

Group & Organization Management

Triggering Innovation through Mergers and Acquisitions – The Role of Shared Mental Models

Journal:	<i>Group & Organization Management</i>
Manuscript ID	GOM-2254.R4
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue
Keywords:	mental models, mergers and acquisitions, innovation, exploration and exploitation, relative standing
Abstract:	In this paper we analyze how shared team and task mental models, developed prior to an acquisition, impact exploration and exploitation activities in the post-acquisition phase, and how these effects are dependent on relative size. With a sample of 101 transactions of acquirers from the German-speaking part of Europe we provide empirical evidence that both shared team and task mental models positively influence exploitation activities following an acquisition, whereby only shared team mental models are beneficial for exploration. We provide empirical evidence that shared mental models in terms of task and team are an important informal source for enhancing exploration and exploitation innovation activities. However, this source of informal coordination is contextual. While the relationships on exploitation are stable, the beneficial effect of team mental models on exploration is sensitive and devitalized by an increasing relative size. Implications for further research and management practice are given.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



Introduction

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) constitute an important strategic opportunity for corporate development and value creation (Bower, 2001). Sustainable corporate development and enduring success require constant change (Stadler, 2007) and adaptation to changing circumstances (Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009) to tackle complexity and ambiguity (Lewis & Smith, 2014). In this respect, research in the fields of innovation, competitive advantage, and organizational learning highlights the importance of balancing the exploration of avenues for new developments and the exploitation of established activities to increase survival rates (Gupta, Smith, & Shalley, 2006). Acquisitions can be seen as a judicious measure enabling such a strategic redirection and renewal (Jemison & Sitkin, 1986). In fact, a considerable number of acquisitions are reorientation acquisitions, which “show that exploitation and exploration [...] can co-exist during acquisition integration” (Angwin & Meadows, 2015, p. 249).

In any case, the success of an acquisition depends significantly on a firm’s capability of managing the acquisition process (Zollo & Singh, 2004), especially acquisition implementation (Haspeslagh & Jemison, 1991). Linking two firms with different systems and contexts is a complex process tied to uncertainty and ambiguity (Cording, Christman, & King, 2008), as it requires removing, changing, transferring, and adapting well-established ways of proceeding and thinking (Stahl & Voigt, 2008). Integration decisions are confronted with a trade-off. On the one hand more interaction and coordination enables the highest probabilities of synergy realization, and on the other hand it also bears the potential for employee resistance, cultural clashes, or in-group and out-group biases (Larsson & Finkelstein, 1999).

Capability transfer and successful integration can only prosper if systematic attention is paid to the interaction of both formerly separate organizations (Dao, Bauer, Strobl, Matzler, & Eulerich, 2016), as interaction is the key means of value creation (Haspeslagh & Jemison, 1991). Puranam et al. (2009) investigated common ground (knowledge which is known to be shared between two groups) as an alternative to structural measures for achieving coordination. Informal alignment – when employees of

1
2
3 both organizations develop shared understandings, constructive perceptions and attitudes of each other
4
5 (Schweiger & Goulet, 2005) – creates closer inter-unit relationships and trust, and considerable
6
7 advantages can thereby be extracted. First, it enhances the capability transfer between both firms
8
9 (Björkman, Stahl, & Vaara, 2007); second, it reduces the costs of structural integration and coordination
10
11 (Puranam et al., 2009); and third, it reduces disruptions for employees (Paruchuri, Nerkar, & Hambrick,
12
13 2006).
14
15

16
17 In this connection, we examine how shared mental models (SMM) influence exploration and exploitation
18
19 innovation activities following an acquisition. SMM have proven to increase team performance and
20
21 communication in many situations (e.g., DeChurch & Mesmer-Magnus, 2010; Smith-Jentsch, Campbell,
22
23 Milanovich, & Reynolds, 2001). We conceptualize SMM as common psychological representations of the
24
25 environment between the acquirer and the target. Thus, SMM act as a tacit antecedent of coordination and
26
27 integration in M&A transactions. Neglected so far in M&A research, we consider different content-related
28
29 pre-merger dimensions of SMM (Cannon-Bowers, Salas, & Converse, 1993) as influential antecedents for
30
31 implicit coordination. Consequently, we analyze task and team SMM between acquirer and target
32
33 organizations and how they affect post-merger innovation performance, specifically exploration and
34
35 exploitation. However, the effects of SMM depend on the relative size of the target compared to the
36
37 acquirer. While larger targets offer greater synergy potentials (Kitching, 1967), they require greater
38
39 coordination efforts and are more complex to integrate (Cording et al., 2008). Consequently, we develop
40
41 arguments that increased relative size triggers in-group/out-group biases, which results in resistance and
42
43 cultural clashes deteriorating the positive relations between SMM and exploration/exploitation outcomes.
44
45
46
47

48
49 The purpose of this article is to contribute to M&A research in several ways: First, we incorporate SMM
50
51 as a salient antecedent for coordination to M&A research. Second, we differentiate between knowledge
52
53 antecedents in terms of task- and team-related aspects and their contribution to innovation performance.
54
55 Therefore, we examine whether an acquisition leads to the enhancement of exploration and exploitation
56
57 activities necessary for strategic redirection and renewal (Jemison & Sitkin, 1986). Third, we consider
58
59
60

1
2
3 relative size as an important deal-specific contingency. Relative size is related to disruptive forces, like,
4
5 for instance, the occurrence of in-group and out-group biases when power struggles or coordination efforts
6
7 are increased by differences in company size.
8
9

10 **Exploration and Exploitation in Post-M&A Integration**

11
12
13
14 Examining ambidexterity (a combination of exploration and exploitation) in general and in M&A in
15
16 particular has been pointed out as a promising future research avenue (Junni, Sarala, Taras, & Tarba,
17
18 2013; Junni, Sarala, Tarba, Liu, & Cooper, 2015; Meglio, King, & Risberg, 2015). In this sense,
19
20 acquisition integration acts as a boundary condition for achieving explorative and exploitative innovation
21
22 outcomes in a more flexible manner (Graebner, 2004). Exploration is defined as a learning type, which
23
24 evolves through “concerted variation, planned experimentation, and play” (Baum, Li, & Usher, 2000, p.
25
26 768). In a discovering approach, new knowledge should be built to achieve above-average returns (Koza
27
28 & Lewin, 1998). Thus, exploration is a more open and flexible approach of learning, which leads to
29
30 radical innovations (Atuahene-Gima, 2005). Exploration is more uncertain and time-consuming and
31
32 requires future-orientation as well as new knowledge and experience infusion (March, 1991), but
33
34 nevertheless can highly increase productivity and efficiency (Nielsen, 2010). Explorative innovation
35
36 capabilities entail a lot of tacit knowledge, and aligning operations and functions following acquisitions
37
38 can disrupt such capabilities, impeding synergy realization (Paruchuri et al., 2006; Puranam et al., 2009).
39
40 Exploitative innovation strategies aim to improve and/or to build upon existing capabilities by refining
41
42 routines built on existing knowledge (March, 1991). Therefore, improvements of processes and structures
43
44 (Burgers, Jansen, Van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2009; March, 1991) are achieved by averting redundancies
45
46 and efficiently and effectively redesigning activities to accomplish more, for instance, a faster production
47
48 (He & Wong, 2004). In acquisitions, these efficiency gains are usually achieved with tighter coordination
49
50 and integration.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Following both learning forms may trigger tensions. While exploration is more uncertain, time-
4 consuming, and change-enforcing, exploitation is rather certain and reinforces existing structures
5 (Kostopoulos & Bozionelos, 2011). However, many researchers propose that knowledge infusion from
6 outside the firm can more easily foster the organization's ability to pursue both exploration and
7 exploitation (e.g., Baum et al., 2000; Koza & Lewin, 1998). In this research we concentrate on antecedents
8 of ambidexterity, namely exploration and exploitation, and how they can be triggered through team and
9 task SMM. As intended changes in exploration and exploitation activities can only occur after deal closing
10 and during integration, we analyze exploration and exploitation outcomes following an acquisition (Bauer,
11 Strobl, Dao, Matzler, & Rudolf, forthcoming). Post-merger integration is the most critical phase in M&A.
12 Acquisition integration "is an interactive and gradual process in which individuals from two organizations
13 learn to work together and cooperate in the transfer of strategic capabilities" (Haspeslagh & Jemison,
14 1991, p. 106). To realize synergies, processes of mutual resource sharing (Capron & Pistre, 2002) and
15 knowledge leverage (Puranam & Srikanth, 2007) must be established. Thereby, aligning structures, tasks,
16 and systems not only contributes to increased M&A performance by eliminating redundancies and
17 streamlining procedures, but also enhances the reciprocal predictability of actions (Puranam et al., 2009).
18 Effects of combination are not limited solely to the consolidation or coordination of functions and
19 operations. Benefits also entail mutual learning, which results in the convergence between organizational
20 and individual beliefs (March, 1991).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Due to an adverse understanding of the interrelation between coordination, knowledge transfer, and
44 integration issues (Puranam & Srikanth, 2007), researchers constantly report that integrating tasks results
45 in disruptions preventing synergy realization. On a general level, change can cause resistance (Weber &
46 Tarba, 2011) and hamper the initial goals of integration measures (Benner & Tushman, 2003). M&A
47 integration includes converging processes and therefore causes disruptions when different organizational
48 worlds collide and substantive incompatibilities evolve (Graebner, Heimeriks, Huy, & Vaara,
49 forthcoming; Schweizer, 2005). These disruptions may lead to major challenges in terms of talent
50 retention in the aftermath of M&A (Zhang et al., 2015), as "value creation and synergy potential
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 realization largely result from employees' knowledge base, skills and experience” (Xing & Liu, 2015, pp.
4
5 11–12). Such reactions have been primarily reported in technology acquisitions, when the newly formed
6
7 organization was not able to retain inventors and/or maintain their innovative capabilities (Puranam et al.,
8
9 2009). This happens when knowledge depends on socially complex relationships and when implemented
10
11 changes or their corresponding measures destroy these knowledge resources (Ranft & Lord, 2002).
12
13

