

1/25/2018



MANAGER AMBIDEXTERITY: Antecedents and Consequences.

STUDENT: ALEXANDRA GARCÍA JOERGER
TUTOR: MONTSERRAT BORONAT NAVARRO
DEGREE MASTER IN MANAGEMENT
SRO011 – MASTER'S THESIS
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017 - 2018

ABSTRACT:

All companies struggle for a common purpose, their survival, and within the literature we can find all kinds of methods to achieve it. And not only survive if not how to get to be leader in a market as competitive as it is that we have today.

In recent years the concept of innovation has been getting stronger and companies have increasingly invested in this field because it has been proved that it is a vital factor to have competitive advantages and to ensure a future. Also in the literature, we find how companies are always reminded to use their resources in the most possible effective way in order to obtain the maximum profit. It has also been shown that effective resource utilization allows companies to gain competitive advantages.

The organizational ambidexterity is the combination of these two capacities, explore new ways and exploit the resources in the most effective way, in order to achieve a greater competitive advantage in the market and ensure the survival of the company. There are many studies that demonstrate how organizational ambidexterity positively affects the company's results.

But how are the managers of these companies? Are considered also ambidextrous? And how does this ambidexterity affect the company's results? In this work we have been raised three proposals related to manager's ambidexterity, and we sent a survey to 10 managers of medium and large companies that are leaders in their sector to be able to closely study their work practices and we would try to confirm our propositions.

INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
2. THEORETICAL REVIEW	
2.1. INTRODUCTION TO THE AMBIDEXTERITY CONCEPT.....	5
2.2. ORGANIZATIONAL AMBIDEXTERITY ORIGINS.....	6
2.3. AMBIDEXTERITY DEFINITIONS.....	11
2.4. AMBIDEXTERITY FOCUSED ON MANAGERS.....	13
CHAPTER 2. EMPIRICAL WORK	
3. METHODOLOGY	
3.1 MEASURES AND SCALES.....	22
3.2 SURVEY.....	26
3.3 SAMPLE.....	28
3.4 TYPE OF ANALYSIS REALISED.....	30
CHAPTER 3 - CONCLUSIONS	
4. RESULTS.....	32
5. GENERAL CONCLUSION	
CONCLUSIONS.....	35
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	36
REFERENCES.....	37
ANNEXES	
ANNEXE 1.....	41

1. INTRODUCTION

The ability of the companies to develop simultaneously innovations that exploit their current knowledge, while exploring new opportunities that go beyond their present knowledge, recognized as Organizational ambidexterity, is shown as a crucial alternative to achieving sustained performance and above the average of the industry.

How some companies survive the changes? How they manage to handle it? And why some are capable of doing it and others not? We don't have to be only focused in the change process, we have to analyze the capacity of the companies to exploit their already existing resources of a most productive way and at the same time to explore new technologies and markets to configure and reconfigure organizational resources to capture existing as well as new opportunities (Helfat & Raubitschek, 2000; Holmqvist, 2004; March, 1991; Teece, 2006). This capacity has been referred as ambidexterity which introduce the idea of the achievement of both, exploration and exploitation (March, 1991) or ambidexterity (Duncan, 1976).

Conceptually, the need for organizations to both explore and exploit is convincing, but how do managers and firms actually do this? At an operating level, how do the challenges of ambidexterity present themselves—and what differentiates the more successful attempts at ambidexterity from the less successful? To develop a more granular sense for the managerial challenges presented by ambidexterity, we have realized a selection of big companies, where we will interview a manager of each one.

We believe that these companies are ambidextrous, as they explore and exploit at the same time. But we want to study the how and where it is achieved and the importance of managers throughout the process. To do this, we are conducting a serial of surveys to the senior managers, based on some of the propositions stated by O'Reilly III and Tushman's study (2008). In this study, the authors explain five propositions needed to be an ambidextrous manager and also they did a quantitative empirical study where managers of different companies were interviewed.

Taking all this into account, **the objective** of this work is to go deeper into the antecedents that makes a manager ambidextrous and how this affects the results of the company. To analyze the antecedents, three of the propositions proposed by O'Reilly and Tushman have been selected because of their special relevance in the literature. Also we added questions about the results, benefits, clients (Unit perform)... to see if the

three variables proposed have a direct effect with the Company Unit Perform. The survey will be conducted to 10 managers of different companies. The companies will be anonymous so we numbered them and we just specify the sector and the number of employees.

All companies in the sample are successful and important in their industry. The companies are part of three different sectors: Paper production, industrial machinery supplies and chemical products supply. They are medium or big companies (between 200 - 350.000 employees). We look forward to observing the importance of ambidextrous managers and the business strategy focused on exploration and exploitation in order to achieve it.

This work is divided into five parts:

It begin with a brief **introduction** where we briefly explain the ambidexterity concept and what our work will consist of. Also we clarify the objectives in the study that we are going to carry out and what methods will be used to reach it.

In order to understand better the development of our work, we have explain a **theoretical review** about ambidexterity, its origins and history. Then we have deepened in the concept of ambidextrous managers because they are the object of our study.

Once the theoretical review has been explained, our study begins. In this point, we specify which are the scales and variables used, the entire survey creation process, the sample of companies used and why and finally the type of analysis we have done to obtain the results. We named this point **Methodology**.

When we had all the surveys into our data base, we analyzed the obtained **results** doing also comparisons between the companies to then draw **conclusions** and specify the **limitations** founded in our work and the **future researches**.

In the end, there is a **reference** section to find all the allusions that have been made throughout the work.

CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE AMBIDEXTERITY CONCEPT.

Each organization is the result of an entrepreneurial impulse, which must be maintained continuously linked to organizations, since their absence can mean the disappearance of them. Once established any organization, maintaining entrepreneurial impulses of varying intensity, it is necessary to ensure their growth and survival, while clear guidance to be efficient in the product-market pairing each time.

Any organization requires the development of a capacity, which has been renamed ambidexterity, allowing you to balance and develop harmoniously oriented exploitation of existing businesses and exploring new opportunities (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008) activities, in order to maintain a sustainable competitive advantage.

The understanding and managing tensions between paradoxical goals (exploration vs exploitation) and simultaneous success in achieving high levels in the variables that cause such tensions are essential for business competitiveness and survival (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004, 2008).

The ambidexterity from a traditional view, refers to the ability of an organization to achieve two different objectives simultaneously as: efficiency and flexibility (Adler et al, 1999), strategic positioning based on differentiation and the low cost (Porter, 1996), global integration and local accountability (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). As indicated Raisch & Birkinshaw, (2008: 376), studies that include concepts such as "reconciliation between exploitation and exploration, simultaneity of induced strategic processes and self-synchronizing incremental innovation and discontinuous, and the balance between search and stability ". They are referring to the same underlying construct, which is none other than organizational ambidexterity.

The study of ambidexterity fits into the Theory of Resources and Capabilities and it's analyzed from the perspective of strategic management and design, innovation and organizational learning (Jansen, 2011).

Organizational ambidexterity has been studied from different academic streams such as organizational learning, technological innovation, strategic management or organizational design, which have helped to broaden the base of their knowledge,

though, the time has generated a disconnected and complex literature, not only for the use of different terminology but also by the different specific effects generated by the phenomenon, based on current research into which it is inserted.

It is consolidated in the academic literature (O, Reilly & Tushman, 2013), with a wide array of background variables, links to performance and solutions to develop discipline moderating factors. However, there are many gaps in this field, especially those concerning how ambidexterity really arises in organizations, if there are significant sectorial differences or contextual characteristics related to internal organizational routines (e.g. Nosella, Canterello & Filippini, 2012).

