings suggest that strategic agility leadership in emerging-market contexts may be more improvisational and constraint-sensitive than in relatively stable institutional environments. Nevertheless, the core mechanisms identified in this study are theoretically consistent with international research on agility and dynamic capabilities.

The study has several limitations. First, the sample was limited to 24 participants from Tehran, and although the participants represented multiple industries, the findings may not fully capture strategic agility leadership in other regions, institutional contexts, or cultural environments. Second, the study relied on semi-structured interviews, which means that the findings reflect participants' interpretations and retrospective accounts rather than direct observation of leadership behavior. Third, the qualitative design was appropriate for model development, but it does not allow statistical testing of relationships among the identified categories. Fourth, although theoretical saturation was reached, additional interviews with middle managers, frontline employees, customers, or external partners could have provided a more multi-level understanding of strategic agility leadership.

Future research should test and refine the proposed model in different organizational and national contexts. Quantitative studies can develop and validate a measurement scale based on the four categories identified in this research and examine their relationships with innovation performance, market responsiveness, organizational resilience, and competitive advantage. Comparative studies can investigate whether strategic agility leadership differs across industries such as fintech, manufacturing, healthcare, retail platforms, and professional services. Longitudinal research would also be valuable because strategic agility is a dynamic process that unfolds over time. Future studies may also examine the role of digital technologies, artificial intelligence, data analytics, and platform ecosystems in strengthening or weakening strategic agility leadership.

From a practical perspective, organizations should develop leadership systems that strengthen all four dimensions of the model. Senior leaders should create structured mechanisms for environmental scanning, weak-signal interpretation, and scenario dialogue. Executive teams should reduce decision delays by clarifying strategic priorities, defining decision rights, and building shared language across functions. Organizations should also redesign resource allocation systems so that budgets, teams, talent, and digital capabilities can be moved toward emerging opportunities without excessive bureaucracy. Finally, leaders should institutionalize learning governance through after-action reviews, psychological safety, rapid feedback loops, and accountability for learning. These practices can help organizations transform agility from an individual leadership quality into an organizational capability.

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

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- D'Aveni, R. A. (1994). *Hypercompetition: Managing the dynamics of strategic maneuvering*. Free Press.
- 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%3C1105::AID-SMJ133%3E3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11%3C1105::AID-SMJ133%3E3.0.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>
- Hamel, G., & Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9), 52–63.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.06.002>
- Overby, E., Bharadwaj, A., & Sambamurthy, V. (2006). Enterprise agility and the enabling role of information technology. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(2), 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000600>
- Sambamurthy, V., Bharadwaj, A., & Grover, V. (2003). Shaping agility through digital options: Reconceptualizing the role of information technology in contemporary firms. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(2), 237–263. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036530>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review*, 58(4), 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13>
- 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%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.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. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81–93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019835>