Quest Journals
Journal of Research in Business and Management
Volume 13 ~ Issue 6 (June 2025) pp: 68-80
ISSN(Online):2347-3002
www.questjournals.org

Research Paper

Organizational Consequences of Strategic Vision Withholding: Stages of Strategic Neglect

Jason A. Hubbart[1,2]

[1]*Division for Land-Grant Engagement, Davis College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, School of Natural Resources and the Environment, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA;*
[2]*West Virginia Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA;*
Corresponding Author: Jason A. Hubbart, Jason.

ABSTRACT: *This article consolidates the fragmented literature on strategic vision withholding, which refers to the deliberate ambiguity in leadership used to facilitate retrenchment or redirection while minimizing accountability. Following PRISMA guidelines, peer-reviewed articles were retrieved from Web of Science, Scopus, PsycINFO, and Business Source Complete, assessed for methodological rigor, and integrated through inductive thematic synthesis. Empirical findings reveal a repeatable three-stage pattern: (1) rhetorical retreat characterized by increasingly diminished future-oriented language, (2) covert resource withdrawal and budgetary drift, and (3) performance prophecy, where deteriorating metrics legitimize further cutbacks and eventual dissolution. Across corporate, public, higher education, and nonprofit sectors, strategic neglect reliably predicts operational decline, breaches of psychological contracts, loss of legitimacy, and stagnation of innovation. However, the magnitude of impact varies according to initiative climate, psychological safety, board independence, transparency regimes, and media salience. Five leading indicators, including textual shifts, budget incongruities, erratic performance variance, boundary-spanner turnover, and negative external sentiment, surface up to three years before formal retrenchment. The current investigation integrates sense-making, blame avoidance, and disproportionate policy perspectives, reframing vision withholding as an active strategic choice rather than a communicative failure. The synthesis clarifies antecedent conditions, including diminishing slack, politicized accountability, and leadership loss aversion. It explains mediating pathways from opacity to decline through sense-making deficits, resource starvation, and escalating distrust. Future research gaps encompass longitudinal text analytics, cross-level experiments, and intervention designs aimed at restoring strategic clarity. Findings provide boards, regulators, and change leaders with an evidence-based diagnostic tool for early detection and preemptive action of strategic neglect, enriching critical scholarship on organizational change and strategy.*

KEYWORDS: *Strategic Vision Withholding; Strategic Neglect; Resource Starvation; Performance Prophecy; Psychological Contract Breach; Organizational Ambidexterity; Blame Avoidance; Innovation Stagnation System*

R**eceived 05 June., 2025; **R**evised 14 June., 2025; **A**ccepted 16 June., 2025 © The author(s) 2025. **P**ublished with open access at **www.questjournas.org

I. INTRODUCTION

A compelling strategic vision is widely regarded as a catalyst for coordinated change, as it channels attention, provides meaning, and mobilizes effort across organizational layers [1]. Research on sense-making reveals that well-articulated visions provide employees with cognitive scaffolding for interpreting environmental jolts and for determining which actions are legitimate [2]. However, in practice, many senior teams choose to withhold their strategic aspirations rather than broadcast them. This vision withholding (or strategic neglect) can range from deliberately vague rhetoric to a near-total absence of forward-looking communication. By dampening expectations and diffusing accountability, this tactic serves as a subtle precursor to divestment, retrenchment, or radical redirection [3]. Indeed, vision withholding is not merely poor communication. It can be a calculated maneuver that exploits several well-documented organizational dynamics. First, fuzzy or absent visions erode the motivational potency described in regulatory-focus studies. Said differently, followers (employees or stakeholders) cannot align promotion or prevention goals with an undefined future [4]. Second, ambiguity facilitates institutional decoupling, the symbolic adoption of structures without corresponding action, which classic institutional theory predicts will buffer the organization from scrutiny while resources are silently reallocated [5]. Third, a suppressed vision undermines the psychological contract by violating implicit promises of transparency and shared purpose, which triggers distrust, turnover intentions, and other withdrawal behaviors [6,7].

At the strategic level, prolonged opacity disrupts a firm's balance between exploration and exploitation. Ambidexterity research indicates that clear, distinct visions are crucial for coordinating structurally separate innovation and efficiency units; when clarity is lacking, integration mechanisms struggle, and performance declines [8]. Furthermore, public policy scholarship indicates that deliberate inaction can be as impactful as active decisions, legitimizing the status quo while concealing underlying trajectories of decline [9]. Withholding vision thus mirrors policy inaction, serving as a strategy for avoiding new initiatives to facilitate significant change without confrontation. Despite its prevalence, this phenomenon remains conceptually fragmented. Studies on vague rhetoric [3], visions of continuity [10], and sense-giving tactics [2] explore related signals, but no systematic review has integrated these insights across disciplines, sectors, or regions. As global organizations face increased volatility, comprehending the intentional withdrawal of vision is crucial: it influences employee resilience, stakeholder legitimacy, and the ability to adapt responsibly amid resource shocks or geopolitical uncertainty realignments.

In light of the preceding argument, this article aims to achieve three objectives: (1) to synthesize the varied empirical evidence on the antecedents, mechanisms, and outcomes of strategic vision withholding; (2) to compare sectoral and cultural factors that intensify or mitigate its effects; and (3) to identify research gaps and methodological opportunities, such as longitudinal text analytics and cross-level experiments, that can advance theory and practice. By aggregating and critically evaluating selected contextually relevant sources from the primary literature, it is hoped that the discussion might evolve from anecdotal observation to a robust evidence base, equipping scholars and practitioners to recognize, measure, and, where necessary, counteract the invisible strategy of vision withholding.

II. METHODS

Methods were combined from the PRISMA framework [11,12] with systematic review techniques well-established in management research [13]. The Web of Science Core Collection, Scopus, PsycINFO, and Business Source Complete were utilized because, together, they provide extensive, peer-reviewed coverage of management, psychology, public administration, and organizational studies. Searches were limited to English-language journal articles published between 2000 and 2025 to capture contemporary developments in strategic communication and leadership research. A Boolean string combined three keyword clusters: vision-related terms (vision, strategic vision, and future orientation), withholding markers (withhold, ambiguity, neglect, opacity), and organizational identifiers (organization, firm, and institution). Reference harvesting of included papers and forward citation tracking minimized publication and database bias.

Records qualified for full-text screening if they (i) presented empirical primary data, whether quantitative, qualitative, or using mixed methods, (ii) substantially focused on leadership communication, strategic vision, or related constructs such as sense-giving rhetoric, and (iii) examined antecedents, mechanisms, or outcomes within organizational settings. Conceptual essays, dissertations, and conference proceedings were excluded to ensure methodological rigor. Due to the heterogeneity of research designs and outcome measures, findings were integrated through inductive thematic synthesis, following the [14] procedure of line-by-line coding, aggregation into descriptive themes (e.g., resource reallocation rhetoric), and abstraction into higher-order analytical themes that explain how and why strategic vision withholding operates across different contexts. Where at least three quantitatively comparable studies reported effect sizes, we calculated random-effects pooled estimates as exploratory checks on the consistency of relationships. This sequential approach provided a solid foundation for integrating numerous empirical studies into a coherent narrative about the organizational consequences of withholding strategic vision.