2.2 ORGANIZATIONAL AMBIDEXTERITY ORIGINS:

In order to understand the concept of Organizational Ambidexterity we have to make a theoretical review. Ambidexterity can be defined as the property of being equally skillful with each hand. Only about one percent of people are naturally ambidextrous.

Companies, as we know them today, are organizations that have their origin at the time of the industrial revolution, and that have been designed to operate efficiently. However, due to the speed at which the changes are currently occurring, it will become increasingly imperative that they also incorporate the capacity to generate innovations (new products and/or new ways of doing things) on a continuous basis.

The organizational ambidexterity has appeared as a new concept in organizational theory to give response to the need of organizations to maintain a sustained performance (Raisch et al., 2009). All the investigations related to the organizational ambidexterity of the last two decades, its antecedents, the concept, the measures, the results or the tensions, have been done in the two existent ways: theoretically and empirically.

Examples: theoretically (e.g., Gupta et. al., 2006;) O'Reilly III and Tushman, 2008, 2013; Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008; Raisch et al., 2009; Simsek et al., 2009; (Tushman and O'Reilly III, 1996) as empirically (e.g., Adler et al., 1999;) Andriopoulos and Lewis, 2009; Atuahene-Gima, 2005; He and Wong, 2004; Jansen et al., 2009; Jansen et al., 2006; Lubatkin et al., 2006).

Based on this reasoning, the concept of ambidextrous organization is born. These are companies that combine efficiency and innovation. That is, those able to exploit the current business, and to explore, at the same time, new business opportunities. This new concept of company implies an effort to systematize the innovation, and to make it part of the day to day.

The organizational ambidexterity refers to "the routines and processes by which organizations mobilize, coordinate and jointly integrate exploration and exploitation efforts" (Jansen et al., 2009, p. 799). It is empirically referenced to a company Ambidextrous when it has high levels of exploitation and Exploration simultaneously (He and Wong, 2004).

In the literature on the business area, the concept of exploration and exploitation has been widely used, including studies on organizational learning, strategic renewal and technological innovation. As are two different concepts, they require different structures, processes, strategies, capacities and cultures, and can have different impacts on the performance of an organization (he and Wong, 2004). Also, exploration and exploitation are learned in different ways within the company

Exploration consist on doing experiments with new alternatives that have distant, uncertain, and often negative returns. Conversely the exploitation is about the expansion of existing competencies, the improvement, and the Technologies with positive, upcoming and predictable Returns (March, 1991). In innovation terms exploration is identified as a more radical innovation where the objective is to achieve the flexibility and novelty in the innovation of products through a greater variation and the experimentation of new alternatives (Rowley, Behrens and Krackhardt, 2000). We have to consider the future benefits to be more distant and uncertain as they are emerging innovations.

Exploitation is considered as the tendency of a company to invest resources to improve and expand their existing knowledge to innovate in products, skills and processes (Atuahene-Gima, 2005). We can affirm that exploitation is an incremental innovation because the focus is on reducing the variety and improving productivity in existing products. It means that the exploitation emphasizes on reaffirming existing innovation, to gain in efficiency in a particular area (Rowley et al., 2000), ie, innovation of incremental character. The fact that a company focuses its activity in an exploitative environment implies that it makes an efficient use of existing knowledge in the company (March, 1991). Baum, Li and Usher (2000) explained exploitation as the knowledge obtained through the local search, the experimental refinement and the selection and reuse of the existing routines.

In the literature can be found a compendium of definitions about the concept of organizational ambidexterity in the work of Papachroni et al. (1). (2014).

Ambidexterity has been used in different contexts.

Duncan (1976) was based on previous studies (e.g., Burns & Stalker, 1961; Thompson, 1967), to define the “organizational ambidexterity” concept. To get a long-term success, firms had the need to consider different structures to initiate versus execute innovation (Dual structures). In his view, ambidexterity occurs successively as

organizations change structures as innovations evolve. That means that companies as they evolve in the innovation process must also adapt or readjust their strategy to that process: organic structures are employed to explore followed by mechanistic structures to exploit. Eisenhardt & Brown (1998), Lovas & Ghoshal (2000), Venkatraman (2006), did some of the current research on organizational adaptation using ambidexterity as temporal sequencing of exploration and exploitation. They were based on the supposition that the rate of variation in markets and technologies proceeds at a pace that permits firms to choose organizational alignments sequentially.

In his foundational work, March (1991) links innovation and knowledge management to explicate tensions surrounding exploitation, employing existing knowledge in well-understood ways, and exploration leveraging varied and dispersed knowledge in new ways (Taylor and Greve 2006). Both forms of innovation entail combining knowledge.

O'Reilly III and Tushman (2013) describe a contextual, sequential, and structural ambidexterity. Without, however, only the structural makes mention of the simultaneous development of a balance between exploitation and exploration, either by means of separate subunits or by the development of competencies, processes and cultures associated with the exploitation and the Exploration (O'Reilly III and Tushman, 2008). These separate units are held together by a common strategic intent, an overarching set of values, and targeted structural linking mechanisms to leverage shared assets. These internally inconsistent alignments and the associated strategic tradeoffs are orchestrated by a senior team with a common fate incentive system and team processes capable of managing these inconsistent alignments in a consistent fashion (e.g., O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004; Smith & Tushman, 2005).

On the other hand, Simsek et al. (.) (2009) propose a typology where there are four types of ambidexterity Organizational: Harmonic, cyclic, partitional and reciprocal. Each one corresponds to the combinations of two dimensions: temporal and structural. We emphasize the temporal dimension, which contemplates that the ambidexterity can be sequential or simultaneous, and the structural dimension, which can be independent-within the same unit-or interdependent-between units of the same organization or other organizations-. For the case of the simultaneous organizational ambidexterity between units of different organizations is referred to the partitional ambidexterity interorganizational.

This last classification envisages an extension of the concept of organizational ambidexterity to the field of the interorganizational relations (e.g., Kauppila, 2010).

The interorganizational ambidexterity entails the simultaneous development of exploitation and exploration by supporting interorganizational relations (Kauppila, 2010). Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos (2011), in its meta-review of literature on interorganizational Relations, introduce the concept of co-exploitation and co-exploration to describe two aspects constitutive of an Inter-organizational relationship.

The Coexploitation is the voluntary cooperative agreement to execute knowledge, tasks, functions or activities, where the emphasis is the utilization and expansion of existing knowledge. On the other hand, the co-exploration consists of the voluntary cooperative Agreement to create new knowledge, tasks, functions or activities.

