Strategic Leadership and the Framework of Competitive Advantage: Aligning Vision, Strategy, and Organizational Capability for Sustainable Performance

Mondy Selle Gold
Bamughan Hellen Gold-Tabai

Abstract

Competitive advantage is increasingly difficult to sustain in environments characterized by technological disruption, intensified competition, shifting stakeholder expectations, and accelerating institutional change. This conceptual article develops a strategic leadership framework that interprets competitive advantage as a framework for alignment rather than as the isolated outcome of a particular resource, market position, or managerial decision. Drawing upon the resource-based view, upper echelons theory, dynamic capabilities theory, strategic positioning, and organizational alignment perspectives, the article proposes that sustainable performance emerges when strategic leadership, strategy formulation, corporate-level scope, business-level positioning, functional execution, organizational capabilities, innovation, organizational culture, ethical leadership, and strategic alignment reinforce one another. The analysis advances a multidimensional model in which strategic leadership establishes direction, strategic formulation establishes choice, corporate strategy establishes scope, business strategy establishes competitive position, functional strategy enables execution, organizational capabilities establish capacity, innovation facilitates renewal, culture shapes behavioral consistency, and ethical leadership strengthens legitimacy and trust. Recent empirical evidence supports the central proposition that strategic leadership influences sustainable competitive advantage through dynamic capabilities, organizational agility, innovation, and organizational renewal. The article further demonstrates that competitive advantage is constrained by strategic misalignment: an organization may possess valuable resources and an attractive strategy yet underperform when incentives, structures, capabilities, technology, culture, and execution contradict strategic intent. The proposed framework therefore shifts the analytical question from what strategy should an organization pursue? to whether the organization can align its leadership, choices, capabilities, people, resources, and execution around the strategy it has chosen. The article concludes that sustainable competitive advantage is best understood as a dynamic organizational condition requiring continuous alignment, learning, adaptation, and renewal.

Keywords: strategic leadership, competitive advantage, strategic alignment, dynamic capabilities, organizational capabilities, strategic renewal, strategic execution, innovation, organizational culture, sustainable performance

Introduction

The history of business is replete with organizations that possessed impressive resources, substantial market share, recognized brands, and considerable financial strength, yet failed to preserve their competitive position. Conversely, relatively young or modestly resourced organizations have sometimes transformed industries by recognizing opportunities earlier, serving customers differently, deploying resources more intelligently, or creating capabilities that competitors found difficult to reproduce. The distinction is important because it reveals a fundamental truth about strategic management: resources alone do not constitute competitive advantage; what matters is how leadership converts resources, knowledge, capabilities, and strategic choices into superior value.

Competitive advantage is therefore not simply a matter of being better than competitors in a general sense. It involves establishing a position that permits an organization to create greater customer value, operate at lower relative cost, differentiate its offerings, or serve a strategically defined market more effectively than rivals. Porter (1985) placed the activities through which organizations create, produce, market, and deliver their offerings at the center of competitive advantage. His value-chain perspective remains consequential because it shifts attention away from vague claims about organizational excellence toward the specific activities through which value and cost are actually generated.

Yet strategy does not formulate itself. Organizations require leaders who can interpret complex environments, establish priorities, make consequential choices, mobilize people, allocate scarce resources, and maintain institutional coherence when circumstances change. Strategic leadership therefore occupies a pivotal position between organizational aspiration and organizational performance. Ireland and Hitt (1999) argued that effective strategic leadership can itself become a source of competitive advantage, particularly when organizations operate in turbulent and unpredictable environments.

This article develops the argument that competitive advantage is best understood as an architecture of alignment. Strategic leadership establishes direction; strategy formulation determines the choices required to pursue that direction; corporate-level strategy determines where the organization will compete; business-level strategy determines how individual businesses will compete; and functional-level plans translate those strategic choices into operational commitments. When these levels reinforce one another, an organization is more capable of producing superior value and sustaining performance. When they contradict one another, even a compelling vision can become little more than institutional rhetoric.

Theoretical Background

The theoretical foundation of this study rests on the proposition that competitive advantage cannot be adequately explained by a single theoretical lens. The resource-based view (RBV) provides the foundational internal perspective by arguing that valuable, rare, difficult-to-imitate, and non-substitutable resources can constitute sources of sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). However, the RBV is less explicit about how organizations continually renew those resources as environments change. Dynamic capabilities theory addresses this limitation by emphasizing an organization's capacity to sense opportunities and threats, seize opportunities, and transform or reconfigure its resource base (Teece et al., 1997).

Contemporary research reinforces the continuing relevance of this perspective, demonstrating that strategic renewal depends upon organizations' ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure capabilities in response to environmental change (Bughin, 2025). Recent evidence further indicates that strategic leadership can strengthen dynamic capabilities and sustainable competitive advantage by facilitating sensing, learning, integration, technological innovation, knowledge management, and organizational agility (Al-Haddad et al., 2026).

A second theoretical pillar is the upper echelons perspective, which conceptualizes organizations partly as reflections of their senior executives' experiences, values, cognitive orientations, and interpretations (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Hambrick, 2007). Strategic leadership therefore matters because leaders do not simply implement strategy; they interpret environmental conditions and determine which opportunities, threats, and organizational capabilities deserve attention. Recent empirical research similarly indicates that strategic leadership influences organizational performance through mechanisms including strategic agility, communication, innovation, and organizational responsiveness (Olowoyeye & Adegoke, 2025; Septiany et al., 2025). This perspective complements Porter's (1980, 1985, 1996) theory of competitive positioning, which emphasizes strategic choice, trade-offs, distinctive activity configurations, and the creation of superior customer value. Taken together, these perspectives suggest that competitive advantage is neither exclusively an external market position nor exclusively an internal resource condition. It is produced through the interaction between leadership interpretation, strategic choice, organizational resources, capabilities, and competitive context.

The article consequently extends these theoretical traditions through an alignment perspective. The central proposition is that individual strategic elements generate their greatest value when they mutually reinforce one another. Strategic leadership without execution remains aspirational; capabilities without strategic direction may be misallocated; innovation without market positioning may produce commercially irrelevant outcomes; and technological investment without organizational adaptation may fail to generate sustainable value. Recent research on digital transformation supports this integrative interpretation, showing that transformation outcomes depend upon the alignment of technology, organizational structures, human agency, and dynamic capability development rather than technological investment alone.

Similarly, recent research on strategic renewal emphasizes the interdependence of dynamic capabilities, organizational learning, exploration, exploitation, and strategic agility in enabling organizations to renew their strategic positions. The theoretical contribution of the present study therefore lies in repositioning competitive advantage as an architectural phenomenon: sustainable performance emerges when direction, choice, scope, position, execution, capability, culture, ethics, innovation, and renewal are configured as a coherent organizational system.

Methodology

This study adopts a conceptual and integrative literature-review methodology designed to synthesize established strategic-management theories with contemporary empirical research on strategic leadership, competitive advantage, organizational capabilities, strategic alignment, innovation, and strategic renewal. Rather than testing a predetermined statistical model with primary organizational data, the study develops a theoretically grounded framework through critical examination and integration of influential scholarship and recent peer-reviewed research. The methodological approach is appropriate because the principal objective is theory development:

to construct a conceptual framework that connects strategic leadership with the organizational mechanisms through which competitive advantage is created, implemented, aligned, and renewed.

The literature was organized around five interconnected theoretical domains: (a) strategic leadership and executive cognition, (b) competitive positioning and strategy formulation, (c) resource-based and dynamic-capability perspectives, (d) organizational alignment and strategy execution, and (e) innovation and strategic renewal. Foundational contributions were retained where they remain theoretically consequential, including Barney (1991), Hambrick and Mason (1984), Hambrick (2007), Porter (1980, 1985, 1996), and Teece et al. (1997). These were complemented by recent peer-reviewed studies published primarily during 2023–2026 to ensure that the framework reflects contemporary developments concerning digital transformation, strategic agility, dynamic capabilities, organizational ambidexterity, strategic renewal, and sustainable competitive advantage. Recent studies indicate, for example, that strategic leadership is positively associated with organizational performance and that its effects can operate through strategic agility and communication (Olowoyeye & Adegoke, 2025), while research in pharmaceutical firms identifies relationships among strategic leadership, dynamic capabilities, innovation, organizational agility, and sustainable competitive advantage (Al-Haddad et al., 2026).

