CHAPTER 2

Changing Forms of Organizing

Abstract This chapter charts the evolution of organizing forms, in particular the nature and scope of exploration and exploitation as complementary forces stimulating change and continuity. The chapter contextualizes the emergence of ambidexterity as the capacity to both use and refine existing knowledge while also creating new knowledge. Further, ambidexterity capability may be leveraged through a duality-based organizing forms architecture, providing the means for enabling organizations to explore and exploit with equal success. Finally, the chapter highlights how ambidexterity capability introduces a unique process view of the explore—exploit tension that draws on duality theory as an explanatory framework.

Keywords Organizing forms · Ambidexterity capability

Introduction

Chapter 1 introduced the commentary beginning in the 1950s calling for 'new' forms of organizing. In the context of a volatile environment escalating in complexity and turbulence, a new popular message radiated through the late twentieth century. The need for an overhaul of traditional, functionally specialized, hierarchical systems and structures had arrived. No doubt traditional forms had served organizations admirably during less demanding and more certain times. However, a dynamic and ambiguous business environment sat uncomfortably with the newfound need for continuity and stability. Growth and prosperity became connected to a

© The Author(s) 2017

A.C.T. Smith et al., *Reinventing Innovation*,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-57213-0_2

flexible, responsive approach, primed to expect the unexpected (Beer and Walton 1990). Organizations were therefore urged to overthrow rigid systems and structures in favor of flat, loosely assembled, networked forms of organizing. As the cumbersome old models languished, the new were hailed as the magic bullet for innovation, exploration, and learning (Limerick and Cunnington 1993; Kanter et al. 1992; Naisbitt and Aburdene 1990; Ulrich and Wiersema 1989).

Claims for more flexible, agile forms of organizing presuppose that environmental turbulence requires a certain structural response that traditional organizational forms, built around steady-state conformity, are ill-equipped to address. But, despite all the noise about discarding tight traditional structures for fluid new ones, organizations actually shifted differently. Studies on organizations across the Western world, for example, have revealed that while new, more flexible forms of organizing did emerge within organizations, hierarchy and other traditional organizational practices remained steadfastly in place. As it turned out, most organizations discovered that a direct exchange of old for new was not the innovation panacea that was promised. In fact, the core aspects of traditional structure—planning, coordinating, and direction-setting—also provide stability during periods of uncertainty. As recent studies show (and we demonstrate in detail through our case study analyses in Chaps. 4–6), the *exploitative* 'accountability and control' attributes of traditional forms of organizing complement and support the *explorative*, 'adaptive attributes' of new forms of organizing (O'Reilly and Tushman 2004; Palmer and Dunford 2002; Pettigrew et al. 2003; Raynor and Bower 2001; Volberda 1998). The problem seems to lie with how we look at the two kinds of organizing frameworks.

Rather than viewing the dual imperatives of change and continuity as distinctive but complementary elements of organizational design, they are generally treated as mutually exclusive, antagonistic opposites. As such they are often represented in adversarial continua such as control versus freedom, hierarchy versus empowerment, or stability versus flexibility. However, by favoring only one side of the change-continuity equation, organizations risk either paralysis through inaction, or chaos through overreaction (Weick 1979). As Davis and Lawrence (1977) noted, the dilemma of change comes with the dilemma of an 'either-or world.'

Some commentators view the 'either-or' dilemma as a problem of managing 'organizing tensions' (Asch and Salaman 2002). Some organizing tension discussions focus on pressures to differentiate *and* integrate, as well as the need for controllability *and* responsiveness. Others argue that the way

forward involves constructing the so-called ambidextrous forms encapsulating explore and exploit domains because they provide an ideal architecture for simultaneous tight and loose structures (Benner and Tushman 2003). Although it sounds awkward, a tight and loose arrangement means that flexible structures operate inside, beside, or outside hierarchical bureaucracy. Yet both kinds of organizing seem essential because flexible exploration goes off the radar without some exploitation to control and scale its yield. Conversely, commercial exploitation inevitably runs out unless a pipeline of innovative products is developed.

