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ABSTRACT

In this paper I investigate the factors leading to the creation of ambidextrous competency, in the creation of a new division. Additionally it is investigated how the pressures of engaging in exploration and exploitation simultaneously is handled in the case setting of a young team, in the labor union and unemployment fund Business Danmark.

The paper is based on a case study approach which incorporates interviews with team members, the manager of the overall communication department and the former manager of the division as well as my own observations as participant in the setting.

This is investigated from different time horizons. First, I look at the time from the division were created until present day, where I find that the division goes through years of extended focus of both objectives, effectively engaging in a temporal strategy for ambidexterity. Second, I look at a full yearly work-cycle looking at inter-temporal mechanism for managing the two objectives, where I find that contextual ambidexterity is present in all activities, but that the division also engages in some degree of inter-temporal cycling of extended focus, to better match the demands of their market in the given months.

This paper also investigates from multiple levels, first looking at the organizational context the division is situated in, then how the balance is achieved in the division, and lastly how the individual team members handle the pressures. It is found that a good fit between organizational context, team context and individual perceptions of the context exist, even though the division is fundamentally differently geared than the rest of the organization.
INTRODUCTION

According to the dictionary *ambidexterity* is the state of being equally adept in the use of left and right hand. Furthermore people who are ambidextrous are uncommon, with only around one out of one hundred being naturally ambidextrous. Ambidexterity in the face of organization and business life means the ability to pursue both *exploration* and *exploitation* simultaneously.

“*Exploration includes things captured by terms such as search, variation, risk taking, experimentation, play, flexibility, discovery and innovation. Exploitation includes such things as refinement, choice, production, efficiency, selection, implementation and execution*” (March 1991, p. 71)

Like the natural affinity in some people, some companies as well seem to engage in ambidextrous behaviors without a specific plan or knowledge about the theoretic domain – it just makes sense to them. It is one of these companies that this paper will focus on.

Business Danmark is a labor union and unemployment fund within the services industry, specialized towards business people within sales, marketing and consultancy. They are neither the most creative company in the world, nor the most process-optimizing, but do things in a fine balance between old school institutionalized labor union practices and new age market and sales understanding. This obviously has the potential of generating some friction, which is why they chose to create their youth department as a separate team, when it was proposed three years ago that going directly after student members could be a new market opportunity. This was called the *Campus division*, and they embarked on a journey from a one person “start-up” to an eight person team four years later.

The division now has its own sales force, own marketing material production, own social media channels, own events and even in some degree own customer service
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capabilities. They manage one of the biggest channels for new memberships, and have the absolute lowest internal price per signup.

When you look at the division from the outside it first seems uncoordinated. They are always laughing when you go by their office, sometimes you will see them carrying around boxes of their branded “Business Beer” and it is not uncommon to catch them around a whiteboard talking loudly about something. On closer inspection you start noticing the two big whiteboards at the end of the room, with various sales statistics indicating everything from overall sales trends, specific events tracked, internal competitions as well as weekly sales competitions. You will also find a big brainstorming area for new ideas, word of the day, movie tickets glued to the board, and a big hand drawn calendar with post-it’s on it. When asked about what they do, because it certainly seems that something more than just phone sales is going on, you start realizing that they also do activities ranging from lectures, career days, theme parties, teambuilding and more. One of them explain to you that actually most of their memberships now come from the various events they host, as they believe that such activities are both more profitable, loyalty enhancing and fun to execute, than traditional phone sales.

One year ago I became the new project manager of that team, and as the time coincided with having to write this master thesis, something interesting occurred. By chance I was introduced to the concept of ambidexterity and its mission in understanding how best to balance the two different logics of both being able to exploit existing capabilities, as well as being able to explore new possibilities, and it occurred to me that this division really seemed to be on the right track doing that, without seeming to have any specific plan or theoretical understanding of the domain.

At the same time my professional thoughts were centered around how best to keep the creative drive which had led the division so far with success, and at the same time optimize the internal and external processes, as that was one of the biggest obstacles for continuous growth in my opinion - or rather not optimizing the processes would be
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A major hindrance in regard to a continuous escalation of activities. It became clear that writing my thesis about ambidexterity would provide insights both to my own professional dilemmas, as well as contribute with meaningful inputs to the existing literature. An initial literature review within ambidexterity literature quickly exposed that studies focusing on the micro foundations of ambidexterity was sought after, as well as studies considering the multi-leveled nature of ambidexterity which I could also provide insights into as I had access to three different layers, all having their own “ambidexterity dilemmas”.

The topic of ambidexterity is of high relevance for both academics and practitioners as it applies a more integrated, and at times holistic, approach to dealing with heavy and often disintegrated topics in the organization such as innovation, learning capabilities, business development and structuring.

This has to do with the notion that two “dominant” pressures will always play a big role in any business, namely that of continually making sure that you optimize, strengthen and fortify your current processes, learning strategies or what specific organizational dilemma you are dealing with (exploitation) and at the same time make sure to investigate and evolve in the market of tomorrow to secure future profitability and adaptive competencies (exploration).

Especially in today’s markets where technology and demand are evolving faster than ever before, and urbanization is bringing people and knowledge together leading to bigger expectations from customers on factors such as price and quality, you have to be able to adapt and align your business relatively fast to survive.

However, for those who succeed in balancing exploration and exploitation and by that succeed in building ambidextrous competency, there is success to be made. From a research perspective ambidexterity is an interesting issue because it’s more holistic framings and properties makes it a useful framework to create theories on the overall balance between different organizational modes and the resulting performance. From
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a practitioner’s perspective, ambidexterity brings possibilities which are barely even scratched yet when it comes to the practical implications of the theory, related to practices such HRM, management, organization and many more.

On the organizational level the theories have already proven useful in deciding the relative balance of exploration and exploitation, which can aid CEOs and other top executives in their decisions, however the theory haven’t really been fully operationalized yet on lower levels, which is a big missing link as much recent literature indicate, that the operational level is where an in-depth understanding of ambidexterity is needed now (Julian Birkinshaw and Gibson, 2004). Imagine an operative manager who can create ambidexterity profiles of prospective employees to figure out what kind of guy he needs to perform the job, or an individual who can accept and manage these two pressures in his everyday work because he suddenly has the vocabulary and tools he needs.

But how do you create this ambidextrous competence at the operational level in the first place and how do you manage it on a daily basis? These questions and more will be answered in this paper, and whenever possible, complex logics and concepts related to ambidexterity will be illustrated with the case organization as an example to ease understanding and provide clarity.

The paper will now progress as follows: First an initial theory review will summarize the field of ambidexterity to its current dilemmas, with a focus on identifying literature gaps. This will help us pinpoint our exact level of analysis as well as unit of analysis which allows for a focused and meaningful contribution to the existing body of knowledge. With the theory in mind the research question and its related sub-questions will be defined and methods and data used to answer the RQ outlined.

Having cleared these initial phases the paper will progress into a situational analysis introducing the company and the division in the framework of a 4P, stakeholder and competitor’s analysis as well as an initial analysis of the organizational frames in which
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the division is placed. This is done to pinpoint contextually important clues allowing the division to be ambidextrous.

The main analysis will be divided into three sections. The first section applies a temporal perspective looking for clues as to the creation of ambidextrous competencies over the course of the 4 years the division has existed. Section two takes the temporal perspective down to a full yearly work cycle, analyzing the relative importance and timing of activities in the department. And lastly, section three brings the individual level into play, looking at how the employees in the division coordinate and design their work structures to handle both explorative and exploitative pressures.

Discussions and areas of future research will be handled within the sections where the issue arises as it provides for at better flow. Lastly I will conclude on my research question.
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**THEORY REVIEW**

In 1976 Robert Duncan coined the term “ambidextrous organization” as a way of describing the dual structures that many companies put in use in order to manage activities that require different time horizons and managerial capabilities (Julian Birkinshaw & Gupta, 2013; Duncan, 1976) and without knowing it at the time laid the founding bricks for what would be a thriving new theoretical field. However it was not before March (1991) described ambidexterity as finding the balance between two different learning activities – exploration and exploitation – that the concept really took off.

The terms exploration and exploitation quickly became a useful theoretical anchor in a lot of different contexts as its broad framing made it very versatile (Birkinshaw & Gupta, 2013) – proven by more than 12,900 citations in Google Scholar, making it the most cited when using the search terms ambidexterity, ambidextrous, exploration and exploitation (Google Scholar, 2014). According to Raisch & Birkinshaw (2008) the concept has been discussed in literature streams such as organizational learning, technological innovation, organizational adaption, strategic management and organizational design. All of these streams each have their own vocabulary to describe what goes on, e.g. in technological innovation research is focused on the balance between incremental and radical innovation, so basically ambidexterity is about handling dualities – be it called exploration/exploitation or something else. On one hand it’s about being able to *exploit* existing opportunities in your business by i.e. improving processes or strengthening existing bonds with partners. On the other hand you need to *explore* new opportunities such as forming new partnerships, get into new markets, do things differently than you use to.

Ambidexterity is then about aligning explorative and exploitative activities (March 1991). Raisch & Birkinshaw (2008) points out that if too much focus is put on either one, you risk falling into two different traps. If you emphasize exploitation to much you will get some short-term benefits but will risk falling into a “competency trap” where
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you might miss important opportunities in your environments, likewise if you focus too much on exploration you will enhance your firms ability to acquire new knowledge, but you risk being caught in an endless cycle of search and unrewarding change. Levinthal & March (1993) frames this nicely by saying that “long-term survival and success depend on an organization’s ability to “engage in enough exploitation to ensure the organization’s current viability and to engage in enough exploration to ensure future viability” (p. 105).

The question then becomes how best to strike this balance between exploration and exploitation. Basically three generic mechanisms for achieving ambidexterity dominates the literature – structural, temporal and contextual ambidexterity (Turner, Swart, and Maylor 2013).

**Structural ambidexterity**

When Duncan wrote his article in 1976 about organizational ambidexterity he emphasized that companies had to manage these conflicting demands by putting in place dual structures: one business unit which focused on alignment (exploitation), and one which focused on adaptation (exploration), and by that grounding his work in what we call structural ambidexterity. Structural separation has for a long time dominated the ambidexterity literature, and is a necessity for optimal organizing the argument goes, because the two activities are so fundamentally different that they cannot effectively co-exist (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004). In a resource-view the argument can be understood as representing the belief that explorative and exploitative activities always will be in a battle of scarce resources and therefore cannot co-exist without inferring a tradeoff on the other activity’s behalf. In other words the inherent dualism precludes them from one another (Turner et al. 2013).

**Temporal ambidexterity**

20 years after Duncan, Tushman & O’Reilly (1996) followed up on his stream of thoughts showing how organizations could go through periods of incremental
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evolutionary change followed by periods of discontinuous revolutionary change, separated in time, continuously following each other, and by that representing a temporal strategy. Temporal cycling between exploration and exploitation is then another way of handling both pressures, temporally instead of spatially, and also represent a belief that the two activities will infer mutual tradeoffs if performed simultaneously.

These two groundings, strategies or mechanisms for implementing and achieving ambidexterity are called the punctuated equilibrium model of ambidexterity, because they both represent a core belief that most organizations spend most of their life in exploitative phases, sometimes disrupted by an explorative phase.

Turner et al. (2013) and Birkinshaw & Gupta (2013) argues that ambidexterity is a nested concept, meaning that it transpires multiple organizational levels simultaneously, so even if you resolve the “ambidexterity dilemma” at the organizational level by e.g. using structural separation, you just push the dilemma on to the next organizational level, all the way down to the individual level. This is a belief that has gained a lot of momentum in later years with prominent ambidexterity researchers besides Birkinshaw and Gupta supporting this belief. To mention a few we see how Turner, Maylor, & Swart (2014), Cao et al. (2009) and Raisch, Birkinshaw, Probst, & Tushman (2009) also ground their current belief about ambidexterity on the belief that exploration and exploitation can co-exist as orthogonal dimensions of learning.

This new understanding has led to a growing focus on the importance of paradoxical (both/and) thinking, as opposed to the trade-off (either/or) thinking described above, as scholars such as Bouchikhi (1998), Earley & Gibson (2002), Gresov & Drazin (1997), Koot, Sabelis, & Ybema (1996), Lewis (2000) and Morgeson & Hoffman (1999) and more have recognized the importance of simultaneously managing these two contradictory tensions (Gibson and Birkinshaw 2004). This leads us to the second
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major stream of ambidexterity research, which has been dubbed *contextual ambidexterity* by Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004).

**Contextual ambidexterity**

Basically contextual ambidexterity focuses on how individuals make daily choices between alignment-oriented (exploitation) and adaption-oriented (exploration) tasks (Birkinshaw and Gibson 2004). Focus is on the behavioral context and culture, and instead of achieving ambidexterity through dual structures, you build processes and systems which encourage the individual to make their own judgments about how to divide their time between the two activities (Gibson and Birkinshaw 2004). This is not to say that the individual is left alone to figure everything out, on the contrary it becomes management’s job to create the frames which fosters these possibilities for the individual. According to Gibson & Birkinshaw (2004), borrowing from Ghoshal & Bartlett (1994), four sets of attributes defines an organization’s context – stretch, discipline, support and trust. By combining stretch and discipline you engage in *performance management* leading to high quality results and ensuring accountability, and by combining support and trust, you provide the *social support* and latitude necessary for people to act ambidextrously. By securing a high level of social support as well as performance management you will secure a high performance context – a context where the employees are likely to behave ambidextrously.

**Dualism or Duality**

Structural and temporal separation as described above exists in what we call a dualism because they infer mutual tradeoffs. Farjoun (2010) argues that exploration and exploitation, or in his words, change and stability, have to be considered as two essential interdependent elements co-existing in a dualistic bond continuously
enabling each other – and by that be seen as a duality. It speaks to the two-sidedness of most tasks, as e.g. stability can also be considered an enabler for change. He argues: “Individuals engaged in routine tasks exercise some degree of experimentation, and those engaged in creative tasks use routines to some degree” (Farjoun 2010, p.218).

It is my belief as well, that the two activities will always co-exist in some degree, not meaning that a structural separation is not possible, on the contrary Gibson & Birkinshaw (2004) even argues that structural ambidexterity should be seen as complementary to contextual ambidexterity as it might be beneficial for new projects to have its own confined space and resources to get started. The long term goal however is reintegration with the mainstream organization as quickly as possible. This is an interesting point we will investigate some in this paper, as the Campus division actually originally was an explorative unit, separated in space, but now have evolved to be strongly explorative as well as exploitative. Whether it should be reintegrated or continue to stand alone is a question this paper hopefully could shed some light on.

**Ambidexterity as an organizational competence**

In the literature it sometimes seems unclear what kind of tool ambidexterity is. Is it a management skill or perhaps an organizational design mechanism? And how do you measure it, is ambidexterity a result? According to Chandrasekaran, Linderman, & Schroeder (2012) you should not look at ambidexterity as a performance outcome, but instead consider it a competence that you build and nurture. Like any other competence this could take time, and you shouldn’t expect results the moment you have finished implementing the ambidextrous design of your choice. When I say “of your choice” this also represents the belief that there is no right answer, but it rather
An integrated view of ambidexterity at the team and individual level

depends on your organizational context. This point will be observed in my analysis as we will see how the division goes through different phases; each best described by different ambidexterity logics - and sometimes even two logics at once.

It is my belief that this combination of considering ambidexterity as being contextually embedded as well as treating it as a competence that you build and nurture will be a fruitful approach in understanding the ambidexterity logics behind the division’s everyday work.

One last important theoretical point I want to highlight is raised by Birkinshaw & Gupta in their 2013 article focused on clarifying the distinctive contributions made to the field. In the article they try to realign the field of ambidexterity research, as they argue that ambidexterity in many instances has just become a new way to describe dualities in organizations that were already well-defined. They say that perhaps then “the study of ambidexterity is the study of organizations” and further illustrate their point by saying that if “ambidexterity is everything, then perhaps it is also nothing” (Birkinshaw and Gupta 2013, p.290–291). What is meant is that the concept of ambidexterity loses its meaning if it just becomes a new way of reframing organizational phenomena that we have already explained. Obviously the point of this paper is not to refute the concept of ambidexterity, but rather to elaborate on it in areas that haven’t been researched extensively enough, as well as doesn’t fall into the trap just described where we simply rephrase existing organizational dilemmas. There will, however, be some familiarity as ambidexterity is closely related to organization studies (or some would say is the study of organizations), but it is the aim of this paper to show how the interplay between these tensions creates valuable insights. If we mix this understanding with our arguments above about considering ambidexterity as a competence, I believe that ambidexterity ultimately proves its value as a coordinating framework and as a competence.
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Considering the state of the current literature as well as my initial hypothesis that the Campus division have succeeded in building ambidextrous competencies, the following research question will guide this paper

**RESEARCH QUESTION**

“How can ambidextrous competency be created and managed in small fast-growing teams”

1. “What factors contribute to the formation of ambidextrous competency seen from a temporal perspective in the division over the course of 4 years?”

2. “How is the balance between exploitation and exploration achieved and managed based on a complete yearly work-cycle in the team?”

3. “How do the individual team members handle the pressure of ambidexterity between each other and what factors helps or hinders this process?”

The analysis will be divided into three sections in order to answer my research question, represented by the three different sub questions outlined above. By answering these three questions we will understand what kind of frames helps or hinders the process of creating ambidextrous competency and we will understand how the team balances exploration and exploitation.

The level of analysis will be at the operational level, more specifically the team and individual level and the unit of analysis will be the team as a whole. This means that when e.g. investigating the individuals in the team, focus is only somewhat on individual mechanism for managing ambidexterity, but mostly on inter-team mechanisms leading to ambidexterity.
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I will also investigate from different time horizons to find clues as to the development and balancing of ambidexterity, first investigating the time from the division was conceived till present day, as well as a full work-cycle analysis spanning one year.

Before the main section however, a situational analysis will be performed introducing the company and the division, and a macro-level analysis of the organizational factors surrounding the division will be performed to better understand the context in which they operate.

By combining our knowledge from the macro-perspective with the knowledge we get from the main analysis it will be possible to provide some insights based on a multi-level approach as well. This is done from the belief that what is needed in present day ambidexterity literature is not more arguments about the desirability of ambidexterity, nor is it one-sided analysis of purely one level or factor, but rather an integrating analysis acknowledging that ambidexterity is a nested concept spanning multiple organizational levels (Birkinshaw & Gupta, 2013). As we mentioned in the theory review, it is important not just to rephrase existing organizational phenomena, and it is my belief that this is where ambidexterity research can really prove itself – as a coordinating framework.
Methods and data

In this section I will first of all describe how I approached this paper methodologically, highlighting choices made which naturally influences the direction of my future research and findings. This will be followed by a section considering the research design, more specifically what a case study approach brings to the table.