The analytical procedure involved thematic synthesis and theoretical integration. Evidence was first examined according to the strategic function it addressed and subsequently mapped onto the proposed conceptual paradigm of alignment, enabling the study to identify the relationships, complementarities, and interdependencies through which strategic leadership and organizational capabilities converge to create, sustain, and renew competitive advantage. Particular attention was given to recurring mechanisms through which leadership and strategy influence performance, including sensing, strategic choice, resource allocation, execution, organizational learning, innovation, cultural adaptation, and capability reconfiguration.

The resulting conceptual model was then subjected to internal theoretical consistency by examining whether each proposed dimension contributes a distinct function and whether its relationship with the other dimensions can be logically defended. The mathematical formulations presented in the article are therefore conceptual propositions rather than empirically estimated equations. They are intended to translate the theoretical architecture into forms that could subsequently be operationalized and tested through quantitative research. This distinction is important because the present study proposes a research framework rather than claiming empirical validation of the proposed coefficients, alignment index, multiplicative relationships, or weakest-link formulation.

Strategic Leadership as the Starting Point of Competitive Advantage

Strategic leadership may be understood as the capacity of the chief executive officer and senior management team to envision a desirable future, communicate that future persuasively, make consequential strategic choices, mobilize organizational resources, and create the conditions necessary for implementation. It is therefore considerably more demanding than conventional managerial supervision.

Management is frequently concerned with ensuring that existing activities are performed effectively. Strategic leadership must additionally ask whether the organization is performing the right activities, whether those activities remain relevant, and whether the organization is preparing adequately for conditions that have not yet emerged.

This distinction becomes particularly important in environments characterized by technological disruption, shifting consumer preferences, geopolitical uncertainty, intensified international competition, and shortened product life cycles. A leadership team that merely protects yesterday's successful formula may become an obstacle to tomorrow's competitiveness.

Hambrick and Mason's (1984) upper echelons perspective provides an important theoretical foundation for understanding this phenomenon. Their central proposition is that organizational outcomes, including strategic choices and performance, are partially predictable from the characteristics of senior managers. Hambrick (2007) subsequently refined the argument by emphasizing that executives' experiences, values, and personalities influence how they interpret strategic situations and, consequently, the choices they make.

The implication is profound. Organizations do not perceive their environments in a purely objective manner. Senior executives interpret opportunities and threats through accumulated experience, assumptions, values, education, professional histories, and cognitive frames. Two chief executive officers may therefore encounter the same technological disruption and reach entirely different conclusions about what it means for their organizations.

Strategic leadership consequently begins with strategic interpretation. Leaders must distinguish between temporary turbulence and structural transformation, between fashionable management ideas and genuine strategic opportunities, and between growth that creates value and expansion that simply increases organizational size.

Ireland and Hitt (1999) identified strategic leadership as a critical mechanism through which firms can achieve strategic competitiveness and above-average returns. Their framework emphasizes the importance of determining organizational purpose, exploiting and maintaining core competencies, developing human capital, sustaining an effective organizational culture, emphasizing ethical practices, and establishing balanced organizational controls.

These responsibilities demonstrate why strategic leadership cannot be reduced to inspirational communication. A compelling vision without organizational capability is aspirational but fragile. Conversely, organizational capability without vision can become efficient execution in the wrong direction.

From Vision to Strategy Formulation

A vision describes a desired future. Strategy determines how the organization intends to move toward that future. Strategy formulation, therefore, involves the deliberate development of a coherent set of choices concerning markets, customers, products, capabilities, resources, competitive positioning, and organizational priorities. It is not simply the preparation of a document called a strategic plan. It is the intellectual process through which leaders decide what the organization will do, what it will not do, where it will compete, how it will create value, and how it will respond when competitors attempt to undermine its position.

Porter (1996) cautioned against confusing operational effectiveness with strategy. Organizations may improve productivity, quality, speed, and efficiency without necessarily developing a distinctive strategic position. Operational improvements are necessary, but they can often be imitated. Strategy, by contrast, depends upon choices and combinations of activities that create a distinctive position and are more difficult for competitors to reproduce.

This distinction is essential because contemporary organizations are often overwhelmed by the language of efficiency. Benchmarking, automation, artificial intelligence, process redesign, outsourcing, quality improvement, and cost reduction may all produce measurable gains. Yet if competitors can reproduce those improvements with relative ease, the organization has not necessarily created a sustainable competitive advantage.

Strategic formulation therefore requires disciplined choices. An organization cannot meaningfully pursue every opportunity, serve every market, satisfy every customer segment, and invest equally in every capability. Scarcity makes choice unavoidable. The quality of strategy is consequently reflected not only in what leaders choose to pursue but also in what they deliberately decline to pursue.

Corporate-Level Strategy: Choosing Where to Compete

Corporate-level strategy addresses the broadest question confronting a diversified organization: Where should the organization compete, and why? This level of strategy concerns decisions about industries, national markets, diversification, acquisitions, strategic alliances, vertical integration, international expansion, and the configuration of the organization's portfolio of businesses.

The significance of corporate-level strategy lies in the fact that entering a market does not automatically create value. Diversification can produce economies of scope, access to complementary resources, knowledge transfer, and risk diversification. It can also create complexity, managerial distraction, capital misallocation, and bureaucratic inefficiency. Corporate leaders must therefore establish a credible relationship between the organization's capabilities and the markets it chooses to enter.

A corporation possessing strong technological capabilities, for example, may have opportunities to expand into adjacent industries. Yet the relevant strategic question is not simply whether expansion is possible. It is whether the corporation possesses transferable capabilities that enable it to create more value in the new market than competitors can create.

This perspective is consistent with the resource-based view of the firm. Barney (1991) argued that sustained competitive advantage can emerge from resources that are valuable, rare, difficult to imitate, and difficult to substitute. The implication is that corporate strategy should not be driven solely by external market attractiveness. It should also be anchored in what the organization can uniquely do. The strongest corporate strategies therefore connect market opportunity with organizational capability.

Business-Level Strategy: Deciding How to Compete

Where corporate-level strategy determines where an organization will compete, business-level strategy addresses the question of how it will compete successfully within a particular industry or market. Porter's framework identifies cost leadership, differentiation, and focus as central approaches to competitive positioning. Cost leadership emphasizes the ability to provide comparable value at lower cost. Differentiation seeks to provide distinctive value for which customers are willing to pay a premium. Focus concentrates resources on a particular segment, geographic market, customer group, or specialized need (Porter, 1980, 1985).

These categories remain analytically useful, but they should not be interpreted as rigid formulas. Competitive environments are more complex than textbook categories sometimes suggest. Hill (1988), for example, challenged the assumption that differentiation and low cost are necessarily incompatible. His contingency framework proposed that differentiation can, under certain conditions, contribute to a low-cost position and that combining differentiation with cost efficiency may be necessary for sustainable competitive advantage.

Empirical research has similarly complicated the notion that organizations must always choose a single strategic orientation. Spanos et al. (2004), studying Greek manufacturing firms, found that hybrid strategies could be more profitable than pure strategies and that firm-specific factors explained substantially more variation in profitability than industry factors.

This evidence should not be interpreted as a repudiation of Porter's framework. Rather, it suggests that strategy must be understood as a matter of strategic fit and configuration. A firm may simultaneously pursue efficiency and differentiation when its organizational capabilities, technological systems, customer relationships, and activity configuration permit those objectives to reinforce rather than undermine one another.

