The Interplay of Environment, Managerial Discretion and Strategic Consensus in the Relationship Between TMT Diversity and Strategic Innovation

Tom Wei Hui Yeh[1]*

College of Management, I-Shou University, Taiwan; tom.w.h.yeh@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author: tom.w.h.yeh@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30209/IJMO.202503.009

Submitted: May. 25, 2025 Accepted: Jul. 08, 2025

ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper examines the influence of Top Management Team (TMT) diversity on strategic innovation, with a particular focus on the moderating roles of managerial discretion and strategic consensus. Drawing on upper echelons theory and norm theory, it proposes a Dual and Multilevel Moderation (DMLM) model in which contextual factors—such as industry norms and environmental dynamism—further shape these moderating effects. The framework aims to reconcile inconsistencies in the existing TMT diversity literature and provide a cohesive foundation for future empirical investigation.

Keywords: TMT Diversity, Managerial Discretion, Strategic Consensus, Strategic Innovation, Industrial Norm, Environmental Dynamism

1. Introduction

The significance of TMT diversity in driving strategic innovation has drawn considerable scholarly interest over the past few decades. Rooted in the upper echelons theory, the assumption is that the demographic and cognitive characteristics of senior executives shape the strategic choices and outcomes of firms (Hambrick 2007; Finkelstein and Hambrick 1996). These characteristics encompass a broad spectrum of attributes, including but not limited to educational background, professional experience, functional expertise, tenure, and even demographic elements such as age, gender, and nationality (Wiersema and Bantel 1992; Bantel and Jackson 1989; Nielsen 2010). While TMT diversity has been linked with greater creativity, increased access to varied knowledge domains, and enhanced strategic innovation (Kilduff et al. 2000; Talke et al. 2011), it has also been associated with interpersonal conflict, slowed decision-making, and communication barriers, leading to inconclusive and contradictory empirical results (Jehn 1995; Amason 1996; Williams and O'Reilly 1998).

In an effort to clarify these inconsistencies, researchers have investigated various moderators, most notably managerial discretion and strategic consensus (Hambrick and Finkelstein 1987; Carpenter and Golden 1997; Kellermanns et al. 2005). These constructs offer meaningful pathways

to explain why TMT diversity sometimes enhances, and other times hinders, organizational innovation (Wei et al. 2025; Talke et al. 2011). However, these moderators themselves have shown mixed empirical outcomes (Kellermanns et al. 2011; González-Benito et al. 2012). A crucial oversight in previous research is the underestimation of the broader environmental context within which these relationships occur (Bourgeois 1985; Kafetzopoulos 2023). Given the prevalence of global disruptions—such as the COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, geopolitical tensions, economic instability, and shifting regulatory landscapes—it is essential to adopt a multilevel perspective that includes both endogenous and exogenous moderators (Li et al. 2025; Bai 2025; Mousa et al. 2025).

In sum, while TMT diversity holds substantial promise for fostering strategic innovation, its effects are neither uniform nor straightforward. The interplay between diversity and innovation is shaped not only by internal team dynamics—such as managerial discretion and strategic consensus—but also by the broader environmental context in which firms operate. Existing research has yet to fully integrate these multilevel influences, leading to fragmented and often contradictory findings. To advance the field, there is a pressing need for a more comprehensive theoretical framework that accounts for both endogenous moderators and exogenous contingencies. Such an approach can better explain the conditional nature of diversity's impact and guide future empirical inquiries toward more nuanced and context-sensitive insights.

This paper introduces the DMLM model, which integrates TMT diversity, strategic innovation, and two levels of moderators: first-level moderators (managerial discretion and strategic consensus) and second-level, exogenous moderators (industrial norms and environmental dynamism). Through this framework, we aim to elucidate the mechanisms through which environmental conditions shape the influence of TMT diversity on innovation. This conceptual model not only deepens theoretical understanding but also offers a structured lens for interpreting the inconsistencies found in previous empirical studies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Upper Echelons Theory

Upper Echelons Theory (UET) was first introduced by Hambrick and Mason (1984) in their seminal work, which proposed that organizational outcomes—strategies, effectiveness, and innovation—are largely reflections of the values and cognitive bases of the top executives of an organization. This marked a significant departure from earlier structural or environmental determinist views by emphasizing the role of individual agency within strategic decision-making (Hambrick 2007; Finkelstein and Hambrick 1996; Rajagopalan and Finkelstein 1992).

