

Ljerka Tomljenović

Polytechnic of Rijeka
Croatia
E-mail: ljerka.tomljenovic@veleri.hr

Anita Stilin

Polytechnic of Rijeka
Croatia
E-mail: anita.stilin@veleri.hr

**RESEARCH OF AMBIDEXTROUS ORIENTATION IN
CROATIAN SMEs**

Preliminary communication

UDK: 005.21:334.71

JEL classification: D23, L25

Abstract

Organizational balance between continuity of operative business activities and changes aimed at future success is often emphasized as a precondition for long-term organizational success. In this context, ambidexterity in firms is studied. It should enable the simultaneous focus on operational processes and active exploration of new opportunities in the process of ensuring long-term success. Due to limited resources of SMEs the question is whether these companies have to decide between operational efficiency and building new business opportunities. Crucial for the implementation of ambidexterity in SMEs is the entrepreneur's ambidextrous orientation which should indicate the flexibility of entrepreneur in reconciling different approaches in business. The assumption is that entrepreneurs who demonstrate ambidextrous orientation induce, encourage, reward and promote activities beyond existing operational processes in order to seek possibilities for exploration and exploitation of new business opportunities in the future. The purpose of this paper is to examine specificities of ambidextrous orientation in Croatian SMEs. Ambidextrous orientation, the level of strategic ambidexterity and the relationship between them will be examined on a sample of 190 Croatian SMEs. Furthermore, the relationship between ambidextrous orientation and performance of the SMEs will be studied assuming that successful companies have a higher level of ambidextrous orientation. The aim is to further clarify the features of ambidextrous orientation in SMEs and how it affects their current success and future potential.

Keywords: Croatian SMEs, ambidextrous orientation, strategic ambidexterity

1. INTRODUCTION

In its original meaning, the ambidexterity refers to the ability to use both hands with equal dexterity. In the organizational context, ambidexterity is the ability of an organization to simultaneously exploit its current potential and to explore the future opportunities. Research of organizational ambidexterity assumes that that successful businesses are ambidextrous, that is, coordinated and efficient in its management of daily business needs and at the same time adaptive to changes from the environment (Raisch, Birkinshaw, 2008). It is based, on the one hand, on the exploitation of existing knowledge in terms of performing everyday tasks efficiently and achieving short-term goals, and on the other hand on the exploring new, innovative opportunities. The two most widespread meanings of organizational ambidexterity (Gibson, Birkinshaw, 2004) are structural ambidexterity and contextual ambidexterity. Structural ambidexterity mostly refers to the organizational structure of the firm, and contextual ambidexterity is focused on the behaviour of human resources in the organization. Research of the structural aspect of organizational ambidexterity is more appropriate in large firms due to the possibility to separate exploratory and exploitative processes both organizationally and strategically. While adapting for tomorrow requires change, flexibility and creativity, profits for today require order, control and stability (Volberda and Lewin, 2003).

The aim of this research is to examine the specificity of organizational ambidexterity in SMEs in the Republic of Croatia. The contextual and strategic aspect of the ambidexterity will be investigated, while the structural ambidexterity will be omitted. Furthermore, the impact of the ambidexterity on the performance of the firms will be studied.

Below this paper, the basic theoretical assumptions will be summarized and the results of the empirical research presented.

2. THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

The concept of ambidexterity was first outlined by Duncan (1967) and March (1991) in the field of organizational theory. Traditionally it was considered that firms tend to concentrate either on capabilities for exploitation or exploration (March 1991, cited in Wulf, 2010). Ambidexterity represents the approach by which organizations need to be effective in managing their today's business demands and at the same time develop flexibility in adapting to new challenges and opportunities in the environment (Gibson, Birkinshaw, 2004).