According to Smith and Tushman (2005, p. 523), exploitation can be seen as 'variance decreasing' based on 'disciplined problem solving.' Exploitation is concerned with continuity and control—the 'tight' side of the organizing equation. It draws on and builds from an organization's past, aiming to increase efficiency and profitability in the current business model. Exploration, in contrast, constitutes 'variance increasing' through trial and error experimentation. Exploration depicts the 'loose,' responsive organizing mode. It is concerned with change and adaptability—encouraging creativity and risk-taking, and tapping into previously untested markets and opportunities (Groysberg and Lee 2009; Smith and Tushman 2005).

Discussion around these concomitant, yet competing, dual pressures gave rise to the concept of ambidextrous forms of organizing. Ambidextrous forms of organizing were seen to reflect a 'mix and match' approach (Jackson and Harris 2003), comprising interactions between organic-, mechanistic-, and knowledge-based structures (Wang and Ahmed 2003). Organizational ambidexterity is really just the capacity to simultaneously exploit existing capabilities while exploring new opportunities (Tushman and O'Reilly 1996). It sounds straightforward enough—even a natural state for a healthy organization—but has proven to be an elusive combination.

This chapter charts the evolution of organizing forms, in particular the nature and scope of exploration and exploitation as complementary forces stimulating change and continuity. We seek to contextualize the emergence of ambidexterity as an organizational capability. As Turner et al. (2013, p. 320) explained, ambidexterity represents the capacity 'to both use and refine existing knowledge (exploitation) while also creating new knowledge to overcome knowledge deficiencies or absences identified with the execution of the work (exploration).' We propose that *ambidexterity capability*, leveraged through what we describe as a dual organizing forms

architecture (explored comprehensively in Chap. 3), may provide the means for enabling organizations to explore and exploit with equal success. This provides the background for the ensuing discussion in Chap. 3. It highlights how ambidexterity capability introduces a unique process view of the explore—exploit tension that draws on duality theory as an explanatory framework. But first a little history.

The Evolution of Organizing Forms: Toward Exploration and Exploitation

Perceptions had shifted inexorably by the turn of the century. As concepts like sustainable futures, long-term growth, competitive collaboration, and people-focused management came into vogue as part of the organizing lexicon through the last decades of the twentieth century, the call for a response encompassing both continuity and change gathered momentum (Limerick and Cunnington 1993; Kanter et al. 1992; Naisbitt and Aburdene 1990; Ulrich and Wiersema 1989). Where earlier environmental turbulence appeared infrequent and manageable for organizations with sufficient resolve, the new century quickly became synonymous with constant change. At the same time, innovation remained slippery. Even its successful delivery could not save firms that had not maintained high levels of core business efficiency as well.

Organizations were caught in a vicious circle. The formulaic model of traditional structures and systems, which focused on planning and budgeting, and putting in place clearly defined systems and procedures (Evans and Doz 1992), had become cumbersome. They simply did not work well in a complex, highly competitive, and globalized marketplace. As Pettigrew and Fenton (2000, p. 279) explained, the overriding assumption was that the 'new competitive landscape renders anachronistic traditional, efficiency-oriented vertical structures and triggers the search for new organizational practices in which flexibility, knowledge collecting and connecting, and horizontal collaboration are essential characteristics.' A seismic shift in focus was needed from a solitary concentration on stability and control to managing innovation and change as well

As we have noted, however, despite some enthusiastic predictions, this shift did not spell the demise of bureaucracy. Rather, high-performing organizations adopted dual organizing forms drawing on the strengths of traditional, robust forms of organizing while they experimented with the new (O'Reilly and Tushman 2004; Pettigrew et al. 2003; Palmer et al. 2007;

Palmer and Dunford 2002; Raynor and Bower 2001; Volberda 1998). The resulting 'dual' or 'paired' forms blended familiar formalized, traditional work practices with new, agile and flexible work arrangements. Instead of just trying to ride out uncertain times and dicey markets, firms tried a blended model in order to maximize control and flexibility at the same time (O'Reilly and Tushman 2004; Pettigrew et al. 2003). Paradoxically, some bureaucratic rules proved essential in facilitating organizational agility and adaptability. Rigid structures offer a stable platform from which exploration and experimentation can be safely and expeditiously pursued (Bahrami 1992; Brooks and Saltzman 2016). It was this realization—stability and change can be combined in high measures to produce an optimal outcome—that opened the door to an entirely new way of thinking about meeting explore and exploit targets without compromising one or the other.