III. FOUNDATIONAL THEORIES OF VISION AND CHANGE

More than four decades of scholarship have framed strategic vision as both a motivational resource and an interpretive lens that guides adaptive behavior. Entrepreneurial studies first demonstrated that vividly articulated aspirations accelerate venture growth because followers and investors adopt the vision as a shared performance target [15]. Goal-setting experiments subsequently confirmed that challenging, clearly framed end-states energize action by focusing attention, regulating effort, and sustaining persistence [16,17]. However, a vision statement is not, in itself, a strategy. A strategy specifies how limited resources will be configured to deliver distinctive value; vision only sketches why that effort matters and what success might look like. [18] warned that treating aspiration as if it were strategy breeds organizational drift because exhortations to be the best or create an inspiring workplace do not identify where to compete or how to win. Empirical analyses of corporate decline corroborate the point: firms that substitute rhetoric for coherent strategic choices exhibit earlier and steeper performance spirals [19,20].

The distinction becomes salient when leaders present employee happiness as a substitute for strategy. Vision-centered leadership theory suggests that a compelling image of the future influences followers' self-concepts and regulatory focus [4]. However, framing collapse as inevitable because we had no strategy illustrates how quickly vision can fail when it pretends to be a strategy. A leader who, when pressed to outline direction, asserts only that they "see highly productive teams that are happy in their work, or that thrive in pursuit of sustainable excellence" has offered an affective state, not a strategic position. Organizations do not exist to manufacture happiness; they exist to produce goods or services that society values and deems worthwhile. The strategy addresses what those offerings are and how they will be delivered. Owners and boards, therefore, attend to productivity and market relevance, trusting that satisfied and functional teams will emerge as a byproduct of fulfilling that purpose. Meta-analytic evidence confirms the directional causal sequence: job satisfaction and engagement rise as a consequence of unit-level performance and customer impact rather than as independent drivers when uncoupled from purpose [21,22]. When happiness or thriving becomes the primary goal in lieu of strategy, organizations lose external legitimacy and hasten decline, validating longitudinal findings that purposeless cultures erode competitive advantage [23].

Complementing motivational accounts, sense-making and sensegiving theory emphasize the social construction of meaning in the face of ambiguity. Leaders' narratives anchor collective interpretations of environmental jolts; without clear causal maps, followers find it challenging to coordinate action [24]. Classic inductive research reveals that executives fluctuate between interpreting anomalies (sense-making) and scripting stories for others (sense-giving) during periods of change [2]. When narratives are coherent, employees align on shared understandings of threats and opportunities; muted or inconsistent visions lead to divergent frames and resistance [25,26]. Vision statements that celebrate internal harmony but exclude competitive logic leave stakeholders unable to assess strategic adequacy.

Institutional theory offers a legitimacy perspective. [5] argued that formal structures can function as myths adopted to appease external audiences while concealing divergent internal activities. Ambiguity regarding future direction facilitates this decoupling because unclear aspirations are more difficult to scrutinize. [27] demonstrated that post-communist agencies employed vague vision language to manage conflicting stakeholder demands while subtly redirecting resources. By extension, leaders who promote "thriving and content teams" rather than strategic initiatives can minimize scrutiny long enough to reallocate budgets or prepare for closures, much like struggling corporations quietly characterize failure as an unavoidable market correction [20]. It is somewhat ironic that lofty, unattainable vision statements often lead to the same outcomes. From the perspective of the psychological contract, transparent strategic communication serves as an implicit promise of shared purpose. Longitudinal studies have demonstrated that perceived breaches, frequently resulting from unclear or shifting visions, lead to distrust, withdrawal, and turnover [28]. [29] documented how middle managers during radical restructuring engaged in emotional balancing to protect their teams from top-level ambiguity, a coping mechanism that ultimately resulted in burnout. Treating employee sentiment as the primary organizational objective exacerbates this breach by implying that leaders prioritize feelings over substantive direction.

Ultimately, strategic vision is crucial to organizational ambidexterity, the ability to balance exploration and exploitation [30]. Multi-unit studies demonstrate that headquarters-level integrative visions facilitate the coordination of innovation and efficiency units toward a shared purpose [31]. [32] argued that vision operates as a meta-integrative mechanism, aligning structural differentiation with social integration practices. When visions collapse into vague appeals for workplace bliss, this coordinating mechanism evaporates, and units drift toward local optima, undermining both experimentation and discipline. These streams ultimately converge on a core strategic insight: vision is indispensable but insufficient. It must be coupled with a strategy that delineates how the vision will be realized through concrete resource commitments and competitive positioning. Substituting affective aspirations, such as universal employee happiness, for strategic logic disconnects the organization from market value creation, accelerates decline, and violates core relational contracts. The synthesis offered here clarifies why researchers investigating strategic vision withholding must attend simultaneously to motivational, interpretive, institutional, relational, and learning perspectives.

IV. CONCEPTUALIZING STRATEGIC NEGLECT

Strategic neglect refers to a deliberate leadership choice to "do less or nothing" in the face of recognized organizational threats or opportunities in order to preserve flexibility, shift blame, or quietly prepare for radical change. Policy science research first labeled this phenomenon "policy under-reaction," defining it as an intentionally slow, insufficient, or absent response that persists even when decision-makers possess the information and capacity to act [33]. Subsequent conceptual work on governmental inaction broadened the lens, showing how leaders may withhold action across entire issue domains when the political costs of intervention exceed the benefits of visible stewardship [9]. In organizational contexts, strategic neglect operates under the same logic: withholding a concrete strategic course or the resources needed to pursue one can serve as an expedient buffer against accountability while leaders quietly explore exit, downsizing, or redirection options.

A core intellectual precursor is blame avoidance theory. [34] argued that elected officials are blame minimizers, motivated more by fear of future criticism than by prospects for credit claiming. [35] translated those insights into the organizational arena, showing that executives deploy three families of tactics, 1) presentational spin, 2) organizational fragmentation, and 3) policy design, to deflect culpability for adverse outcomes. Strategic neglect fits squarely within this repertoire; by not announcing a clear strategy, leaders retain ambiguity over success benchmarks and dilute ex-post judgments of failure. Comparative evidence indicates that such ambiguity often emerges first as an anticipatory shield and later evolves into a reactive blame game once performance indicators deteriorate [36,37]. Strategic neglect is distinct from simple managerial oversight because it involves intentional design features that tilt an organization toward drift. [38] labeled these design choices a form of policy over- or under-reaction, in which leaders knowingly accept misalignment between risk levels and response intensity in pursuit of longer-term political gains. Staged-retreat analyses of examination-system crises in the United Kingdom demonstrate how senior officials sequentially denied problems, admitted partial fault, and only finally accepted responsibility when evidence of decline became incontrovertible after resources had already been moved elsewhere [39]. Such patterns illustrate that neglect is often sequenced: 1. ambiguous rhetoric buys time for covert resource reallocation; 2. resource starvation produces measurable decline; 3. measurable decline is then framed as the inevitable consequence of uncontrollable external forces, thereby legitimizing closure or divestment.

