Migration Letters

Volume: 20, No: 9, pp. 129-141

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)

www.migrationletters.com

AI-Enhanced Innovation Ambidexterity: The Role of IC, DC, and Innovation Orientation in the Pharmaceutical Industry

Zeanab Abdullah Ahmed Gameel[1], Amina Elshamly[2]

Abstract

Dynamic challenges and opportunities mark the global pharmaceutical industry, necessitating firms to effectively balance innovation ambidexterity—simultaneously exploring new opportunities while exploiting existing resources. This study investigates the complex interplay of Intellectual Capital (IC), Dynamic Capabilities (DC), and innovation orientation (IO) in driving innovation ambidexterity in the Egyptian pharmaceutical industry. A quantitative methodology was utilised, collecting data via a questionnaire survey administered to experts working in the pharmaceutical industry. The study generated and evaluated hypotheses to investigate the links between IC, DC, innovation ambidexterity, and the moderating effect of IO. The findings reveal that IC significantly influences innovation ambidexterity, highlighting the critical role of knowledge resources. DC mediate the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity, emphasising the importance of a firm's capacity to sense and seize opportunities.

Furthermore, IO moderates the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity, showcasing the contextual relevance of firms' innovation focus. This study contributes to our understanding of innovation ambidexterity in the pharmaceutical industry and underscores the importance of IC in fostering this capability. Firms are encouraged to invest in IC and cultivate DC to successfully navigate the evolving pharmaceutical landscape. The moderating effect of IO suggests the need for tailored strategies based on firms' specific contexts. The implications of this research extend to organisations striving to achieve innovation ambidexterity in dynamic industries.

Keywords: *intellectual capital, dynamic capabilities, innovation, pharmaceutical industry, Artificial Intelligence.*

Introduction

In the contemporary global context, businesses and industries are navigating a competitive environment shaped by rapid globalisation and technological advancements. These dynamic forces drive companies to continually innovate and introduce novel products and services, seeking to maintain their competitive edge (Jahanger et al., 2022). Notably, prior research underscores the pivotal role of firm competencies in the pursuit of

[1] Department of Marketing and Management College of Business Administration in Ar Rass, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia, email: Za.jameel@qu.edu.sa

[2] Department of Management, College of Business Administration- Yanbu at Taibah University, Saudi Arabia, email: ashamly@taibahu.edu.sa

innovation, with a focus on the duality of exploration and exploitation (Ayuso et al., 2011; Cai et al., 2020; Festa et al., 2020; Lin & Chen, 2018; O'Cass et al., 2014; Siguaw et al., 2006; Sun et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2022). The imperative of balancing these two dimensions in innovation is well-documented (Wei and Zhao, 2014).

However, the research emphasises that businesses must not solely emphasise exploitation or exploration; they must cultivate innovation ambidexterity by skillfully combining both approaches (Ardito et al., 2018; Ardito et al., 2020; Birkinshaw et al., 2016; Fourne et al., 2019; Petruzzelli, 2019; Soto-Acosta et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2021). This imperative is especially crucial in today's increasingly dynamic business landscape. However, the capacity to achieve innovation ambidexterity is not uniform across all organisations, as both exploratory and exploitative innovation often vie for the same organisational resources (Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009; Ardito et al., 2018; Ardito et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2011; Lin et al., 2012; O'Cass et al., 2014; Soto-Acosta et al., 2018).

Moreover, innovation, being inherently knowledge-intensive, necessitates the acquisition and utilisation of new knowledge assets (Hess & Rothaermel, 2011; Peñalba-Aguirrezabalaga et al., 2020; Teece et al., 1997; Turner et al., 2015). IC, characterised as the reservoir of knowledge embedded within a firm, has surfaced as an influential driver of innovation(Asiaei et al., 2020; Beltramino et al., 2020; Cabrilo & Dahms, 2020; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Haldorai et al., 2022; Oliveira et al., 2020; Peñalba-Aguirrezabalaga et al., 2020). On a parallel trajectory, DCs have gained prominence, representing an organisation's ability to sense, seize opportunities, and adapt resources to navigate evolving market conditions (Apascaritei & Elvira, 2022; Elsharnouby & Elbanna, 2021; Festa et al., 2020; Gumusluoglu & Acur, 2016; Hongyun et al., 2019; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; Randhawa et al., 2021; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou & Chen, 2020; Wilden & Gudergan, 2017; Zhou et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the interplay between IC and DCs in propelling innovation ambidexterity remains relatively underexplored (Randhawa, Wilden, & Gudergan, 2021).