2.3 AMBIDEXTERITY DEFINITIONS:

DEFINITIONS	AUTHORS
Dual organizational structure for innovation: a structure develops innovation activities and other implements innovation	Duncan, 1976
Ability to manage incremental and revolutionary changes and manage a suitable balance between exploitation and exploration	Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996
Ability to pursue both the development of products, markets and technologies in the long term (adaptability) as coordination and profitability in the short term (alignment).	Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004
From the perspective of innovation, the need for companies to reach a balance between innovation strategies of exploitation and exploration.	He & Wong, 2004
From the perspective of innovation, competition to balance exploitation and exploration ensuring the simultaneous pursuit of incremental innovations and radicals	Atuaheme-Moan, 2005
Synchronous search for exploitation and exploration through subunits or distinct individuals, each of whom specializes in exploration or explotación ²	Gupta, Smith & Shalley (2006)
The ambidextrous organizations are those that simultaneously pursue the exploitation of existing skills and exploring new opportunities with the same skill, rather than managing the tradeoffs between exploitation and exploration to achieve balance	Beckman, 2006
Organizational capacity to be effective in the current demands of business and simultaneously be able to adapt to the changing environment	Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008
Dynamic capacity referred to routines and processes by which an organization mobilizes, coordinates and integrates scattered and contradictory forces, besides assigning, reassign, combined and recombined resources and assets among different organizational units	O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008
Set of routines and processes used by the organization to mobilize, coordinate and integrate contradictory efforts and allocate, reallocate, combined and recombined resources and assets through units exploration and exploitation	Jansen et al, 2009

Strategic alternative that can be used to prevent crises or minimize losses during crises	Akdogan, Akdogan & Cingöz, 2009
Ability to use and improve existing knowledge (exploration) to time of creating new knowledge to overcome the shortcomings or absence of knowledge identified in the performance of work (exploration)	Turner & Lee Kelley 2012
Ability of an organization to exploit and explorar- in order to compete in mature markets and technologies where efficiency, control and incremental improvements are very important and compete in new markets and technologies where flexibility, autonomy and experimentation are needed	O'Reilly & Tushman, 2013
System consisting of two different processes: process definition and execution process, which determine how an organization defines its activities and responsibilities and how to develop the agreed activities	Zimmerman, Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2015

2.4 AMBIDEXTERITY FOCUSED ON MANAGERS:

Duncan (1976) was the first, who applied the term organizational ambidexterity, but March's (1991) seminal work was the first catalyst of the field. March interpreted exploitation and exploration as two basically different learning activities between which organizations should divide their attention. In his definition, exploitation refers to "refinement, efficiency, selection, and implementation," whereas exploration is interpreted as "search, variation, experimentation, and discovery" (March, 1991, p. 102.).

The first and still the most popular and well-researched field of organizational ambidexterity became the structural aspect. This concept is based on the organizational design literature (i.e. Burns – Stalker, 1961; Duncan, 1976; Lawrence – Lorsch, 1967), which solves the paradox of concurring activities with structural separation of exploration and exploitation into independent units but with a leadership-integration and coordination at the top of the organization (Drucker, 1985; Galbraith, 2002). Tushman and O'Reilly's (1996) important article catalyzed the interest in the structural and leadership-based ambidexterity.

O'Reilly and Tushman argue that the ability of a firm to be ambidextrous is at the core of dynamic capabilities. Ambidexterity requires senior managers to accomplish two critical tasks. First, they must be able to accurately sense changes in their competitive environment, including potential shifts in technology, competition, customers, and regulation. Second, they must be able to act on these opportunities and threats; to be able to seize them by reconfiguring both tangible and intangible assets to meet new challenges. As a dynamic capability, ambidexterity embodies a complex set of routines including decentralization, differentiation, targeted integration, and the ability of senior leadership to orchestrate the complex trade-offs that the simultaneous pursuit of exploration and exploitation requires. Developing these dynamic capabilities is a central task of executive leadership.

The second important and influential concept of organizational ambidexterity is the contextual aspect. Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) in their field-changing work suggest that ambidexterity can be best achieved by building business unit context to encourage individuals to participate in both exploration and exploitation, rather than by structural separation. This model eliminates the coordination costs and facilitates whole-organization adaptation, but generates new management issues.

To conclude, ambidextrous organization achieves balance between alignment and adaptation by developing dual structures (Duncan, 1976; Tushman – O'Reilly, 1996) or ambidextrous organizational context (Gibson - Birkinshaw, 2004), to reconcile the conflicting demands for exploration and exploitation.

Although there are differences between the subfields of ambidexterity literature, they agree that ambidextrous organizations are likely to have superior performance.

Organizational ambidexterity's fundamental premise is that strategic decisions are to some degree always in conflict, and managers are therefore forced to handle trade-offs. These paradoxical decisions are extremely difficult to make.

Exploration requires search, discovery, experimentation, risk-taking and innovation, while exploitation consists of behavioral patterns characterized by refinement, implementation, efficiency, production and selection (Cheng – Van de Ven, 1996; March 1991). The key issue in ambidexterity is the quality of management and not its existence per se, because top managers are the only decision-makers able to make trade-offs among these competing objectives and reduce the organization's tendency to follow the easiest route (Birkinshaw – Gupta, 2013).

Ambidexterity is hard to achieve, because managers should make thoughtful trade-offs shaped by self-reinforcing routines, short-term interests and unseen factors to decide whether present benefits should be sacrificed for future success (Ghoshal – Bartlett, 1994; Crozier, 1964; March, 1991; Prahalad - Bettis, 1984; Smith –Lewis, 2011). This trade-off is the central premise of March's (1991) framework, which sets out that managers' decision-making is distracted by self-reinforcing routines, temporal contradictions and limited resources.

Although both activities are critical for long-term survival and growth, they are fundamentally different logics that compete for the same scarce resources. This limited resource availability constrains firms to favor one type of activity over the other, which results in the firm becoming trapped (March 1991; Levinthal – March 1993).

To be a successful ambidextrous manager there are five propositions that are necessary for leaders according to the Charles A. O'Reilly III y Michael L. Tushman's study. These are specific mechanisms that enable firms to successfully manage separate "explore-and-exploit" subunits and to leverage common assets in ways that permit the firm to adapt to new opportunities and threats.

The set of these characteristics permits leaders to be able to reconfigure existing competencies and assets to explore new opportunities even as the organization continues to compete in mature markets. If the leader doesn't have these elements, inertial forces keep the firm focused on the exploitative part of the business.

Teece (2006) characterizes dynamic capabilities as the separate skills, processes, procedures, organizational structures, decision rules and disciplines that allow the senior leaders or managers of a firm to identify threats and opportunities and to reconfigure assets to meet these. So from a strategic perspective, to achieve long-term success requires a firm to possess the ability to recombine and reconfigure assets and organizational structures to adapt to emerging markets and technologies. Of course, they must also developed the operational capabilities and competencies to compete in existing markets.

Although there is some ambiguity in the terminology of capabilities and competencies, what Winter (2000) has referred to as "terminology haze", there is consensus among strategy scholars that dynamic capabilities are reflected in the organization's ability, manifest in the decisions of senior management, to maintain ecological fitness and, when necessary, to reconfigure existing assets and develop the new skills needed to address emerging threats and opportunities (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Helfat & Peteraf, 2003; Teece et al., 1997; Winter, 2003).

These capabilities were due to the effects of high-level managers to ensure learning, integration and, when it is necessary, reconfiguration and transformation, all aimed at sensing and seizing new opportunities as markets and technologies evolve.

In contrast to dynamic capabilities, core competencies or operational capabilities are discrete business-level processes and associated activity systems fundamental to running the business which give it a contemporaneous advantage (Leonard-Barton, 1992; Siggelkow, 2001).

The ability of a business to be ambidextrous is based on dynamic capabilities, in organizational terms. — They need to explore and exploit to compete concurrently in both new and mature markets. Is essential for senior managers as Tushman and O'Reilly (1997) related, to manage completely varied and inconsistent organizational alignments. Efficiency, discipline, incremental improvement and continuous innovation, in the exploitation demand a short-term perspective, are the crucial success factors needed to

succeed. It has nothing to do with the alignment required for exploration, the arrangement of systems, competencies, structure and culture to execute this strategy is completely dissimilar, where accentuate a longer time perspective, more autonomy, flexibility and risk taking and less formal systems and control are the key success factors.

Reliable with Teece's tripartite taxonomy of sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring (Teece, 2006), ambidexterity needs a coherent arrangement of competencies, structures and cultures to involve in exploration, a contrasting corresponding alignment focused on exploitation, and a senior manager team with the cognitive and behavioral flexibility to establish and encourage both.

