

**EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL
AMBIDEXTERITY ON FIRM PERFORMANCE:
A SERVICE INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVE**

POOJA



**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

MARCH 2025

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2025

**EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL
AMBIDEXTERITY ON FIRM PERFORMANCE:
A SERVICE INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVE**

by

POOJA

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

submitted

In fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

MARCH 2025

DEDICATED TO MY PARENTS

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled **Exploring the Impact of Organizational Ambidexterity on Firm Performance: A Service Industry Perspective**, submitted by **Ms. Pooja** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi in pursuit of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**, is an original research work conducted by her. The research was carried out under our joint supervision, and she has met all the necessary requirements for thesis submission as per the institute's Ph.D. degree standards. This thesis presents findings that have not been submitted, either in whole or in part, to any other university or institution for the purpose of obtaining a degree or diploma.

Prof. Sanjay Dhir

Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, New Delhi India

Prof. Mayur Chikhale

School of Business

University of Petroleum and Energy Studies (UPES), Dehradun

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my deepest gratitude to my thesis supervisors, Prof. Sanjay Dhir and Prof. Mayur Chikahle, from the Department of Management Studies (DMS), Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD). Their profound insights, steadfast support, and indispensable guidance have been essential to the completion of this thesis. Their mentorship has not only shaped this work but also contributed significantly to my holistic development as an academician by engaging me in diverse tasks and activities. Their constant encouragement and belief in my abilities have inspired me to strive for excellence.

I am sincerely grateful to Prof. Smita Kashiramka, Prof. Shveta Singh, and Prof. Sonu Goyal for their constructive feedback and valuable suggestions as members of my Student Research Committee (SRC). Their expertise and guidance have greatly enriched this research.

I extend my deepest gratitude to my parents, friends, and family members whose steadfast faith in me has served as a source of strength during both joyous and difficult moments.

I would also like to thank the Head of the Department, faculty members, support staff, and research scholars at DMS, IIT Delhi, for their support and cooperation. The conducive learning environment at the Strategy and Competitiveness Lab has played a major role in fostering my intellectual growth and facilitating the smooth progress of this thesis.

I am profoundly thankful to the Department of Management Studies, IIT Delhi, for providing all the resources and support necessary for this endeavor.

Finally, I bow with humility and reverence to the Almighty, whose blessings and guidance have been my strength throughout this journey.

(Pooja)

ABSTRACT

In today's rapidly changing and uncertain business environment, achieving outstanding performance has become a top priority for organizations. Companies face growing challenges to innovate and excel amidst fierce competition, ongoing technological advancements, geopolitical uncertainties, market disruptions, and supply chain disturbances. Organizational ambidexterity (OA) has emerged as a pivotal factor in driving the development of novel ideas, products, processes, and services, contributing to superior organizational outcomes. Ambidexterity refers to a firm's capacity to refine existing capabilities while simultaneously cultivating new ones. The concept of organizational ambidexterity has garnered significant attention in management research, highlighting the need to balance leveraging current strengths and exploring emerging opportunities to improve firm performance. This study adopts a comprehensive framework to examine the critical factors (CFs) influencing firm performance (FP) across the two dimensions of ambidexterity, balancing dimension (BD) and combined dimension (CD), within the Indian service sector. Furthermore, it investigates the moderating role of competitive intensity (CI) in shaping the implementation and outcomes of BD and CD. The research is structured into four distinct phases to systematically address these objectives.