Powered by a new paradigm, the marriage of traditional with new forms of organizing fed into a series of studies investigating dualities (Evans and Doz 1989; Quinn and Cameron 1988), organizational ambidexterity (Gibson and Birkinshaw 2004; O'Reilly and Tushman 2004; Tushman and O'Reilly 1996), and the explore—exploit tension (March 1991). While these organizing/structuring concepts only gained prominence in the last decades of the twentieth century with the pioneering work of researchers like Tushman and O'Reilly, Evans and Doz, and March, their provenance can be traced back to the early 1960s. In fact, scholars such as Burns and Stalker (1961), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), and Duncan (1976) first coined the term 'the ambidextrous organization.' We think that as a broader, more inclusive concept, 'dualities' or 'duality theory,' perhaps offers the most productive foundational framework.

Duality theory presents an overarching but nascent conceptual framework depicting exploration (change) and exploitation (stability) as neither mutually exclusive nor inclusive, as the long-standing conundrum implies. Rather, the two exist as a 'duality,' a non-reductive construct characterized by simultaneity, relatedness, minimal thresholds, dynamism, and improvisation (Evans and Doz 1992; Graetz and Smith 2008; Hedberg et al. 1976). In other words, an organizing duality exists when a unique combination of high levels of both change and stability occurs simultaneously, taking on an emergent, complex dynamic. Like a champion sporting team, an organization with duality characteristics can both attack aggressively and defend indefatigably without shifting players or discussing tactics. Thus, we talk about such organizations as possessing ambidextrous capabilities,

pressing forward to score as easily as holding resolute in defense. They make good now while working on what will be good later.

Organizing forms and innovation literature promote the merits of ambidextrous forms of organizing, the inescapable need for organizational dualities, and the possibilities of pursuing concurrent exploration and exploitation. Faced with such an array of terms all expounding a 'paired' or double-pronged approach, the challenge for scholars and practitioners became one of meanings. The salient issue revolved around whether ambidexterity, dualities, and explore—exploit all referred to the same thing, or whether they should have been viewed as either interrelated or distinct. Here, we argue that the successful pursuit of both exploration and exploitation relies first on nurturing ambidexterity capability. To that end, we view ambidexterity capability as an essential pre-condition for explore—exploit outcomes because it normalizes the seemingly contradictory, divisive tension that accompanies the pursuit of exploration and exploitation.

By 'normalization' we mean that ambidexterity capability enables organizations not only to recognize that the tension is real, but also to learn to live with and accept contradiction. In essence, contradiction (or the presence of complexity) is a 'normal', albeit critical, component of a healthy organization. Complementarities emerge through engagement with coexisting (seemingly contradictory) forces, such as stability and change. While their association is undeniable, they are not substitutable. Similarly, dualities, as the word suggests, refers to the distinctive (but complementary) organizing modes present in the explore—exploit duality, such as loose/tight coupling, empowerment/leadership, action/planning, and flexibility/control, and are summarized in Table 2.1. Notions of ambidexterity, dualities, and explore—exploit were all invented in order to best search for a mode of structuring and organizing to foster innovation, flexibility, experimentation, and organizational learning without compromising efficiency.

Organizational Ambidexterity: Building the Capacity to Explore and Exploit

For researchers investigating organizational ambidexterity, and practitioners seeking to cultivate it, the key question concerns how to manage the ostensibly contradictory elements of continuity (efficiency) and change (flexibility) with equal dexterity (Tushman et al. 2010). Organizational ambidexterity underpins survival in dynamic, complex environments, 'aligned and efficient in their management of today's business demands,