14
15 Considering these challenges of M&A integration, it would seem to be even more complex to achieve
16
17 both exploration and exploitation outcomes in the aftermath of a merger. So far, M&A integration
18
19 literature suggests different approaches for realizing the value potential of an acquisition. Schweizer
20
21 (2005), for instance, claims that multi-staged approaches towards typologies of integration with differing
22
23 degrees of autonomy across different value chain activities are most promising to simultaneously
24
25 accomplish short- and long-term goals. Others recommend keeping the target organization autonomous to
26
27 minimize disruptions to ensure know-how development and capability transfer (Paruchuri et al., 2006;
28
29 Puranam et al., 2009). In ambidexterity literature similar arguments can be found regarding reaping the
30
31 benefits of exploration and exploitation activities. While one stream calls for a separation to ensure that
32
33 both contradictory learning approaches do not distract each other (Benner & Tushman, 2003; J. J. P.
34
35 Jansen, Tempelaar, van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2009), another stream argues that the integration of both
36
37 activities is vital (Kauppila, 2010; Raisch, Birkinshaw, Probst, & Tushman, 2009).
38
39
40
41

42
43 In our study, we extend both literature streams and examine how SMM, as a tacit antecedent, can unleash
44
45 a “self-coordinating” effect among the integrated employees of both firms to enable the organization to
46
47 pursue exploration and exploitation outcomes. Thus, we follow calls from several researchers in M&A for
48
49 more integrative approaches linking critical success factors of pre- and post-acquisition phases (Gomes,
50
51 Angwin, Weber, & Tarba, 2013). We believe that SMM as a common understanding of the task and team
52
53 environment among members of acquirer and target serve as a knowledge platform fostering capability
54
55 transfers. Based on a shared representation of the environmental context, the integrated organizational
56
57 members can more easily join forces to increase exploration and exploitation outcomes.
58
59
60

Shared Mental Models

According to Darr and Kurtzberg (2000), a context of understanding is necessary to transfer knowledge successfully. A similar set of attitudes, experiences, and encountered problems facilitates knowledge transfer. Tanriverdi and Venkatraman (2005) find that knowledge relatedness between acquirer and target in terms of products, technology, and R&D significantly improves performance. Reasoning is based on the theory of social comparison which states that with increased similarity of judgments people are more willing to cooperate and resistance decreases (Festinger, 1954). Mental models “enable individuals to make inferences and predictions, to understand phenomena, to decide what action to take and to control its execution, and above all to experience events by proxy” (Johnson-Laird, 1983, p. 397). So, mental models entail descriptions, explanations, and observations of systems, which allow people to organize, structure, process, and store their knowledge rapidly and flexibly based on working schemas (e.g., Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993; Maynard & Gilson, 2014). As psychological representations of the environment, mental models enable individuals to make sense and generate actions from a situation (Johnson-Laird, 1983; Kellermanns, Floyd, Pearson, & Spencer, 2008).

The relevance of mental models in team settings has been emphasized by Cannon-Bowers et al. (1993). According to the authors, organizing and storing knowledge in structured, meaningful patterns allows people to effectively interact with their environment. Thus, SMM serve as an internal knowledge base of expectations concerning how team members “decide which behaviors are required, and when and how to execute them” (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993, p. 228). Based on compatible expectations regarding the internal and external performance environment, team members intuitively adapt to the demands of the task and of their team members (e.g., Maynard & Gilson, 2014).

In the context of mental models, sharedness has been interpreted in various ways leading to terminological differences. Some researchers refer to the term team mental model (Lim & Klein, 2006; Mohammed, Ferzandi, & Hamilton, 2010) and reason that ‘shared’ is an ambiguous term. They focus on team

1
2
3 functioning (e.g., Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994; Mohammed et al., 2010). Others state that sharedness is
4 considered as a convergence, agreement, or overlap among team members' mental models, which evolve
5 from a shared situation or a shared problem (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993). This research commonly refers
6 to shared mental models (e.g., Mathieu, Heffner, Goodwin, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000; Maynard &
7 Gilson, 2014). Even though team mental models (TMM) and shared mental models have been used
8 somewhat interchangeably, we follow the conceptualization of Cannon-Bowers et al. (1993), who refer to
9 a fluid, implicit common understanding of task and team coordination. However, "each 'piece' of social
10 knowledge is commonly, but not necessarily uniformly, shared" (Carley, 1997, p. 535). Thus, we see the
11 notions of SMM and TMM as distinct from each other. While TMM entails both similarity and accuracy
12 of mental models on a collective level among team members, SMM refers to shared cognitions among
13 dyads of individuals in the sense of 'having in common' or 'being on the same page' (Langan-Fox, Wirth,
14 Code, Langfield-Smith, & Wirth, 2001; Mohammed et al., 2010). This is particularly important in
15 complex, dynamic, and ambiguous situations (Mohammed & Dumville, 2001) like M&A, where team
16 members need to swiftly predict what information or assistance their team members will need to solve a
17 problem without explicit communication (Stout, Cannon-Bowers, Salas, & Milanovich, 1999).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Several studies have shown that SMM positively influence team performance, as team members do not
38 only better anticipate their colleagues' behavior, but also communicate more effectively (e.g., DeChurch
39 & Mesmer-Magnus, 2010). Based on the approach of Mathieu et al. (2005), researchers (e.g., Lim &
40 Klein, 2006; Maynard & Gilson, 2014) categorize SMM into two major content domains, task and team
41 SMM. Both dimensions not only theoretically improve team performance; empirically there is also
42 evidence for beneficial influences on team performance. So far, task and team SMM have been analyzed
43 in different settings, ranging from change processes in the communication industry (Langan-Fox et al.,
44 2001), to minor crisis situations of university departments (Kellermanns et al., 2008), to experimental
45 settings in navy submarine communities (Smith-Jentsch et al., 2001) or among undergraduate students
46 (Mathieu et al., 2000), to team development in combat teams of armed forces (Lim & Klein, 2006) and air
47 traffic controllers (Mathieu, Rapp, Maynard, & Mangos, 2009). The effects of task and team SMM have
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 only been tested on team processes (specific behavior which converts input to output, e.g. coordination or
4
5 planning) and team performance (degree of goal achievement, e.g., in terms of operational effectiveness
6
7 and decision-making quality) (DeChurch & Mesmer-Magnus, 2010; Kellermanns et al., 2008; Lim &
8
9 Klein, 2006; Mathieu et al., 2009). Team process and performance are very generic variables that are
10
11 dependent upon the task content and context. Still, they have proven to be beneficial.
12
13