All primary data will then be introduced which consists of interviews, a questionnaire and my own observations. A section on my own influencing of the paper will also be performed at this point. Lastly all secondary data will be introduced which primarily consists of a variety of internal documents as well as theories related to ambidexterity. A section on the chosen theories validity as well as the overall validity of this paper will end of our method section.

METHODODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Methodologically I first of all applied an explorative approach by investigating existing materials related to ambidexterity research, researching the different concepts and their groundings. This led me to articles with many different explanations as to where true ambidexterity resided and how it was to be understood, and I sought to read as many different angles as possible to better grasp the extent of the topic. This included articles on structural separation, temporal separation, and contextual ambidexterity as well as articles which sought to align these framings and articles related to work frames not necessarily framed in ambidexterity terms by the researcher himself. I also read articles relating to different settings such as the project level, management level and individual level going on in service and technology industries with different ways of “measuring” ambidexterity.

After reading what seemed to be an extensive selection of ambidexterity research, I started getting the feeling that none of the logics described what I believed went on in the division adequately and I couldn’t find any theories or case studies which seemed
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to be located in the same setting as I had the possibility to perform research in, which is a labor union at a micro-level with fully emerged participatory data to support the other empirical data.

It seemed that most studies, even when they were based on a qualitative approach, still were based on somewhat peripheral interviews with multiple case-organizations seeking to provide generalizability to their results, but in my opinion losing the essence of what social science research is about. To put it in Thomas' (2010) words, it seemed to me as well that much of this research considered the end-goal of their pursuit to be theoretical development, sometimes at the cost of really understanding what goes on, what people think, feel and dream about, which is really the goal of social research.

I chose to do my study as a case study as well and decided to stick with the concept of ambidexterity as the overall frame to describe how my division goes about handling these dual pressures. I did not however choose a specific part of the ambidexterity research preemptively to focus on, as I wanted to apply an abductive approach. Basing my logic on abduction I would be able to keep my paper in the balance between induction and deduction, continually finding clues untainted by trying to fulfill certain parameters, but still looking for a theory or just idea as how to describe what is going on.

As Thomas (2010) humorously points out “Archimedes did not leap from his bath, shouting “I have a theory!” - his “eureka!” was about explanation, pure and simple, arising from observation and insight arising from abduction” (p. 579). I as well will focus on finding insights based on observations and interview data, and if we are lucky they will fit in our existing knowledge of ambidexterity, if not, new possible avenues for ambidexterity research will be highlighted.

This choice, to write my paper as a case study as well as in a setting I was fully emerged in myself represent my belief in the power of interpretative studies as well as my belief...
in how case studies should be performed within social science research, which I will elaborate on in the following section.

**Case studies – Phronesis or Theory?**

It seems that in social science methods case studies have an aura of methodological second best about it (Thomas 2010). This is seen in Yin’s (2003) remarks when he says that “the case study has long been (and continues to be) stereotyped as a weak sibling among social science methods” (p. xiii) and when Flyvbjerg (2006) comments that among his colleagues there is a sense that case studies provides an insecure basis for serious social scientific endeavor because “social science is about generalizing and one cannot generalize from a single case” (p. 219).

Remarks like these all stem from the same opinion which is that case studies fail in providing induction (theory development) through generalization (Thomas 2010) and therefore are less valid. But let’s stop for a moment and consider this proposition. Is achieving generalizability really the end-goal of case studies or do they provide something else? Really it is a dilemma between seeking something universal or something unique. Thomas (2010) argues that a phronetic stance is valuable and should not be seen as inferior to theory development. In this stance you recognize that interpretation is personal, and that case studies presents understanding from another person’s horizon of meaning, but understood from one’s own understanding. This also goes for the reader of the text, who can make his own impressions. I partly agree with this view, and this is the main reason why I like to work abductively as it allows me to put my own thoughts and theories to the side for a moment and just analyze on what is right in front of me.

*Phronesis is about practical knowledge, craft knowledge, with a twist of judgment squeezed into the mix. As it has been used more recently ... it has come to have more of a sense of tacit knowledge*

- Thomas (2010) p. 578
With that being said I also believe that obviously you can draw meaning out of big generalized theories as a lot of work and precursors lie before them. You lose the uniqueness from the in-depth case study, but you gain the advantage of theory-development which allows for structured continuous efforts in the field. As a researcher doing a solo case study, who believes in the interpretative value of emerging myself in the organization, I see no problems in also using established theory actively in my analysis. One could say that, it is exactly what abduction is about, neither seeking rigid inductive patterns on behalf of truly understanding the context, as much as not trying to reinvent the wheel where others have done excellent work before you. I will now move on to a presentation of the primary empirical data used in this paper.

**PRIMARY DATA**

**Interviews**

I have chosen to do five qualitative interviews, as they are open to the idea behind the research, and seeks insights based on the individual participants perspectives (Kvale 1997). The five interviews are comprised of one interview with the overall manager of the communication department (my boss), one with the former manager of the campus division and three with key employees in the division. Due to my abductive approach in continuously forming new tentative hypothesis along the way, and then going back to get more data on that, the three interviews with the employees will be comprised as one each, but is really conducted over the course of three small interviews during the year. The interview with the communication manager is conducted in one go, and the interview with the former manager is conducted via email and phone as she lives in Dublin now. For the three employees I have analyzed their answers directly in the paper as it made sense to do so in the third main section focusing on personal ambidexterity, whereas the two other interviews have been worked on in the appendix to act as support through the entire paper without taking
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up unnecessary focus. The interviews are to be found in Annex 1-5. All important themes will however be highlighted and worked with throughout the paper.

**Questionnaire**

A questionnaire where created and sent out to all members of the division, asking them to rank different tasks in regard to personal preference, economic value etc. Furthermore they were asked to comment on their answers. This provided a lot of feedback used to create the questions in the interviews with the three fulltime key employees. The questionnaire does however still provide some value in itself as it expresses some division-wide preferences in regard to motivation and tasks.

**Own observations**

In participant observation you seek to get as close to the unit of analysis as possible, but you will never completely be a natural member of the group. As I already am a member of the group as well as a researcher, I bear both the benefits and challenges of completely emerged participant observation. On one hand I can get as close as I want, I know everything that goes on, so I have access to some truths that a researcher from the outside necessarily wouldn’t. I can combine my respondent’s answers with my own knowledge of their work experience and my own organizational thoughts related to ambidexterity, and how that match or doesn’t match up with the responses.

On the other hand, first of all, in some degree there might be some ethical issues with me observing and analyzing everyone without their expressive consent at all times. It’s a hard balance as while I am writing this thesis, I suddenly realize why someone behaves the way they do and directly implement these thoughts in the paper. This provides deep understandings, but also runs the risk of using my knowledge of everyone in the company without their consent. I have sought to minimize this issue by continuously checking with the employee in question whether my take on the situation is what they actually believe they do themselves. Second of all, by being as embedded as I am, the big question of subjectivity quickly arises. According to
Christensen (2011) it is important to remember that subjective truths are not necessarily wrong, but as a researcher it is important constantly to make clear what is objective and what is subjective. I have sought to do this by being clear whenever I speak, and whenever I speak on behalf of someone else using their data. It can be argued that it is not really a question of whether someone is subjective or objective, as subjectivity can be observed in all research designs. Intentions aside, the moment you adopt a specific approach, a specific tool or a specific theory you become subjective as you no longer observe the situation as it is, but through a specific lens. Also in academic research we see how more and more institutions work closely together with the business sector to provide utility, which also un-intentionally decides research areas as well as promote inductive studies which can be generalized. What I seek is to have as little lenses on my eyes as possible, and then let the initial data lead my further tools used in understanding what goes on. So there is definitely a chance of me being subjective as I am emerged in the setting, however there is also a chance that I might get answers even closer to the truth, and if objectivity is about finding real truths, then it follows that my approach could increase objectivity. In the end, all you can do is to make your frames clear which as described above I have done in the biggest extent possible.

SECONDARY DATA:

Internal documents

In regard to internal documents I had unrestricted access due to my position in the company. My boss didn’t impose any restrictions on me as to what I could and couldn’t write about, as well as what documents I could use. This means that my internal documents comprise everything from relatively easy to get documents such as budgets, sales reports and quick email-interviews whenever one question outside my own realm needed answered, to more valuable documents as internal documents with all events performed the current year (which helps in classifying explorative and exploitative activities being performed) as well as competitor analysis and strategies.
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Theory

In my theory selection I have strived to primarily use articles contained in Financial Times' (2012) list of 45 journals used in their own research. Below I have listed the journals primarily used in this paper. FT means the journal are contained in Financial Times’ list. Furthermore the h-value is found for all journals to check its popularity using SCImago Journal & Country Rank (SJR 2013). Lastly it is listed in what percentile the journal is placed among its own category – Q1 meaning the top 25% (SJR 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIT Sloan management review</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of management perspective</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative science quarterly</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization science</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of operations</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of management review</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management journal</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of management journal</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of management</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank in category: Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An integrated view of ambidexterity at the team and individual level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Rank in category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International journal of project management</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International journal of management reviews</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California management review</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Journal rankings

As can be observed all articles have a decently high h-score, and reside in the top percentile within their category, and only two is not contained in Financial Times list.

Besides the above literature a few books is used which are all comprised in most business class literature on marketing, and one website reference to refer to an online article on the development of the labor union market.

Validity & reliability

Lastly I want to discuss the validity and reliability of my findings. It is generally discussed if it makes sense to use validity and reliability as criteria in qualitative research like in quantitative. LeCompte and Goetz (Bryman and Bell, 2007) presents the following criteria in which to judge our method from:

External reliability – Deals with the question of study replicability. It is hard to replicate a qualitative experiment as you are freezing a social setting. If you try to replicate it you will need to take the role of the original researcher. In my paper I have made all frameworks clear, as well as my approach to social science research. It is possible for another researcher to copy my questions and take the same abductive approach to his or hers team, but as I have argued before I believe meaning is contextually embedded which makes it hard to replicate.
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Internal reliability – relates to whether the research team agrees in the interpretation of the results. As I wrote this paper alone I don’t have any team members to confirm results with. Instead I have presented my findings for all employees to make sure I haven’t misinterpreted what they said, as well as I haven’t concluded wrongly when I have brought my own knowledge of the division and the employees into play. This have led to small adjustments along the way, but generally there were, and is definitely now after this process, a good consistency with what I have described and the way things actually are in the division.

External validity – relates to the possible degree of generalization of the findings across social settings. As I have already argued I don’t believe that the purpose of case research necessarily is generalizability, and it shouldn’t be a goal in itself. This paper will instead have a high degree of phronetic reasoning which will add to its validity.

Internal validity – relates to the match between the researchers observations and the theoretical models/thoughts derived from those. I have triangulated as many of my findings as possible by seeking the same answers across interviews, theory and my own observations.
SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

In this section I will look at all important factors surrounding the Campus division to better understand the context in which they operate, and in extension, the context in which ambidexterity is created. First a general product introduction as well as environmental analysis is introduced in the framework of a 4P and Stakeholder analysis.

We then take a look at the industry and the main competitors in order to understand the market effects which greatly influences all decisions related to product-pipeline, and therefore also the relative balance between explorative and exploitative activities. Lastly the company and the organizational drivers for ambidexterity which guides them are analyzed.

Business Danmark was officially founded in 1949, but has roots going 150 years back. Back in 1949 the company was called DAH, and has now grown to be a midsize union with about 32,000 members since within sales, marketing and consulting (Business Danmark, 2015) and has changed its name three times since, ending up with Business Danmark in 2006. They had a turn-around of 79.6 million in 2013 (annex 12) and seek to be profit neutral as the company is owned by the members. This is something that influences the balance between explorative and exploitative activities as this lack of major growth goals to satisfy shareholders influences the scale and scope of new projects launched.

Product

Business Danmark is a labor union and unemployment fund which means that they sell two core services. In the labor union the company helps their members with resume help, contract negotiations, legal advice and subsequent hearings when needed. Besides this, networking opportunities are also provided through a variety of events hosted for the members, and content is pushed in the online magazine “InBusiness” in the form of articles related to business, sales and marketing.
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In an interview with the sales and communication department’s manager Søren Hanager he says that “many of our members don’t use the core services, so for them the communication becomes the product” (Annex 2, p.6). Using Kotler and Armstrongs (2010) integrative book on marketing we see that the actual product may be perceived different among different costumers, but the core product however, which is what initiated most sales in the first place, could be seen as “professional and economic security” for most of the members.

The professional security promise is backed by the career enhancing opportunities described above, as well as some augmented product benefits such as access to cheap “payout level insurance” and different courses aimed at the members continuous professional development. The economic security claim is where the second core product, the unemployment fund, comes in.

In the unemployment fund all members can get money while looking for a job – more specifically 14.690 kroner/month before tax (2015 level). This is a service which is heavily regulated by the government and all unemployment funds in Denmark just administrate the members with a small profit, but pay out the same and follow the same rules. This makes the product nearly impossible to differentiate on other parameters than price – and everyone in the industry have the same fixed cost to the government of around 75% their income depending on their price (Annex 6).

As mentioned above, communication and product is closely related, which means that when communicating with young people, the product is “resume help getting the first job” as well as “get money when you are done studying and looking for a job”, while when talking to adults in job the product is “contract negotiation, legal advice and add-on insurances which doubles the monthly payout should you lose your job”. This internal integration between sales and marketing allows for flexible product development by reconfiguring existing and new competencies into new services ready to be communicated and sold almost at once and is a very important clue to
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understanding how the actual balance between exploitation and exploration is handled in the Campus division.

A final note on the product relates to its complicated nature and low-interest attributes. Insurance is not sexy and the rules are complex, and the product can then be categorized as a high involvement product (Percy and Elliot, 2009) as customers need a high degree of information gathering to make sure they choose the right union and unemployment fund. Furthermore, there are only few perceived differences between the different unions and funds, which means that Business Danmark should engage in “dissonance-reducing buying behavior” (Kotler and Armstrong 2010). The keyword here is perceivd differences as it becomes the communicator’s job to make these differences clear. This is an important clue as well as we will see when the campus division is introduced in more detail, as the way they handle their segment is largely based on building loyalty and attitude towards the product before purchase, which is an essential strategy when dealing with high involvement products (Percy and Elliot, 2009), as well as reducing post-purchase regret.

Price and competition

The union cost 157 kroner/month and the unemployment fund costs 445 kroner/month. If you are a student you can be a free member for up to five years and when you graduate you will get the union membership at half price the first six months. These prices are very competitive and cheaper than all existing competitors besides two, which is irrelevant so far as they don’t compete for the young members at the same schools as the Campus division does.

The market of labor unions in Denmark is roughly divided into two categories – the traditional big “red” ones and the “yellow” ones. The traditional unions focus on making labor agreements across industry and they generally have a strong socialistic/solidarity approach. They are the ones who have secured us all our rights through history at the labor market and tend to be fairly expensive in comparison to the yellow unions (Ritzaus Bureau, 2011)
The yellow unions are a somewhat “new” thing. They have been around for a long time but it is only recently that they have been of great interest, such a great interest actually that the percentage of union-members in yellow unions have gone from 5% in 1995 to more than 20% today – a time period where the total percentage of union members on the Danish market fell from 73.1% to 67.4% (Ebdrup, 2012). Business Danmark is a yellow union as it doesn’t have labor agreements, but it does have a professional focus which is sales, marketing and consultancy.

This sudden spike in interest for smaller more dynamic individualistically oriented unions has to do with the market opening up free union choice, no matter your profession, some 10 years ago. This have created a bloody market where everyone is fighting for each other’s members, as well as forced a lot of the unions to rethink everything from services offered to original marketing strategies.

If we plot in the biggest unions in Denmark on a matrix with union type and industry focus, we see that Business Danmark places itself in a nice unoccupied area (figure 1). The downside however is that when you don’t charge much compared to the traditional unions, but still restricts yourself in a category, you might gain a
differentiated positioning, but you will have a hard time being as competitive as the others cash and member wise.

To illustrate this point further I have compiled a list of the number of member exchanges going on between Business Danmark and 13 other unions in Denmark in 2014. The graph below is created by measuring how many members Business Danmark loses or gains from the respective unions every week the entire year. The highlighted black line is the overall trend line indicating if they gain or lose members in respect to their competitors. Two unions who have stolen a small amount of members from the company “Ase” and “Lederne” and it also happens to be the two only competitors who are a bit cheaper than Business Danmark – again showing how important price is in this industry. As can be observed, overall, Business Danmark win more members than they lose, and the curve keeps rising each week without any major deviations.

Graph 1- Member exchange relationship w. competitors
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To summarize, the market in which Business Danmark operates is characterized by high price sensitivity and bloody competition. However, having found a fairly uninhabited segment, the company is thriving and all numbers are going up. The biggest threat for the company would be if someone else challenged their position as sales and marketing specialists at a cheaper price. However as it is now, the only unions who are geared towards price-leadership is also the unions which rely on great numbers to keep costs down – something that would prove a big challenge if they were to start communicating themselves as more specialized within sales and marketing than Business Danmark who has spent more than 60 years only nurturing this angle. The same logic obviously goes for Business Danmark who would have a hard time getting as many sign-ups as the purely yellow unions – but as profits are not really a goal in itself (because of member-ownership) the position they have now seems to be sustainable with continuous organic growth.

Promotion and placement

The way Business Danmark makes its money is through a subscription fee every month for the services provided. In the campus division money is made when their free student members convert to paying memberships after finishing their studies. On a macro-level the main channels for attracting new members is the internal sales division, external sales bureau, the campus division and others (referral programs, social media, WOM, marketing). All of these (except external sales) are officially located in the SMUK department (Sales, Marketing, Uddannelse, Kommunikation) with Søren Hanager in charge.