At its core, UET posits that the experiences, values, personalities, and demographics of top management team (TMT) members shape how they interpret and respond to strategic problems. Because executives face bounded rationality and cannot process all available information objectively, they rely on their individual cognitive frames, which are in turn influenced by personal attributes such as age, tenure, education, and functional background.

Key Assumptions: Cognitive Orientation: Executives filter and interpret information based on

personal experiences and values. Demographic Proxies: Observable characteristics (e.g., age, tenure, educational background) serve as proxies for underlying psychological constructs. Strategic Discretion: The impact of executive characteristics is most pronounced when leaders operate in environments that afford them greater discretion. Team-level Influence: The composition and diversity of the TMT as a whole are more influential than any individual member alone, due to collective decision-making dynamics.

Extensions and Evolutions: Since its inception, UET has evolved in several directions: Team Heterogeneity: Research has expanded to examine how functional, cognitive, and demographic diversity within TMTs affects decision-making, innovation, and performance. Studies such as Bantel and Jackson (1989) have shown that team heterogeneity can promote innovation, while others highlight its potential to cause conflict.

In conclusion, Upper Echelons Theory has fundamentally reshaped our understanding of strategic leadership by foregrounding the role of executive characteristics in shaping organizational outcomes. Its emphasis on cognitive orientation, demographic proxies, and strategic discretion offers a powerful lens for analyzing how TMTs navigate complex decision environments. However, as the theory has evolved, its application to team-level diversity has revealed both its strengths and limitations—highlighting the dual potential of heterogeneity to spur innovation or incite conflict. These theoretical developments underscore the need for more integrative and context-sensitive models that account for the dynamic interplay between individual cognition, team composition, and environmental contingencies.

Contextual Moderators: Later refinements introduced the role of contextual moderators—such as industry conditions, firm life cycle, and environmental dynamism—which determine when and how executive characteristics matter most. This idea aligns closely with the central structure of your DMLM model. Strategic Consensus: Scholars have also explored the role of consensus among TMT members, finding that alignment in strategic understanding can amplify or mitigate the effects of diversity (Knight et al., 1999). Managerial Discretion: Hambrick and Finkelstein (1987) introduced the concept of managerial discretion as a moderating mechanism, emphasizing that the influence of executive traits is contingent on the latitude of decision-making allowed by the organizational and industry context. Psychological and Behavioral Extensions: More recent scholarship has moved beyond demographics to examine psychological traits like narcissism, regulatory focus, and affective states, bringing UET into dialogue with behavioral strategy and upper echelons' microfoundations.

2.2 TMT Diversity and Strategic Innovation

According to upper echelons theory, the attributes of top executives significantly influence strategic outcomes. TMT diversity—encompassing differences in education, function, tenure, and cognition—can generate varied perspectives that enhance innovation. These differences enable teams to challenge prevailing assumptions, avoid groupthink, and consider a broader range of strategic options. For instance, Bantel and Jackson (1989) found a positive relationship between TMT diversity and innovation in banking firms. The rationale is that heterogeneous teams possess a greater repertoire of cognitive resources, which improves problem-solving and strategic foresight. However, other

studies (Jehn, 1995; Pelled et al., 1999) suggest that such diversity may also lead to dysfunctional conflict and hinder performance due to misunderstandings, reduced cohesion, and increased coordination costs. Therefore, while the potential for innovation exists, the realization of this potential depends on the organizational context and the mechanisms through which diversity is managed.

Proposition 1 (P1): TMT diversity positively influences strategic innovation.

2.3 Managerial Discretion as a Moderator

Managerial discretion refers to the degree of latitude executives possess in making strategic decisions. This latitude is shaped by a variety of external and internal factors, including environmental uncertainty, industry norms, and organizational governance structures. In contexts where discretion is high, top managers are more empowered to act autonomously, allowing them to draw upon the diverse perspectives, experiences, and knowledge within the TMT to initiate innovative strategies. In such settings, the innovative potential of TMT diversity is more likely to be realized, as executives are less bound by rigid hierarchies, standardized procedures, or overly prescriptive corporate policies. High discretion enables leaders to experiment with novel ideas, reconfigure resources, and challenge the status quo—actions that are often necessary for strategic innovation.

