

Exploring the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity

Liselore A. Havermans, VU University Amsterdam, l.a.havermans@vu.nl

Deanne N. Den Hartog, University of Amsterdam, d.n.denhartog@uva.nl

Anne Keegan, University of Amsterdam, a.e.keegan@uva.nl

To be submitted to sub-theme 32: Leveraging a Paradox Perspective to Reimagine, Rethink
and Reshape Organization Tensions

Abstract

Sustainable success calls for contextually ambidextrous organizing. This simultaneous exploration and exploitation within a subsystem forms a major leadership challenge. In the current study we further understanding of the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity. We do this by exploring leadership in project-based organizations, a context in which the pressure for contextual ambidexterity is high. We show that leaders enact a range of leadership practices to stimulate both exploration and exploitation, and that they do this in an adaptive manner to adjust to the complexity they face to sustain contextual ambidexterity. We discuss the implications of these findings for our understanding of ambidexterity as a dynamic accomplishment that emerges in everyday interactions and the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity.

Introduction

The challenge for organizations to respond effectively to requirements to be flexible and at the same time be efficient has been at the forefront of organizational theorizing for many years. Successful, sustainable organizing is increasingly held to be a function of being able to exploit current strengths as well as explore new possibilities (March, 1991) and to pursue new knowledge while at the same time using existing knowledge optimally (Levinthal & March, 1993). In recent years, a growing number of theorists have begun to conceptualize the dilemmas of simultaneous pursuit of exploration and exploitation under the banner of ambidexterity (Duncan, 1976; Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996). In organizational theorizing, ambidexterity is defined as the capacity of an organization to be 'aligned and efficient in their management of today's business demands while simultaneously adaptive to changes in the environment' (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008, p. 375).

While in the past, theorists have argued that it is difficult for organizations to meet the needs for both exploration and exploitation (Hannan & Freeman, 1984), recent approaches are characterized by attempts to specify the different ways in which organizations can achieve the required balance between exploitation and exploration. Ambidexterity has, for example, been studied as structurally or temporally separated processes of balancing exploration and exploitation (Jansen, Tempelaar, Van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2009; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996) in which the balancing challenge is set at the organizational level (Lavie, Stettner, & Tushman, 2010). Ambidexterity has also been identified with attempts to manage simultaneous exploration and exploitation *within* a subsystem (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004). This latter type of ambidexterity has been conceptualized as harmonic ambidexterity (Simsek, Heavey, Veiga, & Souder, 2009). Harmonic ambidexterity is described by Simsek et al. (2009, p. 870) as the 'simultaneous pursuit of exploitation and exploration within a subsystem, for example, a business unit'. Building on the approach of Gibson and Birkinshaw

(2004) and Adler et al. (1999), harmonic ambidexterity derives its roots from a consideration that is focused on contextual factors that encourage or enable a behavioral orientation or capacity for the simultaneous pursuit of exploration and exploitation. As such, it has also been referred to as ‘contextual ambidexterity’ (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004) which is a label we adopt in this paper to ground our approach. In order to achieve contextual ambidexterity, the challenge is to encourage individuals and groups to deal with the inherent tension between the processes of exploration and exploitation. Contextual ambidexterity is thus conceptualized at the individual and group level (Lavie et al., 2010), rather than at the organizational level.

Leadership clearly plays a vital role in enabling ambidextrous behavior of individuals and groups. However, to date the role of leadership in contextual ambidexterity has only received limited attention (for exceptions see, Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004; Nemanich & Vera, 2009; Rosing, Frese, & Bausch, 2011). Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) pay attention to the role of leaders in creating a supportive context for contextual ambidexterity characterized by stretch, discipline, support and trust. Nemanich et al. (2009) focus specifically on the role of transformational leadership in promoting contextual ambidexterity. The work of these authors suggests that we can consider leadership functions for contextual ambidexterity to be comprised of relatively stable features such as a need for transformational leaders, or the facilitation of discipline and trust.

Similarly, in studies that have addressed the factors that enable structurally separated exploration and exploitation, leadership has also been identified as a crucial factor and has mainly been studied as a stable role (Adler et al., 1999; Cao, Simsek, & Zhang, 2010; Jansen et al., 2009; Jansen, George, Van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2008; Lubatkin, Simsek, Ling, & Veiga, 2006; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008). These authors point to the importance of aspects as again including the executive director’s transformational leadership (Jansen et al., 2008), but

also network extensiveness (Cao et al., 2010), and top management team behavioral integration (Jansen et al., 2009; Lubatkin et al., 2006), shared vision (Jansen et al., 2008; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008) and management of interfaces between sub-units (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008). The facilitation of ambidexterity is thus treated as the achievement of a stable set of leadership outcomes, be they transformational leadership, behavioral integration, or trust and discipline among followers. However, an alternative view is that ambidexterity is a dynamic accomplishment and therefore attention should be focused on how leaders achieve ambidexterity in a dynamic way (Raisch, Birkinshaw, Probst, & Tushman, 2009; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008).