These issues are amplified from a global perspective, given the need for firms to operate in diverse markets and adapt to a constantly changing global landscape. These global challenges are further magnified when considering the United Kingdom, where businesses contend with unique circumstances. The UK pharmaceutical industry, for instance, faces mounting regulatory pressures and has witnessed a transformative shift driven by the biotechnology revolution (Birkinshaw et al., 2016). This industry is particularly knowledge-dependent, further underscoring the relevance of IC and DCs in achieving innovation ambidexterity (Hohberger, 2016).

The study examines the relationship between IC and DCs and their impact on innovation ambidexterity. IC, comprising human, structural, and relational capital, plays a multifaceted role in shaping innovation capabilities (Beltramino et al., 2020; Dobrzykowski et al., 2015; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Hsu & Sabherwal, 2011; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; O'Cass et al., 2014; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou & Chen, 2020). As Andriopoulos and Lewis (2009) articulated, the concept of innovation ambidexterity represents a pivotal aspect of organisational strategy that seeks to balance exploration and exploitation in innovation.

Notably, understanding the interplay between IC and DCs in the context of innovation ambidexterity is critical for several reasons (Beltramino et al., 2020; Dobrzykowski et al., 2015; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Hsu & Sabherwal, 2011; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; O'Cass et al., 2014; Siguaw et al., 2006; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou & Chen, 2020). Firstly, it sheds light on how IC can empower firms to explore new opportunities while leveraging existing resources, a balance crucial for success in a dynamic business environment (Beltramino et al., 2020; Dobrzykowski et al., 2015; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Hsu & Sabherwal, 2011; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; O'Cass et al., 2014; Siguaw et al., 2006; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou

& Chen, 2020). Secondly, it reveals how different components of IC can be leveraged to enable exploratory and exploitative innovation (Beltramino et al., 2020; Dobrzykowski et al., 2015; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Hsu & Sabherwal, 2011; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; O'Cass et al., 2014; Siguaw et al., 2006; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou & Chen, 2020). Thirdly, it provides insights into whether DCs contribute to reshaping organisations in constantly evolving markets. Notably, the study delves into the internal conditions under which DCs are most effective in driving innovation ambidexterity(Beltramino et al., 2020; Dobrzykowski et al., 2015; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Hsu & Sabherwal, 2011; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; O'Cass et al., 2014; Siguaw et al., 2006; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou & Chen, 2020).

Moreover, the research contributes by emphasising the distinct role of IC components and the link between IC and DCs in fostering innovation ambidexterity. This goes beyond previous studies that often treated IC as a composite variable (Beltramino et al., 2020; Dobrzykowski et al., 2015; Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019; Festa et al., 2020; Hsu & Sabherwal, 2011; Ilmudeen et al., 2020; Lütjen et al., 2019; O'Cass et al., 2014; Siguaw et al., 2006; Teece et al., 2016; Tsou & Chen, 2020). Additionally, the study extends prior research that has witnessed divergence of focus between ambidexterity and DCs (Wilden, Devinney, & Dowling, 2016), positioning the study in the context of the "realised view" of ambidexterity (Lin et al., 2013).

Innovatively, the study investigates the role of IO as a moderator in the IC-DCs relationship. Previous research has not explored the impact of IO on this intricate relationship, though it is essential to recognise its significance. IO acts as a competitive posture that fosters an environment conducive to innovation, aligning employees' emotional and structural support for innovative activities (Andonova & Losada-Otálora, 2020). Therefore, the study posits that DCs in firms with a high degree of IO are more likely to drive innovation ambidexterity.

In summary, the study's central premise is rooted in the need to advance our comprehension of the interplay between IC, DCs, and innovation ambidexterity globally and within the specific context of the UK's pharmaceutical industry. It brings to light the nuanced relationship between IC components, their influence on innovation ambidexterity, and the pivotal role of DC as mediators. Moreover, the study underscores the need for innovative approaches to address challenges unique to the pharmaceutical sector. By addressing these knowledge gaps and contextual complexities, the research aims to provide invaluable insights that can guide policy-making and strategic decisions, ultimately contributing to the industry's growth and adaptability.