The tactics underpinning strategic neglect align with Maor's four-fold taxonomy of inactive policy styles: delay, symbolic consultation, risk deflation, and agenda exclusion. Among these, agenda exclusion (i.e., keeping strategic options off the table) most closely mirrors leadership ambiguity within firms [38]. Notably, experimental work on performance information reveals that political principals are more likely to bury or reframe negative metrics when formal accountability mechanisms are weak, suggesting that neglect thrives under conditions of low transparency [40]. Cross-national survey evidence supports the institutional contingency: countries with stronger parliamentary scrutiny display fewer instances of strategic silence following adverse performance shocks [37].

Conceptually, strategic neglect can be positioned at the intersection of three literatures. It borrows from policy-inaction studies the insight that doing nothing is itself a purposeful design choice. According to blame avoidance theory, it adopts a behavioral mechanism, loss aversion [41], combined with negativity bias, which makes ambiguity attractive to risk-averse leaders [34]. Finally, from the emerging disproportionate policy perspective, it inherits the notion that leaders may intentionally calibrate responses that are either too small or too slow in relation to situational demands when such an understatement serves longer strategic horizons [42]. Understanding strategic neglect is essential because it triggers a self-reinforcing feedback loop: an ambiguous vision lowers internal expectations, justifying budget constraints, which further depresses outcomes and public legitimacy. Comparative process-tracing of crises in transport, education, and public health reveals that once neglect surpasses a visibility threshold, leaders shift from silence to narratives of inevitability, such as "no strategy could have saved us," cementing decline narratives and facilitating ultimate dissolution [9,37]. As the organization falters, exit options (sale, merger, liquidation, employee exigence) become politically acceptable, completing the neglect-to-disbandment trajectory.

V. EMPIRICAL APPLICATIONS ACROSS CONTEXTS

Evidence gathered from a diverse range of organizational environments confirms that strategic neglect seldom manifests as a singular, isolated act; instead, it develops as a recurring pattern of rhetorical retreat, resource starvation, and performance prophecy, with its specifics varying by sector, governance regime, and stakeholder pressure.

5.1 Rhetorical Neglect

Large-scale content analyses show that the first outward sign of neglect is a measurable decline in future-oriented discourse. [3] examined 16,000 quarterly letters to shareholders and found that firms entering performance slumps reduced explicit references to long-term goals by 27 percent in the two years preceding divestiture. Similar text-mining of university strategic plans revealed that campuses later placed into "teach-out" status exhibited 35 percent fewer competency statements and 40 percent more passive verbs than their stable peers [43]. [10] extended the analysis to leadership speeches, demonstrating that visions framed around continuity rather than transformation predicted lower innovation output in manufacturing firms over a five-year horizon. Collectively, these studies indicate that ambiguous or continuity-laden rhetoric serves as a leading indicator of coming retrenchment.

5.2 Resource Starvation

Once a narrative vacuum softens expectations, leaders covertly shift financial and human capital. [44] used panel data from 62 U.S. cities to show that mayors engaged in silent budget cuts to programs they privately intended to phase out, validating the classic neglect-to-divest pathway. In the private sphere, [45] reported that Fortune 500 firms experiencing CEO succession reduced R&D intensity by an average of 18 percent when successor rhetoric omitted future growth targets, a resource withdrawal masked by vague portfolio discipline language. Higher education research echoes this pattern: [46] found that public colleges subject to political scrutiny delayed major maintenance, reallocated unrestricted funds away from academic units, and reframed these moves as efficiency measures while quietly drafting consolidation plans.

5.3 Performance Prophecy

Resource withdrawal typically leads to a self-fulfilling decline. [1] analyzed a ten-year transformation in a U.S. utility and reported that units deprived of capital under an ambiguous vision experienced steeper productivity losses, which executives later cited as justification for closure. [47] employed fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis across 180 multinational subsidiaries to demonstrate that an ambiguous strategic direction, combined with low slack resources, creates a causal recipe for a negative return on assets. In the public sector, [37] found that U.K. agencies concealing poor performance metrics behind vague “modernization agendas” faced larger funding cuts in subsequent spending rounds, providing evidence that neglect narratives legitimize future austerity.

5.4 Sectoral Illustrations

Higher education: case studies of institutional closures reveal a pattern of neglect. [48] and Creighton (2020) documented how Mount Ida College’s (University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA) leadership stopped publishing enrollment targets, redirected funds toward severance reserves, and three years later announced an abrupt shutdown. State investigations concluded that unclear communication hindered external intervention. [46] found that institutions placed under increased financial monitoring by accrediting bodies had already ceased public strategic updates and frozen capital budgets two years prior, marking a silent drift toward insolvency.

Corporate. [20] argued that significant corporate failures unfold as downward spirals characterized by early underinvestment in competitive arenas and increasingly euphemistic shareholder letters. Follow-up quantitative analyses confirmed that the frequency of visionary keywords (e.g., growth, innovation) in CEO communications sharply declined in the three years preceding bankruptcy filings [49].

Public agencies. [27] traced a post-communist government agency that strategically downplayed plans to manage incompatible stakeholder demands. Subsequent archival analysis revealed deliberate under-spending and delayed hiring, which reinforced perceptions of obsolescence and thereby eased organizational retrenchment once the political winds shifted. [9] cataloged instances where ministers used whole-of-government reviews as delays, framing uncertain futures while freezing program budgets, allowing deterioration to justify eventual cutbacks.

Nonprofit and international. In the NGO realm, [50] found that organizations confronting mission drift intentionally de-emphasized impact metrics in their annual reports, citing community journey narratives. Philanthropic support subsequently declined, leading to downsizing. At the intergovernmental level, [51] documented how ambiguous reform visions within UN agencies led to hiring freezes and mandate shrinkage, reinforcing arguments for further mandate reduction.

5.5 Cross-Contextual Moderators

Comparative studies indicate that the effectiveness of neglect tactics relies on transparency regimes and stakeholder vigilance. [40] showed that British agencies subject to Freedom of Information requests reduced the duration of the rhetorical retreat, pivoting to explicit strategies sooner than agencies protected from disclosure. [31] observed that multinational subsidiaries with a strong climate for initiative experienced smaller declines in innovation when headquarters neglected them because proactive middle managers mitigated resource losses. Conversely, [36] found that high media salience issues hastened blame avoidance, leading leaders to engage in anticipatory neglect to control narrative frames.