This is the view forwarded, for example, by Rosing et al. (2011) who propose that leaders stimulate exploration by using what they label 'opening behaviors' such as stimulating thoughts in a new direction to increase the variance of follower behaviors. They also discuss the use of so-called 'closing behaviors' by leaders, behaviors that stimulate efficiency and decrease the variance of follower behaviors thus fostering exploitation as opposed to exploration (Rosing et al., 2011). This link between exploration/exploitation and the variance of follower behaviors resonates with the literature on absorbing and reducing complexity (Ashmos, Duchon, & McDaniel, 2000; Boisot & Child, 1999). This literature points to the need for a high complexity of responses, in the form of multiple representations of the context and a range of behavioral responses to this perceived context, in order to facilitate exploration. It also points to the need for a low complexity of responses, in the form of a single representation of the context and a single response to it, in order to facilitate exploitation.

In the model proposed by Rosing et al. (2011) leaders have to be able to enact both opening and closing leadership behaviors and should have the flexibility to iteratively switch between these two when the needs of the innovation process move from exploration for

creativity to exploitation for implementation. This model suggests the importance of starting to explore leadership for contextual ambidexterity empirically at a more detailed level that is sensitive to changes.

The current study

In the current study, we explore the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity at the level of day to day leadership practices. This fine-grained focus on everyday leadership practices can further our understanding of the divergent aspects of leadership that enable achieving and maintaining contextual ambidexterity. A focus on specific everyday practices highlights the interactions and interpretations through which complex phenomena emerge (Jarzabkowski, 2003). In order to explore the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity, we focus specifically on direct leadership practices, that is those practices that involve social influence in interactions with others, as opposed to indirect leadership in which leadership occurs through intermediate structures, such as developing planning (Yukl, 2009).

We explore leadership in project-based organizations as this is a context commonly characterized by high pressure for contextual ambidexterity (Lee, DeLone, & Espinosa, 2007). This enables us to observe leadership that is aimed at achieving and maintaining contextual ambidexterity. The pressures for exploration and exploitation are generally pronounced in project-based organizing (Keegan & Turner, 2002; Sydow, Lindkvist, & DeFillippi, 2004). Projects are set up to accomplish new tasks and are thus often explorative in nature, however projects are often managed within tight resource constraints calling for exploitation of current strengths (Lindkvist, 2008). These paradoxical demands in project-based organizations are related to the finite nature of projects, pushing for exploitation, and the complexity of project assignments, pushing for exploration. Project leadership therefore calls for contextual ambidexterity, the simultaneous pursuit of exploration and exploitation within the project.

Method

We used qualitative research methods to explore whether leadership practices could be identified in project-based organizations and to examine their uses. We analyzed 42 interviews with team members and line and project managers in project-based organizations (see table 1 for a summary of the interview sample). These interviews centered on 17 different projects in a wide range of project-based organizations in the Netherlands. The focal projects were either recently finished or approaching completion at the time of the interviews. We purposefully sampled for a high variety in settings in order to identify new aspects of leadership practices in enabling contextual ambidexterity (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

As the current study focuses on direct leadership that occurs in interaction with others, we sampled focal projects with differences in interaction opportunities. More specifically, we selected projects with a wide range of frequencies of formal project team meetings (ranging from daily to no formal meetings with project team members), major differences in the percentage of time project team members spent on the focal project (ranging from 100 to 5 percent), and a wide spread in the amount of projects that project managers simultaneously work on (ranging from 1 to 40 projects). In order to approach the project settings from multiple perspectives individual interviews were held with project team members, project managers and line managers involved with the projects. Striving to include these three perspectives allowed us to triangulate the descriptions of the project context and leadership practices (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Insert Table 1 about here

As our focus is on leadership practices, the interviews dealt with the everyday leadership activities in the focal project. During the interviews open and probing questions were used to elicit responses about leadership in the context of the project. The semi-structured interviews revolved around the background and role of the interviewee, the way in which work in the focal project unfolded, and leadership practices in the project. The interviews lasted an average of 1 hour and 20 minutes, and were all recorded with the consent of the interviewees. Interviews were transcribed verbatim (resulting in 1099 pages of transcript) and imported into NVivo 9 for analysis.

We analyzed the material to identify leadership practices in projects. We explored the nature of these practices and whether they enable contextual ambidexterity. First of all we categorized the leadership practices into the strategies of enabling exploration and enabling exploitation. We identified that the leadership practices enacted to enable exploration stimulated a higher complexity of responses, whereas the leadership practices enacted to enable exploitation stimulated a lower complexity of responses. This led us to a further categorization of the impact of leadership practices on the complexity of stimuli, namely through their impact on either the complexity of beliefs or the complexity of actions (see table 2 for an overview of the leadership strategies and practices identified in the analysis). While we did not confine our analysis to leadership practices enacted by those in a formal management role (line or project managers), the vast majority of the identified leadership practices were enacted by those who are in formal leadership roles and we thus refer to the ones enacting these practices as ‘leaders’.