In organizational framework, it is important to provide balance of organizational characteristics that allow for simultaneous flexibility and efficiency (Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008, p. 380). In this context, ambidexterity is the ability of firms to manage complex organizational relations that enable short-term efficiency and long-term innovation (Tushman and O'Reilly, 1996). Research on organizational ambidexterity often intertwines various areas: organizational learning, technological innovations (incremental vs. radical), organizational

adaptation (balance between continuity and change), strategic management (planned vs. autonomous strategic processes) and organizational design (efficiency vs. flexibility) (Wulf et al., 2010). Ambidexterity studies show that organizations that are able to achieve a high-level balance between exploitation and exploration will be more successful than others (He and Wong, 2004; Lubatkin et al., 2006.; Wulf et al., 2010). Having focus just on one aspect can jeopardize the firm's performance. For example, emphasis on short-term performance can result in obsolescence of organizational competences and inability of taking advantage of new business opportunities. Excessive focus on long-term success can cause a constant examination of organizational abilities and skills, which can lead to exorbitant and unnecessary changes and resource wastage. Obviously, achieving the right balance is a very complex challenge and has been referred to as "central paradox of administration" (Thompson, 1967, cited in Wulf, 2010). Consequently, ambidextrous organisations are complex organizations composed of multiple internally inconsistent architectures that are collectively capable of operating simultaneously for short-term efficiency as well as long-term innovation (O Reilly and Tushman, 2004; Tushman and O Reilly, 1996).

There are many papers on ambidextrous organizations and their related ability to manage opposites between continuity and change (e.g. Raisch, Birkinshaw, 2008; He, Wong, 2004; Lubatkin et al., 2006). However, a small number of papers is concerned with the ambidexterity of SMEs, and "A Small Business is not a Little Big Business" (Welsh, White, 1981), which unfolds a new stream of research in this sector.

Given the evident resource constraints in SMEs, there are some opinions that these firms must decide between operational efficiency and long-term success. Small businesses do not have the potential of a large firm to structurally and organizationally separate activities exclusively aimed at building new opportunities for long-term success in a special business unit. For that reason, the role of a manager and manager's team in stimulating ambidexterity is crucial to SMEs (Lubatkin et al., 2006, p. 647). Their managers concurrently practice both entrepreneurial and operational roles. From the research perspective, the presence of organizational ambidexterity in SMEs should be observed in the context of the entrepreneur's ambidextrous orientation or contextual ambidexterity. Entrepreneurs who demonstrate ambidextrous orientation initiate, encourage, reward and promote activities beyond existing, operational processes in order to pursue possibilities for exploration and exploitation of new business opportunities in the future. This is consistent with the previously mentioned area of contextual ambidexterity. In this research, contextual ambidexterity will be measured as an entrepreneur's individual orientation which should indicate the flexibility of entrepreneur to reconcile different approaches to managing business: directing daily, operational efficiency and simultaneous exploration of new opportunities and perceiving potential opportunities (Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004.; adapted from Young, 2009, p. 263).

In addition to contextual ambidexterity, this research also includes the aspect of strategic ambidexterity. The area of strategic management in

SMEs differs in relation to large firms and there is still no uniform theoretical framework which would explain the specificity of SMEs' strategic behaviour. However, research has shown that SMEs with higher levels of strategic awareness have significantly higher longevity and its related performance. Strategic ambidexterity in this paper is examined as a variety of strategic activities within the existing and new strategic processes. According to Lubatkin et al. (2006, 649) these processes have similar content in small and large firms, but the obstacles encountered by SMEs are different.

Although, there are studies that have tested the effect of organizational ambidexterity on performance of the SMEs (e.g. Gibson, Birkinshaw, 2004; He, Wong, 2004), this correlation is not yet entirely theoretically clarified nor consistently empirically confirmed. This research will determine the joint and individual impact of contextual and strategic ambidexterity on the success of the surveyed SMEs.