The first phase of this thesis focuses on developing a comprehensive understanding of ambidexterity through a systematic review of the existing literature. This includes conducting a bibliometric analysis of articles from 1996 to 2024, followed by a theory, context, characteristics, and methods (TCCM) framework to categorize the literature based on the most extensively studied theories, contexts, constructs, and methodologies. The findings highlight key insights such as research output trends, influential journals, leading authors, impactful countries, highly cited publications, prominent keywords, co-cited references, and a thematic map of the field. Based on the TCCM analysis, a detailed research agenda was formulated to

guide this thesis. In addition, a random-effects meta-analysis was conducted to quantitatively summarize the critical drivers of ambidexterity. The meta-analysis findings reveal the relative importance and variability of these drivers, indicating that constructs such as transformation capability (TFC), cognitive readiness (CGR), networking capability (NC), organizational culture (OC), resource orchestration (RO), strategic agility (SA), technology orientation (TO), and competitive intensity (CI) exhibit significant heterogeneity. In contrast, formalization was identified as a homogeneous factor and, therefore, excluded from the final conceptual model.

The second phase of this thesis examines the influence of antecedents on BD and CD and their relationship with firm performance. The proposed conceptual framework was empirically validated using the partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) approach. The data analysis process involved multiple steps, including preliminary data screening, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and path analysis. Initially, the data was assessed for missing values and outliers, followed by reporting demographic distributions and descriptive statistics for all items. EFA was conducted to identify the underlying factor structure, eliminating insignificant and cross-loaded items. Subsequently, CFA was utilized to evaluate the reliability and validity of the constructs. Construct-to-construct relationships were analyzed through path analysis, also referred to as structural model analysis, where β coefficients and their significance levels were tested. In addition, multicollinearity was checked using variance inflation factors (VIF) to ensure the robustness of the model. Afterward, the PLS structural model was analyzed to evaluate direct, indirect, total, and moderating effects. Out of the 39 hypothesized relationships proposed in the study, 26 were supported, offering a significant understanding of the nuances of ambidexterity and its influence on firm-level outcomes.

In the third phase, a hierarchical framework was constructed to explore the interrelationships among critical antecedents, organizational ambidexterity, and firm performance. The modified total interpretive structural modeling (m-TISM) approach was employed to establish a hierarchical structure of the antecedents. In addition, the Matrice d'Impacts Croisés Multiplication Appliquée à un Classement (MICMAC) analysis was conducted to assess the driving and dependence power of these constructs. The MICMAC analysis categorized the constructs into four clusters: autonomous, linkage, dependent, and independent quadrants. The proposed hierarchy identified competitive intensity, technology orientation, and organizational culture as foundational factors, positioning them at the base of the hierarchy and underscoring their pivotal role in motivating organizational ambidexterity.

The fourth phase focuses on a cross-case analysis to validate and triangulate the study's empirical findings. Triangulation is employed to enhance the credibility and validity of the results by offering an in-depth explanation of the significant antecedents within varied case contexts. Four case studies were selected for this purpose, with two representing BD and the other two representing CD. The case study findings indicated that technology orientation, networking capability, and strategic agility consistently emerge as critical drivers of ambidexterity and firm performance across all four firms. This underscores the practical applicability of these factors in real-world scenarios for both BD and CD. Furthermore, the final chapter of the thesis discusses the practical, theoretical, and policy implications derived from the study, providing valuable insights for both industry and academic stakeholders.