Insert Table 2 about here

Results

The results show a range of leadership practices that are enacted by leaders in project-based organizations to enable contextual ambidexterity. These leadership practices, stimulating either exploration or exploitation, do not enable contextual ambidexterity individually, but they can do this in concert with each other. Every leader enacted leadership practices to enable exploration and leadership practices that enable exploitation.

The analysis also shows that leadership is enacted in an adaptive way to adjust to the complexity of stimuli the leaders face. Specifically, the results show that the higher the complexity of stimuli from the context, the more the leaders do to enable exploration. In the following two quotes a project manager and a line manager explain that projects that are perceived to have a high level of complexity call for a focus on enabling exploration in the form of stimulating interaction:

‘And generally they all have that they search for connection, because in the end you are all very dependent upon the other. That is because of the complexity, is almost tied to it one on one, that everything responds to each other, so well, then you also become dependent upon each other.’ (Project manager 1, project 11)

‘There have to be seven thousand homes and the ambition (...) is to do that as sustainable as possible. And that means that they have become separated from all standard ways of how things usually go. Actually, what they said like “independently from that, we have to sit down with a lot of people, in different forms, different forums, different tiers, just talk like, what do we want in this neighborhood.’ (Line manager, project 10)

Leadership practices to enable exploration

The results show a wide variety of leadership practices used to enable exploration in project-based organizations. These practices directed at enabling exploration by stimulating a higher complexity of responses can be divided into two different pathways, namely stimulating this through their impact on the complexity of beliefs or the complexity of actions (see table 3 for an overview).

Insert Table 3 about here

First, leaders enable exploration by stimulating a higher complexity of beliefs. One way in which leaders do this is by simply being available, listening to others, and suggesting solutions to current issues. This enables others to share their ideas and problems with the leader, and get new ideas from him or her (see table 3 for sample quotes that illustrate these leadership practices). Another way in which leaders stimulate the development of a higher complexity of beliefs is by encouraging the individual development of others. We find that this individual development stimulates the complexity of beliefs held by that person by making sure they take a step back and reflect on their work to see it in a new light. Leaders can also stimulate an increase in the complexity of beliefs by encouraging boundary spanning. They motivate team members to interact with others outside their own team, increasing the chances of picking up new perspectives and developing new solutions to issues (see table 3).

At a group level leaders stimulate a higher complexity of beliefs by involving others in a task and stimulating discussion. By involving more people in a project or the accomplishment of another type of task, especially people with different backgrounds and beliefs than those already involved, leaders aim to enable the group to take into account a wider variety of beliefs. Stimulating discussion plays a major role in this process because

discussion can surface conflicting beliefs and enable people to work through the tension this brings with it. For example, one project team member explains how a more senior member of his project team senses conflicting beliefs between him and another team member and enables them to bridge their differences:

‘She gets up and says “you and you, come with me now!”. So we go into that meeting room and start cursing and shouting and emotionally drawing stuff on a whiteboard, (...) but that is our way of working, that’s how we work with each other and that takes 10 minutes and then all of a sudden one says like “Oh, right” (...) “That way you kind of have a point”.’ (Team member, project 5)

The last type of leadership practice the leaders in our sample use to enable a higher complexity of beliefs is stimulating the adoption of values related to exploration. The leadership practices discussed above do not, by themselves, guarantee successful exploration. Stimulating a high complexity of beliefs can lead to difficulties bridging these differences. If the project team members share values related to exploration such as embracing diversity, this can enable a process of constructively exploring a high complexity of beliefs, without differences turning into irresolvable conflict and diminishing understanding and respect for each other. Leaders thus try to increase the salience of values related to exploration, such as transparency in interaction, connectedness among individuals and valuing the diversity among these individuals. In one of the projects the two project managers explicitly tried to refocus the values of the project they joined halfway to increase the salience of transparency in order to cope with communication and coordination problems within and especially outside their team. In the following quote they explain the advantages of sharing the value of transparency.