Table 2.1 Characteristics of exploration and exploitation

Exploit domain *Exploitative continuity goals* *Control and efficiency*	*Explore domain* *Explorative change goals* *Innovation and flexibility*
Individual focus • Focus on individual skills, expertise, personal characteristics, specialization, competition	Organizational focus • Focus on cooperation and collaboration through teamwork and cross-functional work groups • Building shared values, trust
Static • Maintain the status quo • Assumes a stable, predictable environment • Use of traditional KPIs: balance sheet, gross margins, profit and loss, salary cost, etc.	Dynamic • Organic, flexible, adaptive, loosely coupled • Foster risk-taking and creativity • Use of distinctive benchmarks and performance measures to encourage innovation
Internal focus • Inward, closed system focus • Ownership of upstream and downstream resources and capabilities; insourcing • Long-term staffing—job for life	External focus • Open systems focus, monitor external environment • Short-term staffing: core of permanent staff; buy in expertise for short term projects • Outsource 'non-core' activities and services
Differentiation • Functional specialization, silos—focus on specific, individual skills • Aggregation of business units—traditional divisional, semi-autonomous business structures	Integration • Collaborative networks: Strategic partnerships, joint ventures to complement in-house capabilities and resources • Disaggregation of business units: emphasizing both autonomy and interdependence
Hierarchy • Tall pyramid structures • Tightly coupled, top-down control • Low discretionary powers at operational level	Teamwork • Cross-functional project-based work groups/small specialized teams—autonomy and interdependence • Removing middle management/supervisory layers, increasing individual autonomy and discretion
Leadership/command • Strong, top-down leadership and supervision. Directive	Empowerment • Distributed leadership. Delegation of decision making, increased self-direction and self-management

(continued)

Table 2.1 (continued)

Exploit domain *Exploitative continuity goals* *Control and efficiency*	*Explore domain* *Explorative change goals* *Innovation and flexibility*
leadership. Authority and power with senior management	
Accountability, Control • Focus on uniformity, standardization, performance measurement and quality control systems to monitor, coordinate, control, and disseminate information	Freedom, Flexibility • Recognition that increased competition at both the local and global levels calls for increased responsiveness and flexibility, and continuous improvement and innovation
Planning • Traditional, rational, systematic approach to strategic planning. Assumes a stable, predictable environment	Action • Strategy as emergent, unfolding, responding proactively to environmental uncertainty. Focus on doing
Centralization • Centralized systems and decision making: authority; power with senior management	Decentralization • Redistribution of decision making to involve employee or worker participation
Tight Coupling • Allied to accountability and control. Rigid structures, with traditional segmentation of skills and knowledge into discrete departments. Functional silos	Loose coupling • Fluid, permeable boundaries simultaneously asserting 'both autonomous distinctiveness and interdependence,' thus enabling differentiation and integration between business units

while also adaptive enough to changes in the environment that they will still be around tomorrow' (Gibson and Birkinshaw 2004, p. 209). In short, the capacity to manage contradictory tensions simultaneously—such as efficiency and innovation—means that an organization can extract an efficient return on its long-term investments while chasing new and risky innovations along the way (Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009; Nosella et al. 2012; Turner et al. 2013). Efficiency ensures short-term prosperity, mitigating the risks and expenses of innovation. Conversely, a well-stoked innovation pipeline secures long-term viability and profitability.

Central to ambidexterity is the capacity for 'simultaneity' in managing organizing tensions (Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009; Lubatkin et al. 2006;

Turner et al. 2013). Four tensions in particular take precedence (Raisch et al. 2009): differentiation/integration; individual/organizational; static/dynamic; and internal/external. These tensions represent related and complementary rather than opposing mechanisms for organizational performance. For example, instead of a balanced compromise, efficiency and flexibility should be each maximized. While exploration and exploitation demand distinct learning processes, success arrives from simultaneity in execution (March 1991). Although March (1991) did not employ the term ambidexterity to describe dual organizing forms, his contribution led to an acceptance that both sides must be considered as a complex and dynamic unit (Turner et al. 2013). Ambidexterity is about doing both exploration and exploitation, thereby enabling an organization to 'reconfigure existing assets and capabilities to sense and seize new opportunities' (O'Reilly and Tushman 2008, p. 200).

Ambidexterity capability overcomes the need for trade-offs in allocating scarce resources to either exploitation or exploration at the expense of the other. We propose that *building* ambidexterity capability drives the uncompromising pursuit of exploration and exploitation. As Hill and Birkinshaw (2014, p. 1900) concluded in their study of corporate venture (CV) units, it was the capacity to 'reconcile the competing demands for exploration and exploitation' that proved critical to survival.

