

bradscholars

The effects of knowledge integration and contextual ambidexterity on innovation in entrepreneurial ventures

Item Type	Article
Authors	Amankwah-Amoah, J.;Adomako, Samuel
Citation	Amankwah-Amoah J and Adomako S (2021) The effects of knowledge integration and contextual ambidexterity on innovation in entrepreneurial ventures. Journal of Business Research. 127: 312-321.
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.01.050
Publisher	Elsevier
Rights	© 2021 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduced in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.
Download date	2025-04-30 04:48:54
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10454/18361

The Effects of Knowledge Integration and Contextual Ambidexterity on Innovation in Entrepreneurial Ventures

Joseph Amankwah-Amoah

Kent Business School, University of Kent, United Kingdom, J.Amankwah-Amoah@kent.ac.uk

Samuel Adomako

School of Management, University of Bradford, Bradford, United Kingdom:
S.Adomako@bradford.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper utilizes insights from the knowledge-based view and ambidexterity literature to examine the effects of knowledge integration (KI) on innovation via contextual ambidexterity (CA). The paper also investigates the potential moderating role of human resource (HR) slack on the relationship between KI and CA. Using survey data collected from 245 entrepreneurial firms operating in Ghana, the findings show that KI positively relates to CA, and this relationship is moderated by HR slack. In addition, we observed that CA mediates KI and innovation. The broader theoretical and practical implications of the study are outlined.

Keywords: Africa; *knowledge integration*; *contextual ambidexterity*; *human resource slack*; *innovation*; *entrepreneurial firms*; *Ghana*

1. Introduction

Today's hypercompetitive global environment demands that businesses innovate in a proactive manner in terms of their processes, products and services (Singh, Akbani & Dhir, 2020) to enhance their survival chances (Amankwah-Amoah & Wang, 2019; Amankwah-Amoah, Khan & Wood, 2020). Accordingly, the innovation literature has examined the influences of knowledge resources and mechanisms in firms' innovation process (Salunke, Weerawardena & McColl-Kennedy, 2019; Windler et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2020; Moreira, Kuk, Guimaraes & Albuquerque, 2020; Senbeto & Hon, 2020) and concluded that knowledge resources are crucial for innovations (Kraaijenbrink, 2012; Zhou & Li, 2012). In the past, firms tended to exclusively rely on their resources and expertise to innovate, nevertheless, this has now been superseded by a new approach that places greater emphasis on collaboration (Chesbrough, 2003; Chesbrough & Appleyard, 2007). Many entrepreneurial firms' new approach to innovation emphasizes collaboration, mobilization and utilization of cutting-edge market knowledge to inform strategic decisions (Chesbrough &

Appleyard, 2007; Scuotto, Del Giudice, Bresciani & Meissner, 2017; Revilla et al., 2016). Moreover, entrepreneurial firms tend to integrate various sources of knowledge to complement inter-functional coordination, thereby effectively ensuring alignment goals to the structures, routines and processes.

The innovation literature suggests that a key differentiator between leading and lagging firms in achieving superior performance is their ability to concomitantly acquire and integrate knowledge into the processes of the firm (Grant, 2015; Lichtenthaler & Lichtenthaler, 2009; Scuotto et al., 2017). Indeed, firms' competitiveness and effective strategic alignment with changing customers' demand are increasingly predicated on their ability to mobilize and harness existing knowledge to innovate (Agostini, Nosella & Filippini, 2017). Collaborating with other firms provides an effective means of acquiring expertise, resources and knowledge for innovation activities (Chesbrough & Appleyard, 2007; Revilla, Rodriguez-Prado & Cui, 2016).

By effectively accumulating and leveraging new market knowledge, entrepreneurial firms can be better equipped to sense environmental upheavals to make changes to strategic decisions. Generally, the literature suggests that the alignment of goals to different functional units in innovation typically enhances the use of knowledge integration (KI) mechanisms due to the greater information processing demands involved (Germain & Dröge, 1997; Kumar & Seth, 1998). The integrating knowledge into the organizational process and decision-making also paves the way for firms to increase the chance of arriving at a high-quality solution, thereby enhancing their innovation performance (Tsai & Hsu, 2014).

Given that knowledge is omnipresent in firms' ability to innovate and adapt to changing circumstances (Sung & Choi, 2018), the mediating mechanism of CA could drive innovation for market competitiveness (Kotsemir & Meissner, 2013). The lack of attention is surprising given that KI enhances the competitiveness of entrepreneurial firms (Scuotto et al., 2017). In addition, despite these previous attempts at illuminating the KI-innovation linkage, the mechanisms through which KI relates to innovation remains poorly understood. By innovation, we refer to the

introduction of new approaches to the firm that allows to bring new products or services to market (Burgelman & Sayles, 1988; Singh, Akbani & Dhir, 2020; Jaaron & Backhouse, 2018). This type of innovation can be new to the firm, industry or even the region at which the firm is operating.

While the outcomes of past investigations reinforce the critical importance of KI in innovation activities of entrepreneurial firms (Malerba & McKelvey, 2018; Malecki, 2011; Knockaert et al., 2011), there are still grey areas in terms of the mediating mechanism of the KI-innovation relationship in developing countries' entrepreneurial firms. Specifically, researchers have paid limited attention to how contextual ambidexterity (CA) mediates the relationship between KI and innovations. Defined as “the routines and processes used by organizations to mobilize, coordinate, and integrate dispersed exploratory and exploitative efforts and to allocate, reallocate, combine, and recombine resources and assets”, CA has emerged as a key capability in competing across markets (Meglio, King & Risberg, 2015, p. 32-33, Al-Atwi et al., 2019; Agostini et al., 2017). Whilst previous studies have examined the role of KI in ambidexterity (Filippini, Güttel & Nosella, 2012; Lin et al., 2017), the boundary limits of this nuanced relationship are still less under-researched. Against this backdrop, the purpose of this paper is to examine the KI-innovation relationship by testing the mediating role of contextual ambidexterity.

This paper contributes to the literature in several respects. First, although the innovation literature has taken several approaches to examine the role of KI on innovation in entrepreneurial firms (Malerba & McKelvey, 2018; Malecki, 2011; Knockaert et al., 2011), our understanding of how CA mediates this relationship is far from complete. By testing a model specifying that CA mediates the KI-innovation relationship, this paper extends the current CA literature (Carmeli & Halevi, 2009; Meglio et al., 2015; Wang & Rafiq, 2014) by enhancing our understanding of the mechanisms through which KI influences innovation in entrepreneurial ventures. Second, we integrate the knowledge-based literature (Grant, 1996; Nickerson & Zenger, 2004) and CA research (Meglio et al., 2015; Carmeli & Halevi, 2009) to examine how KI influences CA and the conditions. By testing the moderating impact of HR slack on the KI-CA nexus, we broaden the

current knowledge on when KI effectively influences CA in entrepreneurial firms. This is an important extension of the literature given the lack of studies elucidating the boundary conditions of this nexus.

Third, we deviate from much of the current innovation literature to fill an important void in the African context. There is an under-researched area on exploration and exploitation, and innovation activities within an African context (Asaah, Yunfei, Wadei & Nkrumah, 2020). In such a developing country context, the experience of prior business ownership supplies entrepreneurs with the necessary knowledge to enable them to introduce innovations into the market (Robson et al., 2012). We extend this literature by demonstrating how KI leads to innovation in institutional context where the “rules of the game” are often uncertain or weak in their enforcements (Adomako et al., 2020). This contribution is critical given that previous studies suggest that major innovation activities are increasingly undertaken in developed economies (Luo, Sun & Wang, 2011) and most entrepreneurial firms in emerging economies lack innovation capabilities resulting in “capability failure” (Lee 2013).