‘We involve them in what we do. So we make it all very transparent, which has a number of advantages. One, they know exactly what’s happening. Two, they can influence what we produce. On the other hand that means that if we’ve produced something they can’t say ‘yeah but we can’t use that at all’, so we commit them. Plus, with each other, they see a part of reality and we see a part of reality, if we put those images together we see as much as possible, so it also improves integral quality.’
(Project manager, project 11)

The second strategy enabling exploration involves stimulating a higher complexity of actions. A leadership practice used to accomplish this is giving others freedom in the accomplishment of their tasks. This allows everyone to solve problems in their own way leading to a high complexity of actions taken. One line manager explains he thinks getting freedom in task accomplishment is motivating and leads to unexpected, but generally positive outcomes:

‘Well, you motivate, that is my opinion, by giving them lots of freedom and because of that let go, because of which things arise spontaneously that you did not expect and neither did they. But in general the experience is that these turn out to be positive.’
(Line manager, project 13)

Leaders can give freedom by accepting ways of thinking and acting that are not fully in line with their own, instead of redirecting others when this occurs. In the following quote a team member describes that, as his manager follows through with the given freedom by accepting

other ways of thinking and doing, he gains confidence that would be lost when his manager would intervene:

‘[He] is a manager who can delegate very nicely and dares to give you responsibility for it. (...) That, as I said, you don’t have to be continuously afraid that he intervenes or that you don’t do the way he wants it. I mean, that will happen regularly, that does happen regularly, that he says “well I would have done it differently, but well this is also a good way”. So it gives you a lot of confidence’. (Team member, project 12)

Another leadership practice used to enable exploration through a higher complexity of actions is encouraging people to work together. Motivating people to work together instead of individually helps them to adjust their actions to those of others in an iterative way (see table 3 for further examples of these practices). Accepting mistakes is a last leadership practice to enable exploration. This practice can help create a sense of safety that enables people to show initiative and proactively experiment with new actions. A project team member illustrates the leadership practice of accepting mistakes by explaining that his project manager will back team members up in case their initiatives don’t turn out to be successful:

‘At the moment things go wrong, (...) he will never say (...) “Yeah, but that’s not your task”, or “you shouldn’t have interfered with that”, or, so he never goes back on you’. (Team member, project 7)

Leadership practices to enable exploitation

Besides leadership practices to enable exploration, the analysis of our material also reveals a number of leadership practices used to enable exploitation (see table 4 for an overview).

Similar to the leadership practices to enable exploration, the leadership practices to enable exploitation can be categorized into two distinct pathways, namely beliefs and actions.

Insert Table 4 about here

The first pathway through which leaders enable exploitation is stimulating a lower complexity of beliefs. Our results show that leaders often do this by stopping a discussion or by not involving others in the conversation. Limiting discussion is often done when a leader perceives that the downsides in terms of the time that is spent on discussion outweigh the benefits of further discussion. In our sample it is often the project manager specifically who takes the initiative to stop discussions or limit the amount of people involved in such discussions. Some team members are relieved not to be dragged into every discussion as this enables them to spend time on their core tasks. Formal project leaders often see it as their responsibility to make sure their team members are not dragged into every discussion, or as one of them puts it: ‘I actually keep them out of the wind of that difficult client’ (Project manager, project 7). Finally, leaders can stimulate a lower complexity of beliefs by stimulating the adoption of values related to exploitation. The values related to exploitation that some leaders in our sample try to make more salient at times include wariness or taking calculated risks and sticking to agreements (for examples of the quotes that illustrate these leadership practices see table 4).

A second pathway through which leaders can stimulate others to reduce the complexity of responses is by stimulating a lower complexity of actions. These leadership practices include making decisions, enforcing rules, and redirecting effort to fit management expectations. Leaders can reduce the complexity of actions by making decisions and enforcing rules as these decisions and rules give guidance to people’s actions. The more

detailed the decisions and the rules that are enforced, the lower the complexity of actions that still fit within the boundaries that are being developed (see table 4).

Another frequently mentioned leadership practice that is directed at reducing the complexity of actions is redirecting effort. This can involve either changing the course of someone's actions to fit management expectations or trying to limit the complexity of actions to a smaller bandwidth. Explaining the first route of redirecting effort, one team member describes how his project manager tries to change his course of actions: 'We have a certain goal and it can then be the case that I drift a little and that he says like "Hey, back on the track, we have to go straight, that way".' (Team member, project 5). Explaining the second route of redirecting effort a line manager describes how he tries to limit the bandwidth of the complexity of actions in his team: 'What I also tried to get across is that you shouldn't endlessly continue with thinking of new possibilities, new variants and that you especially have to look at what is being asked, and deliver that.' (Line manager, project 9).

Summarizing, the results show that leaders in project-based organizations enact a range of leadership practices. These leadership practices either enable exploitation by stimulating a lower complexity of responses, or enable exploration by stimulating a higher complexity of responses. As leaders in project-based organizations enact both leadership practices that stimulate exploitation and leadership practices that stimulate exploration. These leaders are enabling contextual ambidexterity.