However, managerial discretion is not uniformly distributed across organizations or environments. It is significantly influenced by contextual factors such as regulatory strictness, stakeholder expectations, political and institutional pressures, and the degree of market volatility or competition. In highly regulated or politically sensitive industries, for example, even the most diverse and capable TMTs may find their ability to implement innovative ideas severely constrained. This means that the positive impact of TMT diversity on innovation is not automatic but conditional on the discretion afforded to decision-makers. As such, managerial discretion serves as a crucial intervening variable, mediating the relationship between team diversity and strategic outcomes, and highlighting the importance of considering broader contextual enablers when evaluating the innovation potential of diverse executive teams.

Proposition 2 (P2): Managerial discretion positively moderates the TMT diversity-strategic innovation relationship.

2.4 Industrial Norms as a Second-Level Moderator

Industrial norms—shared expectations about acceptable managerial behavior within an industry—can either enhance or suppress discretion. These norms are embedded within the culture and operational logic of industries and are often shaped by historical practices, institutional pressures, and collective expectations (Hambrick and Finkelstein 1987; Meyer et al. 1993; Mizruchi and Fein 1999). For instance, technology sectors often reward risk-taking and innovation, creating an environment where managerial discretion is not only accepted but expected. In contrast, highly regulated sectors such as banking or healthcare may favor caution and standardization, thereby restricting discretionary behavior even when formal policies allow some flexibility (Magnan and St-Onge 1997; Bennett 2023). These norms thus condition the efficacy of managerial discretion in translating TMT diversity into innovation. They serve as exogenous, environmental forces that

influence how discretion is perceived and practiced, further adding a layer of complexity to the innovation process (Gezelius 2025; Pauwelyn and Pelc 2025).

Proposition 3 (P3): Industrial norms strengthen the moderating effect of managerial discretion.

2.5 Strategic Consensus as a Moderator

Strategic consensus refers to the extent to which members of the Top Management Team (TMT) agree on an organization's key strategic priorities. As a coordination mechanism, consensus plays a vital role in aligning diverse perspectives toward unified strategic direction, enabling teams to convert cognitive heterogeneity into actionable outcomes (Dess and Origer 1987; Priem 1990; Kellermanns et al. 2005). When consensus is high, it reduces ambiguity, clarifies roles, and streamlines the decision-making process. This alignment enhances the integration of varied viewpoints and fosters mutual commitment to organizational objectives, particularly important in complex or uncertain environments where decisive action is critical (Dooley et al. 2000; Bowman and Ambrosini 1997; González-Benito et al. 2012). In such contexts, consensus functions as a conduit through which TMT diversity translates into coherent strategic innovation.

However, strategic consensus is not without risks, especially within highly diverse teams. While agreement can promote unity, excessive consensus may stifle dissent and suppress the very differences that fuel creative thinking and breakthrough innovation (Simons 1995; Jehn 1995). This phenomenon, sometimes referred to as groupthink or premature convergence, can lead to strategic rigidity and missed opportunities. For diverse TMTs to realize their full potential, it is essential to strike a balance between alignment and cognitive plurality. An optimal level of consensus allows teams to benefit from the coordination efficiencies of shared understanding while maintaining the space for debate, dissent, and alternative viewpoints. In this balanced state, consensus can act as an enabler rather than a constraint—reducing the coordination costs of diversity while preserving its innovation-enhancing benefits (Kellermanns et al. 2011; Bao et al. 2015).

Proposition 4 (P4): Strategic consensus positively moderates the TMT diversity-strategic innovation relationship.

2.6 Environmental Dynamism as a Second-Level Moderator

Environmental dynamism refers to the frequency and unpredictability of changes in the external environment. It encompasses market volatility, technological turbulence, regulatory shifts, and socio-political disruptions (Bourgeois 1985; Kafetzopoulos 2023; Kim et al. 2025). In dynamic contexts, consensus may be particularly valuable for enabling swift and coordinated responses to emerging threats and opportunities (Homburg et al. 1999; Combe and Carrington 2015). A shared understanding among TMT members allows organizations to act quickly, reduce confusion, and maintain strategic coherence in the face of external shocks (Wei et al. 2025; Bao et al. 2008). Conversely, in stable environments where strategic directions are less frequently challenged, the utility of consensus may diminish and may even contribute to rigidity and resistance to change (Markoczy 2001; Miller 1981). As such, the moderating role of strategic consensus is itself subject to environmental conditions, and understanding this interaction is crucial for explaining when and how consensus enhances or impairs

innovation outcomes (Wan et al. 2025; Li and Zhang 2025).

Proposition 5 (P5): Environmental dynamism strengthens the moderating effect of strategic consensus.