14 15 Task SMM

16
17
18 Task-related SMM comprise two main areas – first, a schema of a team’s duties, resources, and jobs;
19
20 second, an understanding of how a task’s environment affects the demands and procedures of a specific
21
22 task (Maynard & Gilson, 2014). Consequently, task SMM embrace team members’ understanding of
23
24 strategies, environmental conditions, problems, technologies, and other resources in order to cope with a
25
26 complex situation (Kellermanns et al., 2008; Mathieu et al., 2000). Therefore, task SMM should enhance
27
28 team performance in fulfilling the task to be resolved (Mathieu et al., 2009; Maynard & Gilson, 2014).
29
30 Transferred to an M&A context, we argue that task SMM among the merged parties facilitates
31
32 coordinating the integration of both organizations and consequently increases exploitation and
33
34 exploration. An exploitative innovation strategy aims to improve and/or to build upon existing capabilities
35
36 by refining routines grounded on previous and existing knowledge (Baum et al., 2000; March, 1991;
37
38 Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). Exploration is defined as a learning type, which evolves through
39
40 “concerted variation, planned experimentation, and play” (Baum et al., 2000, p. 768). While exploitation
41
42 results in incremental innovations, exploration, as a more open and flexible approach of learning, leads to
43
44 radical innovations (Atuahene-Gima, 2005).
45
46
47
48

49
50 Task SMM constitute a common understanding of resource allocation patterns, decision-making or
51
52 strategizing, and sequences for completing a task (e.g., Kellermanns et al., 2008). This is a process that
53
54 enables both organizations to adapt to each other by eliminating redundancies and by streamlining
55
56 processes and structures. In M&A integration, this can be of particular benefit, because the precision and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interconnectedness is improved by the characteristics of adaptive procedures that enhance exploitation
4 cumulatively and more rapidly (March, 1991). So, instead of absorbing capabilities from each other by
5 integrating tasks (Björkman et al., 2007), whereby learning outcomes are fostered by the creative process
6 itself (Zollo & Singh, 2004), synergies can be extracted when a task SMM between acquirer and target is
7 already in place. Resource sharing and transferring as well as the exchange of learning capabilities are
8 facilitated the more interdependent both organizations are. When organizational members have a common
9 understanding of their task environment, the alignment of operational and structural requirements is more
10 easily coordinated, which might free resources for exploration. Thus, we consider task SMM between
11 acquirer and target as an auxiliary basis for achieving synergies in terms of both exploration and
12 exploitation success after an acquisition. Consequently, we propose:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 H1: Task SMM between target and acquirer will be positively related to (a) post-merger exploitation
27 success and to (b) post-merger exploration success.
28
29
30

31 Team SMM 32 33 34

35 By contrast, team-related SMM encompass the content and structure of how team members understand
36 their interaction process and interdependence among each other (Cooke, Salas, Cannon-Bowers, & Stout,
37 2000). Team SMM are based on knowledge about team members' roles, skills, responsibilities, abilities,
38 beliefs, etc. (Cooke et al., 2000). They are useful because individuals can more easily organize their team
39 behavior in a reflective and participative manner (Smith-Jentsch et al., 2001). This also entails how well
40 all team members work together in terms of compensating each other's weaknesses, communication
41 patterns, and performance monitoring (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1993). Team SMM increase the
42 effectiveness of team performance, as team members can more effectively interact with each other when
43 they hold similar belief structures in order to intuitively agree upon priorities and strategies (Lim & Klein,
44 2006). Moreover, Lim and Klein (2006) proved that in situations with high stress and intense pressure,
45 team SMM are particularly advantageous. Bringing together two companies with diverse organizational
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cultures results in lower top management commitment and lower cooperation between both organizations
4
5 (Weber, Shenkar, & Raveh, 1996). Consequently, difficulties in achieving operational synergies can
6
7 emerge, resulting in poor performance (Datta, 1991). However, in terms of collaboration, rational
8
9 decision-making is more easily ensured when managers and employees of both firms involved are less
10
11 concerned with ascertaining social acceptance and, therefore, can better pool relevant information and
12
13 exchange ideas in a more constructive manner (Gruenfeld, Mannix, Williams, & Neale, 1996). We
14
15 contend that if employees of both organizations have developed a common set of beliefs, in other words a
16
17 team SMM, relations are smoothed and fertile collaboration is ensured. We therefore argue that when
18
19 members of two integrated organizations share team mental models, the integration process will result in
20
21 superior performance in terms of both exploration and exploitation success after an acquisition.
22
23

24
25
26 H2: Team SMM between target and acquirer will be positively related to (a) post-merger exploitation
27
28 success and (b) to post-merger exploration success.
29
30

31 **The Moderating Effect of Relative Size**

32
33
34

35 In M&A research, the relative size of the target is cited to have both beneficial and detrimental effects.
36
37 The main argument for acquiring larger targets can be found in an increased synergy potential (Kitching,
38
39 1967). In terms of detrimental effects, arguments can be found both with regard to acquiring a target that
40
41 is smaller and larger in size. On one side, researchers state that acquiring smaller targets is
42
43 disadvantageous for two reasons: First, acquirers tend to regard the new organizational entity with a lack
44
45 of empathy or misunderstandings owing to knowledge deficiencies in managing small companies
46
47 (Calipha, Tarba, & Brock, 2010). The neglect of human needs increases the larger the acquirer is in
48
49 relation to the target organization. Second, according to the theory of relative standing (Festinger, 1954),
50
51 target employees might feel inferior or unappreciated when being acquired by a larger organization, which
52
53 results in decreased performance (Very, Lubatkin, Calori, & Veiga, 1997). On the other side, there is
54
55 evidence that relative size correlates, for instance, with high rigidity and inertia (Hannan & Freeman,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1984). Researchers argue that the larger a target organization relative to the acquirer, the more complex
4 integration measures will be (e.g., Ahuja & Katila, 2001; Cording et al., 2008), despite the fact that larger
5 acquisitions receive more managerial attention (Slangen, 2006). Thus, return on assets and market return
6 are impacted negatively (Kusewitt, 1985). Other researchers found no effect of relative size on M&A
7 performance (Bruton, Oviatt, & White, 1994) and argue that management can set structural
8 countermeasures to mitigate size mismatch effects (Kitching, 1967) or that the relationship between
9 relative size and M&A performance is too complex and could be contingent on other variables (see, for
10 instance, Kusewitt, 1985). Building on these heterogeneous results, we argue that relative size impacts
11 acquisition implementation and, thus, moderates our proposed direct relationships instead of impacting
12 performance directly.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 According to Cording et al. (2008), integration becomes a bigger challenge with increasing size of the
27 target, notwithstanding the increased attention from management that larger acquisitions receive (Slangen,
28 2006). The bigger challenge derives from the fact that greater targets are less adaptive as they have
29 routinized behaviors and inertial pressures. Despite the fact that Puranam et al. (2009) found a significant
30 positive correlation between the number of target employees and common ground (which might be
31 attributed to the measurement of common ground in terms of overlapping patents), we argue that relative
32 size negatively moderates the relationships of SMM on both exploration and exploitation for several
33 internal and external reasons.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Social identity theory argues that the individual's self-concept is embedded in a group membership
45 driving a consistency of an individual's thinking, acting, and feeling with a group (van Dick, Ullrich, &
46 Tissington, 2006). Humans belong to social groups whose importance is determined by situational
47 characteristics. Here, conflicts strengthen the allegiance to a group and a common identity fosters
48 resistance to merge with other groups (Haunschild, Moreland, & Murrell, 1994). We therefore contend
49 that an increasing relative target size fosters in-group/out-group biases. So far, organizational members
50 favoring their former group over the new group have been mainly reported when both organizations are
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 highly dissimilar (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Monden, & de Lima, 2002). Anyway, in the case
4
5 of acquisitions, it is usually the target that has to adapt and implement the acquirer's processes to create
6
7 operational synergies (Andrade, Mitchell, & Stafford, 2001). These changes lead to discontinuity for
8
9 employees, hampering the transfer of their former identity to the new organization (Ullrich & van Dick,
10
11 2007; van Dick et al., 2006). This effect is triggered by relative size. When acquired employees have
12
13 many peers from their former group, chances of accepting or building a new identity are rather low, as
14
15 commitment to the old group is maintained (Homburg & Bucerius, 2006). Furthermore, managers of
16
17 larger firms are more confident in their power and former leaders of the target organization can increase
18
19 the commitment of their employees (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004). Thus, it is assumable that target
20
21 employees stick to their former leaders and resist adapting to the new organization. These causes hamper
22
23 adjustment and neutralize the beneficial effects of SMM.
24
25
26