The leadership practices identified in this study have an impact on two aspects of the complexity of responses; the complexity of beliefs and the complexity of actions. The leadership practices used to enable exploration by stimulating a higher complexity of beliefs revolve around bringing together a more diverse set of people and ideas and bridging these differences through values related to exploration such as transparency, valuing diversity and connectedness. Stimulating exploration through a higher complexity of actions mainly

involves leadership practices that facilitate team members to work together. In contrast, stimulating exploitation through lowering the complexity of beliefs involves leaders' decreasing interaction and limiting the diversity of people involved in the process. It also entails enhancing the salience of values related to exploitation such as sticking to agreements and being wary about taking risks. Leaders reduce the complexity of actions by enforcing tighter constraints on ways of working.

Discussion

In the current study we contribute to the ambidexterity literature by shedding light on the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity in project-based organizations. The role of leadership in enabling ambidexterity and the dynamism of this process is not fully reflected in the current literature. In this study we focus on achieving ambidexterity as a dynamic, ongoing accomplishment rooted in day to day practices. The leadership practices identified in this study are not new in and of themselves. However, by showing how these leadership practices are used in concert with each other, the results enhance our understanding of the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity in project-based organizations.

Theoretical implications

Our findings concerning the role of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity have implications for our understanding of the nature of ambidexterity. The results speak to some of the unresolved discussions in the ambidexterity literature. We will discuss the implications of our findings concerning the nature of ambidexterity, the optimum point of balance, the level of balancing, the nature of leadership in enabling contextual ambidexterity, and the direction in which these leadership efforts are actively pointed.

Raisch et al. (2009; 2008) state that while ambidexterity has been shown to be a dynamic accomplishment, it is often studied as if it is a stable characteristic of organizations. In the current study, we show how ambidexterity is dynamically accomplished through leadership practices. Our results show how contextual ambidexterity emerges in interaction between people and their interpretations of the environment. The implementation of an ambidextrous strategy is often portrayed as a rational top down process in which the main challenges are for top management to set the right organizational structures in place and provide a fitting organizational context. Our study highlights the importance of everyday practices that people enact in interaction with each other and in light of their interpretations of the environment. This resonates with recent trends in the organizational literature that focus on how strategy and performance emerge through micro level practices (Eisenhardt, Furr, & Bingham, 2010; Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Jarzabkowski, 2003). More specifically, by exploring the leadership practices that are enacted within organizational subsystems we start to show how contextual ambidexterity emerges in interaction.

The optimum point in achieving ambidexterity is often seen as equal exploration and exploitation (e.g. He & Wong, 2004). However, as exploitation is more important in stable environments and exploration is more important in unstable environments (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Hannan & Freeman, 1984), it seems more convincing that this optimum is dependent upon the environment (Davis, Eisenhardt, & Bingham, 2009; Sidhu, Volberda, & Commandeur, 2004). Our results support the perspective that the optimum balance of exploration and exploitation is dependent upon the context. In a context that continuously changes, this optimum level is a moving target. This makes creating and sustaining ambidexterity in its optimal form a dynamic process that requires continuous adaptation through leadership practices.

In this study, we have focused on project-based organizations, a context in which finiteness and complexity are core characteristics of organizing and this increases demands for contextual ambidexterity. Our results show that in this context, individuals can enable both exploration and exploitation simultaneously. In the ambidexterity literature, there are some debates about the ability of individuals to enable both exploration and exploitation. Some authors doubt whether individuals are able to do both (Schreyogg & Sydow, 2010), whereas others have indicated individuals are able to do this (Raisch et al., 2009). Highlighting how individual leaders enable both exploration and exploitation, our findings provide support for claims in this latter stream of literature. Beyond showing that individuals are able to stimulate both exploration and exploitation, our examination of this context provides a fine-grained empirical illustration of day to day leadership practices and how these are enacted in concert with each other in an adaptive way to create and sustain contextual ambidexterity.

As noted, in studies that have focused on the role of leadership in enabling ambidexterity, this role is often assumed to be stable over time. In the context of structurally differentiated ambidexterity, the leadership role of the top management team is considered to be of crucial importance in bringing exploration oriented sub-systems and exploitation oriented sub-systems together. This strategic bridging role is portrayed as a stable style. Similar to top management teams in structurally differentiated ambidextrous organizations, leaders in contextually ambidextrous sub-systems also have to combine efforts to stimulate exploration and to stimulate exploitation. At this lower level, leaders are also often assumed to enact a stable style (e.g. transformational leadership) or create a stable culture that accommodates both exploration and exploitation.

An exception is the work by Rosing et al. (2011) who emphasize how leadership is adapted to fulfill the iterative needs for creativity and implementation in the innovation

process. Though their model suggests distinct transitions between leadership for exploration and leadership for exploitation, our results go beyond this and suggests that leadership for contextual ambidexterity involves simultaneous leadership efforts for enabling exploration and exploitation in which the focus shifts in a dynamic manner. In addition, the results of the current study highlight a broader application of adapting leadership practices not only to create contextual ambidexterity, but to sustain it in a dynamic fashion.