The Sales division was originally the only sales force in Business Danmark and it consists of 4 persons, where one of those is the Sales manager. Excluding the external bureau, the sales division managed to pull home 1714 sales in 2014 with an average CPO (cost per order) of around 1500 kr. Now, however, the Campus division has grown rapidly and consists of 8 persons, including myself as the team leader, and engages in a variety of activities to pull home their sales. The most important activities are
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- Lectures at schools
- A student event-club
- Theme-events
- On-location service stations at major schools
- Phone sales on leads
- Career days
- Intro/teambuilding

As can be seen the palette of activities inside Campus is greatly varied in contrast to the rest of the organization, and has evolved drastically for the last three years. The division managed to pull home 2035 new members in 2014, where it is expected that 70% of those will convert to paying members. This makes Campus’ CPO (cost per order) 772 kr. (annex 11), or roughly half of that of the established sales department.

The main difference between Campus and the other sales channels is that almost all of Campus sales are based on personal selling, relationship management and continuous service development within their own segment (students), whereas the established sales department primarily relies on phone sales, even though they now have hired one field sales person (who originally worked in Campus).

Marketing-wise the company relies on “loud” marketing, acknowledging that when you don’t have the biggest budget and seek price leadership, you have to yell higher. They still rely a lot on TV ads, but are slowly shifting attention towards new opportunities online, besides social media.

**Stakeholders**

Campus also has a lot of stakeholders influencing the relative balance between explorative and exploitative activities. Unemployment funds are governmentally regulated, meaning that you cannot just change your product; you have to follow their price regulations and their guidelines. In this regard Campus has a big responsibility in communicating the correct information to their student members, as graduation rules
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in regard to getting benefits afterwards are very specific and non-negotiable. This factor means that everything the division does and all activities they create have to be created on top of this logic, it’s simply not okay to make more sales on the cost of forgetting to mention everything in small. We could call this an exploitative pressure, in the sense that this stakeholder traditionally only hinders exploration and forces more carefulness and optimization of all materials and activities.

Internally as well there are some stakeholders to be aware of. Customer service has suddenly been swamped with student calls (often callbacks) and has had to learn all rules and procedures in way finer detail than before, resulting in a lot of their traditional tasks now residing in Campus, due to the fact that Campus just knows some of the rules in more detail. This might or might not be a good idea, but it is the state of the situation right now, again forcing even more exploitative pressures on the division as the sales team now also has to help existing members.

This clash between traditional and in some areas, outdated, union practices and the Campus divisions efforts in rethinking markets and customer approach, is what holds the biggest tensions in balancing exploration and exploitation.

I will now finish the situational analysis with a section on how the organization in Business Danmark affects the possibilities of building ambidextrous competencies.
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Organizing for ambidexterity

Figure 2- Internal graph of the organization

Organizationally Business Danmark consists of a headquarter with 80 employees and eight small local divisions across Denmark. The local divisions are irrelevant for this paper as they are not part of daily operations, communication or strategy planning. If we look at how Business Danmark is structured (figure 2) we see how it follows a classical hierarchical approach like most companies. Campus however is positioned as a separate entity with its own sales force, social media channels, marketing production and even customer service capabilities in some degree due to the strong specialization on students.

Campus primarily differentiates itself from the other divisions in two key ways. Drawing from Mintzbergs (1983) basic views on organizational function, we use an
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informal communication perspective as well as the notion of work constellations to illustrate how Campus is uniquely positioned to build ambidextrous competencies.

As mentioned by other ambidexterity researchers (Turner et al., 2014), the project manager is in a unique role to focus both on exploration and exploitation simultaneously as he spans the entire hierarchy. This can be observed by the division being strongly connected to sales, marketing and customer service, as the only division in the company. This means that there in practice exists informal communication paths to the majority of people in headquarter, which is a valuable asset in the quest to build ambidextrous competencies. These semi-formal ties also lead to some different work constellations where the division work together with other departments as a lot of shared goals exists.

One exploitative example is how the division has worked together with customer service to create new guidelines for handling the massively growing student flow, something that traditionally fell to customer service to figure out for themselves, but in the end benefits both divisions. To mention an explorative cross-division example as well the division has worked together with IT and sales to develop a new lead-generating solution which allows them to get leads from entirely new channels without even attending events.

We already now see traces related to the value a disintegrated team/division structure brings to the table in regard to managing both explorative and exploitative pressures. In our theory section I argued in line with Birkinshaw and Gupta (2013) on the topic of ambidexterity being a nested concept, transpiring multiple organizational levels and we can illustrate that point in regard to business Danmark by looking at the three levels chosen (figure 3).
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Figure 3 - Ambidexterity dilemma illustrated in Business Danmark

It can be observed how they at a macro-level handle the pressure of ambidexterity by letting the communication department be the primary explorer. The communication department however also have a lot of exploitive operational tasks to deal with so they push the very explorative task of channel development to Campus as a new separated entity (annex 2). Campus however also starts experiencing the exploitative pressures now but can’t push it any further down the chain and is “forced” to resolve the ambidexterity dilemma themselves at the operational and individual level. As they have to handle both pressures on a daily basis it almost makes sense that some kind of contextual ambidexterity will be observed as well as some inter-temporal strategies employed.
 ANALYSIS

We will now begin our main analysis, finding evidence for the different ways ambidexterity can be observed and understood in Business Danmark’s Campus division. The analysis consists of three parts. The first part applies a temporal perspective, looking at how ambidextrous competency is created from the birth of the division until present day. The second part investigates a full yearly work-cycle to look for strategic and practical clues as to the balancing and management of ambidexterity, and finally the third section looks at how the individuals in the team contribute to this balance.

1. BUILDING AMBIDEXTROUS COMPETENCY – A TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE

“What factors contribute to the formation of ambidextrous competency seen from a temporal perspective in the division over the course of 4 years?”

That’s the sub-question I asked in the research question in order to understand how the division has built the competencies necessary in allowing them to shift effortlessly (it seems) between optimizing existing activities and processes (exploitation) and developing new concepts and partnerships (exploration).

To keep the scope of this paper in line, what I want to investigate in this section specifically, is how we can observe the different activities evolve over the four year period the division has existed, and then score the current year on a scale from -100 to +100, -100 representing only exploitative activities being performed, +100 representing purely explorative activities being performed, leaving 0 to represent a state of orthogonal ambidexterity. By doing this, it will first of all be possible to introduce the types of tasks the division are engaged in which will prove valuable when seeking to understand the balancing of these tasks, and second of all it will allow us to map out the divisions development using an “Overall Ambidexterity Score” (OAS),
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which will allow us to spot a time-based trend in the evolvement of explorative and exploitative activities. The OAS is found in a mix between an interview with Maria, the former project manager (annex 1), and my own daily observations. Obviously it is difficult to put an exact number on exactly how explorative a year is, and the quantification is only done to be able to see the relative difference between the years and map out trends.

2011 – Explore, explore, explore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview 2011</th>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 1</td>
<td>Optimize internal work flows and procedures.</td>
<td>10 new partner schools “signed”</td>
<td>Score: +70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: 750.000</td>
<td>Optimize materials with a student angle</td>
<td>On-school lecture concept developed</td>
<td>Primarily exploration to build initial competencies, exploitation on the way though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 600</td>
<td>Continuous optimization of events along the way</td>
<td>Theme-party concept developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career day concept developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Task distribution in Campus 2011

To start at the beginning Campus were conceived in 2011 as a one-woman startup, in the organizational frames already described in the previous section. The goal was clear from the beginning – find a way to attract student members and turn a profit already the first year. Maria, the first project manager, was given 750.000 kr. and the frames to handle it as she saw fit (annex 1-2).

There existed no prior research or materials specifically related to students which meant that Campus was born with strong explorative as well as exploitive pressures surrounding it. Explorative in the way that she needed to create the student market from the beginning, and exploitative in the way that all existing communication materials, rules etc. needed to be optimized towards students.
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This dual pressure from the beginning can also be seen in communication manager Søren Hanagers comments when interviewed on the beginning of Campus. According to him (annex 2) Campus needed to produce 600 sales already the first year even though he was fully aware that Maria also needed to create the market in the first place. Maria herself (annex 1) elaborates on that by saying that she did however have the first six months free with no specific goals to allow her to search for the best angle before the goals of 600 sales were put together.

Having to secure 600 sales in a newly created market on such a short time frame could restrict the possibilities of enough exploration, but according to Søren (annex 2) you need to have concrete sales goals from the beginning to secure project survival when you are operating in a SME with a main focus within sales, or else the project will simply die of early.

For Maria this meant, that she had to focus on optimizing and turning her newly founded partnerships into profitable channels already from the beginning, as well as keep exploring as she still needed more activities to build a strong enough base to support her sales target and growth expectations. When asked if she believes that Campus could have kept growing by only focusing on the initial explorative ideas she replied: “No way! I could have optimized our lecture concept for years, but we would never have reached our desired volume without some alternative events” (annex 1, p.4). This is the essence of why ambidexterity is such an important concept to understand and work with, for Maria couldn’t have created the initial success she did if she didn’t cycle forth and back between the two logics. In a macro-perspective, considering all four years, this first year were primarily characterized by being explorative.

Traditionally, exploration is related to long-term goals of search for new markets and profits, and exploitation is related to short-term goals of here-and-now profits by doing more of what you are already good at. For many companies, however, they don’t necessarily have the capital to launch projects with time and profit horizons
more than one year ahead, especially not if you are an operative manager and therefore are held accountable for sales growth on a short term basis. Short and long term then becomes somewhat closer to each other. Going back to one of my first points about ambidexterity being a nested concept, the ambidexterity dilemma will have to be resolved at the operative and individual level ultimately as it spans the entire hierarchy. So how do you go about that, what comes first for example, exploration, exploitation or a simultaneously pursuit? What can be observed in the Campus division is quite interesting.

The way profits are achieved in the department is strongly related to finding new ways to get student signups (exploration), as the sales goals are fairly stretched, meaning that pure exploitation wouldn't be enough to get all sales, not when Maria started in 2011 and not now in 2014. Even more interesting, it seems that exploitation is considered the long-term factor securing the in-house capabilities to actually handle the big growth returns on all the explorative activities. So in this sense it is almost as if the traditional logic is reversed with exploration securing profits both short and long-term and exploitation act as the lubricant which ensures that the division is geared towards handling all these new projects effectively.

Implications for ambidexterity

It seems so far that two factors positively help secure a foundation for ambidextrous competency to emerge from. The first factor is to build strong dual pressures in the project/division/team from the beginning, no matter how big your budget is. When you are forced to deliver value fairly quick you first of all become good at managing product pipelines with many different small projects, as you don’t have time to only see one through at a time, only to see it possibly fail. Furthermore you are forced to think practically from the beginning as ideas will only take you so far in securing actual profits short-term. Engaging in this behavior is something that is likely to improve your competencies within areas such as creative problem solving, overall adaptability and speed to market – all useful competencies in building ambidextrous competency.
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Brown & Eisenhardt (1997) call this “to probe”, meaning that successful companies who seek to do multiple-product innovation, should have lots of small inexpensive projects to probe into the future, which is what the division does when it creates lots of fairly inexpensive concepts. The division then test the concept at one school, if successful - a full semester, and if still successful are transferred to be considered a permanent activity that is now communicated and optimized (exploitation) so it can be rolled out on all partner-schools the coming semester.

The second factor relates to motivation and the level of the hierarchy. By seeking to achieve ambidextrous competences at the operational level, because you actually need those competences to survive as a project, you will also be the recipient of your own solutions. This means that whatever you create (explore) you will also be the one who will have to execute that project and improve it. This is something that is only possible by having a more or less contextual ambidexterity setting or relatively fast-phased temporal cycling, as a structural separation often would mean that e.g. the R&D department would figure out something new, and then another department or customer base would have to live with those solutions – something that can be very costly and time consuming, should the product or tool not live up to its promised potential. However, when you yourself create and test your solutions, and even in the case of the Campus division, are in contact with a broad majority of your customer base on a weekly basis, it becomes fast and more fluent to improve new service offers and events. This is also what Birkinshaw & Gibson (2004) talk about when they say, that structural separation can lead to isolation as R&D and business development groups lack the linkage to core business.

According to the communication manager Søren Hanager (annex 2) he also believes that the best results are achieved if the same person is responsible for both exploration and exploitation, and he continues saying that he believes that it is healthy for all individuals to have both logics as you have to be careful about giving the “creatives” the exclusive right to be creative. I will touch further on the more personal aspects of ambidexterity in the third main analysis section.
2012 & 2013 – Temporal cycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview 2012</th>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 2</td>
<td>External phone sales to optimize call-through on leads</td>
<td>External phone sales can also be seen as a new sales channel for the division</td>
<td>Score: -50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: 750.000</td>
<td>Website optimized with better student info</td>
<td>Teambuilding at intro-days concept introduced</td>
<td>A lot of exploitation to balance exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 1000</td>
<td>All newly created events optimized and streamlined</td>
<td>Theme-party concept developed</td>
<td>Exploration still going on though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimize work flows again as first batch of graduates now comes through - need to educate colleagues</td>
<td>More schools signed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Task distribution in Campus 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview 2013</th>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 5</td>
<td>Only material optimization in a small degree</td>
<td>Only content-exploration on different social media platforms</td>
<td>Score: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: 950.000</td>
<td>New team-structure with 3 long term hires</td>
<td>New CRM system developed</td>
<td>A bit more exploration but almost balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 1600</td>
<td>New university-segment starts to emerge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Task distribution in Campus 2013

Having cleared the first year which was characterized by a lot of exploration, but also a decent amount of exploitation, the division now reaches a phase of streamlining all the newly created events. As mentioned above, if a concept makes it through one semester and seems successful, it needs to be optimized and improved for national
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 rollout, as the first year had so much exploration it gives that the second year would have a lot more exploitation as all the concepts now needs to be refined.

In 2012 Maria also hired the first part-time employee to help her, by that taking the first steps in separating some of the activities from herself. This first employee was not invited to help in exploration processes, but was a result of the need for more exploitation as mentioned above, as well as a cheap way to “probe” the possibilities of having more employees as he was a free 3-month intern (annex 1).

Already the year after in 2013, she decided to hire three part-time employees more, myself included, as well as two 10-month payed full-time interns and the beginning of some new dynamics were introduced. It was now possible for Maria to focus even more on the explorative activities she still deemed missing like exploring the online possibilities, and most of the exploitative tasks were handled by the employees. What is interesting is that this very classical work distribution, actually doesn’t resemble what happened the coming year in 2014 when I took over, but it seemed the right move at the time, and exactly what the division needed to continue growing and finding its place.

Implications for ambidexterity

If we look at the overall ambidexterity score we have assigned to 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively, a pattern as to the balancing of exploration and exploitation emerges. We see that 2011 were primarily categorized by exploration, 2012 by exploitation, and 2013 almost balanced but a bit more exploration than exploitation again. This way of cycling forth and back between the two dominant logics is what Tushman & O’Reilly (1996) calls temporal ambidexterity, meaning that ambidexterity is achieved by having one focus at a time which dominates.

The logic behind this way of separating, as already discussed in the theory section, is based on the rationality that the two logics will always be in a battle of scarce resources, and therefore cannot co-exist without inferring a tradeoff on the other ones
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behalf. Starting a new division obviously have its resource limitations and it therefore makes sense that Maria, perhaps without knowing it, choose this way of organizing.

I also do believe that a tradeoff always occurs, but in my opinion it’s not a question of whether doing one activity steals time or resources from doing another activity, because obviously it does. It is a question of having the strategic clarity to see what is needed, when, also on a daily basis, and the more you train yourself in shifting between these two logics, the more you train your own capacity to keep focus even though you are perhaps both optimizing some processes and at the same time negotiating with new partners.

Saying that this also goes on at a daily basis, raises an interesting thought. Originally temporal ambidexterity was not meant to describe a continuous cycling between exploitation and exploration, as the grounding thought were that companies will spend most of their time in exploitative phases, sometimes interrupted by an explorative phase (Tushman and O’Reilly 1996). I don’t believe that assumption to be entirely realistic anymore, as most companies have to enter their “explorative” modes in an increasingly bigger and bigger degree to keep up with modern development.

The question then becomes how often you change mode - every year? month? day? hour? If we look back at our theory section where we defined contextual ambidexterity as being the ability to simultaneously pursue exploration and exploitation, and we assume that “simultaneously” must imply some timely separation as you simply physically can’t work on two tasks at the same time (unless all tasks you do always serve both purposes), we then sense that perhaps there is a fine line from doing temporal cycling with increasingly smaller phases, and then moving into complete contextual ambidexterity because you finally succeed in creating the right organizational frames. I will elaborate more on the work frames enabling contextual ambidexterity and how they come into play in Campus in the third main analysis focusing on individual ambidexterity.
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In the interview with Maria (annex 1), when introduced to the concept of ambidexterity, exploration, exploitation and the three dominant control mechanisms, she comments that structural separation would never work in Campus as it would simply be too time-consuming, temporal separation she believed was how she handled it at the beginning, but contextual ambidexterity was the way she could best recognize as being the case of balancing – even without knowing this framework at the time (annex 1). This relates fairly well to our analysis so far and we will now move on to look at the overall factors relating to 2014.

2014 – Contextual 44ambidexterity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview 2014</th>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 8</td>
<td>Lecture-concept</td>
<td>Lecture-concept</td>
<td>Score: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget 1.100.000</td>
<td>improved with better</td>
<td>converted to centralized</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 2000</td>
<td>speakers</td>
<td>event-club concept</td>
<td>ambidexterity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All materials re-created in new design and sharper communication</td>
<td>Service Pitstop concept developed and tested</td>
<td>driven by new concept development, most of the initiatives serve both explorative and exploitative purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training folders created for new employees</td>
<td>3 non-school-related event-types tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead-generation digitally automated</td>
<td>All mentioned concepts “productified” for easy partner-communication and expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All internal processes optimized for faster flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Task distribution in Campus 2014

We now get to 2014, which is the time where I took over the department. As I mentioned in the introduction the biggest challenge I saw it, was to keep up the creative drive that had led the division so far, while at the same time optimize a lot of the processes and materials which seemed necessary for us to keep exploring.
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As I saw it the first issue was an issue of manpower, so three part-time employees more was hired. Besides this, three new full-time interns replaced the existing ones as they are hired on 10-month contracts. This meant that I basically had a chance to define all tasks and the culture in the division as wanted again. From the moment they were all hired I spend a lot of time training them all in the underlying logics behind my decisions, why some events were more profitable than others, what parameters to consider if they had a good idea they wanted to work with etc. The plan was to make them take responsibility to unburden me, and make them more autonomous instead of only giving them exploitative tasks as had been the case primarily up until this point.