3. Theoretical Framework

These elements interact hierarchically, where exogenous factors condition the strength and direction of endogenous moderators. In this framework, contextual variables such as industry norms and environmental dynamism do not operate in isolation but act as shaping forces that amplify or constrain internal mechanisms like managerial discretion and strategic consensus. For instance, the capacity of managerial discretion to enhance innovation may be significantly amplified in industries that culturally support autonomy, experimentation, and flexible decision-making (Hambrick and Finkelstein 1987; Magnan and St-Onge 1997; Choi and Ko 2024). In contrast, in industries characterized by stringent regulation or normative conformity—such as healthcare, finance, or energy—executive discretion may be constrained, regardless of formal authority, thus diminishing its utility in leveraging TMT diversity for strategic innovation (Gezelius 2025; Pauwelyn and Pelc 2025).

Similarly, the benefits of strategic consensus may be more pronounced in fast-changing and unpredictable markets, where rapid alignment and execution are critical for organizational survival and competitive agility (Homburg et al. 1999; Kim et al. 2025; Wei et al. 2025). In such environments, shared mental models among top executives facilitate swift collective responses, reduce ambiguity, and streamline adaptation to emergent conditions (Combe and Carrington 2015; Xie et al. 2025). On the other hand, in more stable environments, excessive consensus may produce groupthink or strategic inertia, particularly if it suppresses constructive dissent or alternative framing (Simons 1995; Markoczy 2001). In these contexts, the marginal benefit of consensus for innovation may be limited or even detrimental.

This hierarchical configuration of exogenous and endogenous variables offers a robust conceptual structure for future empirical testing. It proposes that the efficacy of internal strategic drivers is conditional, not absolute—varying in accordance with broader institutional, industrial, and environmental dynamics (Van de Ven and Drazin 1985; Meyer et al. 1993). By emphasizing this nested interdependence, the model contributes to an emerging stream of strategic management theory that rejects universal prescriptions in favor of contextual fit and contingency-based logics (Schoonhoven 1981; Miller 1981). It encourages scholars to adopt a more nuanced and integrative view of how organizational and environmental variables jointly shape innovation outcomes, and it calls for research designs that reflect this multilevel complexity.

In conclusion, the proposed framework underscores the importance of viewing strategic innovation as a product of nested, multilevel interactions between top management characteristics and contextual contingencies. By highlighting the hierarchical interplay between exogenous and endogenous variables, it moves beyond static or one-size-fits-all models, offering a more dynamic and situational understanding of how TMT diversity influences innovation outcomes. This approach not only refines core assumptions of Upper Echelons Theory but also aligns with contemporary

contingency perspectives in strategic management. It opens new avenues for empirical inquiry that are sensitive to environmental complexity, institutional variability, and organizational heterogeneity. Ultimately, this framework invites a paradigm shift toward more flexible, context-aware theorizing that can better account for the nuanced realities facing firms in today's volatile, uncertain, and globally interconnected environments.

4. Discussion

This section provides a comprehensive interpretation of the conceptual framework introduced in this study, with a focus on its theoretical structure, explanatory power, and avenues for future research. While Section 5 elaborates on implications, the purpose here is to dissect the conceptual logic, examine the assumptions, and reflect critically on the architecture of the Dual and Multilevel Moderation (DMLM) model.

The DMLM model advances understanding by embracing complexity. Unlike linear frameworks that treat variables in isolation, this model captures the interconnectedness of organizational phenomena and recognizes that strategic outcomes are shaped by multiple, interdependent forces. It posits that the relationship between TMT diversity and strategic innovation cannot be understood without accounting for how multiple moderators—both internal (e.g., managerial discretion and strategic consensus) and external (e.g., industrial norms and environmental dynamism)—interact with one another (Hambrick 2007; Miller 1981; Van de Ven and Drazin 1985). These layered interactions reflect the real-world dynamics of strategic decision-making, where firms operate in shifting regulatory, technological, and socio-political landscapes (Kafetzopoulos 2023; Mousa et al. 2025; Kim et al. 2025). A systems-oriented approach captures this ecological complexity by highlighting not just the direct effects of TMT characteristics, but also the conditional and emergent properties of the environment in which they operate (Schoonhoven 1981; Meyer et al. 1993).

This complexity, while theoretically ambitious, offers a more authentic and behaviorally grounded representation of strategic behavior than traditional models that rely on linear causality or isolated variables (Bosse and Phillips 2016; Hitt and Tyler 1991). By accounting for the layered interactions between individual, team, organizational, and environmental factors, the proposed framework reflects the real-world intricacies that shape executive decision-making. It challenges the dominant tendency in strategic management research to isolate variables and instead promotes a systems-oriented view that embraces the contextual embeddedness and cognitive boundedness of strategic actors.