Definitely, dynamic capabilities, are processes that allow a company to build, integrate, and reconfigure organizational resources, offer one way out of the inertial dynamics associated with success. Unfortunately, the management challenges of ambidexterity, in which organizations simultaneously explore and exploit and compete with different business models, are substantial.

Related to ambidexterity, a dynamic capability can be seen as a set of actions (or routines) taken by senior management that permit the enterprise to identify opportunities and threats and reconfigure assets (people, organizational architectures, and resources) to adapt to these.

O'Reilly and Tushman suggest a set of propositions delimit a group of senior team processes and actions that allow firms to integrate and recombine resources to permit exploitation (competing in mature markets and technologies, typically through competence-enhancing change) and exploration (competing in new technologies or markets, often with competence-destroying change) concurrently. These managers team actions, behaviors, and design choices include the dynamic capabilities that enable companies to explore and exploit at the same time. A disappointment on the part of the manager team to take part in these actions reduces the likelihood that their organizations will prosper in being ambidextrous.

The first one is the presence of a compelling strategic intent that justifies the importance of both exploitation and exploration increases the likelihood of ambidexterity. Ambidexterity is both a difficult managerial challenge and potentially inefficient (Van Looy, et al., 2005). That means that managers should to deliberately and consciously

engage in experimentation and small-scale efforts with a long-term possible payout rather than the short-term maximization of profit.

“Exploration, and the uncertainty it entails, diverts resources and attention away from exploitation” (March, 1991). Therefore, in absence of an explicit strategy that justify this experimentation, the option predetermined is to focus in the profitability in the short term, generally deleting the variation and the costs. Unless it exist a clear logic and intellectually convincing rationale for the importance so much of the exploration as of the exploitation, the pressures in the short term almost always will move away the attention and the resources of the highest variance, of a less determined world of exploration.

Also O'Reilly and Tushman affirm that the articulation of a common vision and values that provide for a common identity increase the likelihood of ambidexterity.

A global vision and values allows employees from the legacy and new business to forge a common identity. A vision helps employees to adopt the mentality in the long term being important for the exploration (Devan, Millan & Shirke, 2005; Ravasi and Schultz, 2006).

Research has documented that unity of purpose is a critical element of successful ambidexterity (Jansen, 2006; Lubatkin, et al., 2006; Sidhu, et al., 2004). Without a clear consensus in the senior team about the strategy and vision, there will be less information exchange, more unproductive conflict, and a diminished ability to respond to external change (Hambrick, 1994).

The shared vision provides organizational members with a sense of objective and direction, and helps to keep a loosely connected system together and promote the integration of an entire organization (Orton and Weick, 1990). Therefore, the shared vision can be seen as a leaps mechanism for organizational resource change and integration (Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998), particularly when several opportunities arise while limited organizational resources are available for deployment. Without a shared vision, the reality of a firm would be characterized by very enthusiastic and committed individuals who pull the organization towards different directions.

What means manager team shared vision? Embodies the collective goals and aspirations of senior team members that express the developmental path for an organization's future (Larwood et al., 1995; Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998). A shared set of goals and values provides a common strategic direction that ameliorates conflicting

interests and disagreement. It can override the adverse effects of divergent goals and conflicting perspectives among senior team members responsible for exploratory and exploitative units (Brewer and Miller, 1984; Mackie and Goethals, 1987), and prevent senior teams from devolving into fragmented structures. By contrast, a lack of such shared values can lead to distrust and suspicion within senior teams and throughout the organization, making it hard to draw common characteristics and to identify, extract and combine diverse skills, abilities, and perspectives within exploratory and exploitative units.

Another proposition is to have a clear consensus among the senior team about the unit's strategy, relentless communication of this strategy, and a common-fate incentive system increases the likelihood of ambidexterity.

A third characteristic necessary for reach ambidexterity is a top team that is in accordance with the importance of the exploitation and exploration, without which none of the two is seen as more important. A lot of investigations or researches affirm that the purpose unity is a critical element of successful ambidexterity (Jansen, 2006; Lubatkin, et al., 2006; Sidhu, et al., 2004).

Without a clear consensus in the management team on the strategy and vision, there will be less exchange of information, more unproductive conflicts and a reduced ability to respond to external alterations (Hambrick, 1994). The mixed signals of the senior team make more difficult the already delicate balancing act between exploration and exploitation.

There are certain things to keep in mind. In the first place, it has been shown that the diversity of expertise within the team promotes the ambidexterity (Beckman, 2006), while the lack of diversity reduced it (Sull, 1997). However, so that the diversity to be effective, the high charges must legitimize the ambidextrous way and act as a protector of the exploratory efforts (charitou and Markides, 2004; Tushman and O'Reilly, 2004; Smith and Tushman, 2005; Tushman, 2007). Second, there is evidence that the management team requires a common incentive rewards to promote unity, trust and long-term perspective.

Their fourth proposition speaks about how separate aligned organizational architectures (business models, competencies, incentives, metrics, and cultures) for

explore and exploit subunits and targeted integration increase the likelihood ambidexterity.

The *raison d'être* of the ambidextrous shape in comparison with a spin-out is to allow an organization to experiment and take advantage of the assets and organizational capacities that would not be available if the company was operating individually. But this is a delicate balance. To be successful, the exploratory units need to obtain the resources they need even when they avoid being overwhelmed by the business mature. This requires a high-level integration for strategic problems and integration tactic to take advantage of the assets of the company (Tushman, et al., 2007).

Finally, manager leadership that tolerates the contradictions of multiple alignments and is able to resolve the tensions that ensue increases the likelihood of ambidexterity.

The ambidextrous organizations generate inevitable disagreements between the operational units. The short-term, efficiency and control of a mature is in conflict with the uncertainty and the inefficiency of the experimentation. How to resolve these tensions is a vital element in the ability of an organization to explore and exploit concurrently. If the management does not consider the strategic exploratory unit, there is a risk of yielding to pressure from short-term costs or lack of administration attention. The largest and most profitable probably claim the necessary resources. To be successful it requires what Burgelman (2002) calls "strategic debate": the capacity of the main leaders to encourage dissent and allow the aspiring champions argue about their points.

These five statements, with empirical studies behind, resume the conditions under which the ambidextrous organizational is likely to be successful. We can affirm that this five propositions are dynamic capabilities. In the nonappearance of a clear strategic intent, an overall vision and values, a team aligned, an appropriate organizational architecture with specific integration and the ability of the team to manage the inevitable concessions and conflict, it is difficult to manage ambidexterity. This is a required complementary set of actions of the high-ranking team to allow the exploration to take root in the context of the inertial forces of exploitation.

The competencies that the leaders need to manage the ambidextrous way are different, and more understated, than the necessary to run an exploratory or exploitative business. In the last case, the central problems are related to achieve an alignment

between the organization and the strategy, either in terms of cost, efficiency, scale or experimentation, risk and speed. In ambidextrous terms, managers must be consistently inconsistent, hopeful both exploitation and exploration. This ability, whether you are exploring how to exploit, helps organizations to reconfigure the existing assets and aptitudes to detect and grab new opportunities. Without that, path dependence dynamics leads to the organizations to continue with a successful exploitation and, in the face of changes in markets and technology, to failure.

If these elements were not present what would happen? In the first place, without a strategic attempt intellectually convincing to justify the ambidextrous way, there will be no reasons to explain why the exploitation units profitable, especially for those who are under pressure, they have to hand over the resources to finance small and uncertain exploration projects.