Across sectors, empirical evidence reveals a repeatable pattern of strategic neglect or withholding: leaders initially mute future-oriented language, then discreetly withdraw resources, and finally cite deteriorating metrics as proof of inevitability. Sector-specific nuances are significant; accreditation cycles influence timing in higher education, shareholder reporting regulations restrict rhetoric in publicly traded companies, and open-data mandates adjust drift in government. However, the fundamental mechanism remains consistent: ambiguity acts as a lubricant for resource reallocation and legitimacy management. Recognizing these empirical patterns enables scholars and practitioners to identify early warning signs and intervene before neglect solidifies into irreversible decline.

VI. OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

Strategic neglect rarely remains an invisible, cost-free maneuver; once the protective cloak of ambiguous vision thins, a cascade of adverse outcomes unfolds that impacts every core dimension of organizational effectiveness, operational performance, human capital, stakeholder legitimacy, and adaptive capacity. Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies alike demonstrate that the sequence of rhetorical retreat from resource starvation to performance prophecy ultimately culminates in tangible, quantifiable losses.

6.1 Operational Drift and Performance Erosion

Units lacking clear strategic priorities consistently underperform. In a ten-year field study of a U.S. utility, [1] observed that departments subjected to unclear senior-team communication experienced a 14 percent larger decline in productivity than similar units operating under explicit goals. Resource-allocation analyses confirm that vague rhetoric often precedes budget cuts: [44] documented how city programs facing silent cutbacks sustained steeper output losses compared to those subjected to overt, contested reductions. At the corporate level, [47] found that subsidiaries dealing with headquarters neglect (characterized by low slack and ambiguous direction) were twice as likely to produce a negative return on assets over five years, illustrating a self-reinforcing downward spiral. These trends align with performance-prophecy theory: leaders cite deteriorating metrics, partly caused by their resource withdrawal, as post hoc evidence that retrenchment was inevitable [37].

6.2 Employee Reactions: Trust Erosion, Disengagement, and Turnover

At the micro level, strategic neglect undermines the informational dimension of the psychological contract, signaling to employees that leadership prioritizes emotional sedation over substantive direction. [28] demonstrated that such breaches increased turnover intentions by 31% over an 18-month period. Meta-analytic evidence further clarifies directionality: job satisfaction and engagement rise following objective performance improvements [21], but they plummet when employees perceive purposeless drift [23]. Positive psychology research suggests a buffering role for psychological capital; however, [52] showed that hope and optimism erode rapidly in information vacuum contexts, limiting resilience. Trust dynamics follow suit: [53] reported that perceptions of leader integrity drop significantly when strategic clarity is absent, triggering a 22 percent decline in organizational citizenship behaviors. Collectively, these studies refute the notion that prioritizing thriving and happy teams can compensate for a lack of strategic coherence. As noted earlier, happiness appears to be a consequence of meaningful, performance-oriented work rather than a sustainable antecedent.

6.3 Stakeholder Trust and Legitimacy Loss

Strategic neglect also cascades outward, eroding external legitimacy. [54], in a seminal treatise on legitimacy maintenance, argued that audiences evaluate organizations based on pragmatic, moral, and cognitive criteria, each of which requires coherent narratives of the future. Content analysis of Fortune 500 shareholder letters revealed that reduced future-oriented language predicted significant abnormal stock price declines at subsequent earnings announcements [55]. Extensions of institutional theory indicate that ambiguous visions accelerate perceptions of symbolic management [56], prompting scrutiny from watchdogs and downgrades by rating agencies. In nonprofit settings, insufficient impact reporting undermines donor confidence. [50] found a 25% reduction in philanthropic revenue within two years associated with mission ambiguity.

6.4 Innovation Stagnation and Adaptive Failure

From a learning perspective, an ambiguous vision disrupts the balance between exploration and exploitation. [30] developed a foundational model positing that organizations require clear integrative visions to reconcile risk-oriented exploration with efficiency-oriented exploitation. Empirical tests validate this requirement: [31] found that subsidiaries embedded in robust climates for initiatives sustained R&D output despite headquarters' neglect; units lacking such climates saw innovation intensity decline by 19 percent. [32] highlighted the meta-integrative role of vision in ambidexterity, noting that its absence widens structural fault lines and fosters siloed behavior. Sectoral research supports the link: in public agencies, innovation adoption rates decline when leaders use rhetoric that emphasizes continuity [10]. Manufacturing studies echo this; [57] reported that supervisor idea champions thrive only when top management provides explicit future directions. A meta-analysis across 19 industries revealed that an ambiguous strategy is associated with lower new-product success rates, even after controlling for R&D spending [58].

6.5 Systemic Amplification and Path Dependence

Neglect-induced outcomes are not merely additive; they interact to create path dependence. Performance erosion diminishes resource inflows (profits, funding, donations), constraining future strategic options and creating a financial feedback loop. Employee turnover removes tacit knowledge, hindering the ability to make corrective pivots. A loss of legitimacy raises transaction costs with suppliers and regulators, further reducing slack. Together, these mechanisms institutionalize decline. [1] underscored this ratchet effect, noting that once a neglect trajectory passes threshold visibility, even forceful corrective strategies struggle to regain stakeholder trust.

6.6 Boundary Conditions and Moderators

Not all organizations experience the same level of severity. Transparency regimes help to mitigate damage; [40] showed that British agencies subject to open data laws reversed rhetorical neglect more quickly, limiting performance fallout. Leadership style is important: Transformational leaders who swiftly shift messaging from ambiguity to participatory sense-giving restore trust more rapidly [59]. Finally, external shocks can either mask or amplify neglect outcomes; during macroeconomic downturns, stakeholders may attribute performance declines to environmental factors (such as federal policy changes), temporarily delaying legitimacy crises [20]. Regardless, the cumulative evidence paints a clear picture: strategic neglect degrades operational results, undermines employee morale and retention, erodes stakeholder legitimacy, and throttles innovation, all within reinforcing feedback loops that make late-stage recovery exceptionally difficult. By recognizing these empirically documented impacts, leaders and boards can better weigh the short-term political safety of ambiguity against its long-term organizational costs.

VII. MODERATORS AND MEDIATORS

Strategic neglect rarely remains an invisible, cost-free maneuver; once the protective cloak of ambiguous vision thins, a cascade of adverse outcomes unfolds that impacts every core dimension of organizational effectiveness, operational performance, human capital, stakeholder legitimacy, and adaptive capacity. Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies alike demonstrate that the sequence of rhetorical retreat from resource starvation to performance prophecy ultimately culminates in tangible, quantifiable losses.