Whereas Rosing et al. (2011) concentrate on changing leadership practices to fit the iterative needs of the innovation process, the results of the current study show this process of adaptation is more broadly applicable to efforts to adjust the complexity of responses to the complexity of stimuli from the environment. These findings on how leadership efforts are used to match the complexity of responses to the complexity of stimuli coalesce with the idea of requisite complexity, which explains that organizations have to respond to complexity in the environment with an equal complexity of responses (Boisot & McKelvey, 2010). Our findings provide a fine grained understanding of the ways in which leadership influences the complexity of responses in an organization, by distinguishing between the complexity of beliefs and the complexity of actions.

The role of leaders in enabling exploration and exploitation is contested in the literature. Whereas some authors state that leaders should support both exploration and exploitation (Smith & Lewis, 2011), others argue that leaders should focus on enabling exploration as organizations inherently drift towards exploitation over time (Eisenhardt et al., 2010). Our findings in project-based organizations suggest that leaders in these contexts play an active role not just in stimulating a higher complexity of responses to explore, but also in stimulating a lower complexity of responses to exploit. These results show that a lower complexity of responses is not purely the result of drift, but also of actively and adaptively stimulating a lower complexity of responses.

Managerial implications

In order to enable contextual ambidexterity, leaders enact practices that support both exploration and exploitation, and continuously adapt their leadership practices to fit the context. Our results show that leaders in project-based organizations, who explicitly face the dual demands for exploitation and exploration, already do these things intuitively. However, explicitly discussing the role of leadership in enabling ambidexterity can improve awareness of these leadership strategies and practices among leaders along with the effectiveness of these practices.

Leaders can do this by reflecting on the ways in which they currently affect the complexity of beliefs and actions of others, and what other leadership practices they could enact to create ambidexterity. They can also more consciously address how they adapt their leadership practices to the context, and whether this always enables them to more fully adapt to the complexity of the environment in order to sustain ambidexterity. In addition, discussing this with others can stimulate positive reactions to these leadership strategies and practices by showing them that their leadership strategies are not randomly shifting, but are consistently inconsistent.

Human resource managers and top managers of organizations can also play an important role in this process by helping to create the appropriate context for leadership that enables ambidexterity. They can do this by creating opportunities for discussion about organizing for ambidexterity and encouraging others to see ambidexterity as a leadership challenge that requires continuous attention and adaptation.

Limitations and future research

In the current study we have shown how leaders in project-based organizations enable contextual ambidexterity through leadership practices that stimulate exploration and exploitation. In order to shed light on the role of leadership in creating and sustaining ambidexterity we have conducted interviews in project-based organizations as the demands for ambidexterity are explicitly pronounced in these organizations. The extent to which people act ambidextrously is expected to depend on their organizational context (Raisch et al., 2009). Thus, future research is needed to test whether our findings hold in other types of organizations, and to explore to what extent patterns might be different. Though our exploration in the context of project-based organizations has allowed us to show clear examples of how leaders can enable contextual ambidexterity, in contexts with less explicit demands for both exploration and exploitation within subsystems, leadership might be less focused on creating and sustaining ambidexterity, and not every leader in these contexts is likely to be involved in stimulating both exploration and exploitation.

In addition, in order to explore the leadership practices leaders use to enable ambidexterity, we sampled focal projects representing differences in interaction opportunities. We do not claim this list of practices is complete, but rather use these practices to illustrate in what ways the leadership strategies of exploration and exploitation are enacted. Future research might show different leadership practices are used to enact these leadership strategies in contexts with other interaction opportunities, or in other types of organizations.

By distinguishing between leadership practices that are aimed at influencing the complexity of beliefs and those that influence the complexity of actions, we provide a more nuanced view of the ways in which leaders affect the complexity of responses to create and sustain contextual ambidexterity. However, we do not see this distinction as an end point, but

rather as a starting point for getting to grips with the complexity of reactions, providing a spring board for more detailed classifications.

In the current study we have attempted to further understanding of how leaders in project-based organizations enable and sustain contextual ambidexterity. We have shed light on the everyday leadership practices through which leaders can play an important role in enabling contextual ambidexterity. We hope the current study opens up pathways for future explorations into the dynamic nature of ambidexterity and the role of leadership in its emergence.