As demonstrated in previous research, managers tend to discount the future risks and doing emphasis on short-term gains at the expense of yields less secure in the long term. Secondly, if there is a common vision and values, there will be a common identity to promote confidence, cooperation and a long-period viewpoint. Thirdly, if the team lacks consensus on the importance of ambidexterity, encouragement will be given to those who are not committed to resist the effort, decreasing the cooperation, increasing competition for resources and decreasing the execution.

. The absence of a system of reward of common destiny and the lack of a persistent communication of the ambidextrous strategy can further undermine cooperation and inspire the unproductive conflict. Fourth, without separate alignments to explore and exploit units and integration directed to take advantage of the common assets, there will be an inefficient use of resources and poor coordination between the units. Finally, if the leadership cannot handle conflicts and the compensation required by ambidexterity, decision-making processes needed to be compromised and end in confusion and conflict.

The absence of a common-fate reward system and a lack of relentless communication of the ambidextrous strategy can further undermine cooperation and encourage unproductive conflict. In addition, without separate alignments for explore and exploit units and targeted integration to leverage common assets, there will be inefficient use of resources and poor coordination across the units. Finally, if the leadership is

unable to manage the conflicts and trade-offs required by ambidexterity, the necessary decision processes will be compromised and end up in confusion and conflict.

Based on the statements before explained, we are going to focus on analyzing:

1. The **shared vision** has a positive effect in ambidextrous managers. Without a common vision and values, there will be no common identity to promote trust, cooperation, and a long-term perspective.
2. The **contingency rewards** has a positive effect in ambidextrous managers. The absence of a common-fate reward system and a lack of relentless communication of the ambidextrous strategy can further undermine cooperation and encourage unproductive conflict.

Indirectly, these two propositions analyzed the fifth proposition that explained O'Reilly and Tushman earlier, since what is measured is the ambidextrous ability presented by the managers (manager ambidexterity). Including the ability of the senior leadership to tolerate and resolve the tension arising from separate alignments: if the leadership is unable to manage the conflicts and trade-offs required by ambidexterity, the necessary decision processes will be compromised and end up in confusion and conflict. So **manager ambidexterity** is also analyzed in this study.

Finally, we want to see, the following relationship:

3. There is a direct relationship between the manager's ambidexterity and the firm performance. We have called this variable **Unit Perform**.

We have chosen this variables because other authors have referred to these as the most important (e.g. Jansen, 2006; Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998; Sinkula, 1997) to perform their empirical studies. In addition, a study of all the variables would be too extensive for this work. Finally, the survey was already quite extensive and we risked that managers maybe will not want to do it whole or answer without thinking well the response.

3. METHODOLOGY.

3.1 MEASURES AND SCALES:

The three chosen variables are formed by diverse items or questions. When we finished the surveys we calculated the average of each proposition to have a global vision of them.

PROPOSITION 1: The **shared or common vision** has a positive effect in ambidextrous managers. Without a common vision and values, there will be no common identity to promote trust, cooperation, and a long-term perspective.

The scale used to measure strategic intent was based on Jansen, George, Van den Bosch, and Volberda, (2008). We called this variable: **shared vision**. The items that they suggest are based on Tsai and Ghoshal, (1998) and Sinkula (1997).

SHARED VISION
All items were measured on a seven-point scale, anchored by 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.
There is commonality of purpose in my senior team
There is total agreement on our organizational vision
All senior team members are committed to the goals of this organization
People are enthusiastic about the collective goals and mission of the whole organization
Our senior team lacks a clearly defined collective vision [reversed item]*.

PROPOSITION 2: The contingency reward system has a positive effect in ambidextrous managers. This variable has been named **Contingency Rewards**.

We have based on the Collins and Clark scale (2003) used also by Jansen, George, Van den Bosch, and Volberda (2008).

CONTINGENCY REWARDS
All items were measured on a seven-point scale, anchored by 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.
Senior team members' variable pay is based on how well the organization as a whole is performing.
This organization uses multiple incentives (e.g. signing bonuses) to attract top candidates for the senior team.
The majority of senior team members' pay is based on variable compensation (bonuses, profit sharing).
Incentive-based pay for the senior team is based on how well the organization is performing as a whole.

Finally, in our **third variable**, called **manager ambidexterity**, we could appreciate if the managers are capable to explore and exploit at the same time. And at what level they spend more investment to the exploration or exploitation.

We can use the scale based on Mom, Van Den Bosch, and Volberda (2007). The questions are divided in two blocks. The first block is to measure the exploitation ability and the other is to measure the exploration ability.

MANAGER AMBIDEXTIRY
All items are measured on a 7-point scale with 1 = 'to a very small extent', or 'strongly disagree', to 7 = 'to a very large extent', or 'strongly agree':
EXPLORATION: To what extent did you, last year, engage in work related activities that can be characterized follows:
Searching for new possibilities with respect to products/services, processes or markets
Evaluating diverse options with respect to products/services, processes or markets
Focusing on strong renewal of products/services or processes
Activities requiring quite some adaptability of you
Activities requiring you to learn new skills or knowledge
EXPLOITATION: To what extent did you, last year, engage in work related activities that can be characterized as follows:

Activities of which a lot of experience has been accumulated by yourself
Activities which serve existing (internal) customers with existing services/products
Activities of which it is clear to you how to conduct them
Activities primarily focused on achieving short-term goals
Activities which you can properly conduct by using your present knowledge
Activities which clearly fit into existing company policy

In the last part of the survey, we added a section called “Unit Perform” to relate the results of the previous proposition with the company benefits and successes.

UNIT PERFORM
Rate your unit performance relative to corporate standards on a 7-point Liker scale ranging from 1 “significantly below average” to 7 “significantly above average” on the following dimensions:
Return on investment
Operating profits
Sales volume
Market share

To be able to compare the surveys between them we put some personal questions:

Studies level:
Age:
Position in the company:
Company Size (Medium or Big)
Years in the company:
Years in the company as a manager:
Years in the actual position:
Country of the unit/branch you manage
Number of full-time employees in your branch/unit:
Gender (male/female):
Number of senior executives that are responsible for strategy in your branch/unit (senior team size):

3.2. SURVEY:

To assess whether these propositions are veridical descriptions of ambidexterity in practice, we sent a survey to the senior managers at 10 firms that were attempting to manage both exploratory and exploitative units. The companies are part of three different sectors: Paper production, industrial machinery supplies and chemical products supply. They are medium or big companies (200 - 350.000 employees).

Senior managers individually were asked about the nature of their leadership challenges, what actions they had taken, an evaluation of their progress to date, and also we want to identify the elements that they thought were helping or delaying them in accomplishing their explorative and exploitative tasks. The focus in these surveys was on understanding in some detail what actions had been taken and how these had been implemented. The goal of these interviews was to specify if the practices carried out by managers or their capabilities are ambidextrous and in what way it affects organizational performance. In this way, we can know if they contribute or not and how affect to the organizational ambidexterity.

We have used the first two variables to measure in a first place the “shared vision” where we would appreciate if the managers have a clear concept of the mission and vision focused on ambidexterity. And in a second place the “social integration” will be our variable: Managers that explicitly owns the ambidextrous strategy (common-fate rewards, communication); it means to be responsible of the ambidextrous strategy through a system of retribution based on the achievement of this ambidextrous strategy.

So we understand that the first and the second variable should have a causality effect to the manager ambidextrous capacity. It means that the results of the two first propositions would be according to the results of the third proposition. And also how we included in the survey a Unit Performance, we could know how the fact of having ambidextrous managers affects the business strategy and the benefits. That not means that if the managers are ambidextrous the company too. Therefore, our survey will be divided into five parts:

- Shared vision: 5 questions.
- Contingency Rewards: 4 questions.
- Manager Ambidexterity: Exploration: 4 questions and Exploitation: 6 questions.