In the beginning I had no idea how far I could take this as I on one hand wanted them to be involved in explorative decisions both to help improve them as well as unburden me of some tasks, and on the other hand they were officially hired “just” to do sales and attend events, which is a non-negotiable task. To start off, they only did somewhat what I told them and expected of them in regard to their own personal responsibility projects, Rasmus e.g. is responsible for our social media besides the daily student-tasks. However already after 3-4 months something interesting started to form, which were neither completely planned nor random.

The three full-time employees, now having their own areas of responsibility, started getting new ideas a lot, they started discussing them with each other before presenting them to me, to make sure they lived up to the criteria I had spent the last 4 months indoctrinating them with, and some of these ideas were actually rather good. What they seemed to understand was that everything comes with a tradeoff, so if you e.g. want to do a new activity, then when are you going to have time to do your other exploitative tasks? The ideas which survived all had one thing I common – they served dual purposes. It could be a new approach to our theme-parties e.g. which focused on getting signups instead of leads which would free time calling in sales, time which could be used on the next project etc.
We now start observing an ambidextrous pattern evolve, namely that of contextual ambidexterity. I believe this renewed drive for product development as well as optimization was created because of the work-frames, and that the frames were planned so to speak, but I didn’t know exactly what they would bring. I will introduce some of these projects and how the individuals in the team perceive their work frames in relation with my third main section focusing on personal ambidexterity.

I remember one of the first advices I got from one of our external consultants, who said to remember that a leader’s primary task is to avoid being absorbed by daily operations. So at that point I could choose to either act as a manager and continue to supervise and delegate tasks or I could chose to act as a leader and share all my logics, ideas and visions for the division with my employees, encouraging them to do the same and slowly get them into the right frame of mind for me to let go and hopefully see results from that approach. This approach can also be observed in my own boss’ comments when he says that “my core belief is to hire the right people and then not stand in their way” (annex 2).

The scope of this paper is not aimed towards leadership as it becomes too involved as I am the leader myself, but a quick comment is that this approach to leadership is very much supported in the literature with the classical example being Burns (1978) book on transactional vs. transformational leadership. According to Burns a transactional leader succeeds in using his own personality to inspire followers to change expectations, perceptions, and motivations to work towards common goals, and is in a sense the style you want to strive for. However if we perceive the transformational leader as the very explorative force, then perhaps it is also needed to be the transactional leader at times, who focuses more on give-and-take relationships and here and now optimization i.e. exploitation. So a mix of these leadership styles would perhaps foster ambidexterity? Or perhaps only transformational leadership is needed combined with some other mechanisms to secure exploitation. I will not dwell more on this, as many ambidexterity researchers have already touched upon this subject and it is outside my main scope.
If we move on to look at an overall questionnaire I performed with all employees in the division (annex 7), when asked to rank seven tasks in regard to personal work motivation the top 3 were: “Strong team spirit in in department”, “own responsibilities” and “strong variation in daily work”. So they all wanted good support structures around them in terms of colleagues, but they wanted their own responsibilities which should include a diverse and varied palette of tasks. It is important to also highlight that “sales bonuses” were also on the list which an individual who didn’t feel involved in the greater plan and vision for the division could have been tempted to choose, but all my employees know that, that means more phones sales instead of exploration - what gets measured gets done, as the management consultant Peter Drucker once said.

**Implications for ambidexterity**

I have scored this year 0 on its overall ambidexterity score, because it seems that as many exploitative as explorative activities have been performed. This however doesn’t reflect the scale of these activities, as 2014 have seen a lot more explorative and exploitative activities than e.g. 2012/13, and the graph below therefore represents relative differences between the two activities, and not absolute numbers. If we plot in the OAS from all four years we get the following graph:
What we observe is a temporal cycling between exploration and exploitation, which slowly decreases as the division finds its balance and embeds the pressures of ambidexterity on shorter and shorter time horizons, leading to a contextual balancing in 2014. What 2015 will prove is still too early to say being one month into the year, perhaps it will be a very balanced year again, or perhaps exploration will explode next semester again if this semester’s newly created activities really pans out.

To summarize this first part, I found that the factors which contribute to the creation of ambidexterity are first of all to build in strong dual pressures from the beginning as this force the right mindset. Furthermore I found that it is important to train all team members in both objectives in the long run and create room for them to be explorative, if you want to maintain high growth rates – as this spawns a lot of fairly inexpensive projects meant to probe into the future.
Lastly I found that openness to your balancing makes it easier to grow fast as you perhaps need to be separated structurally the first few years, and then reintegrate, or you might have some years which is screwed towards one side the first few years, and then aligns. The point here is that ambidexterity literature have spent a lot of time discussing which mechanism provides for best organization, where what I observe so far is that they all do in different situations.

I will now continue to our second main analysis looking at one year broken down into its dominating tasks and their respective balancing
2. AN INTER-TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE ON AMBIDEXTERY AND CONTEXTUAL ALIGNMENT

“How is the balance between exploitation and exploration achieved and managed based on a complete yearly work-cycle in the team?”

In this section I will narrow down the focus from the four year temporal perspective in the previous section to a one-year inter-temporal perspective, analyzing one year’s full work cycle and its related tasks the respective months from a team perspective. This will allow me to create an integrated exploration/exploitation model for the division which will allow us to look for clues related to the balancing of explorative and exploitative activities. In order to do this I will first introduce the tasks the division is engaged in, and describe some of them and their character in more details. This will be followed by a section on work frames enabling ambidexterity and lastly I will score each month in the same manner as the previous analysis, where +100 represents purely explorative activities being performed in that month, and -100 would mean purely exploitative activities, leaving 0 to represent a state of orthogonal ambidexterity, or contextual ambidexterity if you will.

**Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitative tasks</th>
<th>Explorative tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurture existing partnerships</td>
<td>Find new partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend events, get sales</td>
<td>Expand online presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update communication channels</td>
<td>New content for existing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative sales work</td>
<td>Create new activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone sales</td>
<td>Work on individual projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on individual projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Explorative and exploitative tasks in Campus

In the table 6 a list of exploitative and explorative activities in the division can be observed. The exploitative tasks primarily includes: attending planned sales events at partner schools, get leads and call in sales, administrative work like importing lead
sheets and updating communication channels and other tracking materials. The exploitative tasks are almost exclusively performed by the team employees and not myself. Also, phone sales approximately only accounts for half a work day, which means that there is, depending on how many events have to be attended, at least a few hours free every day to work on other projects than those directly related to current events and sales. In comparison, most other sales departments would use the majority of their time calling in leads, even in-house the established paying-member sales department only calls leads, and so in this sense we also see how the separation of Campus as a separate division makes sense organizationally.

The explorative tasks include everything from content/service development for existing partners to attempts at new types of partnerships with non-school organizations, as well as expanding presence in the general business study segment of students. Sometimes this line between exploration and exploitation can be pretty blurred, which can be observed in the following real-life example which happened to me at one of my meetings with an existing partner where we talked about next semesters activities:

At the meeting the partner brought up that he is having problems findings internship positions for all his students. This results in me writing an article about the benefits of having interns and posts it at our own communication channels (news production is a new-to-division activity). The next thing that happens is that a lot of small/medium-sized companies start calling me, to get help getting interns, and I use this opportunity to call the rest of the schools who probably faces the same problems and tell them that now we offer help getting their students into internships through our contacts and member base – which were greatly appreciated.

By this we suddenly create a new service (exploration), which further leads to the idea of creating an internship platform related only to the business academies as that is something they need a lot (more exploration). But before that, we figure that we need to be able to handle this new pressure, so we optimize our "Career Starter" kits to
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reflect how we want to be their preferred career partner (exploitation) as well as divide the tasks related to this project and write down a protocol to handle it (more exploitation). I could continue these real-life examples for five more pages, as I am not the only one in contact with new partners, my employees also regularly come to me with new contacts who want to partner up on specific issues.

This small example holds two points. The first is something also mentioned by other researchers such as Gupta, Smith, and Shalley (2006), namely that resources like knowledge and information may be infinite and by that don’t compete for scarce resources. Furthermore they argue that organizations often have access to resources in their external environment, which is the case in the above example, where I can use my contacts as information gatherers on the problems all of the schools face or may face in the future. This argument is also part of the reason why orthogonality can be achieved, and exploration/exploitation doesn’t have to be considered as a continuum (Gupta et al. 2006). So as long as the division makes sure to keep getting new ideas/inspiration externally, they can focus on exploitation and few selected explorative projects.

In extension, the second point is that the above example is a clear example of a contextual approach to ambidexterity where the frames, processes and work procedures naturally lead the balance between exploration and exploitation, because it makes sense to tackle it simultaneously. As we will see later in this analysis, even in contextual ambidexterity there will be some temporal cycling, without directly progressing into pure temporal ambidexterity. The activities are always handled and thought of as integrated, but a different focus is needed in different months depending on where in the work cycle the division is.
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Inter-temporal cycling

As can already be seen the tasks that the division performs are not the same the whole year, as they follow the schools agenda meaning that there exists inflations and deflations in student attention related to occurrences such as intro period, exams, holidays etc. By assigning the above mentioned tasks to each month (table 7), representing the most performed tasks in the respective month, we can score the months on a scale from -100 (pure exploitation) to +100 (pure exploration), 0 being a representation of orthogonal ambidexterity. The dominating tasks for the month in question are found via an event-plan for the entire year (annex 9), a yearly task-cycle description (annex 10) made together with Søren Hanager, the manager of the overall communications department, and my own knowledge of the work cycles. Again, the scores are only meant to illustrate relative differences between months and should therefore not be seen as absolute numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Primary tasks</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Prepares practicalities for coming semester</td>
<td>Mostly exploitative</td>
<td>-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Executes events, adjusts and optimizes</td>
<td>More exploration introduced</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Executes events and phone sales + start to get new contacts/ideas in field</td>
<td>More exploration introduced</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Starts gathering ideas from past two months for new events</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Start working in ideas while finishing of events</td>
<td>Slightly higher exploration focus</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Create all new events, call new contacts etc.</td>
<td>Mostly explorative</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 - exploration/exploitation balance based on tasks

A full work year in the division is comprised of two half-year semesters which is completely identical when it comes to tasks performed. Above the table is made with the spring semester. If we plot this into a graph and add the second identical cycle we get the following graph:
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Graph 3 - Yearly exploration/exploitation balance

As can be seen two things have been added to the graph. The first is the orange arrow, which is to represent that every semester the division will take the best of the ideas generated and filtered through the previous five months experiences, and implement them in the coming semesters activities making them exploitative in the sense that all that’s left now is to optimize them. So when June is done, a lot of explorative activities have been performed and the best projects selected. Focus then shifts as it is now decided to roll them out, and July, which is the last month before everyone is back at school, is therefore very exploitative as the projects now needs to be refined and optimized.

The second thing that is added to the graph is the two orange circles. The circles represents that at least twice a year the division will have a perfect balance doing an equal amount of both types of task. To say that the point lies exactly in April and October might be to specific, but at least it is not far from my experiences, which also can be seen in the event-overview for 2014 (annex 9) where it can be seen that activities are not as hectic as the previous months but still not over, leaving time for
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explorative projects which can be tested in field in a small scale before the semester is over.

As the title of this section also implies, what can be observed, is that the division uses some degree of inter-temporal cycling to manage both pressures, but as also argued before, there is never a situation where only one focus exists. So in some sense it could be said that the division handles ambidexterity by a contextual strategy which allows for seasonal fluctuations in explorative and exploitative activities.

So is this the optimal way of balancing exploration and exploitation? I will follow up on a thought from Birkinshaw & Gupta's 2013 article. In the article they bring up this same issue of whether the two objectives should be balanced, traded off against each other, reconciled or simply managed. In line with what I have also argued earlier, they argue that it is unlikely that firms can deliver the highest possible value on both dimensions simultaneously, and that a simple curve must exist like the one seen in graph 4 (with much resemblance to Porters efficiency frontier). Even though I just argued that some resources like knowledge can be infinite and therefore doesn’t need to be considered on a continuum, there still exist a lot of resources which are finite and it is therefore worthwhile to investigate this logic as well. Birkinshaw & Gupta (2013) briefly proposes three choices that need to be considered.

The first is where to sit on the efficiency frontier, as all positions may be equally valid as long as they are placed on the frontier. In relation to our case division, we see how it would correspond with the division moving along the line, forth and back during a complete year. This also nicely illustrates why it is theoretically valid to say that the division both engages in contextual ambidexterity as well as inter-temporal cycling. The contextual ambidexterity relates to the division actually being on the line and not
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below it, as hopefully illustrated properly in this paper by now, and the temporal aspect is the movement along the line.

This also answers the second “choice” which is to actually reach the frontier using techniques such as benchmarking. I have already shown that the company is top in industry, with an extremely positive exchange-rate with all other unions as well as the campus division being much differentiated compared to other youth divisions as well as really profitable 4 years in a row. I will elaborate more on the numbers in the section following right after.

Lastly, the question becomes how you push the efficiency frontier out. As you become better at what you do, and find new ways to reconcile both activities in better ways, you will be able to increase your performance in both aspects. If we were to plot in the inter-temporal cycling of the division into the graph, and we incorporate that the division slowly becomes better in both objectives, we see how the cycling would push the entire frontier out slowly, one year after the other. This example doesn’t necessarily say that this is the only way to do it as you could in principle approach this in many ways, but it is however a good way to avoid putting too much cognitive pressure on the team members as it allows them to keep an extended focus at different times leading to overall ambidexterity. In the third analysis section I will present three team member’s views on the ambidextrous pressures, but before that a quick and final note on sales and performance.

Sales performance

According to Chandrasekaran, Linderman, and Schroeder (2012) real performance will follow after you succeed in building ambidextrous competency and as such this section
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will shed some light on that. by investigating whether performance actually have increased during the four year period the division have existed. This is done by looking at budgets, sales and other growth drivers, as well as the pipeline for 2015 to see if there is any indication of a big performance increase.

If we compare the budget and sales from the beginning back in 2011 we can calculate the average CPO (cost per order) which is a strong indication of how well you spend your money. After all a sales departments ultimate goal is sales whether it comes from explorative or exploitative activities. The lower a CPO you have, the better.

As can be seen in the graph every year since the beginning the division have optimized their CPO, and this is including all costs on projects and new initiatives engaged in. It then seems that engaging in both exploration and exploitation simultaneously does first of all yield positive results. Internally this CPO is 1/3 of the established sales departments, so internally at least the division does secure better than average results and increasingly better result every year.

It is also interesting to notice that the curve is flattening, which could have something to do with the fact that an ambidextrous balance or competency is about to be fully achieved. If we were to follow Chandrasekaran et al. (2012) logic, the real performance outcomes would then first really start now. This is an interesting thought as it falls
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together with a time in the division’s history where new ideas and expected profits for new activities in 2015 have never been higher.

To mention one of the concepts, the division has just started a type of events called Service Pitstops. The idea is to use all of their built-up knowledge about the students, the key persons sitting at the various schools, the by-now clearly branded expertise within career counseling and their creative approach to sales-generating activities to get a permanent agreement to be present at all schools during normal workdays with an integrated service station. Already now ten schools have agreed on this, and the prospected CPO for this type of event, based on 15 trial events at five different schools, far outperforms any other activity done so far. It is estimated that the CPO for this event will be 286 kr. (annex 11) or a 192% better CPO than this year. Another interesting figure is that this event alone would provide more than 1400 sales in 2015 in itself (as an entirely new activity) without doing any of the other six event types of events also engaged in. So, it is still too early to speculate about 2015 sales, but the direction is definitely clear.

Then, one could argue that the continuously increased performance during the last four years could simply be a matter of economies of scale. Sure enough, when dealing with service products which have close to no variable costs, it gives, that the more sales you make, the lower the fixed cost per sale will be, meaning that the CPO would definitely be lower for that reason. However, the increased total number of sales, which also increases each year, is still a strong indicator of a positive performance-correlation with ambidexterity, as the problem is not so much the money as it is finding ways to get the students to sign up.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that economies of scale doesn’t just come naturally - it comes because you do something right, and continue to get members which results in your average CPO lowering. This is nice, but not the reason you got the signups. It can also be argued that if ambidexterity is achieving a balance between exploration and exploitation, isn’t that exactly what you do when you continue to
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develop new concepts and ideas which is resource-heavy, but still manage to lower your CPO every year. If that is not the case, then you couldn’t say anything about performance in any company, as all companies have some degree of synergies, and how are you going to subtract them from firm performance – and why would you, as ambidexterity is organization and therefore should count in performance if those scale-economies spring from those activities.

So, does there seem to be some support for ambidexterity being connected to performance and additionally does “real performance” show later? At least in the case of this sales division it seems that there is. It seems that in 2014 the first steps have been taken towards a radical optimization in CPO and that 2015 will prove this trend for good.

It is important to notice that it is unlikely that these results would have been achieved alone by being explorative as that would be counterproductive as a sales department that also have daily customer contact within an area relying on 100% correct knowledge about current laws and updated rules, prices etc. Neither is it likely that it could have been achieved purely through exploitation as the market is highly competitive at the time, and the explorative edge is what differentiated the department from the other unions in the first place. It is out of this papers scope to finally conclude on this matter, as it is still impossible to tell if performance would have been the same if only exploration or exploitation had dominated – I hope however that I have shown that it is highly unlikely which is also reflected in both the interview with the previous division manager Maria (annex 1) as well as my own manager Søren (annex 2).

To summarize section two, we found that the division engages in inter-temporal cycling between an extended focus on exploration and exploitation respectively, contextually embedded and controlled by seasonal fluctuations in the market. This allows the division to gain big synergistic effects as the explorative activities will be pinpointed through a three month selection period during the semester, they will then
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be worked on in a high degree for one or two months, after which they will be transferred to next semester’s activities and be streamlined and optimized by the very same persons.

One thing is planning and timing activities as a way of dealing with both objectives, another is whether the individuals in the division feel they have the correct frames and support to actually be ambidextrous. The paper will now move into its final analysis which is focused at the individual level.
3. AN INDIVIDUAL LEVEL PERSPECTIVE ON AMBIDEXTERTY

“How do individual team-members handle the pressures of ambidexterity between each other and what factors helps or hinders this process?”