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. We first present a review of literature on knowledge-based view and contextual ambidexterity followed by our hypothesis development. We then present the research method and key findings deduced from the data. The final section set out the theoretical and practical implications.

2. Theoretical background and hypotheses

2.1 The knowledge-based view

The knowledge-based view (KBV) (Grant, 1996; Martin & Javalgi, 2019; Nickerson & Zenger, 2004) suggests that competitiveness of a business can be traced to the knowledge it possesses, leverages and utilizes to outperform ally and rival firms. By focusing on knowledge as a source of variation in superior firm performance (Grant, 2002; Felin & Hesterly, 2007; Kearns & Sabherwal, 2006), the KBV considers firms’ capabilities as the outcome of the unique processes by which

firms combine knowledge and resources they possess to create value for their customers (Martin & Javalgi, 2019). Knowledge-based resources may include employees' know-how, capacity to learn and utilize knowledge for a successful innovation process (Jackson, DeNisi & Hitt, 2003). Past studies have demonstrated that knowledge tends to be context-specific (Sabherwal & Becerra-Fernandez, 2005) given that it stems from specific prior experiences, observations, research, and an encounter with the current firm's monitoring processes. Thus, internally developed knowledge from prior experience (Leonard & Sensiper, 1998) and externally acquired knowledge from other firms through mechanisms such as acquisition and licensing intellectual property rights (Revilla et al., 2016) and personnel poaching (Amankwah-Amoah, 2020) are considered important sources of firm success. Thus, through knowledge accumulation, firms are better able to navigate the uncertain business environment (Beijerse, 1999) which allows them in their decision-making process (Cabrera-Suárez et al., 2001). Arguably, the importance of knowledge accumulation for entrepreneurial firms is anchored in their ability to acquire and utilize specific knowledge reservoirs to improve their market competitiveness (Cabrera-Suárez, De Saá-Pérez & García-Almeida, 2001).

2.2 Contextual ambidexterity

Since March's (1991) seminal paper, research on exploration activities (search, experimentation, and discovery) and exploitation activities (refinement and execution) has surged across all the management sub-disciplines (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Revilla et al., 2016). Particularly, there has been a concurrent pursuit of both activities (contextual ambidexterity) as the source of firm market competitiveness (Luo, Kumar, Mallick & Luo, 2019). Ambidexterity focuses on both the exploration and exploitation activities of firms (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Revilla et al., 2016). Although achieving the balance exploration and exploitation activities in innovation is a challenging task, it can enhance firm long-term survival and market competitiveness (Atuahene-Gima, 2005; McGrath, 2001; Wang & Rafiq, 2014). The convention ambidexterity literature considers exploration and exploitation as competing activities (Duncan,

1976). To achieve a balance between these competing but vital activities, entrepreneurial firms must create structural or temporal separation between the two (Gupta, Smith & Shalley, 2006; Simsek et al., 2009). Yet, recent research indicates that CA (i.e., the concurrent exploration and exploitation within a business unit) is critical for firm success (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004; Wang & Rafiq, 2014).

In particular, exploratory activities of firms often deviate from current “knowledge and meet the needs of emerging customers or markets” with distinctive offerings (Luo et al., 2019, p. 614). It has been suggested that conceptual ambidexterity is embedded in the organizational culture that promotes creativity and discipline (Jelinek & Schoonhoven, 1993). As such, knowledge plays an important role to develop CA in entrepreneurial firms. By building on organizations’ current knowledge and strengthening the processes, routines, and structures to address new demands, exploitation activities enrich the core competencies required for marked competitiveness (Luo et al., 2019). More importantly, the literature on CA tends to integrate both exploration and exploitation with a single business unit but recognizes their differences in pursuit of organizational goals (Wang & Rafiq, 2014).

Based on the foregoing discussion, this paper argues that KI can influence CA because KI may promote creativity in entrepreneurial firms. The literature suggests diverse individual knowledge, skills, and abilities that promote creativity (Rink & Ellemers, 2007). As has been suggested in the ambidexterity literature, CA requires different knowledge and the integration of different perspectives for coherent decision-making (Eisenhardt & Schoonhoven, 1990). The ability to simultaneously pursue both exploration and exploitation yields stronger innovation performance (Wang & Rafiq, 2014). Therefore, a mechanism is required through which KI may lead to innovation. In addition, we contend that the effect of KI on CA may depend on HR slack since ambidexterity is a knowledge-intensive activity. HR slack is best deployed when the firm embraces growth-oriented activities (Mishina, Pollock & Porac 2004).

2.3 KI and CA

KI focuses on organizations' ability and capacity to instill practices and processes that allow knowledge across functional areas of the business and outside the firm to be harnessed to improve their functioning of the business (Wouters & Roijmans, 2011). KI encompasses harnessing and utilizing both internal and external sources of knowledge to inform organizational decisions, which then could positively effect on performance (Haas, 2006). Firms can acquire external knowledge via inter-organizational personnel mobility (Amankwah-Amoah, 2020), inter-firm collaboration, and acquisition (Park, Mezias, Lee & Han, 2014). Some past studies suggest that the organizational utility of external knowledge is predicated on the existence of existing/complimentary knowledge and managerial expertise, i.e. effective alignment between the external and internal knowledge (Cassiman & Veugelers, 2006; Park, Mezias, Lee & Han, 2014). External knowledge-seeking can enrich firms' reservoir of knowledge to undertake project development activities (Park et al., 2014). KI also entails creating organizational level processes with individuals that allow knowledge to flow across the structures of the firm. By absorbing and utilizing knowledge, organization enhances their ability to concurrently pursue the exploration and exploitation activities (Al-Atwi et al., 2019; Raisch, Birkinshaw, Probst & Tushman, 2009; Greve, 2007), which then enhance their operating capabilities.

In addition, past studies have demonstrated KI as a crucial organizational capability that can be harnessed to enhance new product development efforts (Roller, Eck & Dalakakis. 2004) and improve overall firm market competitiveness. Such cross-functional cooperation stemming from KI efforts are effective in mobilizing and connecting disjointed ideas across the organization (Wouters & Roijmans, 2011), thus, equipping it to innovate by capitalizing on the collaborative efforts. Given that innovation activities encompassed assessing current processes and routines, and problem-solving orientations (Wouters & Roijmans, 2011), KI is likely to boost new venture firms' exploration activities (search, experimentation and discovery) and exploitation activities. Hence:

H1: KI is positively related to CA.

2.4 The mediating role of CA

One of the key objectives of this paper was to examine the mediating role of CA in the KI-innovation nexus. The literature on KI suggests that the accumulation and integration of knowledge resources are critical for innovation activities (Menon & Pfeffer, 2003; Moorman & Miner, 1997). However, how CA mediates this link is not well understood. This paper suggests that CA is a mediator of the KI-innovation nexus for the following reasons. First, knowledge resources drive both exploration and exploitation which are required for innovation. Through CA, KI generates performance outcomes which are consistent with the resource-based perspective of the firm (Barney, 1991). A major rationale is that firm-level capabilities help firms to reconfigure, build, and deploy resources for exploration and exploitation activities within the firm (Amit & Schoemaker, 1993; Zhang et al., 2019).