Following, the results of the empirical research conducted among 190 SMEs in Croatia will be presented.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

The purpose of this research is to identify the key features of organizational ambidexterity in the surveyed SMEs in the Republic of Croatia, and the correlation and impact of organizational ambidexterity on the performance of the firms. The method used in the research was a survey conducted as on-line questionnaire. The owners/entrepreneurs were contacted by e-mail with the request to fill in questionnaire accessed by the provided hyperlink. The database of the Financial Agency (FINA) was used for gathering information about the SMEs. It contained details of industry, number of employees, company size and headquarters. A request for participation in the study was sent at 1500 e-mail addresses selected by random sampling method. The rate of return was 11.5%, and the final research sample consisted of 190 enterprises, specifically 156 small- and 34 middle-sized enterprises. The research population included established small- and medium-sized enterprises (with 10 and more employees, and working for at least 7 years). Micro enterprises (companies with fewer than 10 employees) were excluded from the research population. In order to determine the potential of the surveyed firms, the questionnaire offered an option for the respondents to designate their firm as an innovative, high-tech or fast-growing enterprise. A total number of 46 (25%) firms were classified into one or more of the aforementioned categories.

The study of organizational ambidexterity was conducted by examining two groups of statements. The first group refers to the research of the entrepreneur's ambidextrous orientation (contextual ambidexterity) and it included 5 statements (adapted from Young, 2009). The second group of statements pertains to the research of strategic ambidexterity, of which the first 6 statements investigated the efficiency of existing strategic processes, while the

other 6 statements explored the innovative potential of future strategic activities (Lubatkin et al., 2006). In further analysis, *strategic ambidexterity* (based on Wulf et al., 2010) will be used as an integrated construct.

The performance measures were depicted by statements in two categories. The entrepreneur's perception of the firm's success was measured by 3 statements describing its satisfaction (Davidsson, 1991; Hall, 1994; 1995; Young, 2009). Business performance measures comprised of 6 statements describing the level of various business performance areas in the surveyed firms (adapted from Gupta, Govindarajan, 1984; Young, 2009).

The statements were rated on a scale of 5 grades, with 1 representing the lowest rating (total disagreement with the statement), and 5 was the highest rating (total agreement with the statement).

The results of descriptive statistics - Organizational ambidexterity and performance of the surveyed firms

A descriptive analysis of the explored attitudes on contextual and strategic ambidexterity in SMEs can be found in the table below:

Table 1

Descriptive analysis – contextual and strategic ambidexterity in SMEs

Variables (statements)	Mean	Mod	St. deviation	Coeff. of skewness
<i>CONTEXTUAL AMBIDEXTERITY</i>	3.52			
CA1 Our management sometimes cause people to waste resources on unproductive activities.	2.82	2	1.210	.088
CA2 Our people often end up working at cross-purposes because they are given conflicting objectives.	3.15	4	1.253	-.145
CA3 Our firm encourages its people to challenge traditions and current practises.	3.97	4	.981	-.923
CA4 Management is flexible enough to allow the firm to respond to changes in markets.	3.84	4	1.064	-.841
CA5 If there is a shift in our business priorities, the firm can evolve rapidly to meet the change.	3.86	4	1.009	-.752
<i>STRATEGIC AMBIDEXTERITY</i>	3.68			
SA1 Commits to improve quality and lower cost	3.50	3	.996	-.032
SA2 Continuously improves the reliability of its products and services	3.99	4	.858	-.804
SA3 Increases the levels of automation in its operations	3.38	3	1.081	-.307
SA4 Constantly surveys existing customers' satisfaction	4.11	4	.838	-.975
SA5 Fine-tunes what it offers to keep its current customers satisfied	4.21	4	.813	-1.110

SA6 Penetrates more deeply into its existing customer base	4.09	4	.947	-1.125
SA7 Looks for novel technological ideas by thinking „outside the box“	3.77	4	1.106	-.679
SA8 Bases its success on its ability to explore new technologies.	3.66	5	1.214	-.589
SA9 Creates products or services that are innovative to the firm	3.59	4	1.230	-.571
SA10 Looks for creative way to satisfy its customers' needs	3.61	4	1.048	-.631
SA11 Aggressively ventures into new market segments	2.83	3	1.142	.249
SA12 Actively targets new customers groups	3.47	4	1.171	-.355

Source: research

Reliability test was also performed, and Cronbach's alpha is 0.682 for *contextual ambidexterity* and 0.859 for *strategic ambidexterity*, which indicates the acceptable and high reliability of the applied instrument.