In this analysis I will use Birkinshaw & Gibsons (2004) work on ambidextrous traits in individuals to see how many of them can be spotted in three key employees in the division and how they come into play. The traits that these individuals usually have in common is that they 1) take initiative and is alert to opportunities outside the confines of their own job, 2) they are corporative and seek to combine efforts with others, 3) they are brokers who seek to build internal linkages and lastly 4) they are multitaskers who are comfortable wearing more than one hat.

Additionally, I will analyze the three employees answers in regard to Ghoshal & Bartletts (1994) theory on quality of management where four attributes defines an organizations context. The four attributes – stretch, discipline, support and trust, can be combined in different ways to create more or less favorable contexts. The four attributes can be combined into two dimensions, performance management and social support. Performance management draws from stretch and discipline and basically tells us something about the quality of result and the accountability the employees feel towards those projects. Social support which is built from support and trust ensures that the employees have the right amount of security and autonomy to perform within the given expectations.

I will now analyze each of the three individuals in the frames described above, which will lead to an understanding of the different roles they play and how they perceive their environment. This will be followed up by a section looking at frames for ambidexterity, using Luger, Grohsjean, & Claussens (forthcoming) article on alleviating factors to find the final clues as to how the individuals in this team strive for ambidexterity and what frames helps in that quest.
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Rasmus – the exploitive team player

Rasmus is a team player. When asked to prioritize different factors securing personal motivation as well as continuous growth for Business Danmark, respectively, he was the only one in the team to put “strong team-spirit in the department” as the top most important factor (Annex 5 - Q4, Q5) and his personal comments was that “effectivity comes when the team works together” (Q10). Understanding the value of working with others is a classic behavior observed in ambidextrous individuals (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004). Rasmus have no prior experience of relevance before getting this job.

Task preferences and strategic understanding

When Rasmus is asked about his personal preferences in having to choose between a list of seven tasks of both explorative and exploitative character, his top three is only comprised of explorative tasks (annex 5 Q1), which he states is based on what he finds the most fun to work with (Q10).

He is currently working on a project called “Member Get Parent” (Q8) which is about leveraging the existing student members to get new adult paying members. The campaign makes fun of the fact that you as a poor student could just recruit your parents and get 800 kroners for each as a sign up bonus. According to him he believes that the project has both exploitative and explorative values in it, as going for paying members is a “new-to-division” activity, but within some frames we already know and work on in our normal student recruitment strategies.

What is interesting is that even though he ranks explorative activities the highest and has a good strategic understanding of the need for both types of activities, as well as believes his project has explorative elements, he is actually the most exploitative employee in all other regards, which can be seen in his answers related to the questions measuring the performance management aspects of ambidexterity.
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Performance management
When asked on whether he believes his tasks change a little or a lot, he believes that they change a little, and is mostly about optimizing something existing (exploitation) (Annex 5 -1a). He furthermore acknowledges that he sometimes feel it can be difficult to change between tasks and “park” the old task, and that sometimes he fails to prioritize what is more important (1b, 2a). He also believes that he is prone to ask for permission a lot or ask his colleagues for an opinion. On the question as to whether he feels personally responsible for his projects he says that “Well, I don’t feel accountable because many of the tasks I am given don’t include a great responsibility” (annex 5 – 2b).

In relation to stretched goals he does believe that the overall goals are challenging, but durable, and he doesn’t feel challenged enough in his personal goals (2d)

Social Support
When it comes to the social support aspect, there is nothing but a big yes to all questions related to whether he believes he can always get help and support from his team leader and colleagues, and as I wrote in the beginning of this section, this is something that is of big importance to Rasmus.

Already now we spot an interesting dilemma when you seek to create frames which allows for contextual ambidexterity. On the one hand Rasmus really wants more explorative challenges, and on the other hand he acknowledges that he tend to ask for advice a lot and can have a hard time changing between tasks. To add to this it should be said that Rasmus is actually among our top sales people, and whenever he does something exploitive, he does it really well. He also does have the responsibility for our entire social media platform, so it could be argued that he could just show initiative and come to me with a new idea if he wanted more exploration and chances are I would give him a go-ahead.
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So does Rasmus not live up to his full ambidextrous potential because I as a team leader don’t challenge him enough, perhaps because I find it stabilizing to have at least one person I know makes sure we keep our quality level high? Or should I give him more responsibility for more explorative tasks as well and hope that he has the time and cognitive capacity to fill both roles?

I believe this is an interesting point for several reasons. First of all, trying to make your employees ambidextrous should always be done with more reasons than just the fact that you know it could be productive. Rasmus is really good at what he does now and primarily only do new tasks when I tell him to, so in some sense it seems pointless to keep forcing him to be creative on his own. Second of all, as individual ambidexterity is so much related to personal traits and the capacity to engage in a fine balancing act, perhaps ambidexterity research should turn its focus even more towards ambidextrous HRM practices as it all starts with the person. This obviously doesn’t mean that people cannot change, but as in all other HR matters, if given the opportunity you might as well use the logics of ambidexterity to create ambidexterity profiles of prospective new employees before you hire them – I know I will from now on. Focusing on the truly individual side of ambidexterity instead of the contextual frames which is still at the organizational ambidexterity level could provide new and possibly more complicated insights into the individual side of ambidexterity.

As will be seen in the rest of this analysis, all the employees have something special they bring to the team, and I think it is the sum of these things that brings about true ambidexterity – meaning that Rasmus doesn’t necessarily need be super explorative himself, as long as he delivers a vital ingredient in the big picture of team ambidexterity. This is again not to say that personal ambidexterity is not valuable, on the contrary, but if you see it in relation to overall performance, I, as a manager of that division, have x amount of goals I want to reach in 2015, and as the team works so closely together, it doesn’t really affect performance if Rasmus have a bit more exploitative tasks than the other members as long as this is tasks which is on my 2015 list anyway. Actually in practice if often works the way that I make it clear for the
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entire team which goals I want to achieve the following semester, and then let them figure out which goals they want to be a part of before I make the final decision of who is responsible for what, so in this sense no one have a fixed job description, it varies a lot over the year – also for Rasmus. Doing it this way engages the employees and forces them to find the best road to the overall goals, but also runs the risk of the more quiet employees perhaps not getting what they really dreamt of.

This people logic is also displayed in my boss Sørens interview when asked on how exploration is encouraged when everyone is only measured exploitively in some sense as e.g. 2000 sales is the only goal I have and there is no goals related to market size, expansion, product development etc. He says that:

“It is the old story about crossing the river. You can either say; okay people we need to cross the river, what do we do, which creates a lot of engagement and creativity, or you can say; okay people we need to cross the river this way and here is a manual, which might be the right way, but chances are that more often than in the other case it is not …. So the direction needs to be clear, but the path you will decide yourself through mutual coaching sessions”. (annex 2, p4, translated).

To summarize Rasmus’ personal ambidexterity profile, his balance is a bit shifted towards exploitation, but he seeks more exploration. In regard to Birkinshaw & Gibson (2004) four attributes in ambidextrous employees, we see that he definitely fulfils the one focusing on team play and corporation, but lacks the one focusing on taking initiative and ownership of own tasks. I believe he is comfortable wearing more than one hat, but prefers to focus on one task at a time. He perceives the overall performance management factors to be fulfilled for the department in general, but he personally seeks a little more challenges. I will now continue to Jonathan’s profile.
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Jonathan – the ambidextrous multitasker

Jonathan is a multitasker. He is responsible for three different projects, besides the daily duties of doing service and sales calls. He is also the only one in the division who is responsible for his own school contact which is normally only at my own table. He has some experience as a project manager for a school network before getting this job.

Task preferences and strategic understanding

Jonathan’s highest prioritized task preferences when asked in regard to personal motivation are highly explorative with “create new activities” and “find new ways to attract students” on the first and second place, directly followed by the ambidextrous task “nurture and develop existing partnerships” (annex 4 – Q1). When asked about which factors would motivate him personally his top three is “strong variation in daily work” as the first, “strong-team-spirit in department” as the second and “own responsibilities” as the third (Q4).

Strong variation in daily work can be seen as a precursor for contextual ambidexterity, and when asked on whether he feels comfortable having many different tasks he answers that his whole philosophy is based on knowing as much as possible about different areas of the business, as he feels that it helps him help his customers (4c, 4d).

As mentioned Jonathan has three projects. The first is a win-back sales project which he believes is of exploitative character as it is about heightening the customer experience, the second is aimed at both optimizing the experience for the international students as well as finding new offers for them, so an ambidextrous project with both pressures. The last project is the new Service Pitstop concept as already mentioned earlier, which the division has just created, aimed at being present at all schools with a service (sales) station (Q8), so still really explorative but also exploitative along the way the entire spring semester of 2015.

Looking at Birkinshaw & Gibsons (2004) four attributes displayed in ambidextrous individuals, it is already clear that Jonathan fulfill all of them. He obviously likes to
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multitask and wear many hats as described above, and in relation with that he builds internal linkages with most of the other departments as it helps him get the conversations he seeks (4c). He often seeks me out for good advice, not answers, and likes to work with all the other team members.

Lastly, he takes initiative by asking for more responsibility regularly, which he gets, and he acts independently outside of the established confines of his job. An example is just before Christmas where he had made some calculations for the new concept “Service Pitstop” mentioned above, which we had only tested two times earlier at the time. He had attended both of these events and felt it was a great new channel, but also felt that perhaps we would have a hard time reaching our sales target if we didn’t add some new last-minute activities, and according to his calculations he would like me to approve a budget of 10,000 kr. extra for 4 more events. He got it and I got 100 more sales which just as he said became much needed. This further resulted in me now having the confidence in the concept, a bit ahead of schedule, and the entire spring semester 2015 is now full of service pitstops at all schools and Jonathan is responsible for the concept.

The above example is also a good example of contextual ambidexterity at its best. As we found in earlier analysis, contextual ambidexterity ensures that the division can keep a dual focus on service-development and optimization, with the possibility of national roll-out a few months later if a concept seems profitable. This is exactly what happened in the Service Pitstop case. The time between the idea was born, all the way through testing, refinement and negotiating with partner schools to roll out the concept nationally didn’t take more than around 4 months, and it also spawned a lot of exploitative projects as everyone in the team know that if this concept really is as successful as it seems, then we will get really busy, and we will need to act proactively to get the structures and frameworks in time to handle that.
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Performance management

Looking at Ghoshal & Bartletts (1994) attributes we see that Jonathan answers that in order to stay productive he prefers to switch between tasks daily (2a), which he believes is fairly easy to do (1b). He however also says that he believes that the longer you focus on one task, the harder it is to make the switch. This question of how long to work on each task at a time without losing the ability to make an efficiency-loss-free switch is fairly interesting, and not something the literature to the best of my knowledge have touched upon to much yet. It is also interesting to notice that for Jonathan it gets harder to switch the longer he emerges himself in one task, but in temporal ambidexterity logic this is exactly what you aim for – phases of only one focus. So are people really optimally geared to switch to an explorative mode after let’s say 1 year of exploitation? This is out of the scope of this paper, but it could make sense that you either choose to change relatively often so its becomes contextually embedded and you don’t forget your thoughts on other projects so to speak, or you acknowledge that you have to start at a more basic level every time you make the switch if you apply a more long-term temporal logic to your organization.

When asked on whether he feels accountable for the tasks given, he comments: “Yes, definitely. I feel that I am free to make most decisions as I find fit, but almost always in an open forum whit the team” (annex 4, 2b) again playing into Birkinshaw & Gibsons (2004) characteristics of ambidextrous individuals. In relation to the goals he also find them just challenging enough, clear and direct (2c), and he doesn’t feel there are any challenges missing for him. So overall Jonathan perceive the performance management factors as supporting him the way he needs.

Social Support

Just as Rasmus, Jonathan also strongly believes that he is provided the correct social support to handle his tasks in the form of training and getting help from me and the other team members. Just as Rasmus he adds that he believes this is the basics of a successful workplace (annex 4. 3a-d).
To summarize, Jonathan is the very definition of an ambidextrous employee. He is very enterprising, and thrives in the interesting balance between exploration and exploitation as he finds personal as well as professional value in it. He “fulfill” all of Birkinshaw & Gibsons (2004) traits in ambidextrous employees and perceive both performance and social support frames to support him as he needs. I will now move on the final employee, Nikolaj.
Nikolaj – The explorative service-agent

Nikolaj loves service development! He comes from a background in the travel-service industries and has been responsible for multiple projects aimed at heightening the service level for his customers through new activities and offers. When hired into this division it was intended that he would work primarily with the exploitative sales aspects of the job, but as it turned out he didn’t really like that aspect and together with me we defined a new concept that could bring the sales he was supposed to, as well as build loyalty with existing members through service innovation instead. This is how the division’s new “event-club” was created with brand new offers for the existing members.

Task preferences and strategic understanding

When Nikolaj is asked which tasks he would prefer to work with, his two most preferred is to “get new partnerships for the division” and “nurture and develop existing partnerships” (annex 3, Q1), both tasks relates to the human interaction side of the job, and both tasks aligns nicely with the event-club project he have created. According to himself he believes that his personal project, the event-club, has both explorative and exploitative sides (annex 3, Q8). Furthermore, if he could choose himself he would want to work on just one project, his event club, but he recognizes that all the other tasks are really important to (annex 3, 1b). For him it brings a lot of energy and creativity to focus exclusively on one project at a time, as he feels that it can be frustrating not to feel that you can put the same amount of energy into the other smaller projects (annex 3, 4d). He further argues that when a concept you are working with becomes successful it means that in order for you to continue growing it into what I could be, you need a lot of resources (time), which could be hard to mix with all the other tasks you also have to perform.

He believes that in the long run we need to divide the playing field so to speak, so that the pressure of all our tasks is divided on different persons, with different responsibilities.
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What can be understood from his comments cover more points. First of all, as he mentions the project he works on definitely have both explorative and exploitative characteristics, making it ambidextrous in its nature. However, from an overall perspective looking at all the tasks Nikolaj has, the project is the most explorative one and then he has all the other exploitative tasks he rather be without. This is something I believe we, as designers of ambidextrous contexts, need to be aware off. Because what can be understood from both Rasmus’ and Nikolajs interviews, is that they rather have more explorative tasks, which in some way make sense as it has more creativity and strategic outlook built into it than exploitation. What happens is that when you invite your employees to be creative and develop their own areas, you risk that they find exploration way more interesting than the exploitative tasks and then you have a new problem to solve. It is also more common to hear complaints about having to fill out tracking sheets than having to design a new product.

One way around this problem lies in training your employees in the value of their exploitative tasks, and if it then turns out that some of these exploitative tasks just don’t make sense anymore, then you make an “explorative project” out of optimizing the exploitative processes.

As Nikolaj also mentions, he does see the value of the other tasks, he just feels that he is really busy, and says that he has to change between tasks three times every day to perform within all given expectations. He proposes himself a sharper division between tasks than so far. This is where we see that company size and budgets does matter in the creation of ambidexterity. The reason why ambidexterity was created in this division in the first place interestingly had to do with not having enough resources to focus on only one of the objectives, and the reason why I give my employees so much responsibility, is to be honest, that I don’t have the money to hire more people. Luckily this has worked out great so far, but you will risk a burn-out situation in the long run, which is why some of my 2015 objectives are to hire more people and redistribute the tasks. This actually has nothing to do with ambidexterity in other ways than having to many tasks can hinder your cognitive ability to properly process and deal with both
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pressures. This is something Luger et al. (n.d.) also pinpoints in their article on personal ambidexterity, which I will work more in-depth with, in the next section on work frames.

Performance management
As just mentioned above Nikolaj says he needs to change between tasks three times a day in order to stay productive. He also believes that we have good control of who is doing what so everyone have more free time to work on their projects (annex, 2a). In regard to accountability he says that he feels very accountable for his project, because he has been involved in the whole process of planning and talking with external partners (2b). This means that he has also taken some individual choices, as responsibility and room to make choices autonomously is strongly connected for him. In regard to goals, he believes that the 2015 goals will be challenging, but not impossible, and the only challenges he seeks is to give more speeches at our lecture events as it develops him personally (2d).

Social Support
Like the two others he believes he has all the support he needs from me as well as his colleagues, and he comments that that he feels he has been provided with the tools necessary to perform his job as well as the room to make his own choices (3b).

In the end of the interview Nikolaj says that “this job has an almost perfect combination, I spend some good time on the event club where all my energy and creativity are placed, and then I have the other small assignments to tend to, so it works out quite well so far”. You can almost hear the creative explorative R&D employee complain about having to fill out status reports as well, when all he wants to do is work on his project.

Nikolaj represents the other end of the team dynamic continuum. Rasmus, the first employee was primarily exploitive but wanted more explorative tasks, Jonathan was a
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pure ambidextrous employee who enjoyed the multitude of different tasks, and lastly Nikolaj focusing on a scope-wise bigger explorative project.

This concludes the three individual ambidexterity profiles, and I will now lastly look at the work frames provided, before finishing of this third main analysis.

Work frames

I will now look at some work factors meant to alleviate the cognitive pressures of dealing with the two conflicting activities, exploration and exploitation. According to Luger, Grohsjean & Claussen (forthcoming) four factors ease this balance: 1. More work experience, 2. Lower work loads, 3. Involved in projects with suitable characteristics and 4. Balance exploration and exploitation across distinct work domains. By drawing from the personal ambidexterity profiles mapped out above, combined with my knowledge about the overall task distribution and organization, I will now investigate these four factors.

More work experience

All employees in the division are young and relatively unexperienced, all with theoretical backgrounds within some spectrum of business education. This has to do with the fact that all sales are to other students at their age, and therefore having this more relaxed eye-to-eye level with prospective members really helps differentiation from existing unions.

The job doesn’t necessarily require any specialized knowledge, besides having the right personality to both be a good sales representative as well as “office-worker”. This in itself is actually quite a challenge to hire for as good sales persons traditionally have a very extrovert personality and gets motivated by individual goals and rewards, whereas “office-workers” can have more introvert sides as well, as a lot of thinking and reflection is needed. As I have decided to hire all employees on a broad job description and then later figure out where they perform and enjoy most to be, the hiring process often involves more work and interview rounds, as the mix between the two personalities are sought after.
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According to Luger et al. (forthcoming) more work experience helps improve employee’s attentions capacity for two reasons. The first being that experience lowers the attention individuals need to execute daily operations, it allows them to perform more tasks automatically without as much attention. The second is that experience means you have been in more paradoxical situations before and as a result have built heuristics and simplifications along the way to help you make quick decisions.