Second, given that KI is the firm-level capability (Cepeda & Vera, 2007), it can help generate competitive strategy by transforming the firm's knowledge resources and operation routines to simultaneously pursue CA required to firm innovation activities (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Third, the knowledge-based view suggests that KI and application are important to firm capabilities for firm performance (Nonaka, 1994; Taylor & Greve, 2006). This helps to build knowledge reservoirs to capture external and internal knowledge flows (Salunke et al., 2019) for exploring new competences and exploiting existing competencies (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004) for innovation. Arguably, for the firm to balance its exploration and exploitation activities, the key role of KI in the firm's innovation process is required to ensure that the required new knowledge combinations are made available to managerial decision-making. Taking to together, this paper proposes that:

H2a: CA mediates the relationship between KI and the number of innovations adopted by new ventures.

H2b: CA mediates the relationship between KI and the extent to which innovations are radical rather than incremental.

2.5 The moderating role of HR slack

A core function of strategic HR focuses on developing firms' capacity and workers' skills and abilities to make an effective contribution to the firm's success (Amankwah-Amoah, 2020). HR slack resource denotes the under-utilized workforce that can be tapped to meet future demands or operational requirements (Kim, Shin, Shin & Park, 2019). The KBV suggests that knowledge is grounded in employees that is difficult for other firms to replicate (Mahoney & Kor, 2015). Unlike governments in industrialized economies, those in developing economies including many in Africa often offer limited or no incentives to firms to train their workers culminating in under-investment in skill formation activities (Debrah & Ofori, 2006). Given this limited incentive and unwillingness by firms to invest in training, many organizations are likely to have underutilized workers. However, both exploration and exploitation activities impose demands on firms to utilize their limited resources as such slack resources can provide the buffer to adapt to changes in the business environment (Luo et al., 2019). HR slack provides the opportunity and space to experiment with new ideas and there creating conditions for the development of new knowledge. The firm's ability to act quickly to explore new opportunities is critical so is the exploitation of existing opportunities. However, firms with greater financial slack but limited HR slack will be less able to rapidly pursue exploration and exploitation activities. This may negatively impact on the KI-CA nexus compared to firms with HR slack. A major rationale is that firms with HR slack may be able to use the reservoir of knowledge acquired from keeping excess skilled employees to pursue more new opportunities, and exploiting existing ones more quickly, as they do not face HR constraints. In addition, given CA to be a resource-consuming activity, firms with greater HR slack can tap knowledge and skills required for CA. Thus, firms with greater HR base can leverage their resources for CA activities compared to firms with less HR slack. Particularly, in an entrepreneurial context, knowledge accruing from HRs could be tapped for exploration and exploitation activities. In the main, a firm's stock of employees helps in generating the required knowledge for exploration and exploitation activities as new employees would need time to learn

and contribute to the firm's tacit knowledge (Levin & Cross, 2004). Collectively, holding HR slack appears to be the best way to meet unexpected demands in the exploration and exploitation activities of entrepreneurial firms. Based on this reasoning, this paper suggests that:

H3: HR slack moderates the relationship between KI and CA, such that the relationship is stronger when HR slack is greater.

3. Research method

3.1 Sample and data collection

To test our hypotheses, we collected data from entrepreneurial ventures operating in Ghana, as an emerging economy offers a fertile ground for investigating this issue (Amankwah-Amoah, Boso & Antwi-Agyei, 2018). Respondents were entrepreneurs/founders who have participated in the start-up process of their businesses. Initially, 206 entrepreneurs were discovered by students who contacted entrepreneurs for an assignment in entrepreneurship. In addition, we randomly selected 394 entrepreneurs' names and addresses from the Ghana Business Directory (<https://www.ghanayello.com/>). We sent invitation letters explaining our intention to survey entrepreneurs on their firm innovation for a research project. Before the questionnaires were sent out for the main survey, we conducted a face-to-face interview (each interview lasting for 35-50 minutes) with six entrepreneurs located in Accra. This was done to ensure that the items included in the survey booklet were correctly interpreted by respondents.

We then mailed a total of 600 surveys, followed by self-addressed and stamped returned envelopes, and received 199 complete surveys. Of the 193 surveys, 6 were discarded due to missing values. Thus, 193 useable surveys were obtained in the first round. We sent two rounds of reminders in March and April 2019 respectively, generating another 52 responses. Our final sample size was 245, representing a 40.08 % response rate. We checked for non-response bias by comparing available firm characteristics from the Ghana Business Directory, including firm age, firm size, and industry with our data. The results revealed no bias in the sample. The entrepreneurs in our sample were operating mainly in the service (76.19%) and manufacturing (23.81%) sectors.

Among the 245 entrepreneurs, 70% were males; and 30% were females. The average previous experience was 5 years. The average firm size was 5 full-time employees and had operated for 2 years since incorporated. The average sales revenues for 2019 was \$400,469.20.

3.2 Measures

Knowledge integration. We measured KI with five items ($\alpha=0.93$) from De Luca, Verona & Vicari, (2010). These items capture the extent to which the firms use a set of formal integration mechanisms to integrate scientific and market knowledge. The items were measured on a seven-point scale with anchors ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree. The variable score for KI was calculated by taking the combined mean of the five items of the KI scale.

Contextual ambidexterity. We adopted the measures of competence exploration ($\alpha=0.91$) and exploitation ($\alpha=0.88$) from Atuahene-Gima (2005) and were measured on a seven-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree). To arrive at the overall score for CA, we followed He Wong (2004) in using the aggregate dimension of exploration and exploitation (i.e., combination) as a proxy of contextual ambidexterity.

Human resource slack. We followed precedence and captured HR slack as the number of employees (in FTE) relative to sales (Voss, Sirdeshmukh & Voss, 2008). We then adjusted the measure by subtracting the median ratio of employment to sales for all firms in the same sub-industry in which the firm in question operates (Mellahi & Wilkinson 2010).

Innovation. Previous studies have measured innovation through new product introductions (Katila, 2002). Our measure of innovation refers to firm-level product innovation and was measured with indicators of product introductions. First, entrepreneurs as respondents were asked to report the number of new products or services their firms have introduced in the past 3 years. This item was used to collect data on the number of innovations created by new ventures. Previous research has found this measure of innovation to be robust in many research settings (Baron & Tang, 2011; Smith, Collins & Clark, 2005). Second, we measured the radicalness of innovations (the extent to which the innovations make the firm's current products or services lines obsolete)

with three items ($\alpha=0.96$) from Subramaniam and Youndt (2005). We asked respondents to rate how radical each of the innovations was on a seven-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree). The three items were averaged to obtain the score for radical innovations

Control variables. Several variables were used as control variables. At the individual level, an entrepreneur's age, gender, and previous experience were controlled because they have been found to influence firm innovation (Reynolds, 2000). The age of the entrepreneur was measured as the number of years of the entrepreneur/founder. Gender was coded as 1=female and 0=male. Previous experience was captured with three items that asked respondents to report the number of years of previous entrepreneurial, managerial, and industrial experiences they have had before founding the current business (Baron & Tang, 2011) ($\alpha =0.95$). As with all multi-item scales in the study, the combined mean of the scale measures constitutes the variable score for previous experience. Given that firm size, firm age, industry, and sales revenues influence innovation (Baron & Tang, 2009), we controlled for these firm-level variables. Firm size was measured as the number of full-time employees in each firm as of 2019. Firm age was captured as the number of years since the firm was incepted. The industry was measured as a dummy variable (0=service; 1=manufacturing). Sales revenues were measured by asking entrepreneurs to report the sales revenues of the year 2018. We used the natural log for sales revenues to account for skewed distribution within the data.