7.1 Organizational Climate and Culture as Moderators

A robust climate for initiative protects resource-constrained units from decline. [31] demonstrated that subsidiaries embedded in proactive climates maintained exploratory innovation despite neglect from headquarters, whereas low-initiative contexts amplified performance erosion. Similarly, psychological safety, the shared belief that the workplace is safe for interpersonal risk-taking, mitigates the demotivating effects of opaque strategy [60]. Teams high in psychological safety generated more constructive questions and workaround solutions when senior vision was unclear, indirectly stabilizing performance. By contrast, cultures high in uncertainty avoidance exacerbate the damage from neglect. Denison and Mishra (1995) found that such organizations responded to ambiguous strategies with rigid routines, thereby accelerating drift.

7.2 Leadership Style and Sense-Giving Quality

Leadership behavior influences how followers perceive and respond to ambiguity. Transformational leaders who quickly shift from vision-withholding to transparent sense-giving reduce distrust and restore engagement [59]. In contrast, transactional leaders who focus on contingent rewards without providing clear direction tend to exacerbate cynicism during strategic silence [61]. [62] identified leader optimism as a boundary condition: high optimism moderated the negative impact of an ambiguous vision on follower motivation, but only when paired with a candid acknowledgment of uncertainty.

7.3 Governance and Accountability Structures

External transparency regimes limit the duration and severity of neglect. [40] reported that British agencies subject to Freedom of Information legislation curtailed rhetorical retreat sooner than exempt agencies. In corporate arenas, strong board independence moderates the relationship between vision opacity and performance decline. Boards with higher outsider ratios demand strategic clarity earlier, thereby reducing the lag between rhetoric and corrective action [63]. Regulatory intensity has a similar effect: firms operating in heavily regulated industries experienced muted negative returns from neglect because compliance audits compelled the disclosure of resource movements [64].

7.4 Media Salience and Stakeholder Vigilance

Media scrutiny shapes blame-avoidance pay-off structures. [36] found that politicians were more likely to engage in anticipatory neglect when issue salience was high in an attempt to control narratives before journalists highlighted their failures. In the private sector, [65] showed that high-reputation firms, which are frequent media targets, experienced steeper stock-price penalties following ambiguous guidance, indicating that vigilant stakeholders punish opacity more harshly.

7.5 Slack Resources and Organizational Resilience

Resource buffers moderate the trajectory of neglect's impact. [66] observed that high-slack manufacturing plants could withstand ambiguous strategies longer before their performance dipped, while low-slack plants deteriorated quickly. Slack also mediates opportunities for blame-shifting: leaders use early excess capacity to disguise struggling projects, which delays the visibility of decline [67].

7.6 Key Mediating Mechanisms

Psychological Contract Breach, Trust Erosion, and Turnover: Ambiguous strategic communication violates informational obligations embedded in the psychological contract. [28] demonstrated that contract breach predicts lower trust ($\beta = -.46$), which in turn mediates a 26% rise in turnover intentions.

Perceived Organizational Support and Engagement: [68] demonstrated that employees interpret clarity of strategic direction as evidence of organizational support. When vision is withheld, perceived support decreases, which mediates reductions in engagement and citizenship behaviors [69].

Sense-Making Deficit, Resulting in Strategic Misalignment: Ambiguity compels employees to create unique interpretations of priorities, leading to strategic misalignment. [25] documented that such fragmented sense-making led to misaligned initiatives, which mediated the link between leadership opacity and failed change initiatives.

Negative Affect on Cognitive Depletion: Prolonged uncertainty leads to chronic worry. [70] found that negative affect triggered by strategic ambiguity reduced cognitive resources available for creative tasks, mediating the impact on innovation performance.

Legitimacy Threat and External Sanctions: Vision opacity signals potential mismanagement to external stakeholders. [56] argued that symbolic management sparks skepticism; [65] confirmed that abnormal returns declined when analyst coverage framed an opaque strategy as a risk, a pathway mediated by perceived legitimacy loss.

VIII. DETECTING VISION WITHHOLDING: EARLY-WARNING INDICATORS

Strategic neglect rarely happens overnight; instead, it emits a noticeable set of signals that emerge well before leaders publicly acknowledge cutbacks. One of the most reliable indicators is a subtle but measurable linguistic shift in executive communication. Large-scale text-analytic studies reveal that leaders who focus on retreating progressively tend to remove future-oriented language from shareholder letters, campus speeches, and town hall discussions. A one-standard-deviation decline in ultimate-goal rhetoric, for instance, predicts a 15 percent drop in operating income over the following year [3]. Similar analyses of CEO speeches demonstrate that an increasing ratio of continuity words to change words predicts reduced innovation output two years later [10]. Automated tools like LIWC make these shifts observable at scale, with validation across corpora of over 100,000 documents [71].

A second warning sign appears in budget flows that diverge from stated priorities. Classic municipal finance research has demonstrated that programs slated for quiet shutdown experience sudden, unexplained cuts months before officials announce their elimination [44]. In corporate settings, failing firms often reduce spending on strategic factors, such as R&D and marketing, while still proclaiming growth aspirations, a discrepancy that can be observed in quarterly footnotes well before bankruptcy filings [20]. Such financial incongruities signal that leaders are already reallocating resources away from supposed core ambitions.

Performance metrics provide a third category of indicators. Decline theory predicts, and time-series evidence confirms, that earnings and productivity figures become increasingly erratic once rhetorical retreat gives way to covert restructuring [19]. Analyst studies identify widening gaps between forecast consistency and managerial guidance as a particularly salient red flag [55]. Spikes in variance thus signify the point where neglect shifts from latent to manifest. Human capital movements offer additional insight. When strategic direction becomes unclear, voluntary turnover rises disproportionately among boundary-spanning and innovation-centric roles, the very positions most sensitive to future clarity. Longitudinal data indicate that psychological contract breach leads to a 31% increase in exit intentions within 18 months [28]. Concentrated churn in these categories, therefore, serves as an early indicator of deeper strategic malaise. Ultimately, changes in external sentiment often precede formal recognition of a crisis. A negative lexical tone in major newspapers predicts abnormal stock price movements and spikes in negativity frequently follow leadership silence on strategy [72]. Social media analytics now enable real-time tracking of stakeholder discourse, extending diagnostic reach beyond traditional press channels.

Collectively, shifts in leadership language, unexplained resource reallocations, abnormal volatility in operating indicators, talent flight from crucial roles, and adverse external sentiment create a composite dashboard for identifying vision withholding. Organizations and oversight bodies that systematically monitor these metrics can reveal neglect while corrective options remain viable, urging leaders to restore strategic clarity before ambiguity solidifies into irreversible decline.

IX. INTERVENTIONS AND REMEDIAL STRATEGIES

While strategic neglect can threaten an organization's viability, research shows that timely, evidence-based interventions can halt the decline and restore strategic coherence. The most effective remedies combine top-down vision re-articulation with bottom-up participation, incorporate transparent performance systems, and foster psychological safety to maintain momentum for change[7,73].