सारांश

आज के तेजी से बदलते और अनिश्चित व्यावसायिक वातावरण में, उत्कृष्ट प्रदर्शन प्राप्त करना संगठनों के लिए सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता बन गया है। कंपनियाँ भयंकर प्रतिस्पर्धा, सतत प्रौद्योगिकी प्रगति, भू-राजनीतिक अनिश्चितताओं, बाजार व्यवधानों और आपूर्ति श्रृंखला में गड़बड़ियों के बीच नवाचार और उत्कृष्टता प्राप्त करने की बढ़ती चुनौतियों का सामना कर रही हैं। संगठनात्मक द्विप्रयोगिता नए विचारों, उत्पादों, प्रक्रियाओं और सेवाओं के विकास को प्रेरित करने में एक महत्वपूर्ण कारक के रूप में उभरी है, जिससे श्रेष्ठ संगठनात्मक परिणाम प्राप्त होते हैं। द्विप्रयोगिता का अर्थ है किसी फर्म की मौजूदा क्षमताओं को परिष्कृत करना और साथ ही साथ नई क्षमताओं का विकास करना। संगठनात्मक द्विप्रयोगिता की अवधारणा को प्रबंधन अनुसंधान में महत्वपूर्ण ध्यान मिला है, जो फर्म प्रदर्शन को बेहतर बनाने के लिए वर्तमान ताकतों का लाभ उठाने और उभरते अवसरों की खोज करने के बीच संतुलन बनाने की आवश्यकता को उजागर करता है। यह अध्ययन एक व्यापक रूपरेखा अपनाता है ताकि भारतीय सेवा क्षेत्र के अंतर्गत द्विप्रयोगिता के दो आयामों, संतुलन आयाम और संयुक्त आयाम के माध्यम से महत्वपूर्ण कारकों का फर्म प्रदर्शन पर प्रभाव की जाँच की जा सके। इसके अलावा, यह प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक तीव्रता की मध्यस्थ भूमिका की जाँच करता है, जो संतुलन आयाम और संयुक्त आयाम के कार्यान्वयन और परिणामों को आकार देने में मदद करता है। यह शोध व्यवस्थित रूप से इन उद्देश्यों को संबोधित करने के लिए चार अलग-अलग चरणों में संरचित है।

इस शोध का पहला चरण मौजूदा साहित्य की व्यवस्थित समीक्षा के माध्यम से द्विप्रयोगिता की व्यापक समझ विकसित करने पर केंद्रित है। इसमें 1996 से 2024 तक के लेखों का बिब्लियोमेट्रिक विश्लेषण करना शामिल है, जिसके बाद सिद्धांत, संदर्भ, विशेषताएँ और विधियाँ (TCCM) ढांचे का उपयोग करके सबसे अधिक अध्ययन किए गए सिद्धांतों, संदर्भों, संरचनाओं और कार्यप्रणालियों के आधार पर साहित्य को वर्गीकृत किया जाता है। निष्कर्ष अनुसंधान उत्पादन प्रवृत्तियों, प्रभावशाली पत्रिकाओं, प्रमुख लेखकों,

प्रभावशाली देशों, अत्यधिक उद्धृत प्रकाशनों, प्रमुख कीवर्ड, सह-उद्धृत संदर्भों, और इस क्षेत्र के थीमैटिक मानचित्र को उजागर करते हैं। TCCM विश्लेषण के आधार पर, इस शोध को निर्देशित करने के लिए एक विस्तृत अनुसंधान एजेंडा तैयार किया गया। इसके अतिरिक्त, द्विप्रयोगिता के महत्वपूर्ण प्रेरक तत्वों को मात्रात्मक रूप से सारांशित करने के लिए एक रैंडम-इफेक्ट्स मेटा-विश्लेषण किया गया। मेटा-विश्लेषण के निष्कर्ष दर्शाते हैं कि परिवर्तन क्षमता, संज्ञानात्मक तत्परता, नेटवर्किंग क्षमता, संगठनात्मक संस्कृति, संसाधन आयोजन, रणनीतिक चपलता, प्रौद्योगिकी अभिविन्यास, और प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक तीव्रता में महत्वपूर्ण विविधता है। इसके विपरीत, औपचारिकता को एक समान कारक के रूप में पहचाना गया और इसे अंतिम वैचारिक मॉडल से हटा दिया गया।