3.3 Discriminant validity

Before hypothesis testing, we examined the discriminant validity of our variables. Though KI, CA, and innovation are theoretically different constructs, we performed confirmatory analysis (CFA) using the structural equation modeling software LISREL 8.71. To empirically evaluate discriminant validity, we calculated the square root of the average variance extracted (AVE) for each of the variables. Various models were experimented from including five factors (five variables) to one-factor (five factors combined into one variable). We examined the model fit of each and tested chi-square differences to establish which model provided a better fit to the data.

Table 1 shows that the full-factor model fits the data very well (Thompson, 2004). Additionally, in the full-factor model, all the items significantly loaded on their respective latent variables. To test the discriminant validity of our measures, we calculated the square roots of the AVEs for all multi-item constructs. The results in Table 2 indicated that discriminant validity applies particularly to our core constructs of KI (square root of AVE: 0.81), exploration (square root of AVE: 0.80), exploitation (square root of AVE: 0.82), and radicalness of innovation (square root of AVE: 0.91), which correlate at 0.48, suggesting satisfactory discriminant validity for our measures (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Insert Table 1 about here

3.4 Concerns for common method variance

Given that our data come from a single source, there is a potential concern for common method variance caused by a common source (Podsakoff et al., 2003). As such we undertook several procedural steps to address the common method issue: (1) we conducted a pilot study to establish whether the items are subject to ambiguity, (2) we promised to protect respondent anonymity, (3) the items for the dependent, mediating and independent variables were not located closed to each other in the survey. This was done to attenuate the incentive to use previous responses to answer subsequent questions.

In addition, we utilized statistical methods to address common method variance. First, adopted Harman's one-factor test (Podsakoff et al., 2003) and load all the variables into an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal axis factoring and varimax rotation. This returned five factors with eigenvalues >1.0 and 67.21% of the variance explained. No single factor was dominant, and the largest component accounted for 19.17% of the variance. with the first factor accounting for 17.64% of the variance. Second, we used the approach suggested by Lindell and Whitney (2001) to test for common method variance. Accordingly, we identified a marker item that is not conceptually related to any of the constructs in our model. An item that measures

optimism was identified as a variable not conceptually related to any of our constructs (i.e., “I am always optimistic about my future”). Results demonstrate that correlation between the marker variable item and radical innovation is not significant ($r = -0.04$; $p > 0.10$). We found similar results for the correlations between the marker variable items and the number of innovations ($r = -0.03$; $p > 0.10$). Additionally, we found low and nonsignificant correlations between the marker variable item and other constructs (i.e., ranging between 0.00 and 0.05). Collectively, results from the above analyses indicate that no common method variance was detected in this study.

4. Results

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlation for the study variables. The correlations in Table 2 indicate that KI is positively associated with CA, and CA is positively associated with both the number of innovations and the radicalness of these innovations. The variables were standardized to prevent multicollinearity (Aiken & West, 1991). The largest variable inflation factor (VIF) in the full models was 3.38, which is way below the suggested threshold value of 10 (Neter, et al., 1996). This suggests that multicollinearity did not pose a serious problem in our analysis. Hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analysis.

Table 3 presents the results of the hierarchical regression. The dependent variable in Models 1-4 is CA. Model 1 tests the effects of the control variables. Model 2 added KI and it has a significant effect on CA ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$). This observation provides support for H1. When HR slack was included in Model 3, the influence of KI on CA remains significant ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$). In Model 4, we included the interaction terms for KI and HR slack. The interaction term is positive and significant ($\beta = 0.56$, $p < 0.01$). This finding suggests that HR slack positively moderates the relationship between KI and CA. This finding provides support for H3.

To explain the nature of the significant interactions, the effect of KI on CA was plotted at high and low levels of HR slack (Aiken & West, 1991). Figure 1 suggests that the effect of KI on CA is more positive among firms with greater HR slack than among firms with lower HR slack.

Insert Table 2 about here

Insert Table 3 about here

The dependent variable in Models 5-7 is the number of innovations while Models 8-10 have radicalness of innovation as a dependent variable. Given that the dependent variable in Models 5-7 is a count variable, we followed established practice (Baron & Tang, 2011) in using count hierarchical regression. The results in Models 5-10 test the mediating hypotheses. The mediating hypotheses were tested using the approach suggested by Zhao, Lynch and Chen (2010). First, the independent variable and the mediating variable should be significantly related. As shown in Model 2, the relationship between KI and CA (mediator) was positively related ($\beta = 0.23, p < 0.01$). Second, the mediating variable and the dependent variable should be significantly related to each other. The results in Model 5 contain the influence of the control on number of innovations. Model 6 introduces the effect of the moderator (human resource slack). The results in Model 8 test the influence of the control variables on radicalness of innovation. The results in Model 7 and Model 10 suggest that CA is positively related to both the number of innovations ($\beta = 0.26, p < 0.01$) and radicalness of these innovations ($\beta = 0.29, p < 0.01$). Third, the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable should be non-significant when the mediating variable is added to the regression equation. In Model 7 and Model 10, when both KI and CA are included in the regression equation, CA has a positive influence on both the number of innovations ($\beta = 0.27, p < 0.01$) and the radicalness of innovations ($\beta = 0.29, p < 0.01$). In addition, the effect of KI on both the number of innovations ($\beta = 0.03, ns$) and radicalness of innovations ($\beta = 0.04, ns$) becomes nonsignificant. These results suggest that CA mediates KI and the number of innovations, and radicalness of these innovations. Thus, H2a and H2b are supported.

Insert Table 4a about here

Insert Table 4b about here

To gain additional insights into the mediation analysis, we performed a PROCESS analysis using the approach suggested by (Hayes, 2013). This analysis was conducted to establish the mediation effect when the moderating effect of HR slack is added. Tables 4a and 4b present the conditional indirect effects of CA at different values of HR slack. The results of the PROCESS analysis show that the indirect effect of knowledge integration via contextual ambidexterity was conditional on the level of human resource slack. In Table 4a, the results show that the indirect effect was stronger (Conditional indirect effect=0.09) and significant at high levels of human resource slack (CI ranging from 0.05 to 0.14, not crossing zero) for number of innovations but was weaker (Conditional indirect effect=0.01) and nonsignificant at a low level of human resource slack (CI ranging from -0.02 to 0.03). Besides, in Table 4b the results show that the indirect effect of knowledge integration on radicalness of innovation via contextual ambidexterity was conditional on a high level of human resource slack. The indirect effect was significant at high level of human resource slack (Conditional indirect effect=0.10; CI ranging from 0.08 to 0.19, not crossing zero) and nonsignificant at a low level of financial resource slack (Conditional indirect effect=0.02; CI ranging from -0.01 to 0.05, crossing zero). These findings support H2.