In encouraging a departure from reductionist designs, the Dual and Multilevel Moderation (DMLM) model pushes for integrative theorizing that captures multilevel influences and recursive feedback loops. This not only advances the theoretical scope of upper echelons theory but also enhances its relevance in volatile, uncertain, and ambiguous environments where rigid models often fall short. As firms increasingly confront systemic disruptions and institutional fluidity, the DMLM model provides a more adaptable lens for understanding how diverse top management teams navigate complexity and drive innovation under dynamic conditions.

Another important contribution of this framework is its capacity to explain empirical inconsistencies in the TMT literature. Prior studies have reported mixed outcomes regarding the influence of diversity on innovation—some find positive effects, others find negative or null results (Williams and O'Reilly 1998; Nielsen 2010; Kilduff et al. 2000). The DMLM model suggests that these outcomes are contingent upon moderators such as managerial discretion and strategic consensus, which themselves are shaped by broader environmental conditions (Finkelstein and Hambrick 1990; Carpenter and Golden 1997; Wei et al. 2025). This insight reframes the inconsistency not as a failure of theory but as a signal that context matters deeply (González-Benito et al. 2012; Kellermanns et al. 2005). As such, the model invites researchers to ask not just "does TMT diversity matter?" but rather "under what conditions, and through what mechanisms, does it matter?" (Hambrick 2007; Hitt and Tyler 1991).

However, despite these strengths, the model introduces challenges that warrant discussion. One limitation is the difficulty of operationalization. Concepts such as discretion, consensus, industrial norms, and environmental dynamism are complex and may lack standardized measures across empirical contexts (Dess and Origer 1987; Mizruchi and Fein 1999; Mousa et al. 2025). Researchers will need to exercise methodological rigor and creativity when designing instruments or collecting secondary data (Rosenthal 1995; Aguinis et al. 2005). Moreover, the proposed interactions may require multilevel modeling techniques, which necessitate large sample sizes and nested data structures (González-Benito et al. 2012; Kellermanns et al. 2011). While these requirements are not insurmountable, they raise the bar for empirical testing and may restrict accessibility for some research teams (Markoczy 2001; Walter et al. 2013).

The model's generalizability also deserves scrutiny. While designed to be broadly applicable across industries, the relative influence of its components may vary considerably by sector, geographic region, or organizational lifecycle stage (Miller 1981; Meyer et al. 1993; Schoonhoven 1981). For example, the value of managerial discretion may be more pronounced in entrepreneurial firms than in mature, bureaucratic organizations (Cortes and Kiss 2023; Finkelstein and Hambrick 1990; Ahn and Kapinos 2014). Similarly, the impact of environmental dynamism may differ between volatile tech sectors and more stable public institutions (Kim et al. 2025; Xu et al. 2024). Recognizing these nuances can help refine the model's applicability and guide context-sensitive adaptations in future studies (Rajagopalan and Finkelstein 1992; Bai 2025).

Looking ahead, there are several promising directions for future research. First, empirical validation using mixed-methods approaches could enhance the robustness of the model. Qualitative case studies may illuminate the nuanced ways in which discretion and consensus manifest in executive settings, while large-scale quantitative studies could test the statistical significance and effect sizes of proposed relationships. Second, longitudinal research could examine how these dynamics evolve over time, especially as firms transition through periods of growth, crisis, or transformation. Third, comparative studies across national cultures or institutional environments can assess whether and how cultural norms interact with organizational moderators, thereby enriching the model's explanatory reach.

In addition, scholars may explore the microfoundations underlying the DMLM model. For instance, how do individual executives interpret environmental cues when exercising discretion? What cognitive or emotional processes underpin consensus formation in diverse teams? Addressing these questions could add psychological depth to the framework and connect macro-level strategy research with insights from behavioral science (Lazarus 1993; Kahneman and Miller 1986; Gioia and Thomas 1996). Furthermore, future work might examine how digital transformation, remote work, or AI-enabled decision systems influence the conditions assumed in the model, thus updating its relevance for contemporary organizational contexts (Mohammed et al. 2010; Wildman et al. 2014; McNamara et al. 2002).

By tackling these directions, researchers can build a more nuanced, dynamic, and empirically grounded understanding of how TMT diversity influences strategic innovation. The DMLM model serves as a conceptual launchpad for such inquiries, laying the groundwork for a richer dialogue between theory and practice in strategic management research.