इस शोध का दूसरा चरण संतुलन आयाम और संयुक्त आयाम पर पूर्ववर्ती कारकों के प्रभाव और उनके फर्म प्रदर्शन के साथ संबंध की जाँच करता है। प्रस्तावित वैचारिक ढाँचे को आंशिक न्यूनतम वर्ग संरचनात्मक समीकरण मॉडलिंग (PLS-SEM) दृष्टिकोण का उपयोग करके अनुभवजन्य रूप से सत्यापित किया गया। डेटा विश्लेषण प्रक्रिया में कई चरण शामिल थे, जिनमें प्रारंभिक डेटा स्क्रीनिंग, अन्वेषी कारक विश्लेषण (EFA), पुष्टिकारी कारक विश्लेषण (CFA), और पथ विश्लेषण शामिल हैं। सबसे पहले, डेटा को अनुपस्थित मानों और बाहरी मूल्यों के लिए जाँचा गया, इसके बाद जनसांख्यिकीय वितरण और सभी तत्वों के वर्णनात्मक आंकड़े प्रस्तुत किए गए। EFA का उपयोग अंतर्निहित कारक संरचना की पहचान करने के लिए किया गया, जिसमें महत्वहीन और क्रॉस-लोडेड तत्वों को समाप्त कर दिया गया। इसके बाद, CFA का उपयोग निर्माणों की विश्वसनीयता और वैधता का मूल्यांकन करने के लिए किया गया। संरचनात्मक मॉडल विश्लेषण में β गुणांक और उनकी महत्वपूर्णता का परीक्षण किया गया। इसके अलावा, बहु-रैखिकता s की जाँच विविधता मुद्रास्फीति कारकों (VIF) का उपयोग करके की गई ताकि मॉडल की मजबूती सुनिश्चित की जा सके। इसके बाद, PLS संरचनात्मक मॉडल का विश्लेषण प्रत्यक्ष, अप्रत्यक्ष, कुल, और मध्यस्थ प्रभावों के आकलन के लिए किया गया। अध्ययन में प्रस्तावित 39

परिकल्पित संबंधों में से 26 का समर्थन किया गया, जिससे द्विप्रयोगिता और इसके फर्म स्तर के प्रभावों की बेहतर समझ प्राप्त हुई।

तीसरे चरण में, एक पदानुक्रमित ढाँचा विकसित किया गया ताकि महत्वपूर्ण पूर्ववर्ती कारकों, संगठनात्मक द्विप्रयोगिता, और फर्म प्रदर्शन के बीच आपसी संबंधों की खोज की जा सके। इसके लिए संशोधित कुल व्याख्यात्मक संरचनात्मक मॉडलिंग (m-TISM) दृष्टिकोण को अपनाया गया। इसके अतिरिक्त, Matrice d'Impacts Croisés Multiplication Appliquée à un Classement (MICMAC) विश्लेषण का उपयोग करके इन संरचनाओं की प्रेरक और निर्भरशील शक्ति का मूल्यांकन किया गया। MICMAC विश्लेषण ने संरचनाओं को चार श्रेणियों में वर्गीकृत किया: स्वायत्त, लिंकिंग, निर्भरशील, और स्वतंत्र घटक। प्रस्तावित पदानुक्रम में प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक तीव्रता, प्रौद्योगिकी अभिविन्यास, और संगठनात्मक संस्कृति को मौलिक तत्वों के रूप में पहचाना गया, जो संगठनात्मक द्विप्रयोगिता को प्रोत्साहित करने में महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाते हैं।

चौथे चरण में, अध्ययन के अनुभवजन्य निष्कर्षों को मान्य और त्रिकोणीयकरण (Triangulation) करने के लिए एक क्रॉस-केस विश्लेषण किया गया। अध्ययन की विश्वसनीयता और वैधता को बढ़ाने के लिए चार केस स्टडीज़ का चयन किया गया, जिनमें से दो संतुलन आयाम और दो संयुक्त आयाम का प्रतिनिधित्व करती हैं। निष्कर्षों से पता चला कि प्रौद्योगिकी अभिविन्यास, नेटवर्किंग क्षमता, और रणनीतिक चपलता सभी फर्मों में द्विप्रयोगिता और फर्म प्रदर्शन के प्रमुख चालक के रूप में उभरे। इसके अलावा, शोध का अंतिम अध्याय व्यावहारिक, सैद्धांतिक और नीतिगत प्रभावों पर चर्चा करता है, जो उद्योग और अकादमिक हितधारकों के लिए मूल्यवान अंतर्दृष्टि प्रदान करता है।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
सारांश.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xvi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xx
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2 CONTEXT AND MOTIVATION.....	5
1.3 RESEARCH GAPS.....	7
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES	8
1.5 METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW.....	9
1.6 SCOPE OF RESEARCH.....	9
1.7 STRUCTURE OF THESIS.....	11
CHAPTER 2: BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS AND TCCM FRAMEWORK.....	14
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	15
2.2 METHODOLOGY.....	16
2.3 BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS.....	17
2.3.1 General Results.....	17
2.3.2 Publications and Citations.....	19
2.3.3 Most Influential Papers.....	21
2.3.4 Prominent Journals.....	22