Functional-Level Strategy: Where Strategy Becomes Real

Corporate and business strategies remain incomplete until they are translated into functional-level plans. A functional-level plan establishes the objectives that managers in areas such as marketing, finance, human resources, operations, information technology, research and development, and supply-chain management will pursue to support business-level objectives and, ultimately, corporate goals. This level of strategy is frequently underestimated. Yet it is where strategic intention encounters organizational reality.

A company may declare that innovation is central to its competitive position, but if its financial systems penalize experimentation, its human-resource systems reward conformity, and its procurement procedures make rapid experimentation impossible, the organization has not actually adopted an innovation strategy. It has adopted the language of innovation without creating the institutional conditions necessary to support it. Similarly, an organization may pursue differentiation through superior customer service, but if employees lack training, authority, information, or incentives to solve customer problems, the differentiation strategy cannot be sustained.

Porter's value-chain perspective is useful here because competitive advantage emerges from the interaction of organizational activities rather than from an isolated department. Marketing, operations, procurement, logistics, technology, human capital, and customer service must therefore operate as an integrated system. The functional level is consequently not subordinate in intellectual importance. It is the level at which strategy is either converted into capability or exposed as rhetoric.

Competitive Advantage: Beyond Price and Brand

Competitive advantage is sometimes reduced to the familiar idea of being cheaper, better known, or more innovative than competitors. Such interpretations are incomplete. A competitive advantage exists when an organization creates superior value relative to rivals in a manner that produces meaningful economic or strategic consequences. The advantage may originate in cost efficiency, product uniqueness, brand reputation, customer relationships, intellectual property, organizational culture, proprietary knowledge, technological capability, distribution systems, speed, trust, or a distinctive configuration of activities.

Barney's (1991) resource-based perspective deepens this argument by moving the analysis inside the organization. Resources become strategically significant when they possess qualities that competitors cannot easily replicate or replace. This is why an organization cannot simply purchase sustainable competitive advantage in the same way that it purchases equipment. Physical assets can often be acquired by competitors. What is more difficult to reproduce is the accumulated combination of knowledge, routines, relationships, culture, reputation, managerial judgment, organizational learning, and institutional memory.

The competitive advantage of a major technology company, for example, may not reside in a single product. It may reside in the interaction among research capabilities, software ecosystems, intellectual property, talent, customer data, brand trust, distribution, and organizational routines. Competitive advantage is therefore frequently systemic rather than singular.

Dynamic Capabilities and the Problem of Sustainability

The most difficult strategic question is not how to obtain competitive advantage but how to sustain it. Markets evolve. Technologies mature. Customer expectations change. Competitors learn. Regulations shift. New entrants emerge. A resource that was rare yesterday may become commonplace tomorrow.

Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) addressed this problem through the concept of dynamic capabilities. Their framework emphasizes distinctive organizational processes, asset positions, and evolutionary paths as foundations of competitive advantage in environments characterized by rapid technological change.

Dynamic capabilities shift strategic attention from possessing resources to renewing capabilities. Organizations must be capable of sensing opportunities and threats, seizing promising opportunities, and transforming or reconfiguring resources when existing arrangements become inadequate.

This perspective has particular relevance for strategic leadership. A chief executive officer who protects existing capabilities at all costs may preserve efficiency while simultaneously preventing adaptation. Conversely, leaders who pursue perpetual transformation without strategic discipline may destroy valuable capabilities before alternatives have matured. Strategic leadership must therefore balance continuity and renewal.

This balance is increasingly important in an era in which artificial intelligence, automation, digital platforms, climate-related pressures, geopolitical fragmentation, and changing consumer expectations are altering the competitive environment. Sustainable advantage increasingly depends on an organization's capacity to learn faster than its environment changes and, ideally, to influence the direction of change.

Dimensions of Strategic Leadership

Strategic leadership represents the capacity to move an organization beyond the management of immediate operational demands toward the deliberate construction of future organizational advantage. Whereas operational management is principally concerned with efficiency, continuity, and near-term performance, strategic leadership integrates vision, strategic choice, human capability, innovation, adaptability, and execution to position the organization for sustained relevance. Recent research reinforces this broader conception, demonstrating that strategic leadership influences organizational outcomes through mechanisms such as strategic agility, communication, innovation, dynamic capabilities, and organizational ambidexterity (Olowoyeye & Adegoke, 2025; Septiany et al., 2025).

At its core, strategic leadership is an architecture of alignment: leaders must understand the organization, interpret its external environment, determine what matters most, mobilize people around shared priorities, and continuously recalibrate strategy as circumstances evolve. Thus, strategic leadership may be conceptualized as the capacity to convert purpose into direction, direction into strategic choice, choice into organizational capability, and capability into sustained performance. Its significance becomes particularly pronounced during technological disruption and environmental turbulence, when organizations must simultaneously exploit existing strengths and explore new possibilities (Cozzolino & Verona, 2024; Hoessler & Carbon, 2024).

Table 1: Dimensions of Strategic Leadership

Dimension	Strategic Meaning	Critical Interpretation
Strategic Vision	Establishes a compelling picture of the organization's desired future.	Vision gives direction to organizational effort, but its value depends upon its translation into priorities, resources, and measurable action.
Self-Awareness	Enables leaders to recognize their values, capabilities, limitations, and biases.	Strategic judgment begins with self-governance; confidence without reflection can become strategic overreach.

Environmental Intelligence	Identifies emerging opportunities, threats, technological shifts, stakeholder expectations, and competitive movements.	Strategic leaders must detect weak signals before environmental change becomes organizational crisis.
Strategic Choice	Determines where resources, attention, and organizational energy should be concentrated.	Strategy is fundamentally an exercise in disciplined choice; deciding what not to pursue is as important as deciding what to pursue.
Human Capital Mobilization	Converts individual talent into collective organizational capability.	People are not merely instruments of execution; they are sources of knowledge, innovation, resilience, and strategic renewal.
Communication and Listening	Translates strategic intent into shared understanding while incorporating diverse perspectives.	Communication creates alignment, whereas listening provides leaders with distributed organizational intelligence.
Open-Mindedness	Encourages alternative interpretations, constructive dissent, and diverse perspectives.	Intellectual diversity expands an organization's problem-solving capacity and reduces strategic blind spots.
Innovation and Adaptability	Enables organizations to experiment, learn, renew capabilities, and respond to disruption.	Sustainable advantage increasingly depends upon the capacity to adapt while preserving strategically important strengths.
Decision Intelligence	Integrates evidence, judgment, risk, timing, and consequences.	Strategic leaders rarely possess complete information; their distinctive capability is disciplined decision-making under uncertainty.
Strategic Alignment	Synchronizes people, structure, resources, incentives, technology, and processes around strategic priorities.	Even an excellent strategy can fail when organizational components pull in contradictory directions.
Execution	Converts strategic intent into coordinated action and measurable results.	Strategy without execution is aspiration; execution without strategic direction is merely activity.
Strategic Renewal	Reassesses assumptions and develops new capabilities as conditions change.	Long-term competitiveness requires organizations to renew themselves before environmental disruption makes renewal unavoidable.

Strategic Leadership as an Integrated System

The dimensions above should not be treated as independent leadership traits. They constitute an interconnected system:

The effectiveness of this system depends upon interaction among its components. Recent evidence suggests that strategic leadership can strengthen organizational performance through innovation, entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and other organizational capabilities rather than through leadership influence alone (Woo, 2025). Similarly, research on digital transformation emphasizes the importance of strategic leadership in balancing established operations with new strategic possibilities (Hoessler & Carbon, 2024).

The critical implication is that strategic leadership should not be evaluated solely by the charisma, authority, or visibility of the leader. Its deeper measure is the quality of the organizational system that leadership creates. A leader may articulate an inspiring vision, but if resources remain misaligned, employees lack capability, communication is ineffective, and execution is weak, strategic intent will not translate into durable outcomes. Conversely, organizations that develop dynamic capabilities and organizational ambidexterity can simultaneously exploit existing competencies and explore emerging opportunities (Cozzolino & Verona, 2024; Yunita et al., 2024).