5. Conclusion

This paper introduces a conceptual model that explains how TMT diversity influences strategic innovation through a nested system of moderators. By integrating managerial discretion and strategic consensus with environmental conditions like industrial norms and dynamism, the DMLM model provides a comprehensive framework for future research. The propositions outlined in this paper serve as a structured approach for examining how internal team characteristics interact with multi-layered contextual variables to impact innovation outcomes. Importantly, this approach addresses a key limitation in the existing literature, which often neglects the dynamic and interdependent nature of strategic decision-making environments. By viewing moderators not in isolation but as part of a multi-level and interactive system, this model offers a refined lens through which the mechanisms of strategic innovation can be more accurately understood. Researchers can use this model to identify underexplored configurations of variables that may better explain when and why TMT diversity drives innovation.

5.1 Theoretical Implications

The DMLM framework contributes to the development of strategic management theory in several important ways. First, it refines the upper echelons perspective by explicitly considering the conditions under which TMT diversity translates into strategic innovation. This nuanced approach suggests that TMT characteristics alone are insufficient to predict innovation outcomes; instead, it is the interplay between team diversity and situational moderators that shapes firm behavior. Second, by distinguishing between endogenous (managerial discretion, strategic consensus) and exogenous (industrial norms, environmental dynamism) moderators, the model introduces a layered approach to understanding the boundaries of managerial influence. This conceptual layering allows scholars to move beyond traditional moderation analyses and adopt a more integrative systems perspective. Third, the model provides a foundation for future theory development around nested contingencies—how broader institutional forces condition intra-organizational dynamics. Lastly, the model integrates

perspectives from norm theory, emphasizing that institutional expectations shape not only decisions but also the effectiveness of decision-making structures. This opens new avenues for research into how industry norms and societal expectations act as invisible structures guiding organizational behavior.

5.2 Practical Implications

From a managerial standpoint, the findings of this study offer valuable guidance on how to leverage TMT diversity to foster innovation. Organizations should consider the degree of discretion and consensus afforded to their leadership teams, particularly when seeking to drive innovation in complex and uncertain environments. Leaders need to ensure that the structural and cultural frameworks of their organizations enable—not constrain—diverse viewpoints and novel strategies. Developing leadership development programs that enhance discretionary judgment and strategic alignment could help unlock the innovative potential of diverse teams. Such programs should focus on cultivating adaptive thinking, resilience under ambiguity, and inclusive decision-making processes. Moreover, understanding industry-specific norms and adjusting managerial practices accordingly can prevent conflict between internal strategy and external expectations. This alignment between internal capabilities and external norms not only promotes legitimacy but also enhances innovation diffusion and acceptance. For instance, firms in highly regulated industries may benefit from building stronger consensus mechanisms to ensure alignment and compliance, while firms in dynamic sectors might benefit from empowering managers with greater discretion and risk tolerance. Additionally, policymakers can use these insights to design regulatory environments that balance oversight with the flexibility needed for strategic innovation. A supportive policy infrastructure can reinforce managerial discretion where appropriate, particularly in innovation-intensive sectors such as technology, healthcare, and green energy.

In summary, this conceptual model advances both theoretical inquiry and managerial practice. It calls for an integrated view of strategic behavior that recognizes the layered and contingent nature of innovation, inviting more robust and nuanced empirical exploration. By laying out a structured framework for future research and offering actionable insights for practitioners and policymakers, this paper serves as a bridge between abstract theory and real-world application. It underscores the importance of embracing complexity in strategic decision-making and advocates for organizational systems that are both adaptable and grounded in contextual understanding.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Professors Tsai Fu-Sheng and Shieh Hsiu-Ling for their guidance and support throughout the research process.

References

[1] Aguinis, H., Beaty, J.C., Boik, R.J. and Pierce, C.A. Effect size and power in assessing moderating effects of categorical variables using multiple regression: A 30-year review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 2005, 90(1), 94–107.

[2] Ahn, J.Y. and Kapinos, K.A. Industry-wide managerial discretion and executive compensation. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 2014, 12(4), 203–212.

[3] Amason, A.C. Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision-making: Resolving a paradox for top management team. Academy of Management Journal, 1996, 39, 123–148.

[4] Bai, X. Impact of social mindset of private entrepreneurs on enterprise resilience in environmental dynamism. Applied Economics, 2025, 1–15.