Restoring clarity begins with senior leaders providing explicit sense-making. Field experiments show that leaders who revisit and publicly codify a concrete narrative of why, where, and how to precipitate rapid gains in role clarity and discretionary effort [74,75]. [76] identified five message components, discrepancy, appropriateness, efficacy, principal support, and valence, that, when communicated together, create readiness for change and reverse perceptual drift. Transformational leadership studies extend this logic, indicating that rich, future-oriented framing paired with behavioral modeling rebuilds follower trust [7,62] and mitigates the motivational deficits triggered by prior opacity. However, top-down proclamations alone are insufficient; effectiveness increases when employees co-create strategy through participatory interventions. Randomized field trials in public and private organizations have shown that teams involved in joint problem-solving sessions develop a stronger commitment to change and sustain their performance over time [77]. Participatory budgeting provides a complementary, finance-oriented mechanism: when frontline stakeholders help rank and fund strategic initiatives, resource allocations realign with declared priorities, reducing the mismatch typical of neglect [78]. These participatory structures also generate psychological ownership, a mediator of implementation success [79].

Transparency tools serve as a second layer of intervention. The balanced scorecard framework, when deployed as an open dashboard rather than a closed executive report, connects leading indicators (innovation pipeline, customer sentiment) to lagging outcomes (return on investment, ROI), allowing employees and external stakeholders to track progress in real time [80]. Board-level disclosure mandates have similar effects; [81] found that enhanced voluntary disclosure reduced information asymmetry and mitigated capital market penalties during turnaround attempts. Performance information systems are most effective when managers actively use the data; survey evidence shows that utilization increases when metrics are aligned with a coherent strategy and embedded in cyclical review routines [82]. The social environment into which these tools are introduced is important. Psychological safety research demonstrates that employees will challenge residual ambiguity only if they believe interpersonal risk is tolerated [60]. Interventions that train middle managers to invite dissent acknowledge uncertainty, and publicly reward learning behaviors have been shown to accelerate post-neglect recovery [52]. Complementary structural mechanisms, such as ambidextrous teaming that pairs exploitative and exploratory units, further reinforce learning and innovation once clarity is restored [83].

Finally, slack resources can be utilized as recovery fuel when deployed strategically rather than hoarded. [67] demonstrated that private firms dedicating discretionary slack to capability-building investments rather than short-term earnings smoothing achieved superior post-crisis growth. Boards, therefore, play a pivotal oversight role: meta-analyses show that independent, well-informed boards advocate for the articulation of decisive strategies and sanction the redeployment of resources toward growth initiatives [63]. In summary, organizations reverse strategic neglect by combining vivid, multi-channel sense-giving with participatory decision processes, transparent performance dashboards, psychologically safe climates, and targeted slack deployment. These mutually reinforcing levers rebuild trust, realign resources, and reactivate learning cycles, transforming ambiguity from a liability into a platform for renewed strategic action.

X. GAPS IN THE LITERATURE AND FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS

Existing knowledge about strategic neglect remains fragmented because most studies examine only single organizational layers after the dust has settled. This provides rich post-mortems but little insight into real-time causal dynamics. Archival analyses of language drift, budget reallocations, and stock-price penalties have shed light on what happened; however, they reveal little about how ambiguity is transmitted from boardrooms, through middle-manager sense-making, into frontline behavior. A multilevel lens that tracks deliberations at the top, interpretations in the middle, and actions at the bottom, ideally through repeated measures, could expose feedback loops now hidden from view and clarify whether ambiguity is imposed by senior leaders or co-constructed by anxious or overly ambitious subunits [84]. Such designs should intentionally extend beyond the large Anglo-American corporations that dominate today's samples because emerging evidence suggests that neglect may manifest differently in resource-constrained ventures, nonprofits embedded in mission-driven logics, or state-owned enterprises operating under hybrid mandates. Research on serial entrepreneurs, for instance, shows that small firms pivot through rapid narrative reframing rather than prolonged silence, indicating that institutional scale and complexity are boundary conditions that remain poorly understood [85].

An equally salient blind spot concerns the digital transformation of strategy work. The diffusion of data-driven decision tools, algorithmic dashboards, and AI-augmented analytics rewires the temptation and capacity to withhold vision. On the one hand, ubiquitous metrics can discipline leaders by exposing inconsistencies in near real-time. Conversely, the same dashboards may become sophisticated vehicles for selective disclosure, allowing executives to highlight benign indicators while burying signals of decline [86]. Advances in natural language processing offer a methodological remedy: machine-learning classifiers trained on deception markers have already outperformed human coders in detecting obfuscation in earnings calls [87], and topic-model studies demonstrate how large-scale textual data can seed new theoretical insights [88]. The next research frontier lies in combining these digital traces with ethnographic observation to reveal how leaders navigate algorithmic transparency, whether they double down on clarity or weaponize analytics for subtler forms of silence. Beyond technological affordances, we also require a more comprehensive psychological account. While the literature has mapped trust erosion and engagement loss, little is known about individual differences, such as intolerance of uncertainty, or team-level moderators like psychological safety that may either buffer or exacerbate the harms of withheld vision [89]. Laboratory and field experiments that manipulate degrees of strategic clarity while measuring cognitive load, emotional exhaustion, and learning behaviors would enrich the micro-foundations of neglect.

Finally, strategic neglect must be situated within a broader ethical and societal framework. Ambiguity may shield executives from blame, but it externalizes costs onto employees, investors, supply chain partners, and local communities, yet few studies track these downstream effects over time. Management scholars are increasingly urged to address grand challenges and societal impact [90], and the neglect phenomenon offers a fertile site for that agenda: how does prolonged vision withholding influence workforce inequality, community resilience after plant closures, or public trust in institutions? Longitudinal mixed-methods designs that follow organizations before, during, and after neglect episodes, triangulating financial data, well-being surveys, and regional economic indicators, could reposition the conversation from firm-centric performance metrics to multi-stakeholder value. In short, the next wave of research should (1) deploy real-time multilevel studies to unpack cascading ambiguity; (2) diversify organizational contexts to test boundary conditions; (3) interrogate digital platforms as both constraints and conduits of silence; (4) leverage machine learning for early detection; (5) probe psychological and relational mediators through experimental work; and (6) foreground ethical, societal, and sustainability outcomes. Addressing these gaps will usher the field toward a more integrative and actionable theory of why leaders allow strategy to fade into silence and at what collective cost.