Insert Figure 1 about here

4.1 Supplementary analyses

We undertook additional analyses to substantiate the robustness of our model. First, we used alternative measures of innovation as our dependent variable. Specifically, we used the three-

item scale developed by Naman and Slevin (1993) to measure innovation. The results confirmed findings reported above for all the hypotheses relating to innovation as a dependent variable. Second, we re-estimated our model with firm employment growth as a dependent variable. We used employment growth data (2016–2018) gathered from finance managers of the firms in our sample (N = 119) to retest our hypotheses. Finance managers were asked in the survey to record the level of employment growth in their firms during 2016–2018. Utilizing the same analytical approach, we found that CA mediates the relationship between KI and employment growth. Third, we tested an alternative model by adding additional control variables including environmental dynamism and environmental munificence. Substantially, the results were in line with our initial findings. This indicates that the results presented in this paper are robust to alternative explanations (Stam, 2010).

5. Discussion and implications

Building on the knowledge-based view (Grant, 1996) and prior studies (De Luca, Verona & Vicari, 2010; Zahra et al., 2000), this paper explored how KI influences innovation in new ventures through the mechanism of CA. Specifically, the first finding (i.e., KI positively relates to CA) indicates the importance of the neglecting impact of KI in new ventures' CA. By integrating insights from research suggesting that exploration and exploitation relationship is intrinsically linked to the capability–rigidity paradox in innovation (Leonard-Barton, 1992), that the findings suggest that insights derived from KI are a valuable resource for exploring and exploiting opportunities (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011). We also found that CA mediates the relationship between KI and innovation. Besides, the role of HR slack was found to moderate the relationship between KI and CA in H3. Given that HR slack facilitates growth strategies based on its prior knowledge (Lecuona & Reitzig, 2014), it provides better leverage to increase employees' *knowledge*, a resource that is not liquid and that is bound to context to focus exploitation and exploration. Therefore, a higher level of HR slack could help new ventures to identify and exploit opportunities simultaneously through KI by holding HR slack.

5.1 Theoretical contributions

This study extends the literature in three main ways. First, our paper contributes to the innovation literature (Adomako et al., 2019) by exploring the mediating mechanism of the relationship between KI and innovation. While previous studies have revealed the importance of KI in innovation and entrepreneurship (De Luca & Atuahene-Gima, 2007; Koch, 2011; Zahra, Nielsen & Bogner, 1999), they leave the actual question of the mediating mechanism through which KI relates to innovation for future researchers to address. Thus, we build on these studies to provide an understanding of the mediating mechanism of the link between KI and innovation. Second, the findings enhance our understanding of the role that KI plays in facilitating exploration and exploitation activities in new ventures. Specifically, our study complements existing studies (Simsek et al., 2009; Wang & Rafiq, 2014; Wu & Wu, 2016) by suggesting that KI could help new firms manage the competing tensions of achieving ambidexterity. Therefore, our paper provides a more comprehensive understanding of the role of KI in managing exploration and exploitation activities in new ventures.

Third, this paper addresses the fundamental question of when KI effectively drives CA. In doing so, we advance our understanding of the boundary conditions of the impact of KI. Though the role of KI has been extensively investigated (Tsai, Liao & Hsu, 2015; Zahra et al., 1999), our understanding of when it is more or less effective in driving CA remains limited. Thus, this paper empirically investigates the boundary conditions of the impact of KI on CA. Taken together, this paper contributes by providing a clearer illustration of the mediating mechanism of the relationship between KI and innovation.

5.2 Practical implications

Besides the theoretical contributions, our paper offers some practical implications. First, entrepreneurs of new ventures could leverage their KI activities to manage the exploration and

exploitation tensions. The findings suggest the need for entrepreneurial firms in developing countries to integrate knowledge into ventures' exploration and exploitation activities. Second, the findings that KI has different impacts on CA depending on HR slack suggests that KI may not always lead to improved CA when a firm's level of HR slack is low. This suggests that owners of new ventures would be well- advised to pay particular attention to hiring business excess employees when leveraging on knowledge to increase exploration and exploitation activities. Thus, entrepreneurs need to hold more HR slack than they require to manage exploration and exploitation tensions. Third, the finding that KI indirectly influences innovation through CA is particularly important for entrepreneurs in general. This suggests that entrepreneurial managers should not be only aware of the importance of KI but also CA in the link between KI and innovation. It is therefore crucial for managers to facilitate the dynamics of KI and CA by taking a leading role in managing KI and CA processes in new ventures to yield innovation success. For example, firms can amplify and enlarge knowledge through the dynamic conversion between tacit and explicit knowledge. Thus, entrepreneurial managers should nurture an enabling environment that allows employees to share and exchange tacit knowledge to create new knowledge in entrepreneurial firms.

This paper suggests that KI is important for innovation through CA a developing country because managers require to invest a great deal of time and energy on emotionally laden aims since the institutional frameworks that support innovation are weaker within developing countries. In other words, our analysis suggests that innovation activities can lead to sustained growth in emerging economies such as ones in sub-Saharan Africa where firms tend to experience short-lived growth due to lack of global product competitiveness (Cimoli et al., 2009).

6. Limitations and future research

In spite of the contributions, our study has some important limitations that provide fruitful avenues for future research. The recommendations for future research have been divided into three distinct but related trajectories, namely: theory, contexts, and methodology.

6.1. Future directions – theory

First, we encourage future research to extend our findings beyond the developing country contexts. For example, future research could replicate this research model in emerging economies such as India, China, and Brazil. It will be interesting to explore how KI drives innovation through CA in these economies. Second, our study goes further than other studies by examining the mediating role of CA in the relationship between KI and innovation. However, we did not consider the roles played by organizational routines, cultures and other knowledge management processes such as knowledge creation process and knowledge accumulation. We encourage future research to examine the role of knowledge creation processes in innovation management. Moreover, future studies might gain additional insights by exploring other potential mediators such as organizational factors, other knowledge management processes, or the change of manager.

6.2. Future directions – contexts

Contextually, we drew our sample from new ventures in the manufacturing and services sectors and controlled for firm size, it would be interesting to investigate how KI influences CA in large and mature firms which are considered more resourceful than new ventures. For example, future studies could compare the results in large organizations such as multinationals operating in developing market economies. Moreover, developing countries tend to share some common characteristics such as institutional weakness compared to developed country settings (Adomako et al., 2020). However, there might be some contextual differences within developing countries. Although our study used data from Ghana, a growing entrepreneurial market in Africa, these findings might not be universally applicable to all developing country contexts. We therefore encourage future research to be devoted to a larger and more varied sample of entrepreneurial firms from both developed and developing countries.

6.3. Future directions – methodology

In this study, the self-reported and same source nature of our data could raise potential common method bias concerns. Thus, future research may make use of multiple respondents to capture the independent and dependent variables. For example, future research could collect data on the dependent variable using top managers (e.g., finance, HR, marketing, technology, and operations managers). Moreover, our paper could not collect data with a one-year time-lag between the dependent and independent variables. Besides our failure to manipulate variables or use randomly assigned techniques prevented us from making causal claims. Future research could address this limitation by adopting an experimental design or longitudinal approach with a three-year time-lag between the collection of data on the dependent and independent variables. Finally, as with survey-based research, the results from this study may be influenced by survival bias because it was not possible to collect data on firms that were no longer in operation.