Innovation as a Strategic Capability

Innovation should not be treated solely as the production of new products. It can involve new processes, business models, distribution mechanisms, customer experiences, organizational systems, or methods of combining existing resources.

Ireland, Hitt, and Sirmon (2003) conceptualized strategic entrepreneurship as the simultaneous pursuit of opportunity-seeking and advantage-seeking behavior. Their argument is especially relevant because organizations can be excellent at discovering opportunities yet poor at converting them into durable economic value. Conversely, established firms may possess strong competitive advantages while becoming increasingly incapable of recognizing emerging opportunities.

Strategic leadership must therefore connect entrepreneurial imagination with strategic discipline. Innovation without strategy can become experimentation without direction. Strategy without innovation can become preservation without renewal. The strategic objective is to create an organizational environment in which innovation contributes to a coherent competitive position.

Competitive Advantage in International Markets

The internationalization of business introduces another layer of complexity. A strategy that succeeds in one national market may not produce equivalent results elsewhere because consumers, institutions, competitors, infrastructure, regulations, purchasing power, and cultural expectations differ.

Aulakh, Kotabe, and Teegen (2000), examining firms from Brazil, Chile, and Mexico, found that the relationship between strategy and export performance varied according to the characteristics of foreign markets. Cost-based strategies were associated with stronger performance in developed-country markets, whereas differentiation strategies were more advantageous in other developing-country markets. This finding reinforces a central principle of strategic management: there is no universally optimal strategy independent of context.

Salavou and Halikias (2009) provide a particularly instructive contribution through their study of Greek exporting firms. Their analysis identified three strategic orientations: non-strategists, marketing-based strategists, and hybridists. Importantly, the study found that the hybrid strategy was prevalent but was not necessarily the most profitable export strategy. Marketing-based strategists demonstrated stronger export profitability than the hybrid group. The study is valuable precisely because it complicates simplistic assumptions about competitive strategy. It demonstrates that the strategy most frequently adopted by firms is not necessarily the strategy that produces the strongest performance. Strategic popularity and strategic effectiveness are not synonymous.

Moreover, the researchers' use of factor analysis, cluster analysis, and cross-tabulation illustrates the importance of empirical inquiry in strategic management. Strategic prescriptions should not rest exclusively on elegant theoretical categories; they should also be examined against organizational evidence.

The caution is equally important. Salavou and Halikias (2009) acknowledged limitations concerning sample size, the composition of the sample, measurement of export profitability, and the generalizability of findings. Katsikeas et al. (2000) likewise demonstrated that export performance is a difficult construct to conceptualize and measure consistently, reinforcing the importance of methodological care when interpreting international strategy research.

Strategic Leadership and the Framework of Alignment

The preceding analysis permits a more integrated interpretation of strategic management as a framework of alignment in which different levels of strategy perform distinct but interdependent functions. Strategic leadership establishes direction by defining purpose and long-term intent; strategy formulation establishes choice by determining priorities and trade-offs; corporate-level strategy establishes scope by defining where the organization will compete; business-level strategy establishes position by determining how it will create and defend value; functional-level strategy establishes execution by translating strategic priorities into coordinated action; organizational capabilities establish capacity by determining what the organization can reliably accomplish; innovation establishes renewal by challenging existing assumptions and developing new sources of value; organizational culture establishes behavioral consistency by shaping how strategy is interpreted and enacted; and ethical leadership establishes legitimacy and trust by connecting organizational performance with responsible conduct.

Contemporary research on strategic alignment and dynamic capabilities indicates that competitive performance increasingly depends on the organization's ability to integrate these elements rather than optimize them independently. Dynamic capabilities enable firms to sense environmental shifts, seize opportunities, and reconfigure resources, while strategic agility allows organizations to translate such capabilities into timely responses under conditions of uncertainty (Mikalef et al., 2023; Teece, 2024). From this perspective, competitive advantage is not simply an outcome of possessing valuable resources; it emerges when direction, choice, scope, position, capability, culture, and execution mutually reinforce one another.

This framework also clarifies why organizations can possess apparently sophisticated strategies and nevertheless produce disappointing outcomes. Strategic failure frequently originates not in the formal strategy itself, but in misalignment among strategic intent, organizational structure, resources, incentives, technology, culture, and managerial behavior. Recent empirical research demonstrates that organizational alignment is particularly consequential during digital transformation, because technological investment produces sustainable value only when it is accompanied by appropriate organizational structures, leadership practices, capabilities, and cultural adaptation (Verhoef et al., 2024; Warner & Wäger, 2024). Consider an organization that identifies customer experience as its principal differentiator. If its reward systems prioritize only short-term sales volume, employees have an incentive to maximize transactions rather than cultivate enduring customer relationships.

If information systems fail to provide timely and relevant customer intelligence, employees may lack the knowledge necessary to personalize service. If frontline personnel lack authority to resolve complaints, organizational procedures may contradict the responsiveness promised by the strategy. The resulting problem is therefore not necessarily an absence of strategic thinking but a failure of strategic congruence. The organization possesses a customer-experience *proposition* without possessing the organizational framework required to deliver it. Research on strategy implementation similarly underscores that strategic outcomes are shaped by the interaction between formal strategic choices and the organizational systems through which those choices are enacted (Sull et al., 2024).

Strategic leadership consequently requires a continuous alignment audit between what an organization declares, what it rewards, what it enables, and what it actually does. The central question is therefore not simply whether leaders have articulated an attractive strategy, but whether organizational behavior provides credible evidence that the strategy is being enacted. This distinction separates strategic rhetoric from strategic reality. A strategically aligned organization creates coherence among its objectives, resource allocations, performance measures, leadership behaviors, employee incentives, technological infrastructure, cultural norms, and stakeholder commitments. Such coherence is increasingly important in volatile environments in which organizations must simultaneously exploit existing capabilities and explore emerging opportunities (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2023; Teece, 2024).

Strategic leadership therefore functions as the integrating mechanism that continually tests whether the organization's internal framework remains consistent with its external ambitions. In its most consequential form, strategic leadership is not simply the articulation of a desirable future; it is the institutional discipline of progressively aligning the organization’s structures, capabilities, people, incentives, and behaviors with the strategic imperatives of that envisioned future. Competitive advantage becomes sustainable when this alignment is not occasional or rhetorical, but embedded in the organizational system itself.

Table 2: Strategic Leadership and the Architecture of Alignment

Strategic Element	Primary Function	Symbol	Illustrative Measure	Strategic Question

Strategic Leadership	Establishes direction	**L**	Vision clarity, leadership commitment, strategic communication	Where are we going?
Strategy Formulation	Establishes choice	**F**	Strategic coherence, prioritization, environmental analysis	What will we do, and what will we not do?
Corporate-Level Strategy	Establishes scope	**C**	Market selection, diversification, geographic reach	Where will we compete?
Business-Level Strategy	Establishes position	**B**	Cost leadership, differentiation, focus	How will we compete?
Functional-Level Strategy	Establishes execution	**X**	Alignment of marketing, finance, HR, operations, and technology	How will strategy be implemented?
Organizational Capabilities	Establishes capacity	**K**	Knowledge, skills, technology, routines, resources	What are we capable of doing?
Innovation	Establishes renewal	**I**	New products, processes, technologies, business models	How will we remain relevant?
Organizational Culture	Establishes behavioral consistency	**O**	Shared values, incentives, learning, accountability	Do organizational behaviors support strategy?
Ethical Leadership	Establishes legitimacy and trust	**E**	Integrity, transparency, stakeholder confidence	Can stakeholders trust the organization?
Strategic Alignment	Integrates the architecture	**A**	Degree of consistency among strategic elements	Do all parts of the organization reinforce the strategy?
Competitive Advantage	Produces superior strategic outcomes	**CA**	Customer value, profitability, market position, resilience	Are we creating superior and sustainable value?