Contextual ambidexterity is rated relatively high with considerably higher ratings of statements that measure orientation to new solutions and flexibility (statements CA3, CA4, CA5). In the scope of *strategic ambidexterity*, the highest average ratings were given to statements related to the firm's orientation towards adjusting the offerings for existing customers (SA5; 4.21), increasing the satisfaction of existing customers (SA4; 4.11) and focusing on expansion of the customer base (SA6; 4.09). The lowest ratings received statements that describe the firm's orientation towards aggressive entry into new market segments (SA11; 2.83), focus on new customer groups (SA12; 3.47) and focus on cost-cutting (SA1; 3.50).

Below, the average ratings of the investigated variables of organizational ambidexterity will be compared with the ratings awarded by the firms in the category with the *potential* (high-technology, fast-growing, highly innovative) and compared to other firms. Statistical significance of the difference in ratings will be provided.

Table 2

T-test for independent samples (firms with *potential* and other firms)

Variables (statements)	All firms in the sample (Median)	Firms with potential (Median)	Other firms (Median)	t-test	Sig (2-tailed)
CONTEXTUAL AMBIDEXTERITY	3.53	3.77	3.45	2.597	.010
CA1 Our management sometimes cause people to waste resources on unproductive activities.	2.82	2.87	2.80	.346	.730
CA2 Our people often end up working at cross-purposes because they are given conflicting objectives.	3.15	3.09	3.17	.408	.684
CA3 Our firm encourages its people to challenge traditions and current practises.	3.97	4.35	3.85	3.081	.002
CA4 Management is flexible enough to allow the firm to respond to changes in markets.	3.84	4.30	3.69	4.557	.000
CA5 If there is a shift in our business priorities. the firm can evolve rapidly to meet the change.	3.86	4.22	3.75	3.289	.001
STRATEGIC AMBIDEXTERITY	3.68	4.00	3.58	3.541	.001
SA1 Commits to improve quality and lower cost	3.50	3.54	3.49	.339	.735
SA2 Continuously improves the reliability of its products and services	3.99	4.22	3.92	2.040	.043
SA3 Increases the levels of automation in its operations	3.38	3.74	3.27	2.932	.004
SA4 Constantly surveys existing customers' satisfaction	4.11	4.24	4.07	1.197	.233
SA5 Fine-tunes what it offers to keep its current customers satisfied	4.21	4.28	4.18	.740	.460
SA6 Penetrates more deeply into its existing customer base	4.09	4.26	4.03	1.414	.159
SA7 Looks for novel technological ideas by thinking „outside the box“	3.77	4.43	3.56	5.907	.000
SA8 Bases its success on its ability to explore new technologies.	3.66	4.37	3.43	5.527	.000
SA9 Creates products or services that are innovative to the firm	3.59	4.35	3.35	6.072	.000
SA10 Looks for creative way to satisfy its customers' needs	3.61	3.91	3.51	2.315	.022
SA11 Aggressively ventures into new market segments	2.83	2.98	2.78	1.000	.318
SA12 Actively targets new customers groups	3.47	3.67	3.41	1.334	.184

Source: research.

Contextual ambidexterity in firms with the *potential* for the last three statements (CA3, CA4 and CA5) that describe the entrepreneur's orientation towards encouraging new solutions by employees, flexibility of the management team for change and flexibility of the firm was rated higher statistically significant. Concerning strategic ambidexterity, firms with *potential* have given higher grade to all statements. The statistical significance of higher ratings is confirmed for statements describing the focus of the firm with *potential* on the steadily increase of reliability of its products and services (SA2), increase level of automation of operational process (SA3) and focus on new technology solutions and overall new technology (SA7 and SA8) and focus on promoting creativity and innovation (SA9 and SA10).

The average ratings of composite variables of contextual and strategic ambidexterity display statistically significant higher ratings of firms with *potential*. This indicates their higher level of organizational ambidexterity.