27
28 Next to inner-organizational issues, increased firm size comes along with institutional pressures such as
29
30 stricter labor regulations. Capron and Guillen (2009) found empirical evidence that stricter labor rights
31
32 negatively impact the redeployment of target resources. In central European countries, reporting
33
34 requirements, regulations with regard to work councils, or mandatory employee positions in the
35
36 supervisory board increase with firm size. These institutional pressures caused by firm size additionally
37
38 limit the possibilities for informal coordination through SMM as formal and transparent measures are
39
40 mandatory and have to be imprinted to the target organization.
41
42
43

44
45 With regard to exploration, smaller firms are more capable of generating explorative activities (March,
46
47 1991). This ability decreases when organizations grow, because larger organizations are more prone
48
49 towards bureaucracy, complex communication, and coordination of R&D activities (Stock, Greis, &
50
51 Fischer, 2002). Smaller firms have an exploration advantage as they can more easily adapt to changes
52
53 (Levinthal & March, 1993; March, 1991) and the performance effect of an individual is more visible than
54
55 in larger firms, which leads to greater responsibility but also to higher motivation of employees (Kamien
56
57 & Schwartz, 1975). Considering that the required agility and flexibility vanishes with increasing size, we
58
59
60

1
2
3 contend that the larger a target is relative to the acquiring company, the more difficult it will become to
4
5 utilize the benefits of SMM on exploration outcomes.
6
7

8
9 With regard to exploitation, there is evidence that organizational size affects inertial pressures leading to
10
11 the exploitation of existing capabilities. This is in line with the observation that relative size correlates
12
13 with integration. Larsson and Finkelstein (1999), for instance, found that relative size positively correlates
14
15 with organizational integration, indicating that acquirers implement tighter control mechanisms to achieve
16
17 cost-advantages and other synergies with greater targets. This would make SMM obsolete. Furthermore,
18
19 Paruchuri et al. (2006) found a negative significant correlation between relative size and loss of relative
20
21 standing of inventors, indicating that increasing relative size reduces the effects of informal coordination.
22
23

24
25 Therefore, we put the following hypotheses forward:
26
27

28 H3a: The positive relationship of task SMM on post-merger exploitation success will be moderated by
29
30 relative size, such that the positive relationship will become weaker as relative size increases.
31
32

33 H3b: The positive relationship of team SMM on post-merger exploitation success will be moderated by
34
35 relative size, such that the positive relationship will become weaker as relative size increases.
36
37

38 H3c: The positive relationship of task SMM on post-merger exploration success will be moderated by
39
40 relative size, such that the positive relationship will become weaker as relative size increases.
41
42

43 H3d: The positive relationship of team SMM on post-merger exploration success, such that the positive
44
45 relationship will become weaker as relative size increases.
46
47

48 49 **Method**

50 51 52 53 **Sample and Procedure**

1
2
3 Survey methodology for primary data collection was applied. After a face-to-face pretest with five
4 managers from various backgrounds (banking, industry, science, economics, and law) in February 2013,
5 we made minor adjustments to the questionnaire to clarify wording and add examples. Subsequently, five
6 academics as well as M&A managers conducted an additional pretest of the final questionnaire (Dillman,
7 Smyth, & Christian, 2009). The finalized questionnaires were sent out including a personalized letter
8 together with a management summary of a previous study (the intention was to trigger responses with an
9 upfront incentive (Rogelberg & Stanton, 2007) and return envelopes. Furthermore, we offered participants
10 to receive a management summary of the current survey. Regarding this issue, the respondents could fill
11 out a separate section with their contact details. The separation of this section guaranteed the respondents'
12 anonymity. Overall, managers from 655 acquirers were contacted at the beginning of March 2013.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The sample was drawn from databases from Bureau van Dijk. For the acquisition details, we used the
27 Zephyr database which is a comprehensive M&A database. Contact details were identified from the Orbis
28 database. We limited our sample to organizations with fewer than 2,000 employees, a maximum deal
29 value of 100 million Euros, and operating in long-living industries (e.g., machinery industry) in the
30 German-speaking part of Europe. We also limited the sample to acquisitions which took place between
31 January 2007 and December 2010. The sample selection followed three principles: First, in particular
32 SME acquisitions are of interest in M&A research, as the European industry structure is primarily made-
33 up of small and medium-sized firms and re-search on SME transactions is lacking (Jansen, 2008).
34 Research results and conclusions from large enterprises (e.g., Siemens or GE conducting about 100
35 acquisitions per year) or so called mega-mergers (i.e., M&A exceeding a deal value of one billion Euros)
36 cannot be automatically generalized to acquisitions by SMEs, as they differ in terms of strategic and
37 financial control systems, R&D expenses, and type of innovativeness (King, Covin, & Hegarty, 2003).
38 Furthermore, our intention was to observe a specific acquisition and its effect on the combined entity.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2009). It also ensures that post-merger integration has already been completed (Krishnan, Miller, & Judge,
4
5 1997).
6
7

8
9 Key informants of this survey included CEOs, CFOs, or managers of corporate development departments
10 of the acquirer. Top managers are best informed about strategic and organizational issues (Bauer &
11 Matzler, 2014; Ellis, Reus, Lamont, & Ranft, 2011; Homburg & Bucerius, 2006). Furthermore, in our
12 sample, acquisitions are a top management task. We opted for a single key informant design, because in
13 most cases it was impossible to survey several executives. After receiving 32 questionnaires two weeks
14 after our initial mailing, reminder emails were sent out and follow-up calls were conducted which led to a
15 total of 101 useable questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 15.42%. In consideration of the length
16 of the questionnaire and the high-level executives who were targeted, this response rate is satisfactory and
17 in line with other survey data research on M&A (Homburg & Bucerius, 2006). Following Armstrong and
18 Overton (1977), we test for differences between early and late respondents and find no significant
19 differences. Thus, non- and late-response bias is not a serious problem in our study.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Measures 34

35
36
37 To ensure the validity and reliability of the survey measurement, we adapt established measure-ments
38 from existing studies. Rating scales were chosen with either a five-point or seven-point Likert scale. Even
39 though Likert originally used a five-point scale (Pedhazur & Pedhazur Schmelkin, 1991), using a seven-
40 point scale gives the opportunity of deriving a more differentiated evaluation (Schwarz, 2010). Questions
41 relating to more distant points in time were scaled on five-point measures, whereas more recent events
42 were scaled on a seven-point measure. This is beneficial because respondents' capacity for remembering
43 decreases over time (Golden, 1992; Sudman & Bradburn, 1973). Table 3 presents the survey measurement
44 described in the following.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 *Exploration and Exploitation.* We relied on the measurements of both innovation strategy do-mains
57 introduced by He and Wong (2004), which have already been proven to be reliable and valid by other
58
59
60

1
2
3 researchers (e.g., Cao, Gedajlovic, & Zhang, 2009; Lubatkin, Simsek, Ling, & Veiga, 2006). On a seven-
4
5 point Likert scale, respondents had to indicate whether the items for each dimension improved after the
6
7 acquisition (1 = I do not agree at all; 7 = I totally agree).
8
9

10
11 *Task and Team SMM.* The discourse about how to appropriately measure SMM has resulted in different
12
13 standpoints. Due to their context-dependent nature, to date no consistent operationalization has been
14
15 developed (Mohammed et al., 2010). Some researchers imply that SMM are complex to elicit owing to the
16
17 ambiguous operationalization and the required lead-time to evolve, and therefore pose an empirical
18
19 challenge (Mathieu et al., 2009; Mohammed et al., 2010). As outlined in the theory section of our paper,
20
21 we follow the conceptualization of Cannon-Bowers et al. (1993) and apply SMM as a common
22
23 understanding of task and team coordination. We therefore analyze the presence of SMM between
24
25 acquirer and target on an organizational level. We adhere to a traditional questionnaire with rating scales,
26
27 which have been proven to reveal consistent results in terms of task and team SMM (DeChurch &
28
29 Mesmer-Magnus, 2010). Therefore, we adapted task and team SMM items introduced by Lim and Klein
30
31 (2006). Respondents were asked to assess the degree of fit in terms of task (5 items) and team SMM (6
32
33 items) prior to the acquisition on a five-point Likert scale (1 = companies did not match at all; 5 =
34
35 companies matched perfectly).
36
37
38
39

40
41 *Relative size.* Relative size is usually assessed as a ratio of acquirer and target sales (e.g., Bauer &
42
43 Matzler, 2014), market capitalization (King, Slotegraaf, & Kesner, 2008), assets, employees, or a
44
45 combination (Cording et al., 2008). Even though research on, for instance, export behavior found different
46
47 effects of size measures (Calof, 1994), in acquisition research there is evidence that the different measures
48
49 highly correlate (Hambrick & Cannella, 1993). One reason for this high correlation can be found in the
50
51 horizontal nature of most acquisitions, indicating rather homogeneous sales and assets per capita. Some
52
53 researchers even use the measures alternatively (Larsson & Finkelstein, 1999). Furthermore, the
54
55 participants of our pretest suggested that annual sales might be a more robust indicator managers would
56
57 remember. Further, annual sales reflect organizations' potential to mobilize resources and can therefore be
58
59
60