Exploration and Exploitation: Embracing the Dualistic Tension

In his seminal paper on exploration and exploitation in organizational learning, March (1991, p. 85) defined the essence of exploitation as 'the refinement and extension of existing competences, technologies, and paradigms' with 'positive, proximate, and predictable' returns. In contrast, he described exploration as 'experimentation with new alternatives with returns that are 'uncertain, distant, and often negative.' The ever-present challenge for organizations remains how 'to engage in sufficient exploitation to ensure its current viability and, at the same time, devote enough energy to exploration to ensure its future viability' (Levinthal and March 1993, p. 105). Doing well now and doing well later have never been considered compatible objectives. Compounding this dilemma, many senior managers harbor an instinctive discomfort with ambiguity and uncertainty, encouraging an intuitive reluctance to adapt and improvise. Most naturally seek order and predictability through formulaic procedures

(Collins 2003). Yet, as Pascale (1990) suggested, it is the tension or 'dynamic synthesis' between contradictory opposites that provides the catalyst for self-renewal and long-term organizational effectiveness.

Traditional, formalized logic based on either/or thinking would try and *resolve* the dualistic tension between what were once viewed as 'conflicting truths' (Lewis 2000, p. 761) by favoring one option at the expense of the other. In contrast, we maintain that developing ambidexterity capabilities allows organizations to convert the tensions into explore—exploit outcomes. Yet, although many leaders accept that exploration and exploitation demand equal, uncompromising pursuit, an assumption still holds that each goal takes an organization in a different direction.

We propose that leaders and managers should think in terms of developing ambidexterity capabilities. Here, action reflects the merger of the two explore—exploit polarities. Instead of saying what a company needs to *do* (explore—exploit), the ambidexterity construct focuses on what capabilities a company needs to become comfortable with in pursuing both exploration and exploitation. While this chapter exclusively focuses on the theoretical background to explore—exploit in the form of dualities, our later chapters provide detailed cases unpacking how ambidexterity capabilities can be achieved.

Dual Explore—Exploit Forms of Organizing: The Ambidexterity Capability Pre-requisite

As organizations engage in more cross-boundary collaborations with both internal and external stakeholders, dualities highlight the need to manage 'loose-tight' relationships. Organizations need to establish structures that enhance flexibility and responsiveness (exploration) while simultaneously bolstering performance efficiencies (exploitation). Lowendahl and Revang (2004, p. 50) echoed this sentiment advocating that 'modern change processes demand simultaneous management of change in some dimensions and stability in others' in order to realize the dual need for efficiency and flexibility. As we have noted, inconsistent yet interrelated organizing forms (Lewis 2000) (such as flexibility-efficiency, accountability-freedom, control-innovation, and dynamic-static) have been linked to exploration and exploitation (He and Wong 2004; Lewis 2000; March 1991; O'Reilly and Tushman 2008). Tushman and O'Reilly (1996) defined the capacity to simultaneously exploit existing capabilities while exploring new opportunities as a theory of 'organizational ambidexterity.'

Despite, or perhaps because of, this definition, the labels 'exploration and exploitation' and 'organizational ambidexterity' have appeared almost interchangeably in the literature. It reflects a colloquial presumption that organizational ambidexterity and exploration-exploitation are at least co-dependent if not interchangeable concepts (Benner and Tushman 2003; Chen and Miller 2010; Groysberg and Lee 2009; He and Wong 2004; Lowendahl and Revang 2004; Tushman et al. 2010). Writing more recently, Voss and Voss (2013) observed that achieving ambidexterity is particularly challenging for smaller, younger organizations that lack the resources, capabilities, or experience to simultaneously pursue exploration and exploitation. The correspondence is significant to our argument that undertaking exploration and exploitation with equal vigor and determination depends upon building ambidexterity capability.