1. Mathematical Expression of the Strategic Framework

The conceptual relationship can first be represented as:
$CA=f\ (L,F,C,B,X,K,I,O,E,A)$

Where:

- CA = Competitive Advantage
- L = Strategic Leadership
- F = Strategy Formulation
- C = Corporate-Level Strategy
- B = Business-Level Strategy
- X = Functional-Level Execution
- K = Organizational Capabilities
- I = Innovation
- O = Organizational Culture
- E = Ethical Leadership
- A = Strategic Alignment

This formulation indicates that competitive advantage is not generated by one isolated managerial activity. Rather, it is a function of several mutually reinforcing strategic variables.
A more explicit linear model could be expressed as:

$CA=\beta 0 +\beta 1\ L+\beta 2\ F+\beta 3\ C+\beta 4\ B+\beta 5\ X+\beta 6\ K+\beta 7\ I+\beta 8\ O+\beta 9\ E+\epsilon$

Where:

- $\beta 0$ = intercept;
- $\beta 1 \ldots \beta 9$ = estimated contribution of each strategic variable;
- ϵ = unexplained variation.

The model suggests that, holding other variables constant, an increase in the quality of strategic leadership, strategy formulation, execution, organizational capability, innovation, culture, or ethical leadership should be associated with changes in competitive advantage. However, the more intellectually compelling proposition is that these variables should not simply be added together. They should be aligned.

2. The Strategic Alignment Index

A useful way to formalize the argument is to distinguish between the presence of strategic capabilities and their alignment.

Let:
$A=\sum i=1n\ wi \sum i=1n\ wi\ Si$
Where:

- A = Strategic Alignment Index;
- Si = score of each strategic component;
- wi = importance assigned to each component;

- n = number of strategic components.

If all components are considered equally important:
$A=9L+F+C+B+X+K+I+O+E$

Assuming each variable is measured on a five-point scale:
$0 \leq A \leq 5$

The interpretation could be:

Alignment Score	Interpretation
4.50–5.00	Exceptional strategic alignment
4.00–4.49	Very strong alignment
3.50–3.99	Strong alignment
3.00–3.49	Moderate alignment
2.00–2.99	Weak alignment
Below 2.00	Critical strategic misalignment

This index provides a practical mechanism for converting a conceptual argument into an empirical research instrument.

3. Alignment as a Multiplicative Relationship

The additive model, however, has an important limitation. It assumes that strength in one dimension can compensate for weakness in another. Strategic reality is often different.

A company can have an outstanding chief executive officer but poor execution. It can have excellent technology but a dysfunctional culture. It can have a compelling strategy but inadequate organizational capabilities. Therefore, an alternative model is:

$CA=L\times F\times C\times B\times X\times K\times I\times O\times E$

This formulation expresses an important theoretical proposition: Competitive advantage is constrained by the weakest critical link in the strategic architecture. For example, suppose an organization scores each dimension from 0 to 1:
$L=.90, F=.90, C=.85, B=.90$
but:
$X=.40$

Then the organization possesses excellent leadership, formulation, scope, and competitive positioning, but execution is weak. The resulting strategic capacity becomes:
$CA \propto (.90)(.90)(.85)(.90)(.40)$ $CA \propto .248$

Thus, exceptionally strong performance in several dimensions does not eliminate the consequences of a severe execution deficit. This mathematical interpretation captures a central strategic-management reality: A strategy is only as strong as the organizational system capable of executing it.

4. The Weakest-Link Model

An even more conservative formulation is:
$CA=\min(L,F,C,B,X,K,I,O,E)$
Under this model, competitive advantage is determined by the weakest strategic component.
For example:
$L=0.95$ $F=0.90$ $C=0.88$ $B=0.92$ $X=0.35$ $K=0.86$ $I=0.80$ $O=0.82$ $E=0.91$
Then:
$CA=\min(0.95,0.90,0.88,0.92,0.35,0.86,0.80,0.82,0.91)$ $CA=0.35$

The interpretation is straightforward: execution becomes the binding constraint. This model is particularly useful for illustrating why organizations can possess sophisticated strategic plans and still underperform.

5. Strategic Coherence

The argument can be developed further by introducing strategic coherence. Suppose each strategic element has a score S_i, while $\bar{S}$ represents the average score across all elements. Strategic inconsistency can be represented as:
$D=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(S_i-\bar{S})^2$
Where:

- D = strategic dispersion or inconsistency;
- S_i = individual strategic component;
- $\bar{S}$ = average strategic capability.

Then strategic coherence can be represented as:
$SC=1-\frac{D}{D_{max}}$
Where:

- SC = Strategic Coherence;
- D_{max} = maximum possible dispersion.

Thus:
$0\leq SC\leq 1$

A value approaching **1** indicates high consistency among strategic elements, whereas a value approaching **0** indicates substantial strategic fragmentation. This is important because two organizations can have identical average strategic scores but radically different levels of coherence.

Example

Organization A

L=4, F=4, C=4, B=4, X=4
Average:
$\bar{S}=4$
The organization is highly balanced.

Organization B
L=5, F=5, C=5, B=5, X=0
Average:
$\bar{S}=4$
Both organizations have the same average score of 4. Yet Organization B is strategically dysfunctional because execution is fundamentally disconnected from the rest of the architecture. This demonstrates why average performance is not sufficient for measuring strategic effectiveness.

6. The Customer-Experience Example as a Mathematical Model

The customer-experience example in the original discussion can be expressed particularly effectively. Assume an organization declares: Customer Experience=Primary Differentiation Strategy
For the strategy to become operationally credible, at least four organizational components must reinforce it:
$CX=V\times R\times T\times E$
Where:

- V = leadership vision;
- R = reward-system alignment;
- T = technological/information support;
- E = employee empowerment.

Suppose:
$V=.90$ $R=.30$ $T=.40$ $E=.35$
Then:
$CX=(.90)(.30)(.40)(.35)$ $CX=.0378$

Despite strong leadership rhetoric, the practical customer-experience strategy is extremely weak because the supporting organizational systems do not reinforce the stated objective. This provides a powerful analytical explanation for the proposition: The organization does not have a customer-experience strategy in practice; it has a customer-experience statement. The distinction is between declared strategy and enacted strategy.

7. Strategic Rhetoric Versus Strategic Reality

This distinction can be formalized as:
SR=ESDS
Where:

- SR = Strategic Reality Ratio;
- DS = Declared Strategy;
- ES = Enacted Strategy.

If:
$DS=5$
but:
$ES=2$
then:
SR=52 =0.40

Only 40 percent of the declared strategic ambition is reflected in organizational behavior. A more intuitive formulation is: $G=DS-ES$
Where G represents the Strategic Rhetoric Gap. Thus: $G=5-2=3$

The larger the gap, the greater the distance between what leadership says and what the organization actually does.

8. Integrated Strategic Alignment Model

The entire architecture can therefore be summarized mathematically as:
$CA=f(SL,SF,CS,BS,FS,OC,IN,CULT,EL,SA)$
Where:

- SL = Strategic Leadership
- SF = Strategy Formulation
- CS = Corporate Strategy
- BS = Business Strategy
- FS = Functional Strategy
- OC = Organizational Capability
- IN = Innovation
- CULT = Organizational Culture
- EL = Ethical Leadership
- SA = Strategic Alignment

The conceptual sequence can then be represented as:
Leadership→Formulation→Scope→Position→Execution→Capability→Innovation→Renewal →CompetitiveAdvantage

But this sequence should not be interpreted as strictly linear because organizational culture and ethical leadership influence every stage. A more accurate representation is:
$CA=f[(L+F+C+B+X+K+I)(O)(E)(A)]$
Here, culture (O), ethics (E), and alignment (A) operate as integrating conditions rather than merely additional variables.

9. Analytical Interpretation

The mathematical framework produces several significant theoretical conclusions.

1. Leadership is necessary but insufficient

A highly capable chief executive officer cannot independently manufacture competitive advantage.
$L\uparrow \not\Rightarrow CA\uparrow$
unless complementary organizational variables also improve.
Leadership must therefore be translated into organizational systems.