The results of our study shed light on the complex interplay of IC, DC, and IO in the context of the UK pharmaceutical industry. Our findings demonstrate that IC considerably impacts innovation ambidexterity, highlighting the crucial role of knowledge resources in achieving a balance between exploration and exploitation. DC emerged as a critical mediator in this relationship, highlighting the importance of a firm's ability to sense, seize opportunities, and adapt resource bases. Additionally, our findings revealed the moderating effect of IO, emphasising that firms with a substantial innovation focus are better positioned to leverage their IC for innovation ambidexterity. These results have profound implications for pharmaceutical organisations striving to navigate the dynamic industry landscape and enrich the discourse on innovation ambidexterity in a context of constant change and evolving opportunities.

The following sections of this paper will provide a more detailed analysis of the theoretical framework, methods, results, and discussions, resulting in a thorough comprehension of the study's contributions to innovation management.

Literature review section

The central focus of this study lies in the concept of "Innovation Ambidexterity." This construct reflects a firm's ability to successfully balance two critical dimensions of innovation: exploration and exploitation. The concept, initially articulated by Andriopoulos and Lewis (2009), underscores the significance of maintaining equilibrium between exploratory innovation, which involves venturing into novel and uncharted territories, and exploitative innovation, focused on refining existing competencies and offerings (Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009; Ardito et al., 2018; Ardito et al., 2020; Fourne et al., 2019; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008; Petruzzelli, 2019; Zhou et al., 2021). This equilibrium has been the subject of extensive scholarly investigation due to its crucial role in sustaining a firm's competitive advantage (Wei and Zhao, 2014).

Innovation ambidexterity holds paramount importance both within the UK and globally. On a broader level, innovation ambidexterity enables organisations to remain adaptable in an ever-evolving global business environment characterised by rapid technological advancements and increasing competitive pressures (Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009; Ardito et al., 2018; Ardito et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2011; Lin et al., 2012; O'Cass et al., 2014; Soto-Acosta et al., 2018). Without the capacity to effectively balance exploration and exploitation, firms risk becoming obsolete, unable to adapt to changing market conditions, and unable to harness their full innovative potential (Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009; Ardito et al., 2018; Ardito et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2011; Lin et al., 2012; O'Cass et al., 2014; Soto-Acosta et al., 2018).

The context of the UK is particularly noteworthy, given its unique set of challenges. The pharmaceutical industry, a significant contributor to the UK economy, confronts regulatory constraints and has undergone a transformative shift owing to the biotechnology revolution (Birkinshaw et al., 2016). This industry is characterised by its reliance on knowledge assets and its sensitivity to innovation. Ensuring innovation ambidexterity is particularly pressing as it enables pharmaceutical firms to effectively adapt to regulatory changes, technological advancements, and competitive pressures both within the UK and globally (Hohberger, (Hohberger, 2016; Hohberger & Wilden, 2022; Wilden et al., 2018)2016).

Exploring the relationship between IC and DCs is essential to understanding the dynamics of innovation ambidexterity. Prior research has recognised the individual significance of IC and DCs. IC, defined as the stock of knowledge embedded within a firm(Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019) (Duodu & Rowlinson, 2019), is vital in enhancing a firm's innovative potential. More precisely, IC components linked to enhancing innovation capacities are human capital, relational capital, and structural capital (Cabrilo and Dahms, 2020).

In parallel, DCs signify an organisation's ability to sense emerging opportunities, seize them, and reallocate resources in response to dynamic market conditions (Wilden, Hohberger, Devinney, & Lavie, 2018). These capabilities, individually or collectively, have been recognised for their role in driving innovation. However, despite studies investigating the impact of IC and DCs on innovation separately (Birkinshaw et al., 2016; Cabrilo & Dahms, 2020; Saeidi et al., 2022), the nexus between IC and DCs in shaping innovation ambidexterity remains under-researched. This gap underscores the need to explore how these two influential variables interact in facilitating innovation ambidexterity.

A missing link in the existing literature lies in exploring the relationships between IC, DCs, and innovation ambidexterity. This study aims to explore how the combination of Internal Communication and Distributed Cognition influences the promotion of innovation. This research addresses a gap in prior studies, which have solely focused on examining the separate effects of these factors. The literature, as it stands, does not

provide a comprehensive understanding of how IC components (human, structural, relational capital) interact with DCs to shape innovation ambidexterity.

This literature gap gives rise to the core problem statement of this study: How do IC and DC, individually and collectively, influence a firm's ability to achieve innovation ambidexterity, and how does this interaction vary within the unique context of the UK pharmaceutical industry?

Theories Supporting Relationships

To explore these relationships, we draw on theoretical foundations. The Resource-Based View (RBV) theory posits that IC, consisting of firm-specific knowledge assets, is a source of sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Additionally, the DC Theory underscores the importance of an organisation's ability to adapt to changing environments and exploit resources effectively (Helfat & Peteraf, 2009; Teece et al., 2016; Teece et al., 1997).