References

- Adomako, S., Amankwah-Amoah, J., Danso, A., Danquah, J. K., Hussain, Z., & Khan, Z. (2019). R&D intensity, knowledge creation process and new product performance: the mediating role of international R&D teams. *Journal of Business Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.08.036>.
- Adomako, S., Frimpong, K., Danso, A., Amankwah-Amoah, J., Uddin, M., & Kesse, K. (2020). Home country institutional impediments and international expansion of developing country SMEs. *International Business Review*, 29(5), 101716.
- Agostini, L., Nosella, A., & Filippini, R. (2017). Ambidextrous organisation and knowledge exploration and exploitation: the mediating role of internal networking. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 14(1), 122-138.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. 1991. Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park: CA: Sage.
- Al-Atwi, A. A., Amankwah-Amoah, J., & Khan, Z. (2019). Micro-foundations of organizational design and sustainability: The mediating role of learning ambidexterity. *International Business Review*, 101656.
- Amankwah-Amoah, J. (2020). Talent management and global competition for top talent: A co-opetition-based perspective. *Thunderbird International Business Review*. 62, 343-352.
- Amankwah-Amoah, J., & Wang, X. (2019). Business failures around the world: Emerging trends and new research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 367-369.
- Amankwah-Amoah, J., Boso, N., & Antwi-Agyei, I. (2018). The effects of business failure experience on successive entrepreneurial engagements: An evolutionary phase model. *Group & Organization Management*, 43(4), 648-682.
- Amankwah-Amoah, J., Khan, Z., & Wood, G. (2020). COVID-19 and business failures: The paradoxes of experience, scale, and scope for theory and practice. *European Management Journal*.
- Amit, R., & Schoemaker, P. J. (1993). Strategic assets and organizational rent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(1), 33-46.
- Asaah, J. A., Yunfei, S., Wadei, K. A., & Nkrumah, K. F. A. (2020). Cultural orientations and product innovation in the Ghanaian banking sector. *Service Industries Journal*, 40(7-8), 518-541.
- Atuahene-Gima, K. (2005). Resolving the capability-rigidity paradox in new product innovation. *Journal of Marketing*, 69, pp. 61-83.

- Balboni, B., Bortoluzzi, G., Pugliese, R., & Tracogna, A. (2019). Business model evolution, contextual ambidexterity, and the growth performance of high-tech start-ups. *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 115-124.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Baron, R. A., & Tang, J. (2009). Entrepreneurs' social skills and new venture performance: Mediating mechanisms and cultural generality. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 282-306.
- Baron, R. A., & Tang, J. (2011). The role of entrepreneurs in firm-level innovation: Joint effects of positive affect, creativity, and environmental dynamism. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 49-60.
- Boxenbaum, E., & Rouleau, L. (2011). New knowledge products as bricolage: Metaphors and scripts in organizational theory. *Academy of Management Review* 36 (2): 272–96.
- Burgelman, R. A., & Sayles, L. R. (1988). *Inside corporate innovation*. Simon and Schuster.
- Cabrera-Suárez, K., De Saá-Pérez, P., & García-Almeida, D. (2001). The succession process from a resource-and knowledge-based view of the family firm. *Family Business Review*, 14(1), 37-48.
- Carmeli, A., & Halevi, M. Y. (2009). How top management team behavioral integration and behavioral complexity enable organizational ambidexterity: The moderating role of contextual ambidexterity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 207-218.
- Cassiman, B., & Veugelers, R. (2006). In search of complementarity in innovation strategy: Internal R&D and external knowledge acquisition. *Management Science*, 52(1): 68–82.
- Cepeda, G., & Vera, D. (2007). Dynamic capabilities and operational capabilities: A knowledge management perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(5), 426-437
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W., & Appleyard, M. M. (2007). Open innovation and strategy. *California Management Review*, 50(1), 57-76.
- Cimoli, M., G. Dosi, and J.E. Stiglitz (2009). *Industrial Policy and Development: The Political Economy of Capabilities Accumulation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Debrah, Y. A., & Ofori, G. (2006). Human resource development of professionals in an emerging economy: The case of the Tanzanian construction industry. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 440-463.
- De Luca, L. M., & Atuahene-Gima, K. (2007). Market knowledge dimensions and cross-functional collaboration: Examining the different routes to product innovation performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(1), 95-112.
- De Luca, L. M., Verona, G., & Vicari, S. (2010). Market orientation and R&D effectiveness in High-Technology firms: An empirical investigation in the biotechnology industry. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 27(3), 299-320.
- Duncan, R. B. (1976). 'The ambidextrous organization: designing dual structures for innovation'. In R. H. Kilmann, L. R. Pondy and D. P. Slevin (eds), *The Management of Organization Design*, Vol. 1, pp. 167–188. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they?. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Schoonhoven, C. B. (1990). Organizational growth: Linking founding team, strategy, environment, and growth among US semiconductor ventures, 1978-1988. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 504-529.
- Felin, T., & Hesterly, W. S. (2007). The knowledge-based view, nested heterogeneity, and new value creation: Philosophical considerations on the locus of knowledge. *Academy of management review*, 32(1), 195-218.
- Filippini, R., Güttel, W. H., & Nosella, A. (2012). Ambidexterity and the evolution of knowledge management initiatives. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(3), 317-324.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D., (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research* 18 (1), 39–50.
- Fu, L., Liao, S., Liu, Z., & Lu, F. (2020). An Investigation of Resource Allocation Mechanism for Exploration and Exploitation Under Limited Resource. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*.
- Germain, R., & Dröge, C. (1997). An empirical study of the impact of just-in-time task scope versus just-in-time workflow integration on organizational design. *Decision Sciences*, 28(3), 615–635.

- Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 209-226.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(1), 109–122.
- Grant, R. M. (2002). The knowledge-based view of the firm. *The Strategic Management Of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*, 17(2), 133-148.
- Greve, H. R. (2007). Exploration and exploitation in product innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16(5), 945-975.
- Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The interplay between exploration and exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 693-706.
- Haas, M. R. (2006). Acquiring and applying knowledge in transnational teams: The roles of cosmopolitans and locals. *Organization Science*, 17(3), 367-384.
- Hayes, A. F. 2013. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Jaaron, A. A., & Backhouse, C. J. (2018). Operationalisation of service innovation: a systems thinking approach. *The Service Industries Journal*, 38(9-10), 561-583.
- Jackson, S. E., DeNisi, A., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Managing knowledge for sustained competitive advantage: Designing strategies for effective human resource management* (Vol. 21). John Wiley & Sons.
- Jelinek, M. and C. B. Schoonhoven (1993). *The Innovation Marathon*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kang, S.-C. & Snell, S. A. (2009). ‘Intellectual capital architectures and ambidextrous learning: a framework for human resource management’, *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 65–92.
- Katila, R., 2002. New products search over time: past ideas in their prime? *Academy of Management Journal* 45 (5), 995–1010.
- Kearns, G. S., & Sabherwal, R. (2006). Strategic alignment between business and information technology: a knowledge-based view of behaviors, outcome, and consequences. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 23(3), 129-162.
- Kim, S. I., Shin, H., Shin, H., & Park, S. (2019). Organizational slack, corporate social responsibility, sustainability, and integrated reporting: Evidence from Korea. *Sustainability*, 11(16), 4445.
- Knockaert, M., Ucbasaran, D., Wright, M., & Clarysse, B. (2011). The relationship between knowledge transfer, top management team composition, and performance: The case of science-based entrepreneurial firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(4), 777-803.
- Koch, A. (2011). Firm-internal knowledge integration and the effects on innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(6), 984-996.
- Kotsemir, M., & Meissner, D. (2013). Conceptualizing the innovation process—trends and outlook. Higher School of Economics research paper no. *WP BPR*, 10.
- Kraaijenbrink, J. (2012). Integrating knowledge and knowledge processes: A critical incident study of product development projects. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 29(6), 1082-1096.
- Kumar, S., & Seth, A. (1998). The design of coordination and control mechanisms for managing joint venture–parent relationships. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(6), 579–599.
- Lecuona, J. R., & Reitzig, M. (2014). Knowledge worth having in ‘excess’: The value of tacit and firm-specific human resource slack. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(7), 954-973.
- Lee, K. (2013). ‘Capability Failure and Industrial Policy to Move beyond the Middle-Income Trap: From Trade-based to Technology-based Specialization’. In J. Lin and J. Stiglitz (eds), *Industrial Policy Revolution I*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Leonard, D., & Sensiper, S. (1998). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *California Management Review*, 40, 112-132
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1992). Core capabilities and core rigidities: A paradox in managing new product development. *Strategic Management Journal* 13:111–25
- Levin D, & Cross R. 2004. The strength of weak ties you can trust: the mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science* 50(11): 1477–1490.
- Lichtenthaler, U., & Lichtenthaler, E. (2009). A capability-based framework for open innovation: Complementing absorptive capacity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(8), 1315-1338.
- Lin, H. E., McDonough III, E. F., Yang, J., & Wang, C. (2017). Aligning knowledge assets for exploitation, exploration, and ambidexterity: a study of companies in high-tech parks in China. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 34(2), 122-140.