2. Strategy without execution has limited strategic value

$Strategy \neq Performance$
unless:
$Strategy \rightarrow Execution \rightarrow Capability \rightarrow Value$

A strategy becomes economically consequential only when organizational resources and behaviors give it practical expression.

3. Alignment creates strategic leverage

When strategic components reinforce one another:
$A\uparrow \Rightarrow CA\uparrow$
provided that the underlying capabilities are valuable and relevant to the market.
Strategic alignment therefore acts as a multiplier rather than merely an additive component.

4. Misalignment creates strategic leakage

If leadership emphasizes differentiation while incentives reward cost reduction, strategic resources are being pulled in competing directions. Thus:
$Differentiation\uparrow + \text{Cost-only incentives}\uparrow \Rightarrow \text{Strategic Conflict}\uparrow$

The organization consequently experiences **strategic leakage**, whereby resources are consumed without reinforcing the intended competitive position.

5. Competitive advantage is dynamic

Because markets evolve:
$CA_t \neq CA_{t+1}$

unless the organization continuously renews its capabilities. Consequently:
$CA_{t+1} = CA_t + Innovation + Learning - Obsolescence$

This formulation captures the essence of dynamic capabilities: yesterday's advantage cannot automatically be assumed to remain tomorrow's advantage.

10. Proposed Strategic Alignment Equation

For empirical application in an academic study, the following model may be particularly useful:
$CA = \beta 0 + \beta 1\ SL + \beta 2\ SF + \beta 3\ CS + \beta 4\ BS + \beta 5\ FS + \beta 6\ OC + \beta 7\ IN + \beta 8\ CULT + \beta 9\ EL + \beta 10\ SA + \epsilon$
The corresponding hypotheses could be formulated as follows:

Hypothesis	**Proposition**
H1	Strategic leadership has a positive and significant relationship with competitive advantage.
H2	Strategy formulation has a positive and significant relationship with competitive advantage.
H3	Corporate-level strategic coherence has a positive relationship with competitive advantage.
H4	Business-level strategic positioning has a positive relationship with competitive advantage.
H5	Functional-level strategic execution has a positive and significant relationship with competitive advantage.
H6	Organizational capabilities positively influence competitive advantage.
H7	Innovation capability positively influences sustainable competitive advantage.
H8	Organizational culture positively moderates the relationship between strategy and competitive advantage.
H9	Ethical leadership positively influences organizational legitimacy and stakeholder trust.
H10	Strategic alignment strengthens the relationship between organizational strategy and competitive advantage.

11. The Central Interpretation

The strongest intellectual contribution of this framework is that it moves the analysis of competitive advantage from isolated strategic variables toward organizational alignment. The traditional question is: What strategy should the organization pursue?

The more consequential question is: Can the organization align its leadership, strategic choices, resources, capabilities, incentives, culture, technology, people, and execution around the strategy it has chosen?
This distinction is fundamental.

An organization can formulate an excellent strategy and still fail.
An organization can possess exceptional resources and still fail.
An organization can employ talented executives and still fail.
An organization can possess a powerful brand and still fail.

Failure becomes increasingly likely when these resources and capabilities operate without strategic coherence. The proposed architecture therefore yields the following central proposition:

$$\text{Competitive Advantage} = \text{Strategic Quality} \times \text{Organizational Alignment} \times \text{Execution Capability} \times \text{Continuous Renewal}$$

Or, more conceptually:

$$CA = SQ \times SA \times EC \times CR$$

Where:

- SQ = Strategic Quality
- SA = Strategic Alignment
- EC = Execution Capability
- CR = Continuous Renewal

This equation captures the essential argument of the entire section. A superior strategy that cannot be aligned cannot be executed effectively. A strategy that cannot be executed cannot create superior value. A competitive advantage that cannot be renewed cannot remain sustainable. The ultimate test of strategic leadership is therefore not the elegance of the strategic plan, the sophistication of the presentation, or the eloquence of the chief executive officer. It is whether the organization's actual decisions, incentives, resources, capabilities, behaviors, and outcomes consistently demonstrate the strategy it claims to pursue. That is the dividing line between strategic rhetoric and strategic reality.

Implications for Managers

The foregoing analysis carries several important implications for managers seeking to build, protect, and renew competitive advantage. First, competitive advantage should be defined from the perspective of customer value rather than managerial preference. Resources and capabilities become strategically consequential when they enable an organization to deliver value that customers recognize and competitors cannot readily reproduce. Contemporary research on dynamic capabilities reinforces this logic by demonstrating that firms sustain advantage not simply by possessing valuable resources, but by continuously sensing changes in customer and market requirements, seizing emerging opportunities, and reconfiguring their resource base accordingly (Yang & Stoian, 2024). Managers should evaluate every major capability against a fundamental strategic question: What distinctive value does this capability create, for whom, and for how long can that value remain defensible?

Second, strategy should be understood as a coherent system of choices rather than an inventory of managerial aspirations. Strategic effectiveness requires prioritization, resource commitment, and consequential trade-offs. Organizations cannot simultaneously pursue every attractive opportunity without diluting attention, capital, and managerial capacity. Recent evidence on business-model strategy indicates that environmental conditions materially affect whether replication or renewal generates superior performance, suggesting that strategic choices must be calibrated to the degree of environmental dynamism rather than applied mechanically (Heij et al., 2024). For managers, the implication is clear: strategic discipline requires deciding not only what the organization will pursue, but also what it will deliberately decline, defer, or discontinue.

Third, corporate-level decisions should be anchored in organizational capabilities rather than external attractiveness alone. Diversification, acquisitions, and international expansion may appear compelling when evaluated through market size or growth potential, yet market attractiveness does not automatically confer organizational competence. Research on diversification shows that the performance consequences of expanding into related or unrelated domains depend partly on the firm's absorptive capacity, the ability to acquire, assimilate, and exploit external knowledge (2024). Similarly, evidence from emerging-market firms demonstrates that changing institutional environments can stimulate strategic renewal through internal capability development, acquisitions, and market expansion, with the appropriate response varying according to firms' performance conditions and capabilities (2025). Managers should therefore ask not simply "Is this market attractive?", but "What distinctive capabilities enable us to win in this market, and can those capabilities be transferred or developed at acceptable cost?"

Fourth, functional and middle-level managers should be recognized as strategic actors rather than treated solely as implementers of decisions formulated at the executive level. Strategy is transformed through decisions made across finance, marketing, human resources, operations, information technology, supply chains, and customer-facing activities. Research published in *Long Range Planning* demonstrates that middle managers can materially influence whether intended strategies are implemented as designed or evolve into unintended strategies through their day-to-day activities and interpretations (2024). This finding has substantial managerial significance: senior executives establish strategic intent, but organizational actors throughout the hierarchy shape its ultimate meaning and consequences. Effective strategic leadership should be able to create mechanisms through which functional expertise informs strategy formulation while simultaneously establishing sufficient alignment to prevent implementation from becoming fragmented.

Fifth, competitive advantage should be treated as a renewable strategic asset rather than a permanent organizational possession. Capabilities that generate superior performance under one set of environmental conditions may lose their value when technologies, customer preferences, regulations, or competitive structures change. Recent scholarship on strategic renewal identifies dynamic capabilities, organizational learning, absorptive capacity, exploration and exploitation, and strategic agility as interconnected mechanisms through which organizations renew themselves in response to environmental change (2025). Research on business-model innovation similarly finds that environmental dynamism can weaken the performance benefits of simply replicating existing models while increasing the strategic importance of renewal under appropriate conditions (Heij et al., 2024). Managers should consequently institutionalize learning, experimentation, talent development, technological adaptation, and periodic strategic review rather than waiting for declining performance to force organizational renewal.