In continuation, the analysis of performance was conducted in the surveyed firms. During the formulation of the questionnaire the performance measures were divided into two groups: entrepreneurial performance (EP) and business performance (PRF). Cronbach's alpha of entrepreneurial performance measures in the surveyed firms is 0.705 and shows a high reliability of measurement, while business performance measures scored 0.914 and represent a very high reliability of measurement scale.

The average value of entrepreneurial performance demonstrates that entrepreneurs or responsible individual in the surveyed firms evaluate customer satisfaction (EP1) with the highest score (4.10), followed by employee satisfaction (EP2, 3.60), and the lowest grade was given to the satisfaction of the owner's financial performance (EP3, 3.07). Business performance trends in all segments were rated slightly above the 3, which marked the stagnation of business performance over the past two years. This depicts a slight growth in all aspects of business over the past period.

The comparison of average performance ratings in firms with *potential* in relation to other firms demonstrates that customer satisfaction (EP1) and employee satisfaction (EP2) are significantly higher rated for firms with *potential*, while owner satisfaction (EP3) is rated higher, but without evidence of statistically significant difference. All business performance indicators are significantly higher rated in firms with *potential* and display slight growth in the past period. The evaluation of business performance in other firms stagnates with very small deviations from the average rating. The level of achievement of the strategic goals (SG1) in firms with *potential* is also evaluated significantly higher.

Table 3

Descriptive analysis of entrepreneurial and business performance and t-test for independent samples (firms with *potential* and other firms)

Varijable (tvrđnje)	All firms in the sample (Mean)	Firms with <i>potential</i> (Mean)	Other firms (Mean)	t-test	Sig (2-tailed)
<i>Entrepreneurial performance</i>					
EP1 Our firm is achieving a high level of customer satisfaction.	4.10	4.37	4.01	2.651	.009
EP2 Our firm is achieving a high level of employee satisfaction.	3.60	3.85	3.52	2.563	.012
EP3 The financial stakeholders of our firm are very satisfied.	3.07	3.33	2.99	1.771	.078
<i>Business performance</i>					
PRF1 Monthly cash flow	3.04	3.48	2.90	3.025	.003
PRF2 Gross profit margin	3.11	3.63	2.94	3.410	.001
PRF3 Total sales revenue	3.31	3.87	3.13	3.803	.000
PRF4 Number of fulltime staff changing	3.22	3.74	3.06	4.298	.000
PRF5 Change in market share of your firm	3.15	3.72	2.97	5.232	.000
PRF6 Sales from repeat customers	3.29	3.74	3.15	3.768	.000
<i>Strategic goals</i>					
SG1 Our strategic goals are achieved in accordance with our plans and expectations.	3.26	3.61	3.15	2.785	.006

Source: research.

In conclusion, the results of the descriptive statistics indicate that there is a relatively high level of organizational ambidexterity in the surveyed SMEs, with somewhat significantly higher ratings of strategic than contextual *ambidexterity*. In firms with *potential*, both measured aspects of organizational *ambidexterity* are significantly higher rated in comparison to other firms. The analysis of performance and the level of achievement of the strategic goals suggest that in firms with *potential* all measured aspects of performance are significantly higher assessed.

Results of correlation and regression analysis

Correlation can be described as compliance in the variation of the value of two (or more) variables. It designates the correlation between variables. The following table shows the correlation between contextual and strategic ambidexterity with entrepreneurial and business performance measures and

with the level of achievement of strategic goals. The correlation of contextual ambidexterity with the achieved strategic goals ($r = 0.410$, $p = 0.000$) and with entrepreneurial performance measures ($r = 0.530$, $p = 0.000$) is significant, but with business performance measures there is a weak correlation ($r = 0.250$, $p = 0.000$).

The correlation between the strategic ambidexterity and the achieved strategic goals ($r = 0.435$, $p = 0,000$) and entrepreneurial performance ($r = 0.468$, $p = 0,000$) is significant, and with business performance there is also weak correlation ($r = 0.246$, $p = 0.000$).