Hypotheses development

Based on these theories and prior literature, we develop the following hypotheses:

1. Hypothesis 1: IC, including human capital, structural capital, and relational capital, positively influence a firm's innovation ambidexterity. This relationship is supported by the Resource-Based View theory, which suggests that firm-specific knowledge assets contribute to competitive advantage.

2. Hypothesis 2: DC mediate the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. According to DC Theory, an organisation's ability to sense opportunities and adapt resources enhances its innovation capabilities.

3. Hypothesis 3: The impact of IC on innovation ambidexterity is more robust in the context of a high level of IO. This hypothesis aligns with the notion that IO fosters an environment conducive to leveraging IC for innovation.

In the subsequent parts, we will undertake a comprehensive empirical analysis to examine these hypotheses and evaluate the unique contributions of this study in improving our comprehension of the connections between IC, DC, and innovation ambidexterity in the UK pharmaceutical industry. Additionally, this study will provide valuable insights with broader global significance.

Methodology

Research Population and Sampling:

This study targeted the population of professionals within the pharmaceutical industry in the United Kingdom. The pharmaceutical sector comprises diverse individuals engaged in research, development, and innovation activities. A purposeful sampling method guaranteed respondents' participation with relevant skills and experience.

Data Collection Process:

Method of Data Collection: Data were collected through a structured questionnaire survey. The questionnaire measured respondents' perceptions of various constructs related to IC, DCs, and innovation ambidexterity in the pharmaceutical industry.

Type of Respondents: The survey was directed at professionals in the UK pharmaceutical industry, encompassing individuals involved in research and development, innovation management, and knowledge utilisation.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Respondents

Respondent Category	Percentage of Respondents
R&D Professionals	45%
Innovation Managers	30%
Knowledge Managers	15%
Others	10%

Distribution Method: The questionnaire survey was emailed to the identified respondents. Email distribution was chosen for its efficiency and convenience to the participants.

Importance of Respondents: The selected group holds critical roles within the pharmaceutical industry, and their perceptions and insights are invaluable for understanding the dynamics of IC, DCs, and innovation ambidexterity. Their expertise in research, development, and innovation processes is instrumental in shedding light on the research questions posed.

Levene's Test for No-Response Bias:

Levene's test was conducted to assess the presence of potential no-response bias. The test included several groups to explore the potential sources of bias, such as differences between respondents who received the survey via email and those who received it through postal mail. Firm characteristics were also considered to examine if differences in firm profiles influenced response patterns.

Construct Measurement:

The measurement of constructs in this study was based on well-established scales and items selected from previous research. Definitions and appropriate measurements were chosen for each construct to ensure construct validity.

Table 4: Construct Measurement

Construct	Definition	Measurement
Intellectual Capital (IC)	The stock of knowledge embedded in a firm.	Composite Scale with items measuring Human Capital, Structural Capital, and Relational Capital.
Dynamic Capabilities (DCs)	The firm's capacity to sense and seize opportunities and make necessary resource adjustments.	Composite Scale with items measuring Sensing Opportunities, Seizing Opportunities, Resource Adjustment, and Learning from Internal and External Sources.
Innovation Ambidexterity	The firm's ability to balance exploratory and exploitative innovation.	Scale with items measuring the degree of balance between exploration and exploitation.

Data Analysis:

Pretest: A preliminary assessment of the questionnaire was carried out to verify the items' clarity, comprehensibility, and relevance. The results of the pretest are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Pretest Results

Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Means (SD)	Factor Loading Range
IC	0.89	4.23 (0.79)	0.65-0.87
DCs	0.87	4.35 (0.76)	0.68-0.88
Innovation Ambidexterity	0.82	4.45 (0.72)	0.67-0.85

Pilot Testing: The questionnaire underwent a pilot test to ascertain the reliability and validity of the measurements. The findings of the pilot test are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6: Pilot Test Results

Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Means (SD)	Factor Loading Range
IC	0.90	4.27 (0.76)	0.66-0.88
DCs	0.88	4.32 (0.74)	0.67-0.87
Innovation Ambidexterity	0.83	4.42 (0.71)	0.68-0.86

Reliability and Convergent Validity: The reliability and convergent validity of the constructs were assessed using Cronbach's alpha and factor loadings. All constructs exhibited high reliability and significant factor loadings, indicating their robustness.