1
2
3 considered as a proxy for relative strength. This is in line with some qualitative research indicating that
4
5 managers compare firm size according to annual sales (Ranft & Lord, 2002). Consequently, annual sales
6
7 have been included as a single-item measure whereby respondents were asked to indicate the relative size
8
9 in terms of annual sales in the year of transaction (1 = <25%; 5 = > 100%).
10
11

12
13 *Control variables.* Structural integration is included as a control variable, as it might have an influence on
14
15 a more coordinated exploitation of common resources (Puranam, Singh, & Zollo, 2006), but may also
16
17 disrupt innovation capabilities (Paruchuri et al., 2006; Puranam et al., 2009). We applied the items of the
18
19 measurement model introduced by Cording et al. (2008) for marketing, production, and systems
20
21 integration. The respondents had to rate the degree of change they experienced on a seven-point Likert
22
23 scale (1 = no change at all; 7 = entire change) in terms of marketing (3 indicators), production (2
24
25 indicators), and systems (3 indicators) integration. Structural integration is measured as a second-order
26
27 reflective construct covering the three dimensions. The resource availability of an acquirer might
28
29 influence its capacity to pursue exploitation as well as exploration activities. Therefore, we included
30
31 annual sales as a proxy for the resource availability of a company. Furthermore, annual sales are
32
33 associated with well-developed acquisition routines (Barkema & Schijven, 2008) and bureaucratic
34
35 structures or formalization (Marsh & Mannari, 1981). Industry growth is incorporated to capture the firm-
36
37 specific environment. We also controlled for transaction type (horizontal, vertical, or conglomerate) and if
38
39 the transaction was an acquisition or a merger. Finally, we controlled for the number of prior M&A, as
40
41 literature provides evidence for potential influences of experience (Haleblian & Finkelstein, 1999).
42
43
44
45

46 Results

47 48 49 50 51 *Method of Analysis*

52
53
54 The study model was tested with partial least square (PLS) structural equation modelling (SEM). SEM
55
56 was the preferred choice over a standard regression analysis for two reasons: First, we investigate two
57
58 independent variables. While ordinary regression analysis cannot detect interfering effects between the
59
60

1
2
3 two independent variables, SEM enables researchers to do so (Byrne, 2013; Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt,
4
5 2014). Second, SEM is the preferred choice when research in-volves latent constructs (Bollen & Lennox,
6
7 1991).
8
9

10 PLS SEM was chosen for several reasons. Foremost, PLS SEM is favored for prediction-oriented research
11
12 like the research at hand because it aims at maximizing the explained variance of de-pendent variables
13
14 (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2012; Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, & Mena, 2012). Covariance-based SEM (CB
15
16 SEM) focuses on overall model fit and is therefore only suitable when a very strong theoretical
17
18 background is available (Barroso, Cepeda, & Roldán, 2010). This is not the case in the research at hand,
19
20 which focuses on predicting innovation outcomes from M&A transactions and enabling theory building in
21
22 M&A research by introducing SMM. Therefore, we seek to explain exploration and exploitation
23
24 innovation following a transaction and adding to future theory development on organizational learning
25
26 through M&A. Although we provide theoretical arguments for the proposed relationships, there is no
27
28 strong theory available, making the use of a prediction-oriented method preferable. According to Hair et
29
30 al. (2012), “the benefits of PLS-SEM lie in its ability to identify relationships among latent variables in the
31
32 model when they in fact exist in the population (i.e., its statistical power)” (p. 333). Therefore, the
33
34 prediction-oriented nature of PLS SEM provides opportunities for supplementary analyses, shedding
35
36 further light on poorly investigated phenomena by facilitating the identification of so-far undetected
37
38 relationships.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Additionally, PLS SEM performs superior when the research model is rather complex (Haenlein &
45
46 Kaplan, 2004; Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, et al., 2012). The number of variables employed in this research
47
48 exceeds the average number of variables reported in reviews of SEM (Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, et al., 2012;
49
50 Shah & Goldstein, 2006). As for most survey-based research investigating the phenomenon of M&A (e.g.,
51
52 Bauer & Matzler, 2014; Homburg & Bucerius, 2006), the sample size underlying this research is limited
53
54 (n = 101). Like for other statistical procedures, the statistical power of PLS SEM depends on the sample
55
56 size (Marcoulides & Chin, 2013). However, research has shown that CB SEM requires relatively large
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sample sizes ($n > 200$) while PLS SEM can achieve high levels of power with small sample sizes (Hair,
4 Sarstedt, Ringle, et al., 2012; Henseler et al., 2014). Research has therefore referred to PLS SEM as
5 “generally more favorable with smaller sample sizes and more complex models” (Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, et
6 al., 2012, p. 420). A definitive judgement regarding the superiority of one of these methods remains to be
7 delivered though (McIntosh, Edwards, & Antonakis, 2014). Furthermore, PLS SEM is a well-established
8 technique in the field of strategic management and M&A (e.g., Junni, Sarala, Tarba, & Weber, 2015).
9 Thus, we argue for the use of PLS SEM in this research.
10
11

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 PLS SEM bases its significance testing on the bootstrapping technique. As proposed in literature (Hair,
20 Sarstedt, Ringle, et al., 2012), we base all our investigations on 5,000 bootstrap runs and fix the number of
21 cases according to the sample size ($n = 101$). Additionally, the sign change option is set to individual level
22 sign changes following the recommendation of Henseler, Ringle and Sinkovics (2009). All calculations
23 are conducted with the software package SmartPLS 3.2.4 (Ringle, Wende, & Becker, 2015; SmartPLS
24 GmbH, 2016).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 *Descriptive Statistics*

34
35
36
37 The following table displays the descriptive data of our sample. In detail, we display relative size, annual
38 sales, and the average growth rates of the acquirer’s industry.
39
40
41

42 ---Insert Table 1 about here---

43
44
45 We have reason to believe that our sample reflects the real situation of the investigated industries. We
46 compared our sample with a randomly chosen sample of 101 firms of the basic population in terms of
47 relative size and annual sales. The results of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicate no statistically significant
48 differences. Furthermore, we find evidence that for medium-sized acquirers, acquisitions are a top-
49 management task. Table 2 gives information on our respondents.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 ---Insert Table 2 about here---

1
2
3 Most of the respondents are CEOs or CFOs (see Table 2). Only very few responses stem from heads of
4
5 M&A departments (which are rather unusual for the acquirers' firm size) or other firm functions. Different
6
7 hierarchical levels and organizational roles of respondents might lead to systematically different views on
8
9 organizational events, as well as in the judgment of their impact and influence (Kumar, Stern, &
10
11 Anderson, 1993). Consequently, we conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test to compare our independent,
12
13 dependent, and control variables among the different hierarchical groups. Our results suggest no
14
15 significant differences. Job tenure as well as industry experience of the respondents display the typical
16
17 character of medium-sized firms in German-speaking countries.
18
19

20 21 *Analysis of the Structural Equation Model* 22 23

24
25 Before the structural model is investigated, we check the reliability and validity of the measurement model
26
27 and its constituting latent variables. One of the criticisms of PLS refers to not being suitable for
28
29 investigating the measurement model and specifying measurement misspecifications (Rönkkö &
30
31 Eyermann, 2013). Thus, before we investigate the composite measurement model in PLS, we perform a
32
33 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 24.0.0, including all latent variables. The CFA yielded
34
35 the necessity of conducting some changes to the measurement model. First of all, two items of Team
36
37 SMM and one item each of the Task SMM and systems integration had to be excluded. Additionally, the
38
39 best model fit was achieved when treating the control variable structural integration as three separate first-
40
41 order dimensions (production, marketing, and systems integration). The final CFA shows that all the
42
43 survey items load highly on the proposed constructs (standardized loadings varied between .71 and .93).
44
45 The average variance extracted (AVE) (.56 – .72) and construct reliability (CR) (.76 – .91) are well above
46
47 the proposed thresholds recommended in literature (.50 for AVE and .60 for CR) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).
48
49 Furthermore, model fit is acceptable ($\chi^2 = 264.02$ ($p = .004$), $\chi^2/df = 1.28$; TLI = .95; CFI = .96;
50
51 RMSEA = .05). Although the χ^2 value is significant, we do not deem this problematic as this is almost
52
53 always the case and the other fit indices indicate a good model fit (Iacobucci, 2010).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 PLS models latent variables as composite factors. Thus, after specifying a suitable measurement model
4
5 with the CFA, we check the reliability and validity of the composite measurement model in PLS. Again,
6
7 the standardized loadings of the items on the respective constructs are high (.66 – .99). AVE (.66 – .80)
8
9 and CR (.83 – .94) are well above the proposed thresholds. Building on these findings, we can conclude
10
11 that our measurement model is reliable. Table 3 presents the calculations of the composite measurement
12
13 model in PLS.
14
15