Table 4

Correlation between explored variables

	CA	SA	EP	PRF	SG
Contextual ambidexterity	1	.373**	.530**	.250**	.410**
Strategic ambidexterity	.373**	1	.468**	.246**	.435**
Entrepreneurial performance	.530**	.468**	1	.435**	.544**
Business performance	.250**	.246**	.435**	1	.479**
Strategic goals	.410**	.435**	.544**	.479**	1

**significance level $p=0.000$

Source: research.

It can be concluded that there is a correlation between organizational ambidexterity and business success in the surveyed SMEs. The results of the regression analysis will be summarized below with the aim of determining the effect of organizational ambidexterity on the business success of the investigated firms.

Results of the three regression analysis are summarized in the table 5. In all models, prediction variables are contextual and strategic ambidexterity, and dependent variables are in the first model the entrepreneurial performance variables, in the second model business performance, and in the third model they are representing strategic goals.

The coefficient of determination in Model 1, where the impact of strategic and organizational ambidexterity on entrepreneurial performance measures ($R^2 = 0.366$) was tested, indicates that variables in the model share 36.6% of common factors, i.e. 36.6% of the variance (information) of entrepreneurial performance measures can be explained by the variables of contextual and strategic ambidexterity. Coefficient of determination in Model 2, where the impact of strategic and organizational ambidexterity on business performance measures ($R^2 = 0.090$) has been tested, suggests that variables in the model share 9% of common factors, i.e. 9% of the variance (information) of business performance measures can be explained by the variables of contextual

and strategic ambidexterity. The coefficient of determination in Model 3, where the impact of strategic and organizational ambidexterity on strategic objectives ($R^2 = 0.261$) was tested indicates that variables in the model share 26.1% of common factors, i.e. 26.1% of variance (information) of strategic goals can be explained by variables of contextual and strategic ambidexterity. Beta coefficients do not point to a significant difference between the impacts of two investigated aspects of organizational ambidexterity. In Model 1 contextual ambidexterity ($\beta = 0.433$) has somewhat greater impact compared to strategic ambidexterity ($\beta = 0.335$). Model 3 demonstrates slightly greater impact of strategic ambidexterity ($\beta = 0.451$) in comparison to contextual ambidexterity ($\beta = 0.391$). These differences can be explained by the fact that contextual ambidexterity represents the entrepreneur's individual ambidextrous orientation and thus significantly influences its satisfaction with the business success. Strategic ambidexterity has, as expected, shown greater impact on the achievement of strategic goals.

Table 5

Summary of the results of the regression analysis

Model	R	R ² Square	Adjuster R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.605	0.366	0.359	0.614	2.07
2	0.300	0.090	0.080	0.976	1.899
3	0.510	0.261	0.253	0.850	1.938
1. Predictors: (constant), SA i CA; Dependent Variable: PPC					
2. Predictors: (constant), SA i CA; Dependent Variable: PRF					
3. Predictors: (constant), SA i CA; Dependent Variable: SP					

Source: research.

The success of prediction using regression model was tested by analysis of variance. It was found that the results of all models are statistically significant.

The conclusion can be formulated on the basis of presented results that confirm the assumed link between organizational ambidexterity and the performance of the investigated SMEs. The results of regression analysis show that organizational ambidexterity has a significant impact on entrepreneurial performance measures and the achievement of the strategic goals of the investigated SMEs. The impact on business performance measures is statistically significant, but small. These findings underline the importance of the ambidextrous approach in the sector of small- and medium-sized enterprises. Contextual ambidexterity emphasizes the need for entrepreneur's orientation towards operational efficiency and the development of future potential in parallel. Strategic ambidexterity accentuates the need to use a variety of

strategic choices within current and future strategic activities. It is apparent that ambidexterity is one of the important factors of SMEs' success. But, it can not be applied in SMEs structurally and organizationally by separating exploitative and exploration processes. In SMEs entrepreneur develops an ambidextrous context by undertaking operations efficiently and simultaneously thinking of strategic development. Employees adopt this way of thinking and working. SMEs can thus overcome some of its key weaknesses, namely resource constraints and the development of long-term strategic focus.