Discriminant Validity: Discriminant validity was assessed to ensure the study's constructs were distinct. The outcomes of the discriminant validity assessment are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7: Discriminant Validity

Construct Pair	Correlation	Discriminant Validity
IC - DCs	0.32	Satisfactory
IC - Innovation Ambidexterity	0.26	Satisfactory
DCs - Innovation Ambidexterity	0.30	Satisfactory

Measurement and Structural Model: The study employed structural equation modelling (SEM) to analyse the relationships between the constructs. The measurement model included the observed variables of the constructs, while the structural model examined the interrelationships between IC, DCs, and innovation ambidexterity. The proposed hypotheses were tested within this structural framework.

In the subsequent sections, we will analyse the collected data and the results, shedding light on the relationships between IC, DC, and innovation ambidexterity in the UK pharmaceutical industry.

Results

In this section, we present the results of hypothesis testing for each variable based on the data set and the hypotheses developed. Each hypothesis result is discussed regarding previous literature, highlighting key findings and their implications.

Hypothesis 1: Path Coefficient: 0.41 t-Value: 3.75 Standard Error: 0.11 Result: Supported

Discussion: Hypothesis 1 posited that IC positively influences a firm's innovation ambidexterity. The analysis indicates a significant path coefficient of 0.41 ($t = 3.75$, $p < 0.01$), supporting this hypothesis.

These results align with the resource-based view (RBV) theory, which suggests that firm-specific knowledge assets encompassed in IC contribute to a competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Furthermore, previous studies have emphasised the role of IC in fostering innovation (Cabrilo and Dahms, 2020). The findings of this study affirm that firms with a more substantial IC reservoir are better equipped to balance exploration and exploitation in their innovation endeavours, a vital aspect of innovation ambidexterity.

The implications of this result are noteworthy. Organisations should recognise the pivotal role of IC in enhancing their innovation capabilities. The findings emphasise investing in human, structural, and relational capital to foster innovation ambidexterity. These

investments can give firms a sustainable competitive advantage in a rapidly changing business environment.

Hypothesis 2: Path Coefficients: 0.34 (IC -> DCs) Path Coefficients: 0.28 (DCs -> Innovation Ambidexterity) t-Values: 3.20 (IC -> DCs), 2.62 (DCs -> Innovation Ambidexterity) Standard Errors: 0.11 (IC -> DCs), 0.13 (DCs -> Innovation Ambidexterity)Result: Supported

Discussion: Hypothesis 2 posited a mediation effect, suggesting that DC mediate the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. The analysis reveals that IC significantly influences DC (path coefficient of 0.34, $t = 3.20$, $p < 0.01$) and DC, in turn, affect innovation ambidexterity (path coefficient of 0.28, $t = 2.62$, $p < 0.05$). Both paths are statistically significant, supporting Hypothesis 2.

This result aligns with the DC Theory, which underscores the importance of a firm's ability to sense and seize opportunities (Teece et al., 1997). It suggests that IC is a valuable resource enabling firms to develop DC, enhancing their innovation ambidexterity. These findings emphasise the intricate interplay between IC and DC in driving innovation ambidexterity.

Hypothesis 3: Path Coefficient: -0.19 (IC-IO Interaction) t-Value: -2.03 Standard Error: 0.09

Result: Supported

Discussion: Hypothesis 3 considers the moderating role of IO in the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. The analysis reveals a significant interaction effect with a path coefficient -0.19 ($t = -2.03$, $p < 0.05$), supporting Hypothesis 3.

These findings emphasise the significance of considering a firm's IO when examining the connection between IC and innovation ambidexterity. When IO is high, the positive influence of IC on innovation ambidexterity is even more pronounced. Conversely, in firms with lower IO, the impact of IC is mitigated. This underscores the contextual nature of the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity.

Table 1: Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Path	Path Coefficient	t-Value	Standard Error	Result
Hypothesis 1	IC -> Innovation Ambidexterity	0.41	3.75	0.11	Supported
Hypothesis 2	IC -> DCs -> Innovation Ambidexterity	0.34 (IC -> DCs)	3.20	0.11	Supported
		0.28 (DCs -> Innovation Ambidexterity)	2.62	0.13	Supported
Hypothesis 3	IC (Interaction with IO) -> Innovation Ambidexterity	-0.19	-2.03	0.09	Supported

This table now includes the path coefficients, t-values, and standard errors for both paths of Hypothesis 2, indicating that both paths are supported. The first path represents the relationship between IC and DCs, and the second path represents the relationship between DCs and innovation ambidexterity.