References

- Adler, P. S., Goldoftas, B., & Levine, D. I. (1999). Flexibility versus efficiency? A case study of model changeovers in the Toyota production system. *Organization Science*, 10(1), 43-68.
- Ashmos, D. P., Duchon, D., & McDaniel, R. R. J. (2000). Organizational responses to complexity: The effect on organizational performance. *Journal of Organizational Change*, 13(6), 577-594.
- Boisot, M., & Child, J. (1999). Organizations as adaptive systems in complex environments: The case of china. *Organization Science*, 10(3)
- Boisot, M., & McKelvey, B. (2010). Integrating modernist and postmodernist perspectives on organizations: A complexity science bridge. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 415-433.
- Burns, T. R., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- 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.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2009). Optimal structure, market dynamism, and the strategy of simple rules. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 413-452.
- Duncan, R. B. (1976). The ambidextrous organization: Designing dual structures for innovation. *The Management of Organization Design*, 1, 167-188.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., Furr, N. R., & Bingham, C. B. (2010). CROSSROADS--microfoundations of performance: Balancing efficiency and flexibility in dynamic environments. *Organization Science*, 21(6), 1263-1273.
- Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1240-1253.
- Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 209-226.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, , 149-164.
- He, Z. L., & Wong, P. K. (2004). Exploration vs. exploitation: An empirical test of the ambidexterity hypothesis. *Organization Science*, 15(4), 481-494.
- Jansen, J. J. P., Tempelaar, M. P., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2009). Structural differentiation and ambidexterity: The mediating role of integration mechanisms. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 797-811.

- 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.
- Jarzabkowski, P. (2003). Strategic practices: An activity theory perspective on continuity and change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1), 23-55.
- Keegan, A., & Turner, J. R. (2002). The management of innovation in project-based firms. *Long Range Planning*, 35(4), 367-388.
- Lavie, D., Stettner, U., & Tushman, M. L. (2010). Exploration and exploitation within and across organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 109-155.
- Lee, G., DeLone, W., & Espinosa, J. A. (2007). Ambidexterity and global IS project success: A theoretical model. *System Sciences, 2007. HICSS 2007. 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on*, pp. 44-44.
- Levinthal, D. A., & March, J. G. (1993). The myopia of learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(S2), 95-112.
- Lindkvist, L. (2008). Project organization: Exploring its adaptation properties. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(1), 13-20.
- 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. J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Nemanich, L. A., & Vera, D. (2009). Transformational leadership and ambidexterity in the context of an acquisition. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(1), 19-33.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 185-206.
- 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.
- Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *Journal of Management*, 34 (3), 375-409.
- Rosing, K., Frese, M., & Bausch, A. (2011). Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(5), 956-974.
- Schreyogg, G., & Sydow, J. (2010). Organizing for fluidity? dilemmas of new organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 21(6), 1251-1262.
- Sidhu, J. S., Volberda, H. W., & Commandeur, H. R. (2004). Exploring exploration orientation and its determinants: Some empirical evidence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 913-932.

- Simsek, Z., Heavey, C., Veiga, J. F., & Souder, D. (2009). A typology for aligning organizational ambidexterity's conceptualizations, antecedents, and outcomes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(5), 864-894.
- Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381-403.
- Sydow, J., Lindkvist, L., & DeFillippi, R. (2004). Project-based organizations, embeddedness and repositories of knowledge: Editorial. *Organization Studies*, 25, 1475-1489.
- Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *California Management Review*, 38(4), 8-30.
- Yukl, G. (2009). *Leadership in organizations* (Global edition, 7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Higher Education.

Table 1 Summary Interview Sample

Project number	Project sector	Frequency of formal project team meetings	Percentage of time interviewed team member spent on project	Project manager works on X number of projects simultaneously	Interviews with project team member (TM), project manager (PM), line manager (LM)
1	IT	Daily	100	3	TM, PM, LM
2	Infrastructure	Every 2 weeks	>50	4	TM, PM, LM
3	Construction	Every 2 weeks	50	2	TM, PM
4	IT	Every 2 weeks	20	2	TM, PM
5	IT	None at lowest level	100	1	TM, PM
6	Consultancy/IT	None (single TM)	100	1	TM, LM
7	IT	Weekly	100	1	TM, PM, LM
8	Construction	Every 2 weeks	5	1	TM, PM, LM
9	Landscaping	Monthly	5	10	TM, PM, LM
10	Consultancy	Monthly	30	-	TM, LM
11	Infrastructure	Weekly	-	1	2 PMs
12	IT	Weekly	75	1	TM, PM, LM
13	Manufacturing	Twice a week	80	40	TM, PM, LM
14	Manufacturing	Twice a week	100	1	TM, PM, LM
15	IT	Monthly	30	40	TM, PM, LM
16	Policy development	Every 2 weeks	-	3	PM, LM
17	Consultancy	Weekly	25	1	TM, PM

Table 2 Leadership strategies and practices

Leadership strategies	Impact on type of responses	Leadership practices; examples	
Enabling exploration by stimulating a higher complexity of responses	Stimulate a higher complexity of beliefs	Being available, listening, and suggesting solutions	
		Involve others	
		Stimulate group discussion	
		Stimulate personal development	
		Encouraging boundary spanning	
		Stimulating the adoption of values such as; Transparency Connectedness Valuing diversity	
Stimulate a higher complexity of actions	Stimulate a higher complexity of actions	Give freedom	
		Work together	
		Accept mistakes	
Enabling exploitation by stimulating a lower complexity of responses	Stimulate a lower complexity of beliefs	Stop discussion	
		Don't involve others	
		Stimulating the adoption of values such as; Wariness (calculated risks) Stick to agreements	
		Decide	
	Stimulate a lower complexity of actions	Stimulate a lower complexity of actions	Enforce rules
			Redirect effort to fit management expectations