- Lindell, M. K. & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (1): 114–21.
- Luo, C., Kumar, S., Mallick, D. N., & Luo, B. (2019). Impacts of Exploration and Exploitation on Firm's Performance and the Moderating Effects of Slack: A Panel Data Analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 66(4), 613-620.
- Luo, Y., J. Sun, and L. S. Wang. 2011. Emerging economy copycats: Capability, environment, and strategy. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 25: 37–56.
- Mahoney, J. T., & Kor, Y. Y. (2015). Advancing the human capital perspective on value creation by joining capabilities and governance approaches. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29, 296–308.
- Malecki, E. J. (2011). Connecting local entrepreneurial ecosystems to global innovation networks: open innovation, double networks and knowledge integration. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 14(1), 36-59.
- Malerba, F., & McKelvey, M. (2018). Knowledge-intensive innovative entrepreneurship integrating Schumpeter, evolutionary economics, and innovation systems. *Small Business Economics*, 1-20.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization science*, 2(1), 71-87.
- Martin, S. L., & Javalgi, R. R. G. (2019). Explaining performance determinants: A knowledge based view of international new ventures. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 615-626.
- McGrath, R. G. (2001). 'Exploratory learning, innovative capacity, and managerial oversight', *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, pp. 118–131
- Meglio, O., King, D. R., & Risberg, A. (2015). Improving acquisition outcomes with contextual ambidexterity. *Human Resource Management*, 54(S1), s29-s43.
- Mellahi, K. & Wilkinson, A. (2010). A Study of the Association between Level of Slack Reduction Following Downsizing and Innovation Output. *Journal of Management Studies* 47(3), 483-508.
- Menon, T., & Pfeffer, J. (2003). Valuing internal vs. external knowledge: Explaining the preference for outsiders. *Management Science*, 49(4), 497-513.
- Mishina, Y., Pollock, T. G., & Porac, J. F. (2004). Are more resources always better for growth? Resource stickiness in market and product expansion. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(12), 1179-1197.
- Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1997). The impact of organizational memory on new product performance and creativity. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(1), 91-106.
- Moreira, M. F., Kuk, G., Guimaraes, T. D. A., & Albuquerque, P. H. M. (2020). The genealogy of service innovation: the research field tells its own story. *Service Industries Journal*, 40(15-16), 1064-1086.
- Naman, J. L., & Slevin, D. P. 1993. Entrepreneurship and the concept of fit: A model and empirical tests. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(2), 137-153.
- Neter, J. Kutner, M. H Nachtsheim, C. J. & Wasserman, W. (1996). *Applied linear statistical models*. Chicago: Irwin.
- Nickerson, J. A., & Zenger, T. R. (2004). A knowledge-based theory of the firm—The problem-solving perspective. *Organization science*, 15(6), 617-632.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14–37.
- Park, N. K., Mezias, J. M., Lee, J., & Han, J. H. (2014). Reverse knowledge diffusion: Competitive dynamics and the knowledge seeking behavior of Korean high-tech firms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 31(2), 355-375.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N.P., (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88, 879–903.
- Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 375-409.
- Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational ambidexterity: Balancing exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 685-695.
- Revilla, E., Rodriguez-Prado, B., & Cui, Z. (2016). A knowledge-based framework of innovation strategy: The differential effect of knowledge sources. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 63(4), 362-376.
- Reynolds, P., 2000. In: Katz, J. (Ed.), National panel study of U. S. business start-ups: background and methodology. In: *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence, and growth*, vol. 4. JAI Press, Stanford, CT, pp. 153–227

- Ricciardi, F., Zardini, A., & Rossignoli, C. (2016). Organizational dynamism and adaptive business model innovation: The triple paradox configuration. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5487-5493.
- Rink, F. and N. Ellemers (2007). 'Diversity as a basis for shared organizational identity: the norm congruity principle', *British Journal of Management*, 18, pp. S17–S27.
- Robson, P. J. A., C. K. Akuetteh, P. Westhead & M. Wright (2012) Innovative opportunity pursuit, human capital and business ownership experience in an emerging region: evidence from Ghana. *Small Business Economics*, 39, 603-625.
- Roller, D., Eck., O. & Dalakakis, S. (2004). Knowledge-based support of rapid product development. *Journal of Engineering Design* 15 (4): 367–88.
- Sabherwal, R., & Becerra-Fernandez, I. (2005). Integrating specific knowledge: insights from the Kennedy Space Center. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 52(3), 301-315.
- Salunke, S., Weerawardena, J., & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2019). The central role of knowledge integration capability in service innovation-based competitive strategy. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 76, 144-156.
- Scuotto, V., Del Giudice, M., Bresciani, S., & Meissner, D. (2017). Knowledge-driven preferences in informal inbound open innovation modes. An explorative view on small to medium enterprises. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 21(3), 640-655.
- Senbeto, D. L., & Hon, A. H. (2020). Market turbulence and service innovation in hospitality: examining the underlying mechanisms of employee and organizational resilience. *The Service Industries Journal*, 1-21.
- Simsek, Z., C. Heavey, J. F. Veiga , & D. Souder (2009). 'A typology for aligning organizational ambidexterity's conceptualizations, antecedents, and outcomes', *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 864–893
- Singh, S., Akbani, I., & Dhir, S. (2020). Service innovation implementation: a systematic review and research agenda. *The Service Industries Journal*, 40(7-8), 491-517.
- Smith, K.G., Collins, C.J., & Clark, K.D. (2005). Existing knowledge, knowledge creation capability, and the rate of new product introduction in high-technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal* 48 (2), 346–357.
- Stam, W. 2010. Industry event participation and network brokerage among entrepreneurial ventures. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(4), 625-653.
- Story, V. M., N. Boso & J. W. Cadogan (2015) The Form of Relationship between Firm-Level Product Innovativeness and New Product Performance in Developed and Emerging Markets. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32, 45-64.
- Subramaniam, M., & Youndt, M. A. (2005). The influence of intellectual capital on the types of innovative capabilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 450-463.
- Sung, S. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2018). Building knowledge stock and facilitating knowledge flow through human resource management practices toward firm innovation. *Human Resource Management*, 57(6), 1429-1442.
- Taylor, A., & Greve, H. R. (2006). Superman or the fantastic four? Knowledge combination and experience in innovative teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 723–740.
- Thompson, B., 2004. Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Understanding Concepts and Applications. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Tsai, K. H., & Hsu, T. T. (2014). Cross-Functional collaboration, competitive intensity, knowledge integration mechanisms, and new product performance: A mediated moderation model. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43(2), 293-303.
- Tsai, K. H., Liao, Y. C., & Hsu, T. T. (2015). Does the use of knowledge integration mechanisms enhance product innovativeness?. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 46, 214-223.
- Voss, G. B., Sirdeshmukh, D., & Voss, Z. G. (2008). The effects of slack resources and environmental threat on product exploration and exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(1), 147-164.
- Wang, C. L., & Rafiq, M. (2014). Ambidextrous Organizational Culture, Contextual Ambidexterity, and New Product Innovation: A Comparative Study of UK and Chinese High-tech Firms. *British Journal of Management*, 25(1), 58-76.
- Wouters, M., & Roijmans, D. (2011). Using prototypes to induce experimentation and knowledge integration in the development of enabling accounting information. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 28(2), 708-736.
- Wu, Y., & Wu, S. (2016). Managing ambidexterity in creative industries: A survey. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(7), 2388-2396.