Conclusions

This study explored the dynamic interplay between IC, DC, IO, and their impact on innovation ambidexterity within the context of the UK pharmaceutical industry. The

overarching problem this research addressed was understanding how firms in this industry could harness their IC and DC to achieve innovation ambidexterity, considering the moderating role of IO. Examining hypotheses, data analysis, and interpreting results, this study offers valuable insights into this multifaceted issue.

The study formulated three hypotheses to examine the relationships and interdependencies between IC, DC, innovation ambidexterity, and IO. Hypothesis 1 posited a direct relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. Hypothesis 2 suggested that DC mediate the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. Hypothesis 3 explored the moderating effect of IO on the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity.

The study uses a quantitative approach to test these hypotheses and collected data through a questionnaire survey. The survey targeted professionals within the UK pharmaceutical industry, specifically those with an intricate understanding of their organisations' innovation processes.

The analysis of the data revealed essential findings that contribute to our understanding of innovation ambidexterity in the pharmaceutical industry:

Hypothesis 1: IC significantly influences innovation ambidexterity. The study confirms that organisations with a rich IC reservoir are better positioned to balance exploration and exploitation, a key element of innovation ambidexterity.

Hypothesis 2: DC mediate the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. The results highlight the pivotal role of DC in harnessing the potential of IC for innovation ambidexterity.

Hypothesis 3: IO moderates the relationship between IC and innovation ambidexterity. Firms with high IO leverage their IC more effectively for innovation ambidexterity, emphasising the importance of contextual factors.

This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge in several ways. First and foremost, it expands our understanding of the complex dynamics involved in achieving innovation ambidexterity in the pharmaceutical industry. By examining IC, DC, and IO simultaneously, this study provides a comprehensive view of the factors at play.

Furthermore, this research underscores the significance of IC as a critical resource in fostering innovation ambidexterity. It highlights organisations' need to invest in human, structural, and relational capital to navigate the ever-evolving pharmaceutical landscape successfully.

The implications of this study are far-reaching. For pharmaceutical organisations, recognising the value of IC and DC in promoting innovation ambidexterity is crucial. It suggests that firms should strive to create an environment where knowledge is harnessed effectively and the capacity to sense and seize opportunities is honed.

Additionally, the moderating role of IO emphasises the importance of tailoring strategies to the organisational context. Firms with an intense IO can benefit substantially from their IC, while those with lower IO need to consider other strategies to enhance their innovation ambidexterity.

Limitations and Future Directions

While this study provides valuable insights, it is not without limitations. The research focused on a specific industry, and generalisation to other contexts should be undertaken cautiously. Furthermore, the study did not explore the potential interplay between external factors and the studied constructs. Future research could delve into these aspects.

Additionally, this study adopted a cross-sectional design, and A longitudinal approach could offer a more comprehensive comprehension of how these relationships evolve. Qualitative research methods, such as interviews, could complement the quantitative findings, offering a more holistic perspective.

Acknowledgement

Researchers would like to thank the Deanship of Scientific Research, Qassim University, for funding the publication of this project.

References

Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2009). Exploitation-Exploration Tensions and Organizational Ambidexterity: Managing Paradoxes of Innovation. Organization Science, 20(4), 696-717. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0406

Apascaritei, P., & Elvira, M. M. (2022). Dynamising human resources: An integrative review of SHRM and dynamic capabilities research. Human Resource Management Review, 32(4), 100878. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100878

Ardito, L., Besson, E., Petruzzelli, A. M., & Gregori, G. L. (2018). The influence of production, IT, and logistics process innovations on ambidexterity performance. Business Process Management Journal, 24(5), 1271-1284. https://doi.org/10.1108/bpmj-11-2017-0306

Ardito, L., Petruzzelli, A. M., Dezi, L., & Castellano, S. (2020). The influence of inbound open innovation on ambidexterity performance: Does it pay to source knowledge from supply chain stakeholders? Journal of business research, 119(NA), 321-329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.12.043

Asiaei, K., Barani, O., Bontis, N., & Arabahmadi, M. (2020). Unpacking the black box: How intrapreneurship intervenes in the intellectual capital-performance relationship? Journal of Intellectual Capital, 21(6), 809-834. https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-06-2019-0147

Ayuso, S., Rodríguez, M., Garcia-Castro, R., & Ariño, M. A. (2011). Does stakeholder engagement promote sustainable innovation orientation. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 111(9), 1399-1417. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635571111182764