2.3.5 Relevant Nations.....	25
2.3.6 Prominent Authors.....	26
2.3.7 Keywords Co-occurrence.....	28
2.3.8 Co-Citation of Cited References.....	31
2.3.9 Thematic Map	34
2.4 TCCM ANALYSIS	35
2.4.1 Theory Development.....	37
2.4.2 Context.....	38
2.4.3 Characteristics.....	38
2.4.4 Methods.....	39
2.5 DISCUSSION.....	40
2.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	41
CHAPTER 3: META ANALYSIS.....	43
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	44
3.2 METHOD.....	45
3.2.1 Literature Search.....	45
3.2.2 Selection Strategy.....	46
3.2.3 Meta Analysis Method.....	47
3.3 RESULT.....	47
3.3.1 Determinants of Exploration.....	48
3.3.2 Determinants of Exploitation.....	51
3.4 DISCUSSION.....	53
3.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	54

CHAPTER 4: ORGANISATIONAL AMBIDEXTERITY, ITS CRITICAL FACTORS, AND THEORETICAL LENSES.....	59
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	60
4.2 ORGANIZATIONAL AMBIDEXTERITY.....	60
4.2.1 Exploitation v/s Exploration.....	62
4.2.2 Organizational Ambidexterity: Conceptualization.....	64
4.2.3 Operationalizing Ambidexterity.....	66
4.2.4 The Ambidexterity Premise.....	67
4.2.5 Trade-Off or Paradox?.....	69
4.2.6 Measurement of Organizational Ambidexterity.....	71
4.2.7 Performance-based Classification of Ambidextrous Organizations.....	75
4.3 AMBIDEXTERITY IN SERVICE INDUSTRY.....	76
4.4 ANTECEDENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL AMBIDEXTERITY.....	77
4.4.1 Cognitive Readiness.....	78
4.4.2 Networking Capability.....	79
4.4.3 Organization Culture.....	79
4.4.4 Resource Orchestration.....	80
4.4.5 Strategic Agility.....	81
4.4.6 Transformation Capability.....	81
4.4.7 Technology Orientation.....	82
4.4.8 Competitive Intensity.....	83
4.5 THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS.....	84
4.5.1 Resource Based View.....	84
4.5.2 Dynamic Capability Theory.....	85
4.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	86

CHAPTER 5: DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND	
HYPOTHESES.....	88
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	89
5.1.1 Technology Orientation.....	90
5.1.2 Resource Orchestration.....	93
5.1.3 Networking Capability.....	96
5.1.4 Strategic Agility.....	99
5.1.5 Cognitive Readiness.....	102
5.1.6 Transformation Capability.....	105
5.1.7 Organization Culture.....	108
5.1.8 Ambidexterity and Firm Performance.....	111
5.1.9 Moderating Role of Competitive Intensity.....	114
5.2 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	115
CHAPTER 6: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	118
6.1 INTRODUCTION.....	119
6.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES WITH METHODS.....	119
6.3 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	120
6.4 PHASES OF THE STUDY.....	121
6.4.1 Phase 1.....	124
6.4.2 Phase 2.....	125
6.4.3 Phase 3.....	130
6.4.4 Phase 4.....	131
6.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	133