[5] Bantel, K.A. and Jackson, S.E. Top management and innovation in banking: Does the composition of the top team make a difference? Strategic Management Journal, 1989, 10, 107–124.

[6] Bao, Y., Fong, E. and Zhou, K.Z. Strategic consensus and firm performance: Beyond top management team. Working Paper, 2008.

[7] Bao, Y., Zhou, K.Z. and Su, C. Strategic consensus of market orientation: A transitional economy perspective. Journal of Strategic Marketing, 2015, 23(4), 364–378.

[8] Bennett, M. Managerial discretion, market failure and democracy. Journal of Business Ethics, 2023, 185(1), 33–47.

[9] Bosse, D.A. and Phillips, R.A. Agency theory and bounded self-interest. Academy of Management Review, 2016, 41(2), 276–297.

[10] Bourgeois, L.J. Strategic goals, perceived uncertainty, and economic performance in volatile environments. Academy of Management Journal, 1985, 28(3), 548–573.

[11] Bowman, C. and Ambrosini, V.R. Perceptions of strategic priorities, consensus and firm performance. Journal of Management Studies, 1997, 34(2), 241–258.

[12] Carpenter, M.A. and Golden, B.R. Perceived managerial discretion: A study of cause and effect. Strategic Management Journal, 1997, 18(3), 187–206.

[13] Choi, S. and Ko, Y. Top executives' discretion and organizational performance: Analysis of quasi-governmental organizations in Korean government. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 2024, 90(2), 490–509.

[14] Combe, I.A. and Carrington, D.J. Leaders' sensemaking under crises: Emerging cognitive consensus over time within management teams. The Leadership Quarterly, 2015, 26, 307–322.

[15] Cortes, A.F. and Kiss, A.N. Is managerial discretion high in small firms? A theoretical framework. Small Business Economics, 2023, 60(1), 157–172.

[16] Dess, G.G. and Origer, N.K. Environment, structure, and consensus in strategy formulation: A conceptual integration. Academy of Management Review, 1987, 12(2), 313–330.

[17] Dooley, K.J., Fryxell, G.E. and Judge, W.Q. Belaboring the not-so-obvious: Consensus, commitment, and strategy implementation speed and success. Journal of Management, 2000, 26(6), 1237–1257.

[18] Finkelstein, S. and Hambrick, D.C. Top-management-team tenure and organizational outcomes: The moderating role of managerial discretion. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1990, 35(3), 484–503.

[19] Finkelstein, S. and Hambrick, D.C. Strategic leadership: Top executives and their effects on organizations. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing, 1996.

[20] González-Benito, J.G., Aguinis, H. and Boyd, I. Coming to consensus on strategic consensus: A mediated moderation model of consensus and performance. Journal of Management, 2012, 38(6), 1685–1714.

[21] Gezelius, S.S. Administrative sanctions and loose legal norms: Resistance and street-level policy reversal in Norway. Regulation and Governance, 2025.

[22] Gioia, D.A. and Thomas, J.B. Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in

academia. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1996, 41(3), 370–403.

[23] Hambrick, D.C. Upper echelons theory: An update. Academy of Management Review, 2007, 32(2), 334–343.

[24] Hambrick, D.C. and Finkelstein, S. Managerial discretion: A bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1987, 9, 369–406.

[25] Hitt, M.A. and Tyler, B.B. Strategic decision models: Integrating different perspectives. Strategic Management Journal, 1991, 12(5), 327–351.

[26] Homburg, C., Krohmer, H. and Workman, J.P. Strategic consensus and performance: The role of strategy type and market-related dynamism. Strategic Management Journal, 1999, 20(4), 339–357.

[27] Jehn, K.A. A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1995, 40, 256–282.

[28] Kafetzopoulos, D. Environmental dynamism and sustainability: The mediating role of innovation, strategic flexibility and HR development. Management Decision, 2023, 61(6), 1697–1716.

[29] Kahneman, D. and Miller, D.T. Norm theory: Comparing reality to its alternatives. Psychological Review, 1986, 93(2), 136–153.

[30] Kellermanns, F.W., Walter, J., Floyd, S.W., Lechner, C. and Shaw, J.C. The lack of consensus about strategic consensus: Advancing theory and research. Journal of Management, 2005, 31(5), 719–735.

[31] Kellermanns, F.W., Walter, J., Lechner, C. and Floyd, S.W. To agree or not agree? A meta-analytical review. Journal of Business Research, 2011, 64, 126–133.