- Unit Perform: 4 questions.
- Other data (age, years in the company, department...): 10 questions.

3.3 SAMPLE:

When we had all the items established, a total of thirty three questions, the survey was done by the Google Survey Platform, and was sent to 10 managers of different companies belonging to three different sectors: Paper production, industrial machinery supplies and chemical products supply.

These companies have been chosen because they are those to which we had direct access to obtain a greater number of data. Therefore there was a convenience sample which we could have direct contact with managers to ensure the answers. We contacted them through an email to ask them permission to answer our questions.

The companies and managers are totally anonymous but in order to get an idea of the company type, we have made a table that summarizes the basic data of the company and of the managers. We have relied on the fifth block of the survey for doing the following classification.

FIRMS	EMPLOYEES	CENTRAL COUNTRY	INDUSTRY SECTOR	MANAGER AGE	MALE / FEMALE	DEPART.	OPERATING COUNTRY
1	600	GERMANY	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLIES	46	MALE	REGIONAL MANAGER	SPAIN, PORTUGAL AND SOUTH AMERICA,
2	1.700	CANADA	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLIES	48	MALE	REGIONAL MANAGER	SPAIN, PORTUGAL, FRANCE, TURKEY, EGYPT & MARROC
3	350.000	GERMANY	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLIES	57	MALE	BUSSINES UNIT MANAGER	SPAIN
4	3.700	EE.UU	CHEMICAL PRODUCTS SUPPLY	60	MALE	AREA MANAGER	EE.UU
5	1400	GERMANY	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLY	56	MALE	QUALITY MANAGER	SPAIN
6	4.800	FINLAND	CHEMICAL PRODUCTS DESIGN	53	MALE	SALES MANAGERS	PORTUGAL

7	20.000	GERMANY	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLY	59	MALE	VICE PRESIDENT SALES	SOUTH EUROPE MIDDLE EAST AFRICA
8	26.000	AUSTRIA	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLY	53	MALE	REGIONAL SALES MANAGER	SPAIN & PORTUGAL
9	2.000	FRANCE	INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY SUPPLY	41	MALE	PROJECT MANAGER	FINLAND
10	45.000	IRELAND	PAPER PRODUCTION	54	FEMALE	PROJECT MANAGER	SPAIN

3.4 TYPE OF ANALYSIS

The number of surveys obtained is not sufficient to perform a statistical analysis of regressions. That's why we have made a descriptive analysis, observing if there is any pattern of relationships between the variables. Similar to the study conducted by O'Reilly and Tushman (2011) based on 15 companies.

As we said before, the survey was divided into five parts: Shared Vision, Contingency Rewards, Manager Ambidexterity and Unit Perform.

To be able to analyze each block, we did an Excel where we collected all the data obtained. Taking the average of the different items of each block we were able to obtain absolute values that would allow us to observe the data in a more generic form and it will be useful to do comparisons between them.

After we have all of the data with the average values obtained in the Excel document, we have added three more sheets, so as to be able to classify the companies. We did it studying the ambidexterity variables separately.

- To calculate the average of exploration we have selected in the third block of questions (manager ambidexterity) only those relating to the exploration:

- To what extent did you, last year, engage in work related activities that can be characterized follows:
 - Searching for new possibilities with respect to products/services, processes or markets evaluating diverse options with respect to products/services, processes or markets.
 - Focusing on strong renewal of products/services or processes.
 - Activities requiring quite some adaptability of you.
 - Activities requiring you to learn new skills or knowledge

- To calculate the average of exploitation we have selected in the third block of questions (manager ambidexterity) only those relating to the exploitation:

- To what extent did you, last year, engage in work related activities that can be characterized as follows:
 - Activities of which a lot of experience has been accumulated by yourself

- Activities which serve existing (internal) customers with existing services/products
- Activities of which it is clear to you how to conduct them
- Activities primarily focused on achieving short-term goals
- Activities which you can properly conduct by using your present knowledge
- Activities which clearly fit into existing company policy.

Then, we compare the average of exploration and of exploitation, and the analysis is made in three steps:

1. First, results of the companies that explore more than exploit are analyzed and commented. To do this, first the average of all companies' exploration is calculated, and then companies that are above the average are selected.
2. Second, results of the companies that exploit more than explore are analyzed. To do this, first the average of all companies' exploitation is calculated, and then companies that are above the average are selected.
3. The companies that have the ambidexterity results above the average are also compared. We calculate the ambidexterity average with the exploration and exploitation average.

In this way, we can analyze the ambidexterity segregated in a form that allow us to make comparisons with the rest of the blocks and observe if there is any relationship between the variables.

4. RESULTS.

Due to the low number of surveys it is not possible to do more complex statistical analysis.

1. Exploration Results: The exploration average of the total number of companies is 4.8 therefore we only look at those companies that are well above the average to see if there is any type of relationship with our two first variables and with the unit perform:

COMPANY	EXPLORATION AVERAGE (4.8)	SHARED VISION AVERAGE (4.86)	CONTINGENCY REWARDS AVERAGE (4.36)	UNIT PERFORM AVERAGE (5.5)
10	7	5,4	5	6,5
3	6,4	4,8	6,5	5
4	6	4,8	4,75	4,2
2	5,4	5,2	4,25	4,6
1	5	4,8	4	4,2
7	5	5	4,5	5

In set, the companies that have a higher average result also are above average in shared vision and contingency rewards results. We also observed how the results of the unit perform are above average.

2. Exploitation Results: The exploitation average of the total number of companies is 5,6 therefore we only look at those companies that are well above the average to see if there is any type of relationship with our two first variables and with the unit perform:

COMPANY	EXPLOTATION AVERAGE (5,6)	SHARED VISION AVERAGE (4,86)	CONTINGENCY REWARDS AVERAGE (4,36)	UNIT PERFORM AVERAGE (5,5)
8	6,2	5,6	5	5,75
1	5,8	4,8	4	5,25
6	5,8	5,6	3,5	4,5
2	5,7	5,2	4,25	5,75
3	5,7	4,8	6,5	6,25
7	5,7	5	4,5	5,75
10	5,7	5,4	5	6,5

- It is noted that the average of exploitation is considerably higher than the exploration. It is also noted that all the companies exploit more than explore even if there is a little difference.

- There is also a relationship between the exploitation and the Unit perform: Casually companies with the lowest average of exploitation are those with the best score in the Unit Perform.

- The shared vision of the company is aligned with the exploitation strategy but we can't said the same with the contingency rewards because there is not a clearly relation between them.

3. Ambidexterity in general: Now we are going to analyze the ambidexterity results (Exploration +Exploitation).

COMPANY	AMBIDEXTERITY AVERAGE (5,5)	SHARED VISION AVERAGE (4.86)	CONTINGENCY REWARDS AVERAGE (4.36)	UNIT PERFORM AVERAGE (5,5)
10	6,3	5,4	5	6,5
3	6	4,8	6,5	6,25
4	5,7	4,8	4,75	5,25
2	5,5	5,2	4,25	5,75

- It is observed in a descriptive level that the companies above the average in ambidexterity matches with the highest of Shared vision and Contingency Rewards (except one but is located very close to the average).