CHAPTER 7: EMPIRICAL TESTING OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	134
7.1 INTRODUCTION.....	135
7.2 METHODOLOGY.....	136
7.3 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNING.....	137
7.3.1 Pretesting of the Questionnaire.....	137
7.4 SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION.....	138
7.5 DATA ANALYSIS.....	139
7.5.1 Preliminary Analysis.....	139
7.5.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis.....	145
7.5.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis	149
7.6 PATH MODEL ANALYSIS.....	154
7.6.1 Direct and Total Effects of Factors.....	155
7.6.2 Testing of Indirect Effects.....	160
7.6.3 Testing of Moderation Effects.....	162
7.6.4 Control Variables.....	165
7.6.5 Overall Model Test.....	165
7.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	167
CHAPTER 8: HIERARCHICAL MODELLING.....	169
8.1 INTRODUCTION.....	170
8.2. STEPS OF M-TISM.....	171
8.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	179
8.4 MICMAC ANALYSIS.....	192
8.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	194

CHAPTER 9: RESEARCH SYNTHESIS AND TRIANGULATION.....	196
9.1 INTRODUCTION.....	197
9.1.1 Case Evidence 1: Indus Towers.....	199
9.1.2 Case Evidence 2: Mobily Infotech.....	202
9.1.3 Case Evidence 3: MakeMyTrip.....	204
9.1.4 Case Evidence 4: Ernst and Young.....	208
9.2 RESULTS OF CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS.....	210
9.3 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	211
CHAPTER 10: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATION AND CONCLUSION.....	214
10.1 INTRODUCTION.....	215
10.2 RESEARCH OVERVIEW.....	215
10.3 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS.....	216
10.3.1 Findings from Phase 1.....	217
10.3.2 Findings from Phase 2.....	219
10.3.3 Findings from Phase 3.....	228
10.3.4 Findings from Phase 4.....	230
10.4 IMPLICATIONS OF THESIS.....	231
10.4.1 Implications for Academicians.....	231
10.4.2 Implications for Practitioners.....	233
10.4.3 Implications for Policymakers.....	235
10.5 CONCLUSION.....	237
10.6 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION.....	240
10.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	241

REFERENCES.....	243
APPENDICES.....	278
APPENDIX A.....	278
APPENDIX B.....	290
APPENDIX C.....	292
BIO DATA.....	293

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Data Collection Methodology.....	18
Figure 2.2 Publication and Citation Trend.....	20
Figure 2.3 Sources' Production Trend.....	24
Figure 2.4 Keywords Co-Occurrences.....	29
Figure 2.5 Co-citation Analysis.....	31
Figure 2.6 Thematic Map.....	35
Figure 2.7 TCCM Analysis.....	36
Figure 2.8 Research Agenda Development.....	42
Figure 3.1 Data Collection Process.....	45
Figure 4.1 The Ambidexterity Equilibrium.....	69
Figure 4.2 Relationship between, Exploration, Exploitation and Firm Performance.....	71
Figure 4.3 Measuring Ambidexterity.....	74
Figure 4.4 Ambidextrous Organizations' Classification.....	76
Figure 5.1 Conceptual Framework.....	117
Figure 6.1 Phases of the Study.....	123
Figure 6.2 Steps Involved in Phase 1.....	125
Figure 6.3 Steps for m-TISM.....	131
Figure 6.4 Steps for Case Study Analysis.....	133
Figure 7.1 Data Analysis Procedure.....	136
Figure 7.2 Sector-wise Distribution of Sample.....	140
Figure 7.3 Size of Firm.....	141
Figure 7.4 Respondents' Profile.....	141
Figure 7.5 Respondents' Qualification.....	142