I would like to challenge some of these assumptions a bit, as I believe that some of them could prove to be a limiting factor in some situations. As pointed out in the same article, employees who work in either exploration or exploitation oriented units, develop knowledge structures which are directed towards either, but not both activities. Furthermore, most employees are usually functional experts and their cognitive structures are therefore oriented towards specialization (Luger et al., forthcoming, p. 11). If you are trying to teach someone to act outside of their historically specialized area (be it of explorative or exploitative character) to make them ambidextrous, then it may be a limiting factor to overcome as the very same heuristics which helps individuals make quick decisions, also keeps them in their old habits and knowledge structures for a longer time. This point is obviously very industry-specific, as some industries rely heavily on specialized knowledge, but in theory what would be easiest: to train someone who don’t know what to expect from his or hers tasks because he/she is newly educated, or to take a specialized employee and teach him to be more explorative? I am not sure if there is one uniform answer to that question, but as far as this case analysis is concerned I can clearly see the benefits of having impressionable young people who is eager to take on all types of tasks. This can also be observed in the interview with communication manager Søren Hanager, when he says that: “With all respect to our current employees, and now this may sound age discriminating, but no one could have lifted this tasks as well [as a young person]” (annex 2, translated).

However, if you have encountered paradoxical tasks a lot in your career due to project management positions, extended responsibility or the like, then you are already on an
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Ambidextrous path, and then work experience will mean training your ambidextrous competences. Interestingly, work experience is also the only factor that Luger et al. (forthcoming) doesn’t find a clear linkage with, and as also suggested above they attribute that fact with routines which reduces creativity and cognitive flexibility. Future research could split work experience up in explorative and exploitative years, as work experience in itself could both mean 20 years only as a graphical designer, as well as 20 years as a senior manager. It is however also interesting to notice that we found Jonathan to be the most ambidextrous employee, and he also happens to have been exposed to most paradoxical situations, one would assume, as he has previous project management experience.

Lower work loads
According to Luger et al. (forthcoming) lower workloads positively relates to an individual’s ability to balance exploration and exploitation. As mentioned before, all team employees each have their own personal project, and roughly speaking all team members have around half their day to work on these projects, and the other half is related to daily activities (of exploitative character). This structuring is to ensure that they don’t feel the projects is just a less important side-task. I can also clearly observe that when I start too many projects at a time with them, the time for all of these projects to come back finished are way longer than if they had finished one at a time.

Working on unrestricted projects
This factor says that unrestricted projects lead to a better exploration-exploitation balance. This factor seen in the face of the case organization would equal the pressures of constantly complying with current law on the unemployment fund area. It makes sense that if no restrictions were to apply, then you would be more creative than if you had to comply with certain standards, and it would improve your explorative-exploitative balancing capabilities.

In Luger et al.s (forthcoming) paper it might make sense to talk about what no restrictions would bring because of the industry, but in general it has to be
remembered that restrictions most often exist because they are necessary, which somehow undermines the pragmatic value of this suggestion. E.g. what would happen to the game industry and to the Call of Duty series for example, if no restrictions on storyline and characters etc. existed to guide creativity? Likewise, if I didn’t put up any restrictions in regard to types of events, communicative language etc. what would happen to the company from a macro-perspective? I know e.g. that if I didn’t put up restrictions on certain processes, it would mean that our department would differentiate itself so much that new members might have a hard time recognizing the company when they graduate and suddenly progress into someone else’ care in the company.

Granted, no restrictions would greatly improve creativity, but efficiency considered overall, there would also be a lot of good, but useless ideas in regard to general strategic fit. What I do is to provide my employees the frames and restrictions to work within in regard to creativity, as the creative process needs to be managed, not meaning micromanaged, but managed by providing the correct mindset and frames for them to be creative in the right direction. We can also understand this discussion through what Miller & Wedell-Wedellsborg (2013) calls “creating room for innovation”. Basically it becomes the leader’s task to become an “innovation architect” whose primary goal is to create frames for his employees that enable innovation. It’s about embedding the characteristic ideas from innovation into everyday work routines. What is done in the division is that they know the overall “restrictions” which is not that many after all, and then they are free to play within the frames I have provided them and come up with entirely new ideas and concepts as long as they follow the restrictions that exists - and to be fair, really is non-negotiable as most of it is governmentally regulated.

**Across domain balancing**

The last factor Luger et al. (forthcoming) investigated was how balancing exploration and exploitation across domains related to job performance. This could e.g. be if you worked in a familiar genre but on an un-familiar technological platform, and they
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found strong empirical support related to this way of organizing. In the division this is something which is strongly built into most projects. One example is the event-club project described in Nikolaj’s personal ambidexterity profile, where we see how he takes a familiar area such as the lecture concept, and combine it with an unfamiliar concept such as running an event-club and then seek to transform that into a new type of event with a new purpose and goals.

To summarize section three I found that the individuals in the team all have a decent base level of ambidextrous competency as well as understanding, but that overall ambidexterity can best be described from an integrated team-perspective. What we see here is that Rasmus is a bit more exploitative than the others; he is the solid foundation and brings home the sales effectively with good old phone calls. Nikolaj occupy the opposite spectrum and primarily prefer to be able to work autonomously with his creativity, which he does by creating a scope wise bigger project than the others. Jonathan provides the good common ground with very good personal ambidextrous capabilities. Finally we found that the work frames directly support their development of ambidextrous competences by making sure that there is built in time to be explorative every day (lower daily operations work load), as well as good opportunities to apply skills across domains.
CONCLUSION

In the beginning of the paper I asked the question: ““How can ambidextrous competency be created and managed in small fast-growing teams”.

I found the factors contributing to the creation of ambidexterity to first of all be to build in strong dual pressures from the beginning, as this forces the right mindset. Furthermore I found that it is important to train all team members in both objectives, but that it is okay to have some individuals have an extended focus on one of the objectives in the face of overall team effectiveness. I also found that in order to keep growth rates high, the individuals have to be trusted with explorative tasks as this spawns a lot of fairly inexpensive projects meant to probe into the future. I also found that openness to your balancing makes it easier to grow fast as some times may call for structural separation with later reintegration, and other times may call for an extended focus on either objective, by that engaging in temporal cycling. The point here is that ambidexterity literature have spent a lot of time discussing which mechanism provides for best organization, where what I observe so far is that they all do, in different situations.

Second of all we found that the division engages in inter-temporal cycling between an extended focus on exploration and exploitation respectively, contextually embedded and controlled by seasonal fluctuations in the market. This allows the division to gain big synergistic effects as the explorative activities will be pinpointed through a three month selection period during the semester, they will then be worked on in a high degree for one or two months, after which they will be transferred to next semester’s activities and be streamlined and optimized by the very same persons.

Additionally, I found that that the individuals in the team all have a decent base level of ambidextrous competency as well as understanding, but that overall ambidexterity can best be described from an integrated team-perspective. What we see here is that one of the employees is a bit more exploitative than the others; he is the solid
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foundation and brings home the sales effectively with good old phone calls. Another
occupy the opposite spectrum and primarily prefer to be able to work autonomously
with his creativity, which he does by creating a scope-wise bigger project than the
others. The last employee provides the good common ground with very good personal
ambidextrous capabilities. These three individuals combined efforts creates
contextually embedded ambidextrous competency.

Finally we found that the work frames directly support the individuals development of
ambidextrous competency by making sure that there is built in time to be explorative
every day (lower daily operations work load), as well as good opportunities to apply
skills across domains.
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ANNEX 1 - MARIA INTERVIEW

Format: Phone and e-mail  
Language: Danish  
Description: Maria is the former project manager of the Campus division

Ambidexterity quick overview:

*Ambidexterity is a term used to describe the state in which you as a company, division or individual succeed in balancing exploration and exploitation.*

*Exploration refers to a long-term focus for new markets, innovation, partnerships etc., meaning to secure future viability. So basically this is the “product development” activities.*

*Exploitation refers to a short term focus on optimizing current processes, partnerships, events etc., to secure here-and-now profits. So basically this is the “business streamlining and money saving/earning” activities.*

*There exist 3 different ways to balance these two pressures. You can either have two different departments handling one each, representing a structural separation. You can also separate the two activities in time so that you e.g. optimize for one month and then find new partners the next month, representing a temporal separation. Lastly you can create organizational frames which support both activities being balanced by the individuals themselves on a daily basis, representing contextual ambidexterity.*

**Q1 - Please comment on the above framings and how they relate to the division**
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Derudover er der jo også det, at jo mere udviklet afdelingen er blevet og jo flere vi blev, så blev jeg jo hjemme (mindre praktiske opgaver) for at få tid til de mere strategiske (nye aftaler med skoler/møder og fx udvikle CRM – om noget en lang proces. Så samme afdeling men forskellige hatte til teammedlemmerne.

Q2- How would you categorize the years from 2011-2013 in respect to exploitive and explorative activities being performed, and if you should score the year overall on a scale from -100 representing pure exploitation up to +100 representing pure exploration. Furthermore please fill in budget and sales goals for the corresponding year. OAS = Overall Ambidexterity Score.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview 2011</th>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 1</td>
<td>Procedures and work flows internal in organisation</td>
<td>10 new partner schools “signed”</td>
<td>Score: +70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget:</td>
<td>- Optimise materials with a student angle</td>
<td>- On-school lecture concept developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750.000</td>
<td>- Design and continuous optimization of events along the way</td>
<td>- Career day concept developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily exploration to build initial competencies, exploitation on the way though</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 2</td>
<td>External phone sales to optimize call-through on leads</td>
<td>Score: -50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: 750.000</td>
<td>Website optimized with better student info</td>
<td>Exploitation to balance exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 1000</td>
<td>All newly created events optimized and streamlined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First real amount of graduates – effect on other departments – optimize work flows again/educate colleagues (husk også hele wc kampagnen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overview 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitative activities</th>
<th>Explorative activities</th>
<th>OAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 5</td>
<td>Only material optimization in a small degree</td>
<td>Score: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: 950.000</td>
<td>Only content-exploration on different social media platforms</td>
<td>A bit more exploration but almost balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales: 1600</td>
<td>Team structure, more long term hire. CRM system development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looking more serious on universities – new segment both students and school partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q3 - What were your initial thoughts when starting this division in regard to the balance between explorative activities (create the student market, create new events, partnerships etc.) and exploitative activities (optimize existing knowledge, structures etc.)?

Jeg skulle skabe alt fra bunden ad, samtidig med at jeg også måtte forbedre alle materialer og events hen ad vejen da jeg jo skulle skaffe salg ret hurtigt. Men tænkte ikke over det i de bokse, da jeg sad midt i det. Lidt strategi først var nødvendig for at se, i hvilken retning jeg skulle gå. Derfor lidt research om skoler og konkurrencer. Derefter udvikling af site og brochure var forudsætning for at kunne tage ud på events. Så aftaler med skoler for at komme ud. Efter nogle møder + nogle events kom automatisk erfaringer som jeg så handlede på og derfor justerede hvad der virkede og tilføjede mere af det der gjorde.

Fx var isene for et nummer et tilfælde lavet til SDU og fordi vi fik en masse leads fra det skyndte jeg mig at kopiere til andre skoler. Det var ikke planlagt i forvejen men måtte handle hurtigt mens det stadig var issæson og inden de gik på ferie.


Q4 - Were you aware that you were navigating two different logics or did it all just seem natural?

Nej jeg tænkte ikke over, men det faldt ret naturligt. Det ene er en forudsætning for det andet.
Q5 - Do you think only optimizing your first few ideas would have been enough for Campus to grow or was it important to keep exploring?

På ingen måde!! Jeg kunne have optimeret vores faglige oplæg I årevis, men uanset hvad jeg gjorde med dem, ville vi aldrig nå den ønskede volumen, hvis vi ikke tog mere alternative events i brug. Og derfor havde vi brug for flere folk til at tage til events – dermed studentermedhjælpere og praktikanter. Det er dem, der har gjort forskellen både i forhold til volumen men også i forhold til differentiering og relation til skolerne.

Q6 - What were your thoughts about hiring your first employee in 2012 and then 3 more in 2013?

Det var umuligt for mig, at tage ud på alle eventene alene. Og ja det var meningen at jeg efterhånden kun skulle med hvis vi skulle afprøve et nyt event eller opbygge en ny relation til studieråd. Og det er jo for den langvarige relation eller koncept. Den første praktikant tog vi kun ind, fordi det var en betingelse for at deltage på karrierdagene på Cphbusiness, kombineret med at det var godt at få en fra målgruppen ind i teamet. Så det var ikke så mange tanker bag den første og der var han inde over alt, hvad jeg lavede og med til alle møder.

Efterhånden blev arbejdsfordelingen mere opdelt og sat i struktur fordi der kom nye hele tiden. Da vi ansatte tre praktikanter i 2013 var der et helt klart formål med deres arbejdsopgaver. Her skal også tage med, at den første var 3 mdr. gratis, mens de andre var 10 måneder lønnet. Den første kan man gøre, for at tjekke det ud og får man bare lidt ud af det, så er det fint. Den sidste beslutning havde stor økonomisk betydning samt de står for en kæmpe del af salget, så de skal være gode for at salgs målene kan opfyldes. Det var derfor meget mere velovervejet da konsekvenserne var større. Men vi kunne ikke have nået til den stillingsbeskrivelse (der matchede både Campus behov og praktikanters kompetencer) og ansat tre med den sikkerhed plus udvælge de rette profiler, før vi havde fået erfaringerne fra de tidligere praktikanter. Så man kan ikke springe mellemregningerne over ☺️.
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ANNEX 2 – SØREN HANAGER INTERVIEW

Date: 10/11-2014
Format: Oral
Language: Danish
Time: 19 min. 34 sek.
Description: Søren is the overall manager of the sales and communication department.

A transcription and an initial condensation have been performed using Kvales (1997) methods for interview analysis.

Step 1: Hear the interview, done 10/11-14
Step 2 og 3 – The natural units of meaning is found and themes brought forth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural unit of meaning</th>
<th>Central theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy related to campus / starting phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Campus created without much prior research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Mange af de strategiske mål som vi gerne ville bevæge medlemsbasen i retning af det pegede den her vej (studerende). Rent strategisk var der et mål om; flere yngre, flere kvinder, mindre salg mere marketing, og så at udforske den kanal (studerende) end man havde gjort før.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..... Hvis man havde været danske bank så havde der nok været et større indledende stykke arbejde, mere ”market research”, mere produkt research, set på hvor gearet er organisationen egentlig for at modtage alle de her medlemmer, og der var det sådan lidt mere crash landing ikke.</td>
<td><strong>Campus as own entity on purpose to secure focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational placement of Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Jeg havde selvfølgelig også nogle overvejelser om, hvordan det skulle placeres, og netop som du siger var det bevidst at det blev sin egen enhed, og der er svaret et rungende ja.</td>
<td><strong>Campus easy to define borders and separate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det med at starte det her op, det er en meget speciel størrelse forhold til alt det andet vi gør, det er jo altid en balance imellem specialiseren og fokus og så søjledannelsen kan man sige, men jeg ville ikke tvivle om at det skulle have sit eget fokus, sin egen projektleder, os fordi det langt hen af vejen er en dejlig afgrænsningsbar størrelse, i forhold til mange af vores andre aktiviteter, så det var ud fra den at, vi skal have et fokus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(hvordan var det så i starten, var der konkrete mål til hvad det skulle give i afkast, eller hvor mange salg der skulle nås etc. Eller var der frie tøjler til at finde veje at nå de studernede på?)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Altså der var rimelig frie tøjler. Min grundreligion er at finde de rigtige medarbejdere, og lade være med at stå i vejen for dem. | Free room to explore, no micromanagement |
| Maria havde været fuldstændig fantastisk, og havde performet hele vejen rundt i butikken som studenterhjælper, som kundeservice, som sælger, som hjælp til vores analysemand og alt det der, så jeg havde det sådan lidt, det var det helt rigtige at give den til hende, og ja det var også helt bevidst at det blev givet til en som havde alderen, som var tæt på den der verden (studerende). | Project manager young on purpose |
| Alt respekt for alle vores andre medarbejdere, og nu lyder det måske aldersdiskriminerende, men der var ingen af os andre der kunne løfte den på den samme måde, det er det som i oplever at konkurrenterne stadig gør nu, så kommer der en på halvreds derud, og som ja ikke er i øjenhøjde med de studerende. Så det var ret bevidst. | Campus born with sales goals from the start. So the explorative unit needs to deliver short-term as well. |

**Goals for the division**

*(snakker om om der så ikke var konkrete mål de første år)*

.... Vi satte et mål på, jeg tror det var 600, det gjorde vi ret hurtigt og sagde okay, hvad regner vi med at vi kan nå på det her, og det er også det som er godt ved at få en merc.er (Cand.Merc CBS), som griber det struktureret an og prøver at lave et bud på en markedspen.

*Så allerede fra starten af var begge pres altså indbygget?*

Ja, helt klart. Jamen også fordi der er ingen tvivl om at når vi starter et projekt, så er der ingen tvivl om at der er en ledelsesmæssig forventning om at der kommer resultater, så at starte det op som sådan et forskningsprojekt eller sådan, det kunne vi godt, men så ville det aldrig få lov til at leve. Altså så det er et eller

Concrete sales goals from the start secures survival on the project
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andet med at, ja faktisk gøre det hele samtidigt.

Der er nogen som ville argumentere for at man burde dele det op ....

Det er jo også et spørgsmål om tro og religion, for jeg har det sådan at jeg tror at vi alle sammen får det største engagement og de bedste resultater hvis man har ansvar for både og.

Og jeg har det også sådan at når man arbejder med salg og marketing, så er det evigt explorativt, altså den dag man tror det ikke explorativt længere, så skynd dig at finde et nyt arbejde, for så er nedtællingen i gang.

Det er rigtigt nok at i opstarten af sådan et projekt her så er alt hvad man gør næsten explorativt så der vil være en overdosering af det i starten, men så ser jeg det også som vores egen forbandede pligt at fortsætte med at være explorative, at vende og dreje den på nye måder.

Nu er du jo selv leder af afdelingen SMUK, som er Salg, Marketing, Uddannelse og Kommunikation, har du en holdning til om dine medarbejdere kun skal køre efter en logik eller er det meget sundt at alle har begge logikker de skal kæmpe lidt med?