We think that organizational ambidexterity and exploration—exploitation are *not* interchangeable. Rather, ambidexterity capability precedes the successful, simultaneous pursuit of exploration and exploitation. Together they deliver distinctive yet complementary, co-dependent elements of organizing and structuring. As explained in Chap. 3, ambidexterity capability allows organizations to embed organizational dualities within conventional operations as measured by their ability to deliver both explore and exploit outcomes. As Jansen et al. (2008) showed, while descriptive accounts are plentiful, few studies have tried to explain the drivers of ambidexterity, although the most recent are addressing its 'mechanisms' (Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009; Jansen et al. 2012; Lubatkin et al. 2006; Turner et al. 2013). While there is limited research on how to manage ambidexterity or the explore—exploit tension, 'almost all agree that ambidexterity is an organizational capability that makes it possible to resolve tensions that arise in organizations' (Nosella et al. 2012, p. 540). In contrast, we argue that the aim of building ambidexterity capability is *not* to resolve tension but to encourage it in the form of explore—exploit outcomes.

Conclusion

As this chapter has reinforced, the exploitation—exploration debate is alive and well. Commentaries on balancing or reconciling the organizing tensions accompanying continuity and change thread through more than 50 years of literature. The enduring argument holds that sustainable long-term organizational futures demand simultaneous exploration and exploitation, pursued with equal vigor. In fact, the simultaneous pursuit of

exploration—invoking innovation and efficiency—premised by stability and control remains critical to an organization's success and survival. No one challenges the new realities of organizational life where tension and discontinuity are natural, irreducible elements (Gibson and Birkinshaw 2004; He and Wong 2004; March 1991; O'Reilly and Tushman 2004, 2008; Tushman et al. 2010). The question has always been what to do about it.

We have suggested that ambidexterity capability constitutes the essential precondition for explore—exploit simultaneity and its subsequent execution. Instead of saying what a company needs to *do* (explore and exploit), ambidexterity focuses on what capabilities a company needs to *build* in order to grow and develop, bringing together both structural and contextual considerations. Rather than just assuming that explore and exploit outcomes are both needed, attention must shift to the development and sustenance of exploration and exploitation. As this indicates, the aim of building ambidexterity capability is *not* to resolve, but to engage with, the tension between the dual explore—exploit elements. In addition, we have referenced duality theory as a potential explanatory framework for understanding and managing the tensions that arise in building a capacity for simultaneous, dynamic, related exploration and exploitation through the medium of organizational ambidexterity. These lines of inquiry are pursued in Chap. 3.

References

Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2009). Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science, 20*(4), 696–717.

Asch, D., & Salaman, G. (2002). The challenge of change. *European Business Journal, 14*(3), 133–143.

Bahrami, H. (1992). The emerging flexible organization: Perspectives from Silicon Valley. *California Management Review, 34*(4), 33–52.

Beer, M., & Walton, E. (1990). Developing the competitive organization: Interventions and strategies. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 154–216.

Benner, M. J., & Tushman, M. L. (2003). Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(2), 238–256.

Brooks, S. M., & Saltzman, J. M. (2016). *Creating the vital organization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London, UK: Tavistock.

Chen, M.-J., & Miller, D. (2010). West meets East: Toward an ambicultural approach to management. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 24*(1), 17–22.

Collins, D. (2003). Guest editor's introduction: Re-imagining change. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, *2*(4), iv–xi.

Davis, Stanley M., & Lawrence, P. R. (1977). *Matrix*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Duncan, R. (1976). The ambidextrous organization: Designing dual structures for innovation. In R. Kilmann, L. Pondy, & D. Slevin (Eds.), *The management of organization* (pp. 167–188). New York: North-Holland.

Evans, P., & Doz, Y. (1989). The dualistic organization. In P. Evans, Y. Doz, & A. Laurent (Eds.), *Human resource management in international firms: Change, globalization, innovation* (pp. 219–242). London, UK: Macmillan.

Evans, P., & Doz, Y. (1992). Dualities: A paradigm for human resource and organizational development in complex multinationals. In V. Pucik, N. Tichy, & C. Barnett (Eds.), *Globalizing management: Creating and leading the competitive organization* (pp. 85–106). New York: Wiley.

Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*(2), 209–226.

Graetz, F., & Smith, A. (2008). The role of dualities in arbitrating continuity and change in forms of organizing. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 10*(3), 265–280.

Groysberg, B., & Lee, L.-E. (2009). Hiring stars and their colleagues: Exploration and exploitation in professional service firms. *Organization Science, 20*(4), 740–758.