Figure 7.6 Scree Plot.....147

Figure 7.7 PLS Structural Model.....158

Figure 7.8 Moderating Role of Competitive Intensity.....163

Figure 8.1 Steps of M-TISM Process.....173

Figure 8.2 Diagraph with Transitive Links.....177

Figure 8.3 Final m-TISM Hierarchy.....178

Figure 8.4 MICMAC Analysis.....194

Figure 9.1 Steps Adopted to Cross-Validate the Findings.....198

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 General Results.....	19
Table 2.2 Publication and Citation Overview.....	20
Table 2.3 Top Cited Articles.....	21
Table 2.4 Top Journals.....	23
Table 2.5 Top and Least Studied Countries.....	25
Table 2.6 Most Influential Authors.....	27
Table 2.7 Keywords Clusters.....	30
Table 3.1 Drivers with Supporting Studies.....	46
Table 3.2 Meta Analysis Results for Relationship with Exploration.....	56
Table 3.3 Meta Analysis Results for Relationship with Exploitation.....	57
Table 3.4 Heterogeneous constructs with Explanation of Heterogeneity.....	58
Table 4.1 Organizational Ambidexterity Conceptualization.....	75
Table 6.1 Research Objective with their Respective Methods.....	120
Table 7.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	143
Table 7.2 KMO and Bartlett's Test.....	146
Table 7.3 Final EFA Result.....	148
Table 7.4 Reliability and Validity Analysis.....	151
Table 7.5 Fornell Larcker.....	152
Table 7.6 HTMT.....	153
Table 7.7 VIF Values.....	154
Table 7.8 Direct and Total Effect.....	156
Table 7.9 Indirect Effect.....	160
Table 7.10 Moderation Effect of Competitive Intensity.....	162
Table 7.11 Proposed Hypotheses.....	163

Table 7.12 Control Factors.....	165
Table 7.13 R ² and Q ² Values.....	166
Table 7.14 Model Fit Indices.....	167
Table 8.1 Factors with Codes.....	170
Table 8.2 Reachability Matrix with Transitivity Linkages.....	174
Table 8.3 Hierarchical Partitioning.....	174
Table 8.4 Factors and their Levels in Hierarchy.....	176
Table 8.5 Driving-dependence Power of Factors.....	193
Table 9.1 Overview of Case Firms.....	198
Table 9.2 Case Study Analysis.....	212
Table 10.1 Arguments for Acceptance/ Non Acceptance of Hypotheses.....	224
Table B.1 Communalities Table.....	290
Table B.2 Total Variance Explained.....	290
Table C.1 List of Experts.....	292

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Acronyms	Expanded Form
AC	Average Citation
AVE	Average Variance Extracted
B2B	Business to Business
B2C	Business to Customers
BD	Balancing Dimension
CA	Competitive Advantage
CB-SEM	Covariance Based Structural Equation Modeling
CD	Combined Dimension
CEOs	Chief Executive Officers
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CI	Competitive Intensity
CII	Confederation of Indian Industry
CP	Cited Publications
CPY	Citations Per Year
CGR	Cognitive Readiness
CR	Composite Reliability
CSFs	Critical Success Factors
DCT	Dynamic Capability Theory
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
ERT	Exploration
EXT	Exploitation
ERV	Explorative

ETV	Exploitative
EY	Ernst and Young
FICCI	Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry
FLC	Fornell-Larcker Criterion
FP	Firm Performance
fsQCA	Fuzzy Set Comparative Analysis
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HTMT	Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio
ISM	Interpretive Structural Modeling
IT	Indus Towers
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
MI	Mobily Infotech
MICMAC	Matrice d'Impacts Croisés Multiplication Appliquée à un Classement
MMT	Make My Trip
m-TISM	Modified Total Interpretive Structural Modeling
NC	Networking Capability
OA	Organizational Ambidexterity
OC	Organization Culture
PAF	Principal Axis Factoring
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PLS-SEM	Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

RBV	Resource Based View
RO	Resource Orchestration
SA	Strategic Agility
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
SRMR	Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual
TFC	Transformation Capability
TC/CP	Cites per Total Cited Publications
TC/TNP	Citations per Total Number of Publications
TCCM	Theory, Context, Characteristics and Methodology
TMT	Top Management Team
TNP	Total Number of Publications
TO	Technology Orientation
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
VIF	Variance Inflation Factors
CFs	Critical Factors