Det er sundt at have begge logikker. Jeg har det sådan at i alle former for organisering, så er der nogle ulemper, altså selvfølgelig kunne det være super fedt at have en produktudviklingsafdeling, men det er også noget med at være realistisk i forhold til den størrelse vores afdeling er. Og så har jeg det også sådan at man må aldrig give de kreative patent på at være kreative, fordi alle mennesker er sku kreative, og hvis man får et engagement og man får et ansvar i begge retninger, så avler det en kreativitet på at løse tingene bedre og gøre tingene bedre, og når man også selv skal være offer for løsningerne, så tror jeg også der er en selvforstærkende virkning i det, jeg tror der er en indsigt i det for dem som skal lave det. ...... Det stiller store krav til de folk som er der.

Best results are achieved if the same person is responsible for both exploration and exploitation

There will always exist an over-emphasis on exploration in the beginning of such a project

All employees should deal with both exploration and exploitation in some degree

The “creative” is not the only ones who can be creative. Important to remember.

You solve things better when you are the target of your own solutions.

Big demands on people
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Nu kommer vi også over i ledelse og selvledelse. Man siger jo lidt firkantet, What gets measured, gets done. Og vi har jo mange kvantitative mål som x antal salg. Hvordan leder man det bedst, når man fx bliver målt meget kortsigtet, hvilket ville ligge op til flere exploitive aktiviteter, men man måske i virkeligheden også bliver vurderet ligeså meget på ens langsigtede strategiske aktiviteter (exploration).


Så det lyder også til at det så handler om at kontrollere kreativiteten så der er retning på og ikke bare ideer her og der.

... Ja man kan sige, retningen var ligesom sat, vi skulle over floden, men nogle gange så kommer der jo også lidt kaos, der er en fase af projektudvikling hvor man slet ikke kan overskue det, hvor fanden er det nu man skal gå hen, og så er det ligesom at tingene falder i hak og man kommer ud med en løsning der fungerer. Og jeg synteso også det handler om at acceptere at der et sted i processen er et fint element af kaos, og manglende kontrol, men det syntes jeg er fint.

Engagement and creativity of employees secures correct solutions.

We do measure mostly exploitively, but the way you reach your goals is up to you so that is where exploration kicks in.

In the end its about sharing sessions, creativity and hard work that we reach our goals.

Controlled creativity as the key. Direction is clear, the specific path is not.

Starting new projects is about accepting that there will be some element in chaos. That is okay.
### Campus i fremtiden

Jeg har svært at se det ikke er sin egen enhed da der skal være det fokus. Misforstå mig ret, men specielt den udveksling vi har med praktikanter, at man bevarer den nyhedens entusiasme/ungdommelighed er vigtigt.

Meget afhængigt af hvordan de strategiske resultater udvikler sig, så tror jeg min største ting på hvor meget det ender med at fylde, jeg har altid og vil altid være i tvivl om den organisering jeg har, som på den ene led kan være markedorienteret, altså segmentorienteret, alternativt at være specialeorienteret.

Tit og ofte så ender man med et eller andet mix af dem, på papiret er der altid en der er den rigtige, men når man sidder i den virkelige verden med en flok mennesker, nogle opgaver og nogle mål og skal få det til at passe. Så det er også derfor at dybest set har vi en bastard i dag, vi har en blanding imellem segment orientering og speciale orientering. Det tror jeg et eller andet sted jeg vil blive ved med, igen lidt afhængigt af hvad de forskellige ting kommer til at fylde.

Lad os tegne et scenarie. Campus kommer til at gå fantastisk. Vi får super konverteringsprocenter, i en verden hvor vi får færre penge til at lave markedsføring og så noget, så vil jeg umiddelbart se en vinkel hvor Campus den vokser. Og Campus kan vokse sig meget, meget stor, og det kan vise sig den bliver det primære.

*Kan det så ske at den bliver reintegeret?*

Det kan være den ender med at sluger de andre. Det er et scenarie. Hvis campus udvikler sig som det skete i C3, hvor jeg læste også om en anden en for nylig hvor det var helt tydeligt at deres marketingsafdeling, den handlede om Campus.

At agere og have fuld knald på ude på studiepladserne, hvis det er det der skal til, så er det det. Det er et
### Exploitaion and exploration in org. setup

_I forhold til de forskellige niveauer i organisationen, så har John (direktør) håndteret den explorative del ved at love marketingafdelingen komme med forretningsudviklende ideer, og du driver selv en afdeling som både skal sælge, markedsføre og uddanne medlemmer. Syntes du man kan se Campus som en måde for dig at håndtere nogle af de explorative pres der også i stor grad ligger på dine skuldre, netop ved at skille den ud fra den normale afdelingsstruktur? Og hvordan håndterer man så det når vi nu ser at Campus også får en masse exploitive pres, hvordan deler man den så i sidste ende?

Jeg vil sige der er noget livscyclus i den her fordeling. Man kan sige at jo yngre, eller tidligere man er i sin cyclus, jo mere explorativt vil det være. Jeg tror på sigt så vil campus hverken være mere eller mindre explorativ end den øvrige kommunikations og marketingsafdeling, eller salg for den sags skyld, fordi så er Campus en marketing/salgs organisation som den anden, den har bare haft flere år til at køre sig ind.

_Så modenheden af afdelingen hænger også sammen med hvordan balancen bliver skåret?

Ja. Man kan også sige at da du tog over der var der blevet skabt et fundament, og det første du sagde til mig var at du så mange muligheder for at tune og trimme, og det er så spørgsmålet om den ligger i den ene eller den anden i det her spektre. Hvis man tuner for at kunne håndtere mere udvikling.

_Ressourcer – tror du på at der eksisterer et ressource-tradeoff i vores afdeling, eller er de contextuelt afhængige.

Det kommer an på om vi laver den rigtige udvikling. Der er to ting jeg tænker. Det første jeg vil sige er at drift kan godt være dræbende for udvikling. Jeg har siddet i adskillige udvalg, og vi siger altid at i alle sammen er_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The younger a project or division is the more explorative it will be</th>
<th>The question is if exploitation in regard to optimizing existing activities have a short-term focus if it is to be able to explore more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the long run I see Campus being as balanced as our existing sales/marketing dept.</td>
<td>Daily operations can definitely work against exploration activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An integrated view of ambidexterity at the team and individual level

Step four – what does the dominating themes say about:

Organization
Campus is a separate organizational entity to secure focus. Starting up a project as Campus involves some degree of chaos at some point, and that is fine. Campus will most likely continue as a separate entity, or even end up absorbing the normal marketing/sales department if the trend continuous.

People
People need room to explore on all levels. The leader hires the correct persons and provides strategic goals and guidance. The road you travel is up to the individual. It is healthy to deal with both exploration and exploitation on all levels as you are more invested when you yourself are the target of your ideas. The “creative” don’t reserve the right to be creative.
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**Work frames for ambidexterity**
Controlled creativity is the key. Provide frames within people can be creative in respect to the job they need to fulfill.

**Ambidextrous pressures in department**
Research left to department, not much prior research. Division born to be ambidextrous in the sense that they both have to handle everything related to obtaining student members as well as fulfill concrete sales goals already from year one. These goals secure project survival as the company is not big enough to pure R&D activities with a long-term perspective.

**Exploration/exploitation balance**
The balance between exploration and exploitation will always lean towards exploration in the beginning, and then slowly seek a balance over the life-cycle of the division/project.
It is interesting to consider whether e.g. process optimization is necessarily short-term if it is done to create capacity to be handling long-term goals. So even though process optimizations do yield short-term benefits and would be considered an exploitive activity, it is instrumental in securing capacity to be explorative.

**Step 5 – The descriptive statement**
Overall the dominant belief is that exploration and exploitation is best handled at all levels of the organization embedded in everyone’s job (at least if you are employed in a marketing/sales department). This has to do with the fact that if you let people figure out the best path themselves you create engagement and creativity as well as secure a tight fit between resource’s spent and actual results as you implement your solutions “live” with yourself being the target. Obviously this puts a lot of pressure on the human capital part of the organization.
Quantitative Survey data

Q1 - Top three most preferred tasks to work with based on personal interest:
1. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
2. Nurture and develop existing partnerships (exploitation)
3. Optimize materials (exploitation)

Q2 - Top three based on securing short-term economic value for Business Danmark
1. Optimize materials (exploitation)
2. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
3. Find new ways to attract students (exploration)

Q3 - Top three based on securing long-term economic value for Business Danmark
1. Administrative sales work (exploitation)
2. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
3. Nurture and develop existing partnerships (exploitation)

Q4 - Top 3 work factors securing personal work motivation
1. Strong variation in daily work (ambidexterity)
2. Own responsibilities (individual)
3. Strong team-spirit in department (team)

Q5 - Top 3 work factors securing continuous growth for Business Danmark
1. Own responsibilities (individual)
2. Strong team-spirit in department (team)
3. Strong variation in daily work (ambidexterity)

Q6 - If you had 100.000 kr. would you raise level of existing activities, create new activities or a mix:
- A mix of both existing and new activities (ambidexterity)

Q7 - On an average work-week please distribute your time (100%) below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do sales calls</th>
<th>Attend events</th>
<th>Work on personal project</th>
<th>Others:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 - Would you say that the personal project you are working on at the time will contribute to a continuous development of the department’s activities (exploration) or help optimize existing opportunities or processes (exploitation)?

1. Jeg sidder med en forårsplan for en eventklub for foråret 2015, som har til formål at inspirerer og udvikle studerende, i fællesskab med hinanden.
2. Jeg mener at projektet indeholder både exploration og exploitation. Konceptet har til formål at inspirerer og udvikle studerende til interessante foredrag inkl. Netværkning, for at optimerer konverteringsgraden når de er færdige med studiet. Derudover er konceptet også et springbrat for at bedre markedsføring med en høj værdi af 'good will' hvis konceptet får succes. Hypotesen: når mange unge netværker og lære interessante ting hos os, så forbliver de efter studiet af ren 'Good will'. Derfor mener jeg produktet indeholder 50/50 af begge kvaliteter.

Q9 - what is your general impression of the way we handle both pressures right now in the division? Do some work with a lot of exploitative tasks and others the explorative? Or is it a mix?

2. Jeg kunne godt se en radikal ændring i arbejdsopgaver. Men det er med fokus på min egen opgave. Jeg kan godt se at hvis konceptet skal være så stor en succes som jeg forventer, så kræver det at der bruges en hel del ressourcer på det, hvilket er svært at mikse med andre opgaver. Mange af arbejdsopgaverne i det nye concept kræver
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precis de samme arbejdsoptagere som vores normale arbejdsoptagere, bare med en anden vinkling, så det ville være svært at kombinerer to næsten ens optagere og så kombinerer det og ligge lige mange kræfter i begge ting. Så ja, der ville sku være forskel på arbejdsoptagere, men stadigvæk med samme mål - At fastholde og hverve flere medlemmer.

3. Jeg tror jeg svare lidt på både 2. & 3. spørgsmål her også. :) Jeg tror som sagt at det ebdste ville være at kridte banen op igen (for at bruge fodboldtermes) og give hver spiller en zone, og lade dem koncentrerer sig om det. Indtil videre findesder 1 job (Handelsøkonom jobopagaver) / pt. er vi ved at oprette et nyt koncept (Event-, salgs- og markedsføringsopagaver) / senere vil der være 2 jobs (Handelsøkonom opagaver + Event manager opagaver.) Så jeg tror for at ingen går ned med stress eller får alt for meget trukket over hovedet og fejler, så skulle presset uddeligeres til forskellige personer, med forskellige ansvarsområder. Nogle med mere ansvor for noget end andre, hvilket også optimalt set ville give mulighed for at bruge mere tid på deres optagere.

Q10 – Please comment on your thoughts behind the above questions:

- **C1:** I think it is more important for BD - Campus to have a good contact to their young partners, and a big sortiment for them.
- **C2:** We will also need to execute great events with professionalism, so we need a "guide" to them, so everyone knows what to do. I think that is the best way to sell us as a company, to our young partners.

**Interview testing for discipline, stretch, support and trust**

This interview seeks to get thoughts and opinions related to the four dimensions highlighted by Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) which together provide a high-performance context perfect for individual ambidexterity. Stretch and discipline relates to performance management. Support and trust relates to social support. Performance management and social support creates a high performance context.

All four dimensions have two related questions to heighten validity and provide more depth. All questions were handed out without the titles and dimensions they were related to, to secure as honest answers as possible.
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Task variation – exploration and exploitation

1a - Do you feel your tasks vary a little or a lot in regard to the nature of them? Are they about developing something new or about optimizing something existing or a mix?

My job is to plan and execute a newly formed project, an eventclub, as my main assignment which has to goal to optimize the number of membership and conversion after they finish study. Furthermore I have assignments as calling out to students, take calls from students. I’m also in the process to evolve the new brochure and material and some smaller projects, so yes I feel I have many tasks that varies.

1b - Do you feel it is difficult to change between here and now phone sales/customer service and development projects with a bit longer time horizon?

Well, yes I think it is. Of course I want to work more with my projects and what I think I can evolve and put a lot of innovative creativity into, but I think everyone wants to do their own projects, and I know the other assignments are necessary, so I would say “yes”, it is possible.

Performance management

Discipline (2a) – When you have many different tasks how do you make sure you keep focused and productive? Do you shift between them hourly? Daily? Weekly?

I like to spend a lot of time with something I’m good at, to perfect it. On the other hand, I think it is necessary in this kind of job to switch 3 times each day, to get everything done. With that said, we have a good control of what needs to be done and who does it, so we all get more time to finish our projects. I think I switch 2-3 times a day, to give the needed focus in every assignment as there is a natural process in all of them which needs to be maintained.
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**Discipline (2b)** – Do you feel accountable for the tasks you are given? And do you make choices of your own or ask permission every time?

I feel very accountable for the eventclub, course I have evolved an planned everything that is going out of the house, more or less. I feel accountable for the success, so I sometimes need and feel I ahve to take some individual choices, sometimes over the phone or how I want to put everything. Responsibility and taken the big choices, is linked together for me. With that said, of course I check my budget, materials and coordinate with my boss, who has the big overview over whole Campus and the big budget.

**Stretch (2c)** - Do you feel the goals in the department are easy to reach? Hard to reach? Or just challenging enough?

I think the goals for 2015 will be challenging. Not impossible, but the new things we have in motion will need to be tested and we have no data on how it will go. Still, I’m sure we will reach the goal, but it will be challenging if everything doesn't go as planned.

**Stretch (2d)** – Is there any goals/challenges you miss to properly challenge you?

I would like to make more lectures or speaks for students in a big forum. I want to challenge my presentation techniques and behavior, how to speak and react on the stage. I have a big passion for consultation work and being in front of a big crowd, so I want to evolve this ability further.

**Social support**

**Support (3a)** - Do you feel you can always come to your team leader if you get stuck or don’t know how to prioritize your tasks?
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Yes, I feel we all have a good understanding “security net” in our teamleader. If we fall out of track, or don’t know what to begin with, he is good to coordinate and has the big overview.

Support (3b) – Do you feel you have been provided the right tools and competencies to properly do your job? Could you get more help if you needed it?

Yes I have. I have the full responsibility and given the right to decide how I want to form this eventclub, which speakers I want. That is the only thing needed for me to do my work, that I am in control of my own work.

Trust (3c) - What happens if you fail in prioritizing your tasks in the right order?

I never prioritize wrong. But if I do, it is usually because something new comes up that has to be taken care of. When that happens, I get a little annoyed, but I always have a plan B so I know what to do in case of troubles or inconvenience.

Trust (3d) - Do your trust your colleagues to have your back and help you?

Yes I do, shortly. Me as a person has a hard time trusting everything/everyone that is not me 100 % (like the danish motto: “selvgjort er velgjort”). So, I will always have a plan B if something gets messed up so I don’t get surprised. When that is said, I love my colleagues and think they do an awesome job with what they are doing, and I trust them to always have my back.

Ambidextrous traits in employee

This section seek to test for four of the traits highlighted by Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) in ambidextrous employees

4a - Do you like to take initiative and look for opportunities outside of the tasks you are specifically given?
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Yes, I do. I’m an innovative guy, I like to take up challenges, and make them happen with what I got; My character and some resources given

4b - Do you often work with the other members of the team whenever there is a good opportunity?

N/A

4c - Do you talk to and engage other members of the organization because you feel they could be valuable to know?

If you mean I talk to other colleagues in Business Danmark? – Then yes. I think everyone has something to share, which also are my experience. I have always chosen network in front of “school education”.

4d - Do you feel comfortable having many different tasks or would you prefer one specialized area?

I would prefer 1 specialized task. I get satisfaction and value into putting my energy and creativity in 1 project and make it almost perfect, before moving on to a new project. I work best that way, when I can see my projects come to live and working. Get annoyed when I fail/or smaller projects has lesser success, because I don’t have the time to finish it properly. With that said, this job makes almost a perfect combination. I spend some good time on the eventclub where all my energy and creativity are placed, and then I have other smaller assigments to tend to, so that works quite alright for me so far.
Quantitative Survey data

Q1 - Top three most preferred tasks to work with based on personal interest:
   1. Create new activities (exploration)
   2. Find new ways to attract students (exploration)
   3. Nurture and develop existing partnerships (exploitation)

Q2 - Top three based on securing short-term economic value for Business Danmark
   1. Administrative sales work (exploitation)
   2. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
   3. Find new ways to attract students (exploration)

Q3 - Top three based on securing long-term economic value for Business Danmark
   1. Create new activities (exploration)
   2. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
   3. Optimize materials (exploitation)

Q4 - Top 3 work factors securing personal work motivation
   1. Strong variation in daily work (ambidexterity)
   2. Strong team-spirit in department (team)
   3. Own responsibilities (individual)

Q5 - Top 3 work factors securing continuous growth for Business Danmark
   1. Own responsibilities (individual)
   2. Strong team-spirit in department (team)
   3. Strong variation in daily work (ambidexterity)

Q6 - If you had 100.000 kr. would you raise level of existing activities, create new activities or a mix:
   - A mix of both existing and new activities(ambidexterity)

Q7 - On an average work-week please distribute your time (100%) below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do sales calls</th>
<th>Attend events</th>
<th>Work on personal project</th>
<th>Others:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q8 - Would you say that the personal project you are working on at the time will contribute to a continuous development of the department’s activities (exploration) or help optimize existing opportunities or processes (exploitation)?