[32] Kim, K., Seo, E.H. and Kim, C.Y. The relationships between environmental dynamism, absorptive capacity, organizational ambidexterity, and innovation performance from the dynamic capabilities perspective. Sustainability, 2025, 17(2), 449.

[33] Kilduff, M., Angelmar, R. and Mehra, A. Top management-team diversity and firm performance: Examining the role of cognitions. Organization Science, 2000, 11(1), 21–34.

[34] Li, S. and Zhang, K. The moderating effect of environmental dynamism on entrepreneurship and open innovation. South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences, 2025, 28(1), 5767.

[35] Magnan, M.L. and St-Onge, S. Bank performance and executive compensation: A managerial discretion perspective. Strategic Management Journal, 1997, 18(7), 573–581.

[36] Markoczy, L. Consensus formation during strategic change. Strategic Management Journal, 2001, 22(11), 1013–1031.

[37] McNamara, G.M., Luce, R.A. and Tompson, G.H. Examining the effect of complexity in strategic group knowledge structures on firm performance. Strategic Management Journal, 2002, 23(2), 153–170.

[38] Meyer, A.D., Tsui, A.S. and Hinings, C.R. Configurational approaches to organizational analysis. Academy of Management Journal, 1993, 36(6), 1175–1195.

[39] Miller, D. Toward a new contingency approach: The search for organizational gestalts. Journal of Management Studies, 1981, 18(1), 1–26.

[40] Mizruchi, M.S. and Fein, L.C. The social construction of organizational knowledge: A study of the uses of coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1999, 44, 653–683.

[41] Mohammed, S., Ferzandi, L. and Hamilton, K. Metaphor no more: A 15-year review of the team mental model construct. Journal of Management, 2010, 36(4), 876–910.

[42] Mousa, M., Tarba, S., Arslan, A. and Cooper, S.C. When extreme work becomes the norm: An exploration of coping

strategies of public sector nurses. Public Management Review, 2025, 27(1), 297–316.

[43] Nielsen, S. Top management team diversity: A review of theories and methodologies. International Journal of Management Reviews, 2010, 12(3), 301–316.

[44] Pauwelyn, J. and Pelc, K. Can informal judicial norms protect against political pressure? Review of International Political Economy, 2025, 32(1), 53–75.

[45] Rosenthal, R. Writing meta-analytic reviews. Psychological Bulletin, 1995, 118(2), 183–192.

[46] Rajagopalan, N. and Finkelstein, S. Effects of strategic orientation and environmental change on senior management reward systems. Strategic Management Journal, 1992, 13, 127–142.

[47] Schoonhoven, C.B. Problems with contingency theory: Testing assumptions hidden within the language of contingency theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26(3), 349–377.

[48] Simons, T.L. Top management team consensus, heterogeneity, and debate as contingent predictors of company performance: The complementarity of group structure and process. Academy of Management Proceedings, 1995, 62–66.

[49] Talke, K., Salomo, S. and Kock, A. Top management team diversity and strategic innovation orientation: The relationship and consequences for innovativeness and performance. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 2011, 28(6), 819–832.

[50] Van de Ven, A.H. and Drazin, R. The concept of fit in contingency theory. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1985, 333–365.

[51] Walter, J., Kellermanns, F.W., Floyd, S.W., Veiga, J.F. and Matherne, C.F. Strategic alignment: A missing link in the relationship between strategic consensus and organizational performance. Strategic Organization, 2013, 11(3), 304–328.

[52] Wei, L.Q., Ling, Y., Kellermanns, F.W. and Zhang, Y. Strategic consensus at founding and product innovation performance in high-tech ventures. Journal of Business Research, 2025, 188, 115082.

[53] Wiersema, M.F. and Bantel, K.A. Top management team demography and corporate strategic change. Academy of Management Journal, 1992, 35(1), 91–121.

[54] Williams, K.Y. and O'Reilly, C.A. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1998, 20, 77–140.

[55] Wildman, J., Salas, E. and Scott, C.P.R. Measuring cognition in teams: A cross-domain review. Human Factors, 2014, 56(5), 911–941.

[56] Xie, Y., Xia, Q., Song, J. and Hu, S. Can sustainability orientation make firms more resilient? Exploring the role of digital business model innovation, digital orientation, and environmental dynamism. Sustainable Development, 2025, 33(1), 364–378.

[57] Xu, S., Yaacob, Z. and Cao, D. How transformational leadership promotes employee creativity within the context of environmental dynamism: A multilevel perspective. International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 2024, 27(2), 101–119.