4. CONCLUSION

The research area of SMEs' performance factors is always current and yet not sufficiently conceptually encompassed field. One of the factors that could help SMEs increase their chances of success is ambidexterity. The theoretical part of this paper attempted to clarify the notion of ambidexterity in the context of organizational theory and specificity in the sector of small- and medium-sized enterprises. Ambidexterity generally represents the firm's ability to simultaneously engage in its operational and developmental processes with success. Unlike large firms, small businesses are not able to organizationally separate developmental processes. The entrepreneur's ambidextrous orientation is a key factor in the development of ambidexterity in SMEs. This paper also includes the aspect of strategic ambidexterity because of the assumption that SMEs with more pronounced strategic development potential are more successful.

Empirical part of this paper contains the analysis of the study conducted in 190 Croatian SMEs. Descriptive analysis suggests a relatively high level of organizational ambidexterity in the researched SMEs, with strategic ambidexterity more pronounced than contextual. Statements pertaining to the development of existing business activities in relation to the development of new business have been rated higher. In the firms with *potential (fast-growing, high-tech and innovative SMEs)*, organizational ambidexterity, as well as organizational performance and the level of achievement of strategic goals are evaluated with higher grades significantly. The correlation analysis results show a significant correlation between the variables of organizational ambidexterity and entrepreneurial performance measured by the entrepreneur's satisfaction and the level of achievement of strategic goals. Relationship with business performance measures is statistically significant, but small. Regression analysis has shown significant influence of organizational ambidexterity on the performance of the researched SMEs. This confirms the importance of ambidexterity as one of the factors of SMEs' success.

Future research streams should focus on conducting high-quality, in-depth studies using a case study method that would further clarify the specificity of the ambidextrous processes in SMEs.

REFERENCES

Birkinshaw, J., Gibson, C. (2004). Building Ambidexterity Into an Organization, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, pp. 47-55.

Davidsson, P. (1991). Continued entrepreneurship: ability, need, and opportunity as determinants of small firm growth. *Journal of Business Venturing* 6 (6), pp. 405-429.

Duncan, R. (1976). *The ambidextrous organization: Designing Dual Structures for Innovation*, The management Organizational Desing, New York, North Holland, pp. 167-188.

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

He, Z., Wong, P. (2004). Exploration vs. Exploitation; An empirical test of the ambidexterity hypothesis, *Organization Science*, 15 (4), pp. 481-494.

Lubatkin et al. (2006). Ambidexterity and Performance in Small-to Medium-Sized Firms: The Pivotal Role of Top Management Team Behavioral Integration, *Journal of Management*, 32 (5), pp. 646-672.

O'Reilly. C.A., Tushman, M. L. (2004). The Ambidextrous Organization, *Harvard Business Review*, 82(4), str. 74-81.

Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational Ambidexterity: Antecedents, Outcomes and Moderators, *Jornal of Management*, 34 (3), Sage publications, pp. 375-409.

Tushman, M. L., O'Reilly. C.A (1996). Ambidextrous Organizations: Managing Evolutionary and Revolutionary Change, *California Management Review*, 38 (4), pp. 8-29.

Volberda, H. W. and Lewin, A. Y. (2003). Co-evolutionary Dynamics Within and Between Firms: From Evolution to Co-evolution. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40: pp. 2111–2136.

Welsh, J. A., White, J. F. (1981). A Small Business Is Not a Little Big Business, *Harvard Busines Review*.

Wulf et al. (2010). Ambidexterity and the Concept of Fit in Strategic Management – Which Better Predicts Success, Leipzig Graduate School of Management, *HHL Working Paper No, 89*.

Young, I. S. (2009). *The Relationship between Organizational Fitness and Business Performance: Specific Evidence for SMEs*, Doctoral Thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Faculty of Design and Creative Technologies.