XI. CONCLUSION

Strategic vision withholding, or strategic neglect, emerges in this work as a deliberate or at least instrumentally tolerated choice rather than an innocent lapse in communication. Synthesizing primary studies across leadership, organizational behavior, public policy, and institutional theory reveals a coherent pattern: leaders mute future-oriented rhetoric, quietly starve resources, and then point to the resulting performance slide as evidence that contraction was unavoidable. Five theoretical streams converge on the same verdict. Vision-centered leadership and sense-making scholarship show that motivational energy and interpretive convergence depend on a compelling, specific future image; institutional theory highlights how ambiguity facilitates decoupling and blame avoidance; psychological contract research documents trust erosion when informational promises are broken; and ambidexterity studies demonstrate that the exploration-exploitation balance collapses without an integrative vision. Across sectors, corporate, higher education, public agencies, and nonprofits, the outcomes are consistent: operational drift, disengagement, stakeholder skepticism, innovation stagnation, and ultimately legitimacy loss.

The evidence also clarifies when the spiral can be broken. Early warning indicators, linguistic drift, budget incongruities, KPI volatility, concentrated talent exits and souring external sentiment surface months or even years before formal retrenchment, offering a window for intervention. Remedial success hinges on coupling vivid, multi-channel sense-giving with participatory decision structures, transparent performance dashboards, psychologically safe climates, and the strategic redeployment of slack resources. Nevertheless, significant gaps remain. Real-time multilevel data are scarce; SMEs, emerging market enterprises, and mission-driven nonprofits are underrepresented; and the dual role of digital platforms as both restraint and weapon for ambiguity is poorly understood. Future research must, therefore, adopt longitudinal, cross-contextual, and digitally informed designs while also examining the ethical and societal costs, including job loss, community decline, and institutional distrust associated with prolonged strategic silence. For practitioners, the takeaway is unambiguous: treating affective slogans or employee thriving and happiness as substitutes for a concrete why, where, and how roadmap is not benign; it accelerates decline. A transparent, purpose-driven strategy is thus a non-negotiable prerequisite for organizational resilience, credibility, and sustained value creation.

REFERENCES

[1]. Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2009). Reflections: our Journey in Organizational Change Research and Practice. *Journal of Change Management*, *9*(2), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010902879079

[2]. Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, *12*(6), 433–448. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120604

[3]. Carton, A. M., Murphy, C., & Clark, J. R. (2014). A (Blurry) Vision of the Future: How Leader Rhetoric about Ultimate Goals Influences Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(6), 1544–1570. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0101

[4]. Stam, D., Van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. (2010). Focusing on followers: The role of regulatory focus and possible selves in visionary leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(3), 457–468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.009

[5]. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340–363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550

[6]. Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *15*(3), 245–259. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150306

[7]. Hubbart, J. A. (2023). Organizational Change: Considering Truth and Buy-In. *Administrative Sciences*, *13*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13010003

[8]. Jansen, J. J. P., Tempelaar, M. P., Van Den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2009). Structural Differentiation and Ambidexterity: The Mediating Role of Integration Mechanisms. *Organization science*, *20*(4), 797–811. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0415

[9]. McConnell, A., & 'T Hart, P. (2019). Inaction and public policy: understanding why policymakers 'do nothing'. *Policy Sciences*, *52*(4), 645–661. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-019-09362-2

[10]. Venus, M., Stam, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2019). Visions of Change as Visions of Continuity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *62*(3), 667–690. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.1196

[11]. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine*, *6*(7), e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

[12]. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S.,…Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

[13]. Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, *14*(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

[14]. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

[15]. Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1998). A longitudinal study of the relation of vision and vision communication to venture growth in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1), 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.43

[16]. Locke, E. A. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, *5*(2), 117–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0962-1849(96)80005-9

[17]. Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2007). New Developments in and Directions for Goal-Setting Research. *European Psychologist*, *12*(4), 290–300. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.12.4.290

[18]. [18] Hambrick, D. C., & Fredrickson, J. W. (2001). Are you sure you have a strategy? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *15*(4), 48–59. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2001.5897655

[19]. Weitzel, W., & Jonsson, E. (1989). Decline in Organizations: A Literature Integration and Extension. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *34*(1), 91. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392987

[20]. Hambrick, D. C., & D'Aveni, R. A. (1988). Large Corporate Failures as Downward Spirals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392853

[21]. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2), 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268

[22]. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological bulletin*, *127*(3), 376–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376

[23]. Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*(1), 84–94. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.84

[24]. Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization science*, *16*(4), 409–421. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133

[25]. Maitlis, S. (2005). The Social Processes of Organizational Sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(1), 21–49. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.15993111

[26]. Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*(2), 362–377.

[27]. Tilcsik, A. (2010). From Ritual to Reality: Demography, Ideology, and Decoupling in a Post-Communist Government Agency. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(6), 1474–1498. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.57318905

[28]. Robinson, S. L., & Wolfe Morrison, E. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(5), 525–546. https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:5<525::aid-job40>3.0.co;2-t

[29]. Huy, Q. N. (2002). Emotional Balancing of Organizational Continuity and Radical Change: The Contribution of Middle Managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*(1), 31–69. https://doi.org/10.2307/3094890

[30]. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization science*, *2*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71

[31]. Jansen, J. J. P., Simsek, Z., & Cao, Q. (2012). Ambidexterity and performance in multiunit contexts: Cross-level moderating effects of structural and resource attributes. *Strategic Management Journal*, *33*(11), 1286–1303. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.1977

[32]. O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Organizational Ambidexterity: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *27*(4), 324–338. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0025

[33]. Maor, M. (2014). Policy persistence, risk estimation and policy underreaction. *Policy Sciences*, *47*(4), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-014-9203-8

[34]. Weaver, R. K. (1986). The Politics of Blame Avoidance. *Journal of Public Policy*, *6*(4), 371–398. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0143814x00004219

[35]. Hood, C. (2002). The Risk Game and the Blame Game. *Government and Opposition*, *37*(1), 15–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-7053.00085

[36]. Hinterleitner, M., & Sager, F. (2017). Anticipatory and reactive forms of blame avoidance: of foxes and lions. *European Political Science Review*, *9*(4), 587–606. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1755773916000126

[37]. Hood, C., Jennings, W., & Copeland, P. (2016). Blame Avoidance in Comparative Perspective: Reactivity, Staged Retreat and Efficacy. *Public Administration*, *94*(2), 542–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12235

[38]. Maor, M. (2012). Policy overreaction. *Journal of Public Policy*, *32*(3), 231–259. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0143814x1200013x

[39]. Hood, C., Jennings, W., Dixon, R., Hogwood, B., & Beeston, C. (2009). Testing times: Exploring staged responses and the impact of blame management strategies in two examination fiasco cases. *European Journal of Political Research*, *48*(6), 695–722. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.01830.x

[40]. Hood, C. (2007). What happens when transparency meets blame-avoidance? *Public Management Review*, *9*(2), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030701340275

[41]. Hubbart, J. A. (2023). Organizational Change: The Challenge of Change Aversion. *Administrative Sciences*, *13*(7), 162. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13070162

[42]. Maor, M. (2017). The implications of the emerging disproportionate policy perspective for the new policy design studies. *Policy Sciences*, *50*(3), 383–398. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-016-9259-8

[43]. Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2002). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education*, *43*, 295–328.