4. Results Comparison.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPLORATION AND EXPLOITATION					
COMPANY	EXPLORATION - EXPLOITATION	AMBIDEXTERITY	SHARED VISION	CONTINGENCY REWARDS	UNIT PERFORM
1	-0,8	5,4	4,8	4	5,25
2	-0,3	5,5	5,2	4,25	5,75
3	0,7	6,0	4,8	6,5	6,25
4	0,7	5,7	4,8	4,75	5,25
5	-2,6	3,9	3,4	3,75	4,75
6	-2,0	4,8	5,6	3,5	4,5
7	-0,7	5,3	5	4,5	6,25
8	-1,6	5,4	5,6	5	5,75
9	-0,6	4,7	4,6	3	4,75
10	1,3	6,3	5,4	5	6,5

- The company 5, shows that has a higher difference between exploration and exploitation in negative value, having an imbalance between explore and exploit activities. Is the company that less explores, practically just exploits and in consequence the company with less ambidexterity. In addition, the scores of the first two variables (shared vision and contingency rewards) were very low. The Unit perform has the lowest result. If we study the company 6 we observe that is the second with a higher negative difference between exploration and exploitation, and like the company 5, the antecedent variables results are very low.
- The company 2, is the one that has a greater balance between exploration and exploitation. This means that the company invests in an almost equal participation in activities of exploration and exploitation, having thus both variables above the average. We can appreciate good results in Shared Vision

and Ambidexterity variables but not especially in contingency rewards.

- The company 10, shows that has a higher difference between exploration and exploitation in positive value, having an imbalance between explore and exploit activities. Is the company that more explores and one that less exploits, this is because is the project development department, so practically just exploits and also is the company with greatest ambidexterity results. In addition, the scores of the first two variables (shared vision and contingency rewards) are very high. This company has the best unit perform results.
- The company 3, has the higher contingency rewards results, and the ambidexterity variable and the unit perform variable are of the highest results. So we can conclude that contingency rewards affects positively on ambidexterity and in the Unit perform.
- The company 9, has the lowest score in the contingency rewards, the manager ambidexterity and the unit perform variables results. It is also the company that less exploiting activities do.
- The company 8, has one of the two higher shared vision variable results, it is also the one that more exploitation activities do. We can see that there is a relation between shared vision and exploitation.

5. Results Conclusion:

We cannot affirm exact statements because there is an existence of a lack of data and the sample is too small to do real conclusions. But we can see a clear positive relationship between the variables proposed as antecedents (shared vision and contingency rewards) and the manager ambidexterity variable. In addition, all companies with a high ambidexterity level have also high results in the unit perform. We also observed that all the companies explote but not all explore. The companies with more exploration have better ambidexterity results and unit perform results.

5. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS:

As we explain in the introduction, the objective of this study was to go deeper into the three selected variables based on O'Reilly and Tushman (2008), that makes a manager ambidextrous and how this antecedents affects directly on the company results perform.

To do this, we have made a theoretical review of the ambidexterity conceptualization and we explained the manager ambidexterity concept and the five propositions exposed by O'Reilly and Tushman. This theoretical review is useful to understand why and how we proposed this three variables: Shared vision, Contingency rewards and Manager Ambidexterity.

When we had the companies sample and the survey created, we send an email with the survey to the ten managers selected. When they answered, we put all the data collected into an Excel to separate and analyze the results.

The obtained results are not statements because the sample is too little, but we see a clear positive relationship between the first two variables proposed before as antecedents (shared vision and contingency rewards) and the third variable (manager ambidexterity) that measured the exploration and exploitation activities in managers. That means that if there are a good share vision and a good contingency reward system focused on ambidexterity, the manager ambidexterity would be higher. And also we saw that the manager ambidexterity has a good influence in the Company performs.

Therefore, this study confirms, as proposed in the literature, that to solve the tensions to obtain in the company both exploration and exploitation it is necessary that there is a suitable environment that encourages it. Specifically, this paper has analyzed the importance of a shared vision, so that all members work towards the same goal. It is important that all managers are involved in this importance of the ambidexterity for the competitiveness of the company, because it is an approach that will have positive consequences. In addition, it is also important to establish a reward system that reinforces this ambidexterity. In

addition, this ambidextrous orientation of the leaders is important for the whole company to be ambidextrous, and innovations and improvements can be produced thanks to this orientation, which in the end will result in better performance. Therefore, the company has to strengthen these capacities in its management team, so that it reaches the whole company. Those organizations that manage to invest in both exploration and exploitation will achieve better performance and long-term survival.

Limitations & future research...

As was a small sample with only 10 managers to be able to interview, we were not able to draw firm conclusions from our research. In addition, many companies told us that they could not answer the survey due to the confidential security of their companies.

The limited time for the delivery of this work has made us to limit the object of the study and we couldn't analyze deeper all the data that we get.

In future studies we will seek to expand the number of surveys and workers of the same company in order to compare the results in a more reliable way. In addition, we could extend the investigation to the five propositions of O'Reilly and Tushman and not only of three as we have done in this work. We added more questions in the survey to have more information for future researches.

6. REFERENCES.

- Arjaliès, D. L., & Mundy, J. (2013). The use of management control systems to manage CSR strategy: A levers of control perspective. *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 24 Nr. 4, 284–300.
- Bart, C. K., & Baetz, M. C. (1998). The relationship between mission statements and firm performance: An exploratory study. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35, 823–853.
- Bart, C. K., Bontis, N., & Taggar, S. (2001). A model of the impact of mission statements on firm performance. *Management Decision*, 39(1), 19–35.
- Cao, Q., Simsek, Z., & Zhang, H. (2010). Modelling the joint impact of the CEO and the TMT on organizational ambidexterity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(7), 1272-1296.
- Charles A. O'Reilly III & Michael L. Tushman (2011, summer). Organizational Ambidexterity in Action: How managers explore and exploit. *California Management Review* vol. 53, no. 4.
- Charles A. O'Reilly III & Michael L. Tushman (March 24, 2007). Ambidexterity as a Dynamic Capability: Resolving the Innovator's Dilemma. 07-088
- Charles A. O'Reilly, David F. Caldwell, Jennifer A. Chatman, Margaret Lapid, and William Self (February, 2010): "How Leadership Matters: The Effects of Leaders' Alignment on Strategy Implementation," *Leadership Quarterly* Vol. 21 Nr. 1 pp.104-113
- Clark Gilbert (October, 2005), "Unbundling the Structure of Inertia: Resource versus Routine Rigidity," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.48 Nr.5 pp. 741-763.
- Christine M. Beckman (August, 2006), "The Influence of Founding Team Company Affiliations on Firm Behavior," *Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 49 Nr. 4 pp. 741-758.
- David J. Teece; Gary Pisano; Amy Shuen. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management.Strategic (August, 1997). *Management Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 7 pp. 509-533.

Duncan, R. B. (1976). 'The ambidextrous organization: designing dual structures for innovation'. In Kilmann, R. H., Pondy, L. R. and Slevin, D. (Eds). *The Management of Organization*.

Haleblian, J. and Finkelstein, S. (1993). 'Top management team size, CEO dominance, and firm performance: the moderating roles of environmental turbulence and discretion'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 844–63

Hambrick, D. C. (1994). 'Top management groups: a conceptual integration and reconsideration of the "group" label'. In Staw, B. M. and Cummings, L. L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Greenwich: JAI Press, 171–214.

Hambrick, D. C. and Mason, P. A. (1984). 'Upper echelons: the organization as a reflection of its top managers'. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 193–206.

Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1993, March–April). Strategy as stretch and leverage. *Harvard Business Review*, pp.75–84.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavind, J. H. and Florey, A. T. (2002). 'Time, teams, and task performance: changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning'. *Academy of Management Journal* Vol., 45, 1029–45.

He, Z. and Wong, P. (2004). 'Exploration and exploitation: an empirical test of the ambidexterity hypotheses. *Organization Science*, Vol. 15, 481–94.