He, Z. L., & Wong, P. K. (2004). Exploration vs. exploitation: An empirical test of the ambidexterity hypothesis. *Organization Science, 15*(4), 481–494.

Hedberg, B., Nystrom, P., & Starbuck, W. H. (1976). Camping on seesaws: Prescriptions for a self designing organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(1), 41–65.

Hill, S. A., & Birkinshaw, J. (2014). Ambidexterity and survival in corporate venture units. *Journal of Management, 40*(7), 1899–1931.

Jackson, P., & Harris, L. (2003). E-business and organizational change: Reconciling traditional values with business transformation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 16*(5), 497–511.

Jansen, J. J. P., George, G., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., & 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, 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.

Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A., & Jick, T. D. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change*. New York: The Free Press.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 12*(1), 1–47.

Levinthal, D. A., & March, J. G. (1993). The myopia of learning. *Strategic Management Journal, 14*(S2), 95–112.

Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 760–776.

Limerick, D., & Cunnington, B. (1993). *Managing the new organisation*. Sydney: Business and Professional Publishing.

Lowendahl, B. R., & Revang, O. (2004). Achieving results in an after modern context: Thoughts on the role of strategizing and organizing. *European Management Review, 1*(1), 49–54.

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 behavioral integration. *Journal of Management, 32*(5), 646–672.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 71–87.

Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1990). *Megatrends 2000: Ten new directions for the 1990's*. New York: Avon Books.

Nosella, A., Cantarello, S., & Filippini, R. (2012). The intellectual structure of organizational ambidexterity: A bibliographic investigation into the state of the art. *Strategic Organization, 10*(4), 450–464.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2004). The ambidextrous organization. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(4), 74–81.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28*(1), 185–206.

Palmer, I., & Dunford, R. (2002). Out with the old and in with the new? The relationship between traditional and new organizational practices. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 10*(3), 209–226.

Palmer, I., Benveniste, J., & Dunford, R. (2007). New organizational forms: Towards a generative dialogue. *Organization Studies, 28*(12), 1829–1847.

Pascale, R. (1990). *Managing on the edge: How successful companies use conflict to stay ahead. New York: Viking Penguin.*

Pettigrew, A. M., & Fenton, E. M. (2000). Complexities and dualities in innovative forms of organizing. In A. M. Pettigrew & E. M. Fenton (Eds.), *The innovative organization* (pp. 279–300). London, UK: Sage.

Pettigrew, A. M., Whittington, R. L., Melin, L., Sanchez-Runde, C., Van Den Bosch, F. A. J., Ruigrok, W., et al. (2003). *Innovative forms of organizing*. London, UK: Sage.

Quinn, R. E., & Cameron, K. S. (Eds.). (1988). *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing.

Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational ambidexterity: Balancing exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. *Organization Science, 20*(4), 685–695.

Raynor, M. E., & Bower, J. L. (2001). Lead from the center: How to manage divisions dynamically. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(5), 93–100.

Smith, W. K., & Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organization Science, 16*(5), 522–536.

Turner, N., Swart, J., & Maylor, H. (2013). Mechanisms for managing ambidexterity: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 15*(3), 317–332.

Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1996). The ambidextrous organization: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *California Management Review, 38*(4), 8–30.

Tushman, M., Smith, W. K., Chapman Wood, R., Westerman, G., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2010). Organizational designs and innovation streams. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 19*(5), 1331–1366.

Ulrich, D., & Wiersema, M. F. (1989). Gaining strategic and organizational capability in a turbulent business environment. *The Academy of Management Executive, 3*(2), 115–122.

Volberda, H. W. (1998). *Building the flexible firm. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Voss, G. B., & Voss, Z. G. (2013). Strategic ambidexterity in small and medium-sized enterprises: Implementation exploration and exploitation in produce and market domains. *Organization Science, 24*(5), 1459–1477.

Wang, C., & Ahmed, P. (2003). Structure and structural dimensions for knowledge-based organizations. *Measuring Business Excellence, 7*(1), 51–62.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organization* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-57212-3

Reinventing Innovation
Designing the Dual Organization
Smith, A.C.T.; Sutherland, F.; Gilbert, D.H.
2017, IX, 138 p. 3 illus., Hardcover
ISBN: 978-3-319-57212-3