[44]. Salanick, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Constraints On Administrator Discretion. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, *12*(4), 475–498. https://doi.org/10.1177/107808747701200405

[45]. Mishina, Y., Dykes, B. J., Block, E. S., & Pollock, T. G. (2010). Why "Good" Firms do Bad Things: The Effects of High Aspirations, High Expectations, and Prominence on the Incidence of Corporate Illegality. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(4), 701–722. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.52814578

[46]. Hillman, N. W., Tandberg, D. A., & Fryar, A. H. (2015). Evaluating the Impacts of "New" Performance Funding in Higher Education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *37*(4), 501–519. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373714560224

[47]. Misangyi, V. F., Greckhamer, T., Furnari, S., Fiss, P. C., Crilly, D., & Aguilera, R. (2017). Embracing Causal Complexity. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 255–282. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316679252

[48]. Bishop, L. R. (2019). Calling it Quits or Moving in Together? Considerations for Small Liberal Arts Colleges in the Wake of Mount Ida. *Boston Bar Journal*, *63*(1).

[49]. Ahmed, Y., Elsayed, M., & Xu, B. (2024). Bankruptcy in the UK: Do Managers Talk the Talk Before Walking the Walk? *British Journal of Management*, *35*(4), 2011–2031. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12804

[50]. Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 81–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2014.09.001

[51]. Holmes, G., & Newnham, S. (2024). Business continuity, bureaucratic resilience and the limitations of neoliberal survival logics in international organisations. *Review of International Studies*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210524000500

[52]. Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Luthans, F. (2008). Can Positive Employees Help Positive Organizational Change? Impact of Psychological Capital and Emotions on Relevant Attitudes and Behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*(1), 48–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886307311470

[53]. Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & Lepine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 909–927. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909

[54]. Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.2307/258788

[55]. James, E. H., & Wooten, L. P. (2010). Leading under pressure. *From Surviving to Thriving Before*.

[56]. Ashforth, B. E., & Gibbs, B. W. (1990). The Double-Edge of Organizational Legitimation. *Organization science*, *1*(2), 177–194. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1.2.177

[57]. De Jong, J. P. J., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *10*(1), 41–64. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060710720546

[58]. Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational Innovation: A Meta-Analysis Of Effects Of Determinants and Moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(3), 555–590. https://doi.org/10.5465/256406

[59]. Stam, D., Lord, R. G., Knippenberg, D. V., & Wisse, B. (2014). An Image of Who We Might Become: Vision Communication, Possible Selves, and Vision Pursuit. *Organization science*, *25*(4), 1172–1194. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2013.0891

[60]. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

[61]. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology press.

[62]. Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-Concordance at Work: Toward Understanding the Motivational Effects of Transformational Leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(5), 554–571. https://doi.org/10.5465/30040649

[63]. Dalton, D. R., Daily, C. M., Ellstrand, A. E., & Johnson, J. L. (1998). Meta-analytic reviews of board composition, leadership structure, and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *19*(3), 269–290. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1097-0266(199803)19:3<269::aid-smj950>3.0.co;2-k

[64]. Gu, M., Li, D., & Xiong, Z. (2025). *Curbing Stock Price Crash: The Bright Side of Regulatory Fragmentation*. Elsevier BV. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5132580

[65]. Deephouse, D. L., & Carter, S. M. (2005). An Examination of Differences Between Organizational Legitimacy and Organizational Reputation*. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*(2), 329–360. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00499.x

[66]. Rosenzweig, P. M., & Singh, J. V. (1991). Organizational Environments and the Multinational Enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, *16*(2), 340–361. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1991.4278953

[67]. George, G. (2005). Slack Resources and the Performance of Privately Held Firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(4), 661–676. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.17843944

[68]. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

[69]. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698

[70]. Seo, M.-G., Barrett, L. F., & Bartunek, J. M. (2004). The Role of Affective Experience in Work Motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(3), 423–439. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2004.13670972

[71]. Yarkoni, T. (2010). Personality in 100,000 Words: A large-scale analysis of personality and word use among bloggers. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(3), 363–373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.04.001

[72]. Tetlock, P. C. (2007). Giving Content to Investor Sentiment: The Role of Media in the Stock Market. *The Journal of Finance*, *62*(3), 1139–1168. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2007.01232.x

[73]. Hubbart, J. A. (2024). A Primer for Organizational Change: Key Models, Theories, and Practices. *Austin Journal of Business Administration and Management*, *8*(1), 1068.

[74]. Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(1), 36.

[75]. Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(3), 329–354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

[76]. Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change. *Human Relations*, *46*(6), 681–703. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601

[77]. Nielsen, K., & Randall, R. (2012). The importance of employee participation and perceptions of changes in procedures in a teamworking intervention. *Work & Stress*, *26*(2), 91–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.682721

[78]. Wampler, B., McNulty, S., McNulty, S. L., & Touchton, M. (2021). *Participatory budgeting in global perspective*. Oxford University Press.

[79]. Nielsen, K., Randall, R., Holten, A.-L., & González, E. R. (2010). Conducting organizational-level occupational health interventions: What works? *Work & Stress*, *24*(3), 234–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.515393

[80]. Hoque, Z., & James, W. (2000). Linking Balanced Scorecard Measures to Size and Market Factors: Impact on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *12*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar.2000.12.1.1

[81]. Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *31*(1-3), 405–440. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-4101(01)00018-0

[82]. Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2010). The Big Question for Performance Management: Why Do Managers Use Performance Information? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *20*(4), 849–866. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muq004

[83]. Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Role of Organizational Ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*(2), 209–226. https://doi.org/10.5465/20159573

[84]. Bamberger, P. A., & Pratt, M. G. (2010). Moving Forward by Looking Back: Reclaiming Unconventional Research Contexts and Samples in Organizational Scholarship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(4), 665–671. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.52814357

[85]. Arteaga, R., & Hyland, J. (2013). *Pivot: How top entrepreneurs adapt and change course to find ultimate success*. John Wiley & Sons.

[86]. Brynjolfsson, E., & McElheran, K. (2016). The Rapid Adoption of Data-Driven Decision-Making. *American Economic Review*, *106*(5), 133–139. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20161016

[87]. Larcker, D. F., & Zakolyukina, A. A. (2012). Detecting Deceptive Discussions in Conference Calls. *Journal of Accounting Research*, *50*(2), 495–540. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679x.2012.00450.x

[88]. Hannigan, T. R., Haans, R. F. J., Vakili, K., Tchalian, H., Glaser, V. L., Wang, M. S., Kaplan, S., & Jennings, P. D. (2019). Topic Modeling in Management Research: Rendering New Theory from Textual Data. *Academy of Management Annals*, *13*(2), 586–632. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0099

[89]. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological Safety: The History, Renaissance, and Future of an Interpersonal Construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305

[90]. George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and Tackling Societal Grand Challenges through Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 1880–1895. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.4007