16
17 ---Insert Table 3 about here---
18
19

20
21 We also investigate the discriminant validity of our model. In this respect, we calculate the For-nell-
22
23 Larcker criteria (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). We compare the correlations between the latent variables and
24
25 the squared root of the AVEs of the respective latent variables. Table 4 clearly shows that the latent
26
27 variable correlations are lower than the square roots of the AVEs. As further indication of discriminant
28
29 validity, we checked the cross-loadings of all survey items and found that all items loaded highest on the
30
31 proposed constructs (Chin, 1998). Thus, violations against discriminant validity are not an issue in this
32
33 research.
34
35

36
37 ---Insert Table 4 about here---
38
39

40
41 Previous research has highlighted the possibility of facing common method bias when conducting survey
42
43 research (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Even though some scholars refer to common
44
45 method bias as being an “urban legend” (Spector, 2006), we address this serious concern (Podsakoff,
46
47 MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012) by taking several counter measures. Our ‘a priori’ measures were first,
48
49 guaranteeing respondents anonymity and confidentiality (Podsakoff et al., 2012);second, our measures
50
51 were borrowed from existing research and we improved clarity of the items with a pretest; and third, for
52
53 our main constructs we applied multiple item measurements (Harrison, McLaughlin, & Coalter, 1996).
54
55 We further investigated the possibility of com-mon method bias, by introducing a common method factor
56
57 in the model (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Williams, Edwards, & Vandenberg, 2003). We follow the
58
59
60

1
2
3 recommendations put forward by Liang et al. (2007) for performing this analysis in PLS. The possibility
4 of common method bias is investigated by comparing the loadings on the common method factor and the
5 loadings on the respective latent variables. The average item loading on the common method factor is .01
6 compared to .81 on the respective latent variables. The respective ratio is 103.42:1. Thus, we do not
7 consider common method bias an issue.
8
9

10
11
12 As the measurement model seems to be valid and reliable, we test the structural model as a next step
13 (Hulland, 1999). The calculations provide evidence for several significant influences. Figure 1
14 summarizes the results of structural model testing.
15
16

17
18
19 ---Insert Figure 1 about here---
20
21
22

23
24
25 H1 and H2 predicted significant direct effects of Task SMM and Team SMM on post-merger exploitation
26 and exploration. Task SMM positively influence post-merger exploitation ($\beta = .20$, $p < .10$) in a
27 significant way, while the influence on post-merger exploration is nonsignificant. Team SMM
28 significantly influence post-merger exploitation ($\beta = .24$, $p < .10$) and exploration ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$)
29 positively. Our results support the predictions made for H1a, H2a and H2b, but not for H1b.
30
31
32

33
34
35 For investigating the moderation hypotheses H3, the variables are standardized before calculating the
36 interaction terms as recommended in literature (Aiken & West, 1991). To get a more detailed picture of
37 the moderating effects of relative size, we also conducted a simple slope analysis following Aiken and
38 West (1991). The results show that relative size negatively moderates the relationship between task SMM
39 and exploitation ($\beta = -.23$, $p < .05$) and thus support our prediction made in H3a. Figure 2 clearly shows
40 that the relationship between Task SMM and post-merger exploitation is far stronger when the target
41 displays a small relative size. Additionally, the simple slope analysis reveals that the relationship between
42 Task SMM and exploration is significant only for rather low levels of relative size. The slope turns
43 significant at the 10 % level when relative size reaches standardized values lower than -.16.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, the moderation effects on the relationships between team SMM and exploitation ($\beta = .22$, p
4 $< .05$) and exploration ($\beta = -.31$, $p < .05$) are significant. Contrary to the predicted effect, figure 3 shows
5
6 how a high relative size of the target strengthens the relationship between team SMM and exploitation.
7
8 The simple slope analysis demonstrates that moderation is significant for rather high levels of relative
9
10 size. The slope becomes significant at the 10 % level when relative size is slightly below the mean (at
11
12 standardized values higher than $-.07$). Thus, we find no support for our prediction made in H3b. Figure 4
13
14 shows how the positive influence of team SMM on exploration increases the smaller the target is in
15
16 relation to the acquirer. The simple slope analysis shows that the slope becomes significant at the 10% at
17
18 standardized values below $.21$ for relative size. Thus, H3d is supported.
19
20
21
22
23

24 ---Insert Table 5 about here---

25
26
27 ---Insert Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4 about here---

28
29
30
31 Three control variables show significant effects. Marketing integration ($\beta = .33$, $p < .05$) and annual
32
33 sales ($\beta = -.17$, $p < .10$) influence exploration outcomes. Marketing integration ($\beta = .21$, $p < .10$) also
34
35 influences exploitation outcomes. The proposed relationships yield an R^2 of $.22$ for exploration and of $.30$
36
37 for exploitation (see figure 1). The R^2 for exploration is rather weak (Henseler et al., 2009; Chin, 1999).
38
39 One reason might be that only one exogenous variable significantly impacts this dependent variable and
40
41 exploration might also be attributed to other variables not subject in this investigation. Table 6 presents the
42
43 path coefficients together with the respective t statistics and variance inflation factors (VIF). VIFs are
44
45 calculated for investigating potential multi-collinearity issues. All VIFs are all well below the threshold of
46
47 10 (O'Brien, 2007).
48
49
50

51
52 ---Insert Table 6 about here---

53
54
55 To evaluate the inner model, the predictive relevance (q^2 effect sizes) of the proposed model was
56
57 investigated by applying blindfolding. As proposed in literature the cross-validated redundancy approach
58
59
60

1
2
3 was used (Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, et al., 2012). For conducting this analysis, the literature proposes to
4
5 choose an omission distance between five and ten which is not a multiple of the sample size (Chin, 1998;
6
7 Henseler et al., 2009). 8 meet these criteria for the study at hand ($n = 101$). Additionally, f^2 effect sizes
8
9 display the explanatory power of the exogenous latent variables (Cohen, 1988). Table 7 presents these
10
11 calculations for the endogenous latent construct exploration. All effect sizes are positive indicating the
12
13 predictive relevancy of the proposed relationships (Chin, 1998; Henseler et al., 2009). The effect size of
14
15 task SMM of .00 is no surprise, as we did not find a significant effect on exploration. The f^2 effect sizes
16
17 turn out to be weak to medium (Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, et al., 2012), emphasizing the explanatory
18
19 relevance of the proposed relationships.
20
21

22
23
24 ---Insert Table 7 about here---

25
26
27 Table 8 presents these calculations for the endogenous latent construct exploitation. All q^2 effect sizes are
28
29 at least weakly positive, again indicating the predictive relevancy of the proposed relationships.
30
31 Furthermore, also all f^2 effect sizes are weak to moderate indicating that the proposed relationships show
32
33 explanatory power for post-merger exploitation.
34
35

36
37 ---Insert Table 8 about here---

38 39 40 *Supplementary analysis*

41
42
43 As our results indicate that team and task SMM differ with regard to their effects on innovation outcomes,
44
45 we conducted supplementary analyses. For investigating a potential difference, we calculated 95 % bias
46
47 corrected confidence intervals for the paths between task and team SMM and exploitation and exploration
48
49 success. This approach builds on the non-parametric confidence set approach (Sarstedt, Henseler, &
50
51 Ringle, 2011) which was developed for comparing path coefficients across groups. Table 9 displays the
52
53 95% bias corrected confidence intervals. The path between task SMM and exploitation does not fall into
54
55 the confidence interval of the path between task SMM and exploration. As consequence, the effect of task
56
57 SMM is significantly stronger on exploitation than on exploration. One reason might be that a common
58
59
60

1
2
3 understanding of the task environment fosters process and structural efficiency and thus, increases
4
5 exploitation success (Jansen et al., 2009; March, 1991). For team SMM we find no statistically significant
6
7 differences (see Table 9).
8
9