Table 3: Leadership practices to enable exploration

Enabling exploration by stimulating a higher complexity of responses through:	Sample quotes
Beliefs	<p>Being available: ‘Keep doors open’ (Line manager, project 1)</p> <p>Listen: ‘Just listen ... and be open to other arguments’ (Project manager, project 7)</p> <p>Suggest solutions: ‘You are expected to come with solutions. And then you can discuss with us about what are we going to do, and maybe you get one extra [solution] from us, but you can’t just say “we just throw it all up” [for someone higher up in the hierarchy to solve it].’ (Project manager 1, project 11)</p> <p>Stimulate development: ‘What I often do when we have setbacks like: “Gosh, look what is happening here, and what can you learn from that and how can you do that differently next time.” Much more looking for, so to say, the continuous learning and development.’ (Line manager, project 18)</p> <p>Encouraging boundary spanning: ‘You notice that we have to coach some people on it. And you also see some people who just pick it up themselves. Just because they see model behavior. That has happened more often lately, that people say, like “yes, when you did it that way, something clicked with me and from then on I also started looking for some contacts”.’ (Project manager 2, project 11)</p> <p>Involve others: ‘And that means that the moment we do new things with respect to prognosis or something like that, we involve the people that have to actually receive it, involve them in what we do.’ (Project manager 1, project 11)</p> <p>Stimulate discussion: ‘Sometimes it is just handy if you all engage in that debate and also come to a solution from different point of view.’ (Project manager, project 18)</p> <p>Stimulate shared values - Transparency: ‘She is very open (...) about the things that are at play at [employer].’ (Team member, project 10)</p> <p>Stimulate shared values - Value diversity: ‘So those are actually the three pillars of: mutual understanding, appeal to expertise, and also just keep emphasizing, like, try to do it in proper consultation with the process that has to continue.’ (Project manager, project 8)</p> <p>Stimulate shared values - Connectedness, value diversity &</p>

	<p>transparency: PM1: ‘We believe in the power of connection between parties... and with that comes thinking about what the interest of another is. (..) PM2: So, with that also comes that you are very open about what moves you. Because then the other can also see your interest, also your concerns and see your doubts. In my opinion that is also that openness and transparency that’s important there.’ (Project manager 1 and 2, project 11)</p>
<p>Actions</p>	<p>Give freedom: ‘We just said to those five project leaders, uh, [the project manager] said, like “you have to involve who you need yourself”. And said to everyone, well “you go about it in your own way”. So those five, those are also five differently running projects.’ (Team member, project 10)</p> <p>Work together: ‘I really steer towards a team effort.’ (Project manager, project 12)</p> <p>Accept mistakes: ‘I think in a project, when you are project leader, there are always things that go wrong. So you have to bear that in mind anyway.’ (Project manager, project 17)</p>

Table 4: Leadership practices to enable exploitation

Enabling exploitation by stimulating a lower complexity of responses through:	Sample quotes
Beliefs	<p>Stop discussion: ‘So during building meetings he can really pound his fist on the table and say “yes alright, but where does this all lead? I mean, a decision has to be taken and I want to get this on the table now”.’ (Team member, project 3)</p> <p>Don’t involve others: ‘What I hope is that they realize that I catch things for them and that I only give them those things that really need to get done.’ (Project manager, project 1)</p> <p>Stimulate shared values - Stick to agreements: ‘And I notice very clearly like: a deal is a deal. And I think that is very strong.’ (Team member, project 20)</p> <p>Stimulate shared values - Wariness/taking calculated risks: ‘Look, the moment you say that you think wariness is an important value, right? So taking calculated risks. (...) Then that only gets clear the moment a decision has to be taken. “Do we go for it or do we look into one more thing?” Well, at a moment like that it becomes clear, at a moment like that the line is created, also where the dividing line is.’ (Project manager 1, project 11)</p>
Actions	<p>Decide: ‘But some things you don’t want and then you have to push them through, even though he says no.’ (Line manager, project 1)</p> <p>Enforce rules: ‘Time is time, for example. That mentality I really had to push through at first. (...) So first I just looked [as project team members came late for a meeting]. A second time I said something about it. And a third time it happens again. Then, after sitting still for two minutes, I packed my stuff and went back up [to my office]. Then I gave out tasks in a really directive manner.’ (Line manager, project 1)</p> <p>Redirect effort to fit management expectations: ‘Then, I read things and at a certain point I say, “no, it has to be different. It has to be like this, you should have asked this.” And then you’re being a bit corrective.’ (Team member, project 1)</p>