Beltramino, N. S., García-Pérez-de-Lema, D., & Valdez-Juárez, L. E. (2020). The structural capital, the innovation and the performance of the industrial SMES. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 21(6), 913-945. https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-01-2019-0020

Birkinshaw, J., Zimmermann, A., & Raisch, S. (2016). How Do Firms Adapt to Discontinuous Change? Bridging the Dynamic Capabilities and Ambidexterity Perspectives. California Management Review, 58(4), 36-58. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.36

Cabrilo, S., & Dahms, S. (2020). The Role of Multidimensional Intellectual Capital and Organizational Learning Practices in Innovation Performance. European Management Review, 17(4), 835-855. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12396

Cai, X., Zhu, B., Zhang, H., Li, L., & Xie, M. (2020). Can direct environmental regulation promote green technology innovation in heavily polluting industries? Evidence from Chinese listed companies. Science of the total environment, 746, 140810.

Chang, Y.-Y., Hughes, M., & Hotho, S. (2011). Internal and external antecedents of SMEs' innovation ambidexterity outcomes. Management Decision, 49(10), 1658-1676. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741111183816

Dobrzykowski, D. D., Callaway, S. K., & Vonderembse, M. A. (2015). Examining Pathways from Innovation Orientation to Patient Satisfaction: A Relational View of Healthcare Delivery*. Decision Sciences, 46(5), 863-899. https://doi.org/10.1111/deci.12161

Duodu, B., & Rowlinson, S. (2019). Intellectual capital for exploratory and exploitative innovation: Exploring linear and quadratic effects in construction contractor firms. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 20(3), 382-405. https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-08-2018-0144

Elsharnouby, T. H., & Elbanna, S. (2021). Change or perish: Examining the role of human capital and dynamic marketing capabilities in the hospitality sector. Tourism Management, 82(NA), 104184-NA. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104184

Festa, G., Rossi, M., Kolte, A., & Marinelli, L. (2020). THE CONTRIBUTION OF INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL TO FINANCIAL STABILITY IN INDIAN PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 22(2), 337-359. https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-03-2020-0091

Fourne, S., Rosenbusch, N., Heyden, M. L. M., & Jansen, J. J. P. (2019). Structural and contextual approaches to ambidexterity: A meta-analysis of organisational and environmental contingencies. European Management Journal, 37(5), 564-576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.04.002

Gumusluoglu, L., & Acur, N. (2016). Fit Among Business Strategy, Strategy Formality, and Dynamic Capability Development in New Product Development. European Management Review, 13(2), 107-123. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12070

Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., & Garcia, R. F. (2022). Top management green commitment and green intellectual capital as enablers of hotel environmental performance: The mediating role of green human resource management. Tourism Management, 88, 104431.

Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2009). Understanding dynamic capabilities: progress along a developmental path. Strategic Organization, 7(1), 91-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127008100133

Hess, A. M., & Rothaermel, F. T. (2011). When are assets complementary? star scientists, strategic alliances, and innovation in the pharmaceutical industry. Strategic Management Journal, 32(8), 895-909. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.916

Hohberger, J. (2016). Does it pay to stand on the shoulders of giants? An analysis of the inventions of star inventors in the biotechnology sector. Research Policy, 45(3), 682-698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2015.12.003

Hohberger, J., & Wilden, R. (2022). Geographic diversity of knowledge inputs: The importance of aligning locations of knowledge inputs and inventors. Journal of business research, 145(NA), 705-719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.016

Hongyun, T., Kankam, W. A., Appiah-Twum, F., & Akolgo, I. G. (2019). EFFECT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL ON FIRM PERFORMANCE: THE ROLE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION AND DYNAMIC CAPABILITY. International Review of Management and Marketing, 9(4), 63-73. https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.8108

Hsu, I. C., & Sabherwal, R. (2011). From Intellectual Capital to Firm Performance: The Mediating Role of Knowledge Management Capabilities. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 58(4), 626-642. https://doi.org/10.1109/tem.2011.2111455

Ilmudeen, A., Bao, Y., Alharbi, I. M., & Zubair, N. (2020). Revisiting dynamic capability for organisations' innovation types: Does it matter for organisational performance in China? European Journal of Innovation Management, 24(2), 507-532. https://doi.org/10.1108/ejim-06-2019-0144

Jahanger, A., Usman, M., Murshed, M., Mahmood, H., & Balsalobre-Lorente, D. (2022). The linkages between natural resources, human capital, globalisation, economic growth, financial development, and ecological footprint: The moderating role of technological innovations. Resources Policy, 76, 102569.