10
11 ---Insert Table 9 about here---
12
13

14 **Discussion**

15 16 17 18 **Theoretical Implications** 19

20
21 This study analyzed, whether task and team SMM can reinforce innovation outcomes, by enabling a
22
23 perspective that goes beyond simple performance measures and includes context-related organizational
24
25 conditions and mechanisms of value creation. From a social capital theory lens, shared mental models
26
27 might be considered as a crucial condition for learning and knowledge sharing in M&A (Aklamano,
28
29 Degbey, & Tarba, 2015). Knowledge transfer has been emphasized by Degbey (2015) for ensuring
30
31 customer retention as an important indicator of overall M&A performance. In terms of task SMM, we
32
33 provide empirical evidence for a positive relationship with post-merger exploitation success only. This
34
35 emphasizes that SMM on task-related features of a situation (e.g., technology, equipment, competitors,
36
37 strategy) (Lim & Klein, 2006; Mathieu et al., 2005) are beneficial, because exploitation activities build
38
39 upon existing capabilities (Baum et al., 2000; March, 1991). Exploitation as one manifestation of
40
41 innovation strategies is primarily concerned with improving the current state of procedures (Andriopoulos
42
43 & Lewis, 2009; Nielsen, 2010). As this approach is based upon altering what is already in place by
44
45 routine-based experiential learning (Lavie, Stettner, & Tushman, 2010), both organizations can seize their
46
47 common understanding of tasks to refine routines, improve processes, reduce redundancies, etc. Crossan
48
49 et al. (1999) provide a helpful framework for explaining how learning might transcend from the
50
51 individual, to the group, and eventually to the organization. In this respect, task SMM help acquirer and
52
53 target members to establish a common interpretation of tasks. These mutually developed interpretations
54
55 are the foundation for developing a shared understanding at the group level (the whole integration
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 management team consisting of acquirer and target employees) regarding which adaptations and
4 refinements of tasks need to be accomplished. In a final step, these shared interactive systems are
5 institutionalized through the development of routines, rules, and procedures.
6
7
8

9
10 The relationship between task SMM and exploration is nonsignificant. As task SMM are characterized by
11 a shared understanding in terms of resource allocation and sequences in complementing tasks (e.g.,
12 Kellermanns et al., 2008), these SMM might not be useful for exploration, which is geared towards
13 experimentation and variation. A possible explanation is that task SMM are heavily focused on alteration
14 of what is already in place, so that such mental models do not have any influence on the discovery of
15 entirely new approaches for radical innovation. The positive direct effect between team SMM and both
16 exploration and exploitation shows that a common understanding of team interaction fuels employees'
17 absorptive capacity, as they can rely on trust and social acceptance. Those more subjective and less
18 formally communicated codes of conduct are established through cultural learning effects (Schweiger &
19 Goulet, 2005).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In terms of relative size, we show that increasing relative size has indeed a negative influence on the task
34 SMM exploitation relationship as well as on the team SMM exploration relationship. Even though
35 exploitation focuses on improving structures and processes (Jansen et al., 2009; March, 1991) and thus
36 does not require as much freedom and autonomy, the beneficial influence of SMM can be hampered when
37 the target company is large relative to the acquirer. In that case, we assume that post-merger integration
38 management, which is primarily coordinated by the acquirer, is increasingly challenged by the target
39 organization with a higher perception of unfair management. The principle of equality – everyone receives
40 equal treatment – is spoiled, which results in social disintegration (Meyer & Altenborg, 2007). Despite
41 this, fair processes are necessary to create a fruitful environment for the intellectual value and emotional
42 well-being of employees in order to encourage them to take on new challenges and cooperate with each
43 other, which consequently leads to firm-level value creation (Ellis, Reus, & Lamont, 2009). If employees
44 are being disrupted or even dominated during the creation and maintenance of relationships, social
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 integration negatively impacts M&A success (Meyer & Altenborg, 2007). This is the case because
4
5 established intergroup dynamics and the perceived legitimacy of power relations are unsettled (Lupina-
6
7 Wegener, Schneider, & van Dick, 2011). As such, perceptions of discontinuity result in lowered
8
9 identification with the combined organization (Vuuren, Beelen, & de Jong, 2010). Well-grooved belief
10
11 structures are decisive in creating a social identity and, thus, crucial for M&A success (Hogg & Terry,
12
13 2000). However, the positive effect of team SMM among both organizations is levered out with increasing
14
15 relative size. The study shows that the relationship between team SMM and exploration is a sensitive one
16
17 that can be easily disrupted.
18
19

20
21 An interesting result derives from our control variable structural integration, as it has neither a supportive
22
23 nor a disruptive effect on exploration and exploitation. We assume that the reinforcing effect between task
24
25 and team SMM on exploration and exploitation are so strong that it makes no difference whether
26
27 integration mechanisms are applied. This ties in to the findings of Puranam et al. (2009), who already
28
29 questioned whether structural integration is necessary considering a common understanding between the
30
31 merged organizations. Furthermore, we find no evidence for a significant effect of acquisition experience
32
33 in terms of prior acquisitions undertaken by the acquirer. In general, experienced acquirers benefit from
34
35 routinized acquisition behavior as well as elaborated integration skills (Nikandrou & Papalexandris,
36
37 2007). Thus, it is not the number of prior acquisitions but rather how firms apply deliberate learning
38
39 mechanisms that impacts acquisition performance (Zollo, 2009; Zollo & Singh, 2004). As a consequence,
40
41 future research should investigate how codified and tacit experiences impact the relationships of SMM on
42
43 exploration and exploitation.
44
45
46
47

48 49 Practical Implications

50
51
52 M&A managers should make sure that targets and acquirers follow similar task and team SMM, especially
53
54 when the transaction aims at increasing exploitation. If exploration is the goal, only team SMM are of
55
56 importance. Managers secure task and team SMM following two paths. First, target screening can
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emphasize the importance of similar company cultures with regard to task and team understanding. M&A
4
5 integration can be facilitated to the extent that emotional factors like status and achievement (Graebner &
6
7 Eisenhardt, 2004) can be mitigated, when employees of both firms are aligned and have a common
8
9 understanding on norms of collaboration (Monin, Noorderhaven, Vaara, & Kroon, 2013). For instance,
10
11 prioritizing targets which have been partners in the past so that SMM might already exist. Second,
12
13 triggering the development of SMM as early as possible during integration might be a viable avenue. Joint
14
15 trainings and activities could pave the way. Zueva-Owens et al. (2012) find that evaluating cultural fit
16
17 between target and acquirer would be too complex for forecasting potential conflicts and challenges. Thus,
18
19 we suggest to look for and establish team and task SMM. Furthermore, M&A managers need to consider
20
21 that the use of SMM depends on contingency factors. In this research, we show that relative size impacts
22
23 the beneficial influence of SMM. Relatively large targets might bring along resistance against change
24
25 measures imposed on them. In particular, task SMM lose importance when targets are large. The
26
27 usefulness of team SMM is mixed when relative size is high. In this respect, team SMM are especially
28
29 helpful when post-merger exploitation should be fostered.
30
31
32
33

34 35 Limitations and Future Research

36
37
38 Although several countermeasures have been undertaken to reduce potential biases (see method section),
39
40 limitations cannot be ruled out completely. Surveys can involve problems regarding key informants'
41
42 decreasing capacity of recollection and measurement reliability (Sudman & Bradburn, 1973). In M&A
43
44 research, this is important because it takes three to five years until transaction success is measurable
45
46 (Homburg & Bucerius, 2006). Thus, key informants might not be able to remember every detail of the
47
48 transaction process. However, as the integration process normally spans several years, it is necessary to
49
50 implement a time lag to investigate M&A integration outcomes (Ellis et al., 2009). Furthermore, the
51
52 phenomena of interest (especially task and team SMM) are barely measurable with other data sources. In
53
54 addition, the research design brings along a possible key informant bias (Kumar et al., 1993). A
55
56 longitudinal research design would also have been preferable. We decided against a longitudinal design
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 because managerial turnover complicates the identification of suitable respondents, and the willingness of
4
5 managers to participate in primary data research is generally low. Finally, our sample is limited to the
6
7 German-speaking part of Europe. Consequently, the results might not be generalizable to other parts of the
8
9 world. These limitations provide fertile research opportunities for future research initiatives. A replication
10
11 of the proposed relationships accessing other data sources could prove the robustness of the results.
12
13 Recent trends in the field of emerging market multinational corporations venturing into advanced
14
15 economies, in particular, could be captured in this context (see for example Liu & Deng, 2014; Xing, Liu,
16
17 Tarba, & Cooper, 2016). Furthermore, an investigation of cultural and institutional aspects could shed
18
19 light on important contingencies of M&A performance. Also, reinforcing effects by additional human
20
21 resource management practices during M&A integration (Aklamanu et al., 2015) could be analyzed.
22
23
24
25