Sixth, managers should resist equating popularity, conformity, or imitation with strategic effectiveness. A strategy can become widespread because it is legitimate, visible, fashionable, or socially validated without necessarily being economically superior. Recent research on emerging-market firms shows that imitation is contingent upon performance feedback and the informational and legitimacy value of different role models; firms do not imitate all models uniformly, and their imitation tendencies change according to performance conditions (Wang et al., 2023). The managerial lesson is that benchmarking should function as an analytical input rather than a substitute for strategic judgment. Leaders should examine why a competitor's strategy works, whether its underlying conditions exist within their own organization, and whether imitation would strengthen or weaken their distinctive position.

Seventh, strategic effectiveness is inherently contextual. Strategies do not operate in an institutional vacuum; their outcomes are conditioned by industry structures, national institutions, cultural expectations, technological regimes, resource configurations, and competitive intensity. Recent international-business research demonstrates that dynamic capabilities underpinning international growth include the ability to sense and seize opportunities and reconfigure resources in response to changing foreign-market conditions (Yang & Stoian, 2024). Research on international alliances likewise shows that the relationship between international portfolios, innovation, and financial performance can be nonlinear and contingent upon geographical distance and absorptive capacity (2024). Consequently, managers should resist transferring a strategy from one national or organizational context to another without examining the institutional and capability conditions that produced its original success.

Taken together, these implications suggest that strategic management is less about discovering a universally superior strategy than about constructing an organizational system capable of making contextually intelligent choices and renewing those choices as conditions evolve. The managerial challenge is therefore simultaneously one of positioning, capability development, organizational alignment, and strategic renewal. The contemporary evidence points toward a dynamic conception of competitive advantage in which firms must continually sense changing conditions, interpret emerging possibilities, seize opportunities selectively, and reconfigure resources without abandoning the strategic coherence that gives the organization its identity (Heij et al., 2024; Yang & Stoian, 2024).

Implications for Management Education and Student Leadership

The study of strategic management should extend beyond the memorization of concepts such as cost leadership, differentiation, focus strategy, corporate strategy, and functional planning. Its deeper pedagogical purpose is to cultivate strategic judgment, the capacity to interpret ambiguity, interrogate assumptions, evaluate competing alternatives, and make context-sensitive decisions. Contemporary management-education research increasingly emphasizes experiential, problem-based, and active learning approaches because students develop stronger analytical and decision-making capabilities when they are required to apply theoretical frameworks to complex and uncertain situations rather than merely reproduce established definitions (Baepler et al., 2024; Sailer et al., 2024). Accordingly, students should be challenged to move from asking *"What does this concept mean?"* to asking "Why did this strategy produce a particular outcome under these conditions, for this organization, and what would have to change for the outcome to be different?"

Such inquiry transforms strategic management from a body of terminology into an intellectual discipline centered on interpretation, evidence, judgment, and consequential choice.

The educational value of this approach becomes even greater when student leaders are incorporated as active participants in strategic inquiry. Student leaders occupy a distinctive position within educational institutions: they experience institutional policies from the learner's perspective while simultaneously interpreting those policies for their peers, communicating emerging concerns, and observing how institutional decisions affect engagement and trust. Recent higher-education research emphasizes the importance of student voice, partnership, and agency in institutional decision-making, particularly because students can contribute experiential knowledge that may not be visible through conventional administrative data (Matthews et al., 2024; Mercer-Mapstone et al., 2023).

Structured dialogue with student leaders can therefore function as a form of organizational sensemaking. Their experiences may illuminate how communication is received, how incentives influence participation, where institutional processes generate unintended consequences, and how changing student expectations affect organizational legitimacy. The objective, however, should not be to romanticize student leadership or treat student perspectives as automatically correct; rather, their insights should be subjected to the same analytical scrutiny, evidentiary standards, and constructive challenge applied to managerial decisions.

The classroom can consequently become a laboratory for strategic experimentation, critical dialogue, and institutional learning. Debates involving student leaders should examine not only successful initiatives but also failed strategies, unintended outcomes, ethical tensions, competing stakeholder interests, and the assumptions that shaped consequential decisions. Emerging research on responsible management education and sustainability-oriented learning further suggests that management education is most consequential when students are equipped to connect organizational decisions with broader social, ethical, and environmental consequences (Formentini et al., 2024; Rieckmann & Barth, 2024).

In this context, students should be required to interrogate contemporary organizations through a structured strategic lens: What strategic vision is leadership communicating? What assumptions support that vision? What competitive advantage does the organization claim? Is that advantage genuinely valuable to customers? Can competitors imitate or substitute it? How does corporate-level strategy reinforce business-level positioning? How are strategic choices translated into functional action? What capabilities make execution possible? What evidence demonstrates performance? Which environmental shifts could render the strategy obsolete?

These questions cultivate the habit of thinking beyond immediate answers toward systems, consequences, evidence, and future possibilities. Ultimately, the educational objective is not simply to produce students who can *describe strategy*, but emerging leaders who can question strategy, evaluate strategy, defend strategy, revise strategy, and recognize when strategic renewal has become indispensable.

Discussion and Conclusion

The central argument of this article is that competitive advantage should not be understood as the consequence of a single strategic decision, resource, leadership attribute, or technological investment. It is better understood as the outcome of an organizational framework in which strategic elements reinforce one another. Strategic leadership establishes direction; strategy formulation establishes choice; corporate strategy establishes scope; business strategy establishes competitive position; functional strategy establishes execution; organizational capabilities establish capacity; innovation establishes renewal; culture establishes behavioral consistency; and ethical leadership establishes legitimacy and trust. Strategic alignment connects these dimensions into a coherent system. Recent empirical evidence strengthens this interpretation by demonstrating that strategic leadership can influence sustainable competitive advantage through dynamic capabilities and that strategic renewal depends upon continuous capability development and organizational adaptation.

The framework also provides an explanation for an enduring paradox in strategic management: why organizations with apparently excellent strategies can nevertheless perform poorly. The answer frequently lies in misalignment between strategic intent and organizational framework. An organization may announce customer experience as a differentiation strategy while rewarding employees primarily for short-term sales volume. It may proclaim innovation while maintaining budgeting, approval, and risk systems that discourage experimentation. It may invest heavily in digital technologies while leaving organizational structures, skills, processes, and incentives unchanged. Recent research on digital transformation similarly demonstrates that technological investment alone does not guarantee transformation; sustainable outcomes depend upon the interaction of technology, organizational structure, human agency, and capability reconfiguration. The implication is conceptually important: strategic failure may arise not because leaders selected the wrong strategy, but because the organization failed to construct the institutional conditions required to enact that strategy.

The proposed framework also advances the argument that alignment should be understood as a strategic multiplier rather than merely another organizational variable. An organization with outstanding leadership but weak execution cannot fully convert vision into value. An organization with sophisticated technology but inadequate human capability cannot extract the technology's full strategic potential. An organization with strong capabilities but an obsolete strategy may become highly efficient at doing something the market no longer values. This logic is consistent with dynamic-capability research, which emphasizes the importance of sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring rather than simply accumulating resources. Contemporary scholarship on strategic renewal similarly identifies capability development, organizational learning, exploration, exploitation, and strategic agility as mutually reinforcing mechanisms of organizational adaptation. The weakest-link and multiplicative formulations proposed in this article therefore provide useful theoretical metaphors for explaining why exceptional performance in one dimension cannot always compensate for severe deficiencies elsewhere.

A further contribution of the framework is its treatment of strategic leadership as an integrating mechanism rather than a personality construct. Leadership should not be evaluated primarily by charisma, visibility, rhetorical sophistication, or hierarchical authority. Its more consequential measure is the organizational system that it creates. Effective strategic leaders establish priorities, mobilize human capital, encourage constructive dissent, allocate resources according to strategic importance, create learning mechanisms, maintain ethical standards, and continuously test whether organizational behavior remains consistent with strategic intent. Recent evidence linking strategic leadership with organizational performance, agility, communication, and sustainable competitive advantage reinforces the importance of these integrative mechanisms. The leader's fundamental task is consequently not simply to formulate a desirable future but to make the organization increasingly capable of realizing that future.