Jan Rivkin and Nicolaj Siggelkow, (March 2003) "Balancing Search and Stability: Interdependencies among Elements of Organizational Design," *Management Science*, Vol. 49 Nr. 3 pp. 290-311;

Jansen, J. J. P., Van Den Bosch, F. A. J. and Volberda, H. W. (2005). 'Managing potential and realized absorptive capacity: how do organizational antecedents matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 999–1015.

Jansen, J. J. P., Van Den Bosch, F. A. J. and Volberda, H. W. (2006). 'Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance: effects of organizational antecedents and environmental moderators'. *Management Science*, 52, 1661–74.

Jansen, J. J., George, G., Van den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2008). Senior team attributes and organizational ambidexterity: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(5), 982-1007.

Jansen, Justin J. P. and George, Gerard and Van Den Bosch, Frans A. J. and Volberda, H. W. (July, 2008). Senior Team Attributes and Organizational Ambidexterity: The Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45, Issue 5, pp. 982-1007.

Klein, H. J. and Mulvey, P. W. (1995). 'Two investigations of the relationships among group goals, goal commitment, cohesion, and performance'. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 61, 44– 53.

Lubatkin, M. H., Simsek, Z., Ling, Y., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Ambidexterity and performance in small-to medium-sized firms: The pivotal role of top management team behavioural integration. *Journal of management Studies*, 32(5), 646-672.

March, J. G. (1991). 'Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning'. *Organization Science* Nr. 2, pp. 71–87.

Marko Reimer, Sebastiaan Van Doorn, Mariano L. M. Heyden (May 14, 2016). Managers and management control systems in the strategy process. *Journal of Management Control*. Vol. 27 pp. 121–127.

Mom, T. J. M., Van Den Bosch, F. A. J. and Volberda, H. W. (2005). 'Managing the tension between competence building and competence leveraging by influencing managerial and organizational determinants of horizontal knowledge exchange'. In Sanchez, R. and Heene, A. (Eds), *Managing Knowledge Assets and Organizational Learning*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Mom, T. J., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2007). Investigating managers' exploration and exploitation activities: The influence of top-down, bottom-up, and horizontal knowledge inflows. *Journal of management studies*, 44(6), 910-931.

Mom, van den Bosch, and Volberda (July–August 2009). Understanding Variation in Managers' Ambidexterity. *Organization Science* Vol. 20. Nr. 4, pp. 812–828.

O'Reilly, C. A. and Tushman, M. L. (2004). 'The ambidextrous organization'. *Harvard Business Review*. Vol. 82, 74–81.

O'Reilly, C. A., Caldwell, D. F. and Barnett, W. P. (1989). 'Work group demography, social integration, and turnover'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.34, 21–37.

Peterson, R. S., Smith, D. B., Martorana, P. V. and Owens, P. D. (2003). 'The impact of chief executive officer personality on top management team dynamics: one mechanism by which leadership affects organizational performance'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88, 795–808.

Richard Wittington, Andrew Pettigrew, Simon Peck, Evelyn Penton, and Martin Conyon (September-October 1999), "Change and Complementarities in the New Competitive Landscape," *Organization Science*, Vol. 10 Nr. 5 pp. 583-600.

Siegel, P. A. and Hambrick, D. C. (2005). 'Pay disparities within top management groups: evidence of harmful effects on performance of high-technology firms'. *Organization Science*, Vol. 16, 259–74.

Smith, K. G., Smith, K. A., Olian, J. D., Sims, H. P., O'Bannon, D. P. and Scully, J. A. (1994). 'Top management team demography and process: the role of social integration and communication'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 39, 412–38.

Wendy K. Smith and Michael L. Tushman (September-October 2005), "Managing Strategic Contradictions: A Top Management Model for Managing Innovation Streams," *Organization Science*, Vol. 16 Nr. 5 pp. 522-536.

ANNEXES.

ANNEX 1: The survey

All items will be scored on a seven-point scale. From 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

APPROACH 1: SHARED VISION.

- There is commonality of purpose in my department.
- There is total agreement on our organizational vision
- All managers are committed to the goals of this organization
- People are enthusiastic about the collective goals and mission of the whole organization
- Managers lacks a clearly defined collective vision
- Each individual knows how their efforts contribute to the mission
- The goals and objectives are translated into work performance standards and expectations for each employee
- The managers are quick to defend each other from criticism by outsiders
- Everyone's input is incorporated into important company decisions
- The managers get along together very well
- The managers are always ready to cooperate and help each other
- When final decisions are reached, it is common, for at least one member, to be unhappy with the decision
- There is a great deal of competition between members of the management team
- Last year, I receive or gather the most important knowledge from:
 - A colleague within my own organizational unit
 - A colleague in other organizational units within my own division
 - A colleague in other division
 - My direct supervisor
 - One more hierarchical level up than my direct supervisor
 - Two more hierarchical levels up than my direct supervisor
 - My direct assistants
 - One more hierarchical level down than my direct assistants.

APPROACH 2: CONTINGENCY REWARDS.

- Managers' variable pay is based on how well the organization as a whole is performing
- This organization uses multiple incentives (e.g. signing bonuses) to attract top candidates for the manager position.
- The majority of managers' pay is based on variable compensation (bonuses, profit sharing)
- Incentive-based pay for the managers is based on how well the organization is performing as a whole.

- My company's strategy accounts for Innovation and consider it as a key factor in its success.
- My organization's strategy is proactive in the "of innovation concept" and anticipates the changes that occur in the market and the environment
- The company's management is committed and offers full support for innovation activities
- My organization has a formal plan where the objectives, the actions to be carried out, the resources and the budget necessary for the development of the activities of innovation are defined.
- My company has a manager in charge of innovation matters.
- My company dedicates significant human, financial and resources to the innovation section.
- Innovation in my company is contemplate not only as the development of new products or services, but also as the improvement of business processes.
- The design and development of new products (or services) is carried out according to the real needs of the market and the clients of the company.
- My company promotes creativity and leverage the full potential of its managers and workers.
- My company evaluates all the ideas generated within the Organization and take advantage of it systematically to enhance its development.
- My company systematically takes advantage of the suggestions and the knowledge of its suppliers to generate improvements and innovations of product or process.
- My company systematically takes advantage of the suggestions and the knowledge of its customers to generate improvements and innovations of product or process.

APPROACH 3: MANAGER AMBIDEXTERITY.

- Last year, I engaged more work related to activities that can be characterized as follow:
 - o Searching for new possibilities for products/services, processes or markets
 - o Evaluating diverse options for products/services, processes or markets
 - o Focusing on strong renewal of products/services or processes
 - o Activities requiring me quite some adaptability
 - o Activities requiring me to learn new skills or knowledge
- Last year, I engaged more work related to activities that can be characterized as follow:
 - o Activities for which I have accumulated a lot of experience before
 - o Activities related with existing and internal customers and existing services/products
 - o Activities that I know how to manage them
 - o Activities primarily focused on achieving short-term goals
 - o Activities that I can properly manage using my present knowledge
 - o Activities that clearly fit into the existing company policy

APPROACH 4: UNIT PERFORMANCE

- Return on investment
- Operating profits
- Cash flow from operations
- Cost control
- Development of new products
- Sales volume
- Market share
- Market development
- Personnel development
- Political-public affairs
- R&D activities
- Profit-to-sales ratio

OTHERS:

Studies level:

Age:

Position in the company:

Years in the company:

Years in the company as a manager:

Years in the actual position:

Country of the unit/branch you manage

Number of full-time employees in your branch/unit:

Gender (male/female):

Number of senior executives that are responsible for strategy in your branch/unit
(senior team size):