I primarily work on 3 projects right now. A win-back project aimed at optimizing the sales experience and secure loyalty which I would call an exploitative project. A project aimed at optimizing the experience for international students as well as find new offers for them, so I guess a mix of exploration and exploitation. The last one is that I am now responsible for our new concept Service Pitstop, which means that I both have to improve our events as we go along as well as look for new things we could offer the students in that setting, again I think both exploration and exploitation.

Q9 - what is your general impression of the way we handle both pressures right now in the division? Do some work with a lot of exploitative tasks and others the explorative? Or is it a mix?

Campus is still in a super growth phase, so there is room for exploration. It is handled pretty well I think as we are also really focused at cutting out the less profitable things.

Q10 – Please comment on your thoughts behind the above questions:
Jeg brænder for at udvikle og bruge min kreative tankegang. Derfor mener jeg også at udvikling af nuværende samt udvikling af nye typer events og aktiviteter er vigtigt på lang sigt, så vi kan få et endnu mere solidt og strømlinet produkt at tilbyde til universiteterne. Jeg vil altid mene at det er vigtigt at tænke ud af boksen og finde på nye tiltag der kan sikre innovationen.
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Interview testing for discipline, stretch, support and trust
This interview seeks to get thoughts and opinions related to the four dimensions highlighted by Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) which together provide a high-performance context perfect for individual ambidexterity. Stretch and discipline relates to performance management. Support and trust relates to social support. Performance management and social support creates a high performance context.

All four dimensions have two related questions to heighten validity and provide more depth. All questions were handed out without the titles and dimensions they were related to, to secure as honest answers as possible.

Task variation – exploration and exploitation
1a - Do you feel your tasks vary a little or a lot in regard to the nature of them? Are they about developing something new or about optimizing something existing or a mix?

My tasks vary a lot in doing, but with a common goal. Right now they are about 50/50.

1b - Do you feel it is difficult to change between here and now phone sales/customer service and development projects with a bit longer time horizon?

No, there is an easy switch from one to the other - However, my experience tells me that the longer you concentrate on one, the harder it is to make the switch.

Performance management

Discipline (2a) – When you have many different tasks how do you make sure you keep focused and productive? Do you shift between them hourly? Daily? Weekly?

I prefer daily – depending on the size and priority of the tasks.
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**Discipline (2b)** – Do you feel accountable for the tasks you are given? And do you make choices of your own or ask permission every time?

Yes, definitely. I feel that I am free to make most decisions as I find fit, but almost always in an open forum with the team.

**Stretch (2c)** - Do you feel the goals in the department are easy to reach? Hard to reach? Or just challenging enough?

Challenging enough, clear and direct.

**Stretch (2d)** – Is there any goals/challenges you miss to properly challenge you?

Not to my knowledge.

**Social support**

**Support (3a)** - Do you feel you can always come to your team leader if you get stuck or don’t know how to prioritize your tasks?

Yes very much

**Support (3b)** – Do you feel you have been provided the right tools and competencies to properly do your job? Could you get more help if you needed it?

Yes I do feel so, and I believe I know where to go if I need help.

**Trust (3c)** - What happens if you fail in prioritizing your tasks in the right order?

I don’t / I reprioritize.
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Trust (3d) - Do your trust your colleagues to have your back and help you?

Yes I believe it is the basic of a successful workplace – and I believe we have such a one.

Ambidextrous traits in employee

This section seek to test for four of the traits highlighted by Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) in ambidextrous employees

4a - Do you like to take initiative and look for opportunities outside of the tasks you are specifically given?

Yes, I thrive in variety of work and in execution of products.

4b - Do you often work with the other members of the team whenever there is a good opportunity?

Yes. My creative side is mostly activated in dialog – and I find that problem solving in spontaneous situations and in long term planning is best in group work.

4c - Do you talk to and engage other members of the organization because you feel they could be valuable to know?

Yes, I find that knowing the people in every part of the organization helps me help the customers faster and better, because I know who and where to ask, and I learn more for every question if the relationship between me and the other members of the organization is positive.

4d - Do you feel comfortable having many different tasks or would you prefer one specialized area?

My philosophy is based on the answer to question 4c, therefore I feel most comfortable having many different tasks.
Quantitative Survey data

Q1 - Top three most preferred tasks to work with based on *personal interest*:
1. Find new ways to attract students (exploration)
2. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
3. Create new activities (exploration)

Q2 - Top three based on securing *short-term* economic value for Business Danmark
1. Administrative sales work (exploitation)
2. Update communication channels (exploitation)
3. Nurture and develop existing partnerships (exploitation)

Q3 - Top three based on securing *long-term* economic value for Business Danmark
1. Get new partnerships for the division (exploration)
2. Nurture and develop existing partnerships (exploitation)
3. Optimize materials (exploitation)

Q4 - Top 3 work factors securing personal work motivation
1. Strong team-spirit in department (team)
2. Motivational climate (team)
3. Own responsibilities (individual)

Q5 - Top 3 work factors securing continuous growth for Business Danmark
1. Strong team-spirit in department (team)
2. Motivational climate (team)
3. Own responsibilities (individual)

Q6 - If you had 100,000 kr. would you raise level of existing activities, create new activities or a mix:
- A mix of both existing and new activities (ambidexterity)

Q7 - On an average work-week please distribute your time (100%) below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do sales calls</th>
<th>Attend events</th>
<th>Work on personal project</th>
<th>Others:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q8 - Would you say that the personal project you are working on at the time will contribute to a continuous development of the department’s activities (exploration) or help optimize existing opportunities or processes (exploitation)?

Jeg sidder med projektet "MGP" som omhandler de studerende skal skaffe flere betalende leads --> idéen skal sendes ud via vores stud.-nyhedsmail og facebook

Vil mene at det er en blanding af exploration og exploitation, da det er nyt for os i Campus at sætte fokus på betalende medlemmer, men det er inden for nogle overordnede rammer vi kender

Q9 - what is your general impression of the way we handle both pressures right now in the division? Do some work with a lot of exploitative tasks and others the explorative? Or is it a mix?

Exploitation: Ingen tvivl om, at vi i Campus hver dag benytter dette når det kommer til telefonsalg - hver dag sætter vi mål, hver dag evaluere vi, hver dag udvikler vi os

Exploration: Her føler jeg det er mere individuelt for tiden, da alle hver især sidder med deres --> men hele tiden har man folk man kan spørge til råds og få sparring med

Q10 – Please comment on your thoughts behind the above questions:

- **C1**: Spg. 1 = hvad jeg finder sjovest Spg. 2 = hjælpe medlemmer og hurtig registrering Spg. 3 = Sørge for lange relationer og samarbejde
- **C2**: Effektiviteten kommer når teamet arbejder godt sammen og har god energi som kan påvirke hinanden
Interview testing for discipline, stretch, support and trust

This interview seeks to get thoughts and opinions related to the four dimensions highlighted by Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) which together provide a high-performance context perfect for individual ambidexterity. Stretch and discipline relates to performance management. Support and trust relates to social support. Performance management and social support creates a high performance context.

All four dimensions have two related questions to heighten validity and provide more depth. All questions were handed out without the titles and dimensions they were related to, to secure as honest answers as possible.

Task variation – exploration and exploitation

1a - Do you feel your tasks vary a little or a lot in regard to the nature of them? Are they about developing something new or about optimizing something existing or a mix?

I think my tasks vary a little. It is mostly about optimizing something existing.

1b - Do you feel it is difficult to change between here and now phone sales/customer service and development projects with a bit longer time horizon?

It’s not difficult to change but sometimes I fail to prioritize which task is more important than the other.

Performance management

Discipline (2a) – When you have many different tasks how do you make sure you keep focused and productive? Do you shift between them hourly? Daily? Weekly?

I make sure that I’m not exclusively focus on one task at the time. If I feel I’m stuck with a problem or I need to get my head clear I simply concentrate on the other task for a while. I however admit it can be difficult sometimes just to “park” the task.
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**Discipline (2b) –** Do you feel accountable for the tasks you are given? And do you make choices of your own or ask permission every time?

Well I don’t feel accountable because many of the task I am given don’t include a great responsibility. If I need to take a choice, I prone to ask for permission or maybe get a second opinion from one of my colleague.

**Stretch (2c) -** Do you feel the goals in the department are easy to reach? Hard to reach? Or just challenging enough?

Actually I think the goals are challenging. They are not too hard but durable.

**Stretch (2d) –** Is there any goals/challenges you miss to properly challenge you?

I think I get challenged enough through our goals. However sometimes I don’t think I get challenged enough in my tasks.

**Social support**

**Support (3a) -** Do you feel you can always come to your team leader if you get stuck or don’t know how to prioritize your tasks?

Yes always

**Support (3b) –** Do you feel you have been provided the right tools and competencies to properly do your job? Could you get more help if you needed it?

Yes I feel comfortable in most situations. If I need more help I can always ask.

**Trust (3c) -** What happens if you fail in prioritizing your tasks in the right order?
An integrated view of ambidexterity at the team and individual level

I would get busy finishing the tasks. If I completely fail I could ask for help by one in the team.

Trust (3d) - Do your trust your colleagues to have your back and help you?

Yes, always. I hope they think the same about me!

Ambidextrous traits in employee

This section seek to test for four of the traits highlighted by Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) in ambidextrous employees

4a - Do you like to take initiative and look for opportunities outside of the tasks you are specifically given?

Sometimes. If I feel that I have a great idea I always talk to at least one of the other members about it.

4b - Do you often work with the other members of the team whenever there is a good opportunity?

Yes. I believe that it is easier to be creative and effective in a group instead of being alone. However it depends on that everyone listen to each other’s ideas.

4c - Do you talk to and engage other members of the organization because you feel they could be valuable to know?

Yes I do. At least I like to get other members opinion and reflect on their response

4d - Do you feel comfortable having many different tasks or would you prefer one specialized area?

I feel comfortable having many different tasks because it develops me.
ANNEX 6 – DIVISION-WIDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Type: Statistical questionnaire

Length: 1 page

Who: All eight members of the division’s weighted preferences

Sp.1 - Order the tasks below in a preferred list, the top one being the task you would like most to carry out personally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Explorative</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Nurture and develop existing partnerships (plan more activities)</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td>Personal motivation: It seems that overall personal preferences indicate a want for both explorative and exploitative tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Get new partnerships for the division (new schools, other partners)</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Find new ways to attract students beside what we already do</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Create new activities (new events, new channels etc.)</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Update communication channels (facebook, instagram, email newsletter)</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Administrative sales work (lead-import, write down details in CRM etc.)</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Optimize materials (Manuals, training, sales arguments, competitor analysis etc.)</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sp.2 - Order these same tasks in a way of importance for Business Danmark in regard to short-term economic value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Explorative</th>
<th>Economic value (short-term): Focus shifted more towards exploitative tasks when confronted with short term focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Administrative sales work (lead-import, write down details in CRM etc.)</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Nurture and develop existing partnerships (plan more activities)</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Get new partnerships for the division (new schools, other partners)</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Optimize materials (Manuals, training, sales arguments, competitor analysis etc.)</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Find new ways to attract students beside what we already do</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Update communication channels (facebook, instagram, email newsletter)</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Create new activities (new events, new channels etc.)</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sp.3 - Order these same tasks in a way of importance for Business Danmark in regard to long-term economic value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Explorative</th>
<th>Economic value (long-term): Focus shifted more towards explorative tasks when confronted with a long term focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Get new partnerships for the division (new schools, other partners)</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Find new ways to attract students beside what we already do</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Nurture and develop existing partnerships (plan more activities)</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Create new activities (new events, new channels etc.)</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Optimize materials (Manuals, training, sales arguments, competitor analysis etc.)</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Administrative sales work (lead-import, write down details in CRM etc.)</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Update communication channels (facebook, instagram, email newsletter)</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>Explorative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sp.5 - Arrange these 6 factors in regard to personal work motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Personal motivation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Strong team-spirit in department</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>Personal motivation matches with traits highlighted in ambidextrous employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Own responsibilities</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Strong variation in daily work (different types of tasks)</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Motivational factors (help from colleagues, boss and others)</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Small sales bonuses (gifts, movie tickets etc.)</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Stability in daily work (same type of tasks)</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sp.6 - Arrange these 6 factors in regard to keeping a continuous growth for Business Danmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>BD growth: Same factors, now has to secure growth, ambidexterity downprioritized. Indicates that they dont believe strong variation is good for growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Strong team-spirit in department</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>Ambedexrerf They understand that a mix is important to be balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Own responsibilities</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Motivational factors (help from colleagues, boss and others)</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Small sales bonuses (gifts, movie tickets etc.)</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Strong variation in daily work (different types of tasks)</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Stability in daily work (same type of tasks)</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sp.7 - If you had 100.000 to spend would you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Ambidexterity</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 A mix of raising level of existing activities and create new types of events/partnerships</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>They understand that a mix is important to be balanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Focus all the money on raising the level of all existing activities</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Use the money to create a new type of event / partnership</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ANNEX 7 – ORGANIZATIONAL CHART**

Copyed and translated from internal strategy work-document 25/11-2014
The mayor touchpoints for Campus are the colored squares/circle.
ANNEX 8 – LOTTE LARSEN EMAIL

Hej Mark,
Her har du alle opkrævningsbeløbene. A-kassen beholder kr. 108,- pr. måned pr. medlem
Kr. 331,- Statsbidrag – sendes direkte til staten
Kr. 482,- Efterlønsbidrag – sendes direkte til staten
Kr. 6,- ATP – sendes direkte til staten
Kr. 108,- Adm.bidrag – dette beløb beholder A-kassen

Venlig hilsen
Lotte Larsen

Fra: Mark Vestergaard
Sendt: 12. januar 2015 14:08
Til: Lotte Marianne Larsen
Emne: Et lille økonomisk spørgsmål
Hej Lotte,
Mit spørgsmål er ganske simpelt, ud af de 445 kr. vi får i kontingent pr. medlem i a-kassen, hvor meget af det går så direkte til staten?

Venlig hilsen
Mark V. Kristiansen
Projektleder Campus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-jan</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>24-okt</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-jan</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>05-sep</td>
<td>Introfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-jan</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>24-sep</td>
<td>Praktik dating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-jan</td>
<td>p-møde</td>
<td>28-aug</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-feb</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-feb</td>
<td>Introbar</td>
<td>21-aug</td>
<td>Intro happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-feb</td>
<td>Fastelavnsfest</td>
<td>29-aug</td>
<td>Introfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-feb</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
<td>05-sep</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-feb</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-feb</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>26-aug</td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-mar</td>
<td>oplæg</td>
<td>05-sep</td>
<td>Introfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-mar</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
<td>01-sep</td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-mar</td>
<td>Fastelavnsfest</td>
<td>25-sep</td>
<td>FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mar</td>
<td>Internt oplæg</td>
<td>09-okt</td>
<td>FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-mar</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
<td>23-okt</td>
<td>FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-mar</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>06-nov</td>
<td>FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-mar</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>20-nov</td>
<td>FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-mar</td>
<td>Jobroulette</td>
<td>04-dec</td>
<td>FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-mar</td>
<td>Casinofest</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>Huset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-mar</td>
<td>Career Sunday</td>
<td>01-okt</td>
<td>Personal Branding (DA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-mar</td>
<td>Konference</td>
<td>03-okt</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-mar</td>
<td>Casinofest</td>
<td>19-nov</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-mar</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Schools on the run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-apr</td>
<td>Jobroulette</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>Schools on the run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-apr</td>
<td>Karrieremesse</td>
<td>23-sep</td>
<td>Pitstop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-apr</td>
<td>Casinofest</td>
<td>12-nov</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-apr</td>
<td>Casinofest</td>
<td>16-sep</td>
<td>Pitstop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-apr</td>
<td>Pårskefest</td>
<td>12-nov</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-maj</td>
<td>Casinofest</td>
<td>14-sep</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-maj</td>
<td>Oplæg</td>
<td>24-sep</td>
<td>Pitstop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-aug</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
<td>30-sep</td>
<td>Messestand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-aug</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
<td>28-nov</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-aug</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Introfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-aug</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
<td>02-okt</td>
<td>Salgstale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-aug</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
<td>04-sep</td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-sep</td>
<td>Fælles i fælled, øl, musik</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-nov</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
<td>30-sep</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-aug</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
<td>21-okt</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-sep</td>
<td>Foredrag CV/samtale</td>
<td>22-okt</td>
<td>Karrieredag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-sep</td>
<td>Foredrag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-sep</td>
<td>FestivalFriday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 10 – YEARLY TASKS DESCRIPTION

Januar
- De studerende læser til eksamen
- Få introevents ultimo januar
- Fortsæt med at booke events for kommende semester
- Udviklingsopgaver

Februar + Marts + April
- Afhold hele semestrrets events
- Søg og ansæt nye praktikanter til efteråret

Maj
- Nyd stilheden...
- Book dimissionsevents
  - Ring rundt alle skoler (sidste chance for a-kasse)
  - Ring ud intro
  - Ring til nye praktikanter og ønsk dem god ferie

Juni
- Lav oversigt over optimal/ønskede aktivitetsplan på hver skole
- Forsøg at booke events til kommende skoleår – kom top of mind hos relationerne (tag gerne et møde med dem).

Juli
- Læst plus – skolerne er lukkede
- Mads og Katrine leads / ring ud / tag telefon nyuddannede

August
- Oplæring af nye praktikanter
- Materiale klar til kommende events
- Event på introforløb starter omkring 20/8

September
- EVENTS!!! I døgndrift 😊

Oktober + November
- En del events
- Opfølgning på leads i salg (I er sikkert bagud)
- Husk efterårssferien

December
- Få events
- Udviklingsprojekter
- Lav ønsket aktivitetsplan på skolerne for kommende semester
- Start med at booke events for kommende semester især for intro ultimo januar
- Send julekort
- Husk det er en meget kort måned, da skolerne lukker ned/har eksamen, så det er svært at lave aftaler med både studerende og stud.ledere/skemaer ikke klar endnu.
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ANNEX 11 – SALES AND CPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget increase</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Sales increase</th>
<th>CPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>750000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>750000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>950000</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>110000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service pitstop CPO calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay interns</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy for booth</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/event</td>
<td>4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated signups</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>286,66667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total signups channel</td>
<td>1.440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEX 12 – FINANCIAL RESULTS 2013

Økonomiske resultater for perioden 2007-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill. kr.</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indtægter</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udgifter</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underskud</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overskud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for året</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>