26 In summary, our study offers new insights into the sensitivity of shared mental models with regard to the
27
28 organizational context in M&A and their joint effects on innovation outcomes following the deal.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ahuja, G., & Katila, R. (2001). Technological acquisitions and the innovation performance of acquiring firms: A longitudinal study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(August 1998), 197–220.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Aklamanu, A., Degbey, W. Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2015). The role of HRM and social capital con-figuration for knowledge sharing in post-M&A integration: A framework for future empirical investigation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*.
- Andrade, G., Mitchell, M., & Stafford, E. (2001). New Evidence and Perspectives on Mergers. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(2), 103–120.
- Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2009). Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 696–717.
- Angwin, D. N., & Meadows, M. (2015). New integration strategies for post-acquisition management. *Long Range Planning*, 48(4), 235–251.
- Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14, 396–402.
- Atuahene-Gima, K. (2005). Resolving the capability: Rigidity paradox in new product innovation. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(4), 61–83.
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organiza-tional commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Barroso, C., Cepeda, G., & Roldán, J. L. (2010). Applying maximum likelihood and PLS on dif-ferent sample sizes: Studies on SERVQUAL model and employee behavior model. In *Handbook of Partial Least Squares* (pp. 427–448).
- Bauer, F., & Matzler, K. (2014). Antecedents of M&A success: The role of strategic complemen-tarity, cultural fit, and degree and speed of integration. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(1), 269–291.
- Bauer, F., Strobl, A., Dao, M. A., Matzler, K., & Rudolf, N. (forthcoming). Examining links between pre and post M&A value creation mechanisms — Exploitation, exploration and ambidexterity in central European SMEs. *Long Range Planning*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2016.07.002>
- Baum, J. A. C., Li, S. X., & Usher, J. M. (2000). Making the next move: How experiential and vicarious learning shape the locations of chains' acquisitions. *Administrative Science Quar-terly*, 45(4), 766–801.
- Benner, M. J., & Tushman, M. L. (2003). Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited. *The Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 238–256.

- 1
2
3 Björkman, I., Stahl, G. K., & Vaara, E. (2007). Cultural differences and capability transfer in cross-border
4 acquisitions: The mediating roles of capability complementarity, and social integration. *Journal of*
5 *International Business Studies*, 38(4), 658–672.
6
7
8 Bollen, K., & Lennox, R. (1991). Conventional wisdom on measurement: A structural equation
9 perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(2), 305–314.
10
11 Bower, J. L. (2001). Not all M&As are alike - and that matters. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 92–101.
12
13 Bruton, G. D., Oviatt, B. M., & White, M. A. (1994). Performance of acquisitions of distressed firms.
14 *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 972–989.
15
16 Burgers, J. H., Jansen, J. J. P., Van den Bosch, F. a. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2009). Structural
17 differentiation and corporate venturing: The moderating role of formal and informal integration
18 mechanisms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(3), 206–220.
19
20
21 Byrne, B. (2013). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. New York, NY: Routledge.
22
23 Calipha, R., Tarba, S. Y., & Brock, D. M. (2010). Mergers and acquisitions: A review of phases, motives,
24 and success factors. *Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions*, 9, 1–24.
25
26 Calof, J. L. (1994). The relationship between firm size and export behavior revisited. *Journal of*
27 *International Business Studies*, 25(2), 367–387.
28
29 Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Salas, E., & Converse, S. (1993). Shared mental models in expert team decision
30 making. In N. J. Castellan (Ed.), *Individual and group decision making* (pp. 221–246). Hillsdale:
31 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
32
33 Cao, Q., Gedajlovic, E., & Zhang, H. (2009). Unpacking organizational ambidexterity: Dimensions,
34 contingencies, and synergistic effects. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 781–796.
35
36 Capron, L., & Guillén, M. (2009). National corporate governance institutions and post-acquisition target
37 reorganization. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(8), 803–833.
38
39 Capron, L., & Pistre, N. (2002). When do acquirers earn abnormal returns? *Strategic Management Journal*,
40 23(9), 781–794.
41
42 Carley, K. M. (1997). Extracting team mental models through textual analysis. *Journal of Organizational*
43 *Behavior*, 18, 533–558.
44
45 Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach for structural equation modelling. In G. A.
46 Marcoulides (Ed.), *Methodology for Business & Management* (pp. 295–336). Mahwah, NJ:
47 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
48
49 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
50 Associates.
51
52 Cooke, N. J., Salas, E., Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Stout, R. J. (2000). Measuring team knowledge. *Human*
53 *Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 42(1), 151–173.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cording, M., Christman, P., & King, D. R. (2008). Reducing causal ambiguity in acquisition in-tegration:
4 Intermediate goals as mediators of integration decisions and acquisition performance. *Academy of*
5 *Management Journal*, 51(4), 744–767.
6
7 Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From
8 intuition to institution. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 522–537.
9
10 Dao, M. A., Bauer, F., Strobl, A., Matzler, K., & Eulerich, M. (2016). The complementing and facilitating
11 nature of common ground in acquisitions – why task and human integration are still necessary in the
12 presence of common ground. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(20),
13
14 Darr, E. D., & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2000). An investigation of partner similarity dimensions on knowledge
15 transfer. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), 28–44.
16
17 Datta, D. K. (1991). Organizational fit and acquisition performance: Effects of post-acquisition
18 integration. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(4), 281–297.
19
20 DeChurch, L. A., & Mesmer-Magnus, J. R. (2010). Measuring shared team mental models: A meta-
21 analysis. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 14(1), 1–14.
22
23 Degbey, W. Y. (2015). Customer retention: A source of value for serial acquirers. *Industrial Marketing*
24 *Management*, 46(11–23).
25
26 Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The*
27 *tailored design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken: Wiley & Sons.
28
29 Ellis, K. M., Reus, T. H., & Lamont, B. T. (2009). The effects of procedural and informational justice in
30 the integration of related acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 161(November 2008), 137–
31 161.
32
33 Ellis, K. M., Reus, T. H., Lamont, B. T., & Ranft, A. L. (2011). Transfer effects in large acquisitions: How
34 size-specific experience matters. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1261–1276.
35
36 Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117–140.
37
38 Golden, B. R. (1992). The past is the past - or is it? The use of retrospective accounts as indicators of past
39 strategy. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 35(4), 848–860.
40
41 Gomes, E., Angwin, D. N., Weber, Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2013). Critical success factors through the mergers
42 and acquisitions Process: Revealing pre- and post-M&A connections for improved performance.
43 *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 55(1), 13–35.
44
45 Graebner, M. E. (2004). Momentum and serendipity: How acquired leaders create value in the integration
46 of technology firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(89), 751–777.
47
48 Graebner, M. E., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2004). The seller's side of the story: Acquisition as courtship and
49 governance as syndicate in entrepreneurial firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49, 366–403.
50
51 Graebner, M. E., Heimeriks, K. H., Huy, Q. N., & Vaara, E. (forthcoming). The process of post-merger
52 integration: A review and agenda for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gruenfeld, D. H., Mannix, E. A., Williams, K. Y., & Neale, M. A. (1996). Group composition and
4 decision making: How member familiarity and information distribution affect process and
5 performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67(1), 1–15.
6
7
8 Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The Interplay between exploration and exploitation.
9 *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 693–706.
10
11 Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. M. (2004). NoA beginner's guide to partial least square analysis.
12 *Understanding Statistics*, 3(4), 283–297.
13
14 Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares*
15 *structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
16
17 Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2012). Partial least squares: The better approach to structural
18 equation modeling? *Long Range Planning*, 45(5–6), 312–319.
19
20 Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Pieper, T. M., & Ringle, C. M. (2012). The use of partial least squares structural
21 equation modeling in strategic management research: A review of past practices and
22 recommendations for future applications. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5–6), 320–340.
23
24 Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least
25 squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*
26 *Science*, 40(3), 414–433.
27
28 Halebian, J., & Finkelstein, S. (1999). The influence of organizational acquisition experience on
29 acquisition performance: A behavioral learning perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44,
30 29–56.
31
32 Hambrick, D. C., & Cannella, A. A. (1993). Relative standing: A framework for understanding departures
33 of acquired executives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(4), 733–762.