The framework further suggests that competitive advantage is inherently temporal. A capability that is valuable today may become commonplace tomorrow. A technology may be displaced; customer preferences may change; competitors may imitate successful practices; institutions may be reconfigured; and previously distinctive organizational routines may become sources of rigidity. Strategic renewal is therefore not an optional activity that organizations undertake after decline becomes evident.

It is an ongoing requirement of competitiveness. Recent research on strategic renewal emphasizes the role of dynamic capabilities in sensing environmental changes, seizing opportunities, and reconfiguring organizational resources, while contemporary work on knowledge creation demonstrates that newly generated knowledge contributes to dynamic capabilities through processes of routine renewal. Sustainable competitive advantage therefore requires an organization to preserve what remains strategically valuable while deliberately transforming what has become obsolete.

The article's theoretical contribution can consequently be summarized in the proposition: Competitive Advantage = Strategic Quality × Strategic Alignment × Execution Capability × Continuous Renewal.

This formulation should not be interpreted as a claim that these dimensions have already been empirically demonstrated to operate through a literal multiplicative function. Rather, it expresses the theoretical logic of the framework: superior strategy requires alignment; alignment requires execution; execution requires organizational capability; and sustainable advantage requires continuous renewal. The formulation also highlights why competitive advantage is difficult to sustain. Weakness in any strategically critical dimension can constrain the value created by strengths elsewhere.

The framework generates several avenues for future empirical research. First, researchers could operationalize the proposed Strategic Alignment Index and examine whether higher levels of alignment predict superior financial, operational, innovation, and stakeholder outcomes. Second, longitudinal studies could test whether strategic alignment moderates the relationship between strategic leadership and competitive advantage under conditions of environmental turbulence. Third, future research could examine whether organizational culture and ethical leadership function as moderators or boundary conditions rather than direct predictors. Fourth, comparative studies across industries and national contexts could determine whether the framework operates differently in emerging and developed economies. Fifth, structural equation modeling could test the proposed relationships among strategic leadership, strategic choices, dynamic capabilities, strategic alignment, innovation, and competitive advantage. Such research would transform the conceptual framework developed here into an empirically testable theory.

The study also has implications for management education and the development of future leaders. Strategic management should not be taught solely as an inventory of concepts, models, and terminology. Students should learn to interrogate assumptions, evaluate strategic alternatives, analyze evidence, recognize trade-offs, and determine whether organizational behavior is consistent with declared strategy. Recent management-education scholarship increasingly emphasizes active and applied learning because complex strategic judgment develops through engagement with problems that require interpretation rather than simple recall. The classroom should therefore become a laboratory in which students examine real organizations, challenge managerial assumptions, debate competing strategic choices, and confront the consequences of implementation failure.

At its most fundamental level, the deepest lesson of this framework is that strategy becomes real only when organizational behavior gives it evidence. A vision without choices is aspiration. Choices without resources are intention. Resources without capabilities are potential. Capabilities without execution are unrealized capacity. Execution without renewal eventually becomes rigidity. And competitive advantage without ethical legitimacy may prove unsustainable even when financial performance appears strong.

The decisive question for strategic leadership is therefore not simply, “What strategy have we chosen?” It is the more demanding question: “Does the organization actually behave in ways consistent with the strategy it claims to pursue?” This question marks the critical dividing line between strategic rhetoric and strategic reality, revealing whether strategy has been translated from an articulated intention into coherent organizational action.

The enduring competitive advantage of the future may consequently belong not simply to organizations possessing the greatest resources, the largest markets, or the most sophisticated technologies, but to organizations whose leaders can interpret change intelligently, choose deliberately, align systematically, execute coherently, learn continuously, and renew courageously. Competitive advantage, in this sense, is not something an organization simply possesses. It is something an organization must continually architect, enact, defend, and renew.

References

Aulakh, P. S., Kotabe, M., & Teegen, H. (2000). Export strategies and performance of firms from emerging economies: Evidence from Brazil, Chile, and Mexico. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(3), 342–361. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556399

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Cozzolino, A., & Verona, G. (2024). Decision tree for adaptation after radical changes: Linking dynamic capabilities, ambidexterity, and strategic alliances. *Journal of Management and Governance, 28*, 745–769. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-024-09702-2

Dess, G. G., & Davis, P. S. (1984). Porter's generic strategies as determinants of strategic group membership and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*(3), 467–488. https://doi.org/10.2307/256040

Hambrick, D. C. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An update. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 334–343. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.24345254

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. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628

Heij, C. V., Volberda, H. W., & Hollen, R. M. A. (2024). To replicate or to renew your business model? The performance effect in dynamic environments. *Long Range Planning, 57*(3), 102440.

Hill, C. W. L. (1988). Differentiation versus low cost or differentiation and low cost: A contingency framework. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 401–412. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306957

Hoessler, S., & Carbon, C.-C. (2024). Guiding incumbent companies in navigating digital transformations: A qualitative study on structural ambidexterity and strategic leadership. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation, 20*(4), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.7341/20242043

Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Executive, 13*(1), 43–57. https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.1999.1567311

Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., & Sirmon, D. G. (2003). A model of strategic entrepreneurship: The construct and its dimensions. *Journal of Management, 29*(6), 963–989. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00086-2

Katsikeas, C. S., Leonidou, L. C., & Morgan, N. A. (2000). Firm-level export performance assessment: Review, evaluation, and development. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 28*(4), 493–511. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070300284003

Liang, Y., Dai, K., & Matthews, K. E. (2024). Followers, customers, or partners? Comparing conceptualisations of students as partners in Australian, Mainland Chinese, and Hong Kong universities. *Higher Education, 88*, 2251–2267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01215-z

Mercer-Mapstone, L., Dvorakova, S. L., Matthews, K. E., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P., Knorr, K., Marquis, E., Shammas, R., & Swaim, K. (2023). A systematic literature review of students as partners in higher education. *International Journal for Students as Partners, 7*(1), 1–20.

Olowoyeye, A. S., & Adegoke, O. O. (2025). Analysis of the impact of strategic leadership on organisational performance: A study of Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti. *African Journal of Stability and Development, 17*(2), 1412–1432. https://doi.org/10.53982/ajsd.2025.1702.32-j

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1996). What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review, 74*(6), 61–78.

Rieckmann, M., & Barth, M. (2024). Educating future change agents: Competencies and pedagogical approaches for sustainable development in higher education. *Sustainability Science, 19*, 1121–1137.

Salavou, H. E., & Halikias, J. (2009). Strategy types of exporting firms: A view on the basis of competitive advantage. *European Business Review, 21*(2), 144–158. https://doi.org/10.1108/09555340910940141

Sailer, M., Hense, J., Mayr, S. K., & Mandl, H. (2024). How gamification and active learning approaches influence student engagement and learning in higher education. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 72*, 1123–1145.

Septiany, S., Erica, H., Mulyadi, M., Aseanty, D., & Anggiani, S. (2025). Mapping the impact of strategic leadership on organizational performance: A systematic literature review. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting, 6*(4), 3768–3781. https://doi.org/10.38035/dijefa.v6i4.5412

Spanos, Y. E., Zaralis, G., & Lioukas, S. (2004). Strategy and industry effects on profitability: Evidence from Greece. *Strategic Management Journal, 25*(2), 139–165. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.369

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

Wang, Y., Li, K., Zhu, Y., & Chen, J. (2023). Imitation, performance feedback, and outward foreign direct investments by emerging market firms. *International Business Review, 32*(4).

Woo, H. R. (2025). Strategic leadership in SMEs: The mediating roles of corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship in organizational performance. *Administrative Sciences, 15*(4), Article 151. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15040151

Yang, H., & Stoian, M.-C. (2025). Post-entry internationalization of born globals: The role of dynamic capabilities in accelerating growth. *International Business Review, 34*(2), Article 102299. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2024.102299

Yunita, T., Sasmoko, S., Bandur, A., & Alamsjah, F. (2024). Dynamic capabilities facilitate the use of technology to promote organizational ambidexterity. *Business: Theory and Practice, 25*(2), 468–487. https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2024.18998