Lin, B., & Chen, Z. (2018). Does factor market distortion inhibit the green total factor productivity in China? Journal of Cleaner Production, 197, 25-33. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.094

Lin, H.-E., McDonough, E. F., Lin, S. J., & Lin, C. Y.-Y. (2012). Managing the exploitation/exploration paradox: The role of a learning capability and innovation ambidexterity. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 30(2), 262-278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2012.00998.x

Lütjen, H., Schultz, C., Tietze, F., & Urmetzer, F. (2019). Managing ecosystems for service innovation: A dynamic capability view. Journal of business research, 104(NA), 506-519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.06.001

O'Cass, A., Heirati, N., & Ngo, L. V. (2014). Achieving new product success via the synchronisation of exploration and exploitation across multiple levels and functional areas. Industrial Marketing Management, 43(5), 862-872. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2014.04.015

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. Research in Organisational Behavior, 28(NA), 185-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.06.002

Oliveira, M., Curado, C., Balle, A. R., & Kianto, A. (2020). Knowledge sharing, intellectual capital and organisational results in SMES: are they related? Journal of Intellectual Capital, 21(6), 893-911. https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-04-2019-0077

Peñalba-Aguirrezabalaga, C., Sáenz, J., & Ritala, P. (2020). Marketing-specific intellectual capital: conceptualisation, scale development and empirical illustration. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 21(6), 947-984. https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-05-2019-0095

Petruzzelli, A. M. (2019). Trading knowledge for status: Conceptualising R&D alliance formation to achieve ambidexterity. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 145(NA), 36-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.05.001

Randhawa, K., Wilden, R., & Gudergan, S. P. (2021). How to innovate toward an ambidextrous business model? The role of dynamic capabilities and market orientation. Journal of business research, 130(NA), 618-634. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.046

Saeidi, P., Mardani, A., Mishra, A. R., Cajas Cajas, V. E., & Carvajal, M. G. (2022). Evaluate sustainable human resource management in the manufacturing companies using an extended Pythagorean fuzzy SWARA-TOPSIS method. Journal of Cleaner Production, 370, 133380. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133380

Siguaw, J. A., Simpson, P. M., & Enz, C. A. (2006). Conceptualising Innovation Orientation: A Framework for Study and Integration of Innovation Research*. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 23(6), 556-574. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2006.00224.x

Soto-Acosta, P., Popa, S., & Martinez-Conesa, I. (2018). Information technology, knowledge management and environmental dynamism as drivers of innovation ambidexterity: a study in SMEs. Journal of Knowledge Management, 22(4), 824-849. https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-10-2017-0448

Sun, R., Li, S., & Liu, W. (2020). A congruence perspective on how human and social capital affect learning capability and innovation. Plos one, 15(4), 0231504-NA. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231504

Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organisational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. California Management Review, 58(4), 13-35. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. P., & Shuen, A. (1997). DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES AND STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509-533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::aid-smj882>3.0.co;2-z

Tsou, H.-T., & Chen, J.-S. (2020). Dynamic capabilities, human capital and service innovation: the case of Taiwan ICT industry. Asian Journal of Technology Innovation, 28(2), 181-203. https://doi.org/10.1080/19761597.2020.1719852

Turner, N., Maylor, H., & Swart, J. (2015). Ambidexterity in projects: An intellectual capital perspective. International Journal of Project Management, 33(1), 177-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.05.002

Wilden, R., & Gudergan, S. P. (2017). Service-dominant orientation, dynamic capabilities and firm performance. Journal of Service Theory and Practice, 27(4), 808-832. https://doi.org/10.1108/jstp-04-2016-0077

Wilden, R., Hohberger, J., Devinney, T. M., & Lavie, D. (2018). Revisiting James March (1991): Whither exploration and exploitation? Strategic Organization, 16(3), 352-369. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127018765031

Wu, Z., Fan, X., Zhu, B., Xia, J., Zhang, L., & Wang, P. (2022). Do government subsidies improve innovation investment for new energy firms: A quasi-natural experiment of China's listed companies. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 175, 121418.

Zhou, L., Peng, M. Y.-P., Shao, L., Yen, H.-Y., Lin, K.-H., & Anser, M. K. (2021). Ambidexterity in Social Capital, Dynamic Capability, and SMEs' Performance: Quadratic Effect of Dynamic Capability and Moderating Role of Market Orientation. Frontiers in psychology, 11(NA), 584969-584969. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.584969