- Zahra, S. A., Nielsen, A. P., & Bogner, W. C. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship, knowledge, and competence development. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 23(3), 169-189.
- Zahra, S.A., Ireland, R.D., and Hitt, M.A. (2000). International Expansion by New Venture Firms: International Diversity, Mode of Market Entry, Technological Learning, and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(5):925–50.
- Zhang, H., Amankwah- Amoah, J., & Beaverstock, J. (2019). Toward a construct of dynamic capabilities malfunction: Insights from failed Chinese entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Research*, 98, 415-429.
- Zhou, K. Z., & Li, C. B. (2012). How knowledge affects radical innovation: Knowledge base, market knowledge acquisition, and internal knowledge sharing. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(9), 1090-1102.

Table 1. Results of confirmatory factor analysis

	χ^2/df	CFI	NNFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Recommended values	≤ 3	≥ 0.9	≥ 0.9	≤ 0.08	≤ 0.08
Full model CFA	1.34***	0.96	0.96	0.05	0.06
One factor model CFA	2.45***	0.67	0.66	0.09	0.14

*** $p < 0.01$. CFI=comparative fit index; NNFI=non-normed fit index; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; SRMR= standard root mean-square residual

Table 2: Descriptive statistics and correlations (square root of AVE in the diagonal)

	Variables	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Firm size (employees)	5.25	1.52	--												
2.	Firm age (years)	3.54	0.80	-0.05	--											
3.	Industry	0.76	0.42	0.09	-0.04	--										
4.	Sales revenues ^a	5.84	1.58	0.11	-0.09	0.18**	--									
5.	Entrepreneur's age	48.14	9.47	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.00	--								
6.	Gender	0.73	0.42	0.11	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.01	--							
7.	Previous experience	4.58	1.85	0.09	0.07	0.12	0.19**	0.27**	0.04	(0.83)						
8.	Knowledge integration	4.02	1.35	0.15*	0.07	-0.05	0.25**	0.19*	0.03	0.28**	(0.81)					
9.	Human resource slack ^b	14.22	21.87	0.16*	0.11	-0.08	0.10	0.19**	0.05	0.20**	0.30**	--				
10.	Exploration	4.81	1.13	-0.05	-0.09	0.17**	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.14*	0.30**	0.15*	(0.80)			
11.	Exploitation	4.58	.84	0.02	0.05	0.15	0.11	0.07	0.05	0.12	0.21**	0.12	0.24**	(0.82)		
12.	# of innovations	1.42	1.89	0.15*	-0.11	0.27**	0.15*	0.13*	0.09	0.27**	0.19**	0.39**	0.35**	0.11	--	
13.	Radicalness of innovations	4.55	1.11	0.14*	-0.15*	0.23**	0.12	0.09	-0.19**	0.13*	0.22**	0.25**	0.26**	0.43**	0.29**	(0.91)

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01 (2-tailed test); S.D. = Standard Deviation. ^a Natural logarithm. ^b The mean value for this construct can be interpreted as a percentage

Table 3: Regression Results

	Models 1–4: Contextual Ambidexterity				Models 5–7: Number of innovations			Model 8-10: Radicalness of Innovation		
<i>Control variables</i>	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10
Firm size (employees)	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.05
Firm age	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.09	-0.09	-0.08
Industry dummy	0.17**	0.17**	0.18**	0.17**	0.20**	0.21**	0.22**	0.20**	0.20**	0.18**
Sales revenues ^a	0.14*	0.13	0.14*	0.14**	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.12	0.10
Entrepreneur's age	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.04
Gender	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.05	0.06	-0.18**	-0.19**	-0.16**
Previous experience	0.14*	0.14*	0.14*	0.14*	0.23**	0.24**	0.24**	0.14	0.12	0.11
<i>Independent variable</i>										
Knowledge integration (KI)		0.23**	0.22**	0.14*		0.26**	0.03		0.25**	0.04
<i>Moderator</i>										
Human resource slack (HRS) ^b			0.14*	0.12		0.28**	0.28**		0.28**	0.29**
<i>Interaction</i>										
KI * HRS				0.56**						
<i>Mediator</i>										
Contextual ambidexterity							0.27**			0.29**
<i>Model fit statistics</i>										
F	1.59	3.78**	5.10**	9.16**	3.23**	4.19**	5.71**	3.18**	4.96**	5.67**
R ²	0.11	0.16	0.21	0.29	0.13	0.18	0.24	0.14	0.18	0.23
ΔR ²	-	0.05	0.05	0.08	-	0.05	0.06	-	0.04	0.05
Largest VIF	1.11	2.56	3.19	3.38	1.09	1.64	3.16	1.99	1.07	2.08

N = 245; ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.; standardized coefficients are shown. ^a Logarithm transformation of original values. ^b The mean value for this construct can be interpreted as a percentage.

Table 4a. Moderated mediation results for number of innovations across levels of financial slack

Moderator	Number of innovations				
	Level	Conditional indirect effect	SE	LL 95% CI	UL 95% CI
Human resource slack	Low (-1.03)	0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.03
	High (1.03)	0.09	0.04	0.05	0.14

Results are based on 1000 bootstrap sample

Table 4b. Moderated mediation results for radicalness of innovation across levels of financial slack

Moderator	Radicalness of innovation				
	Level	Conditional indirect effect	SE	LL 95% CI	UL 95% CI
Human resource slack	Low (-0.89)	0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.05
	High (0.89)	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.19

Results are based on 1000 bootstrap sample




Figure 1: Interaction effect of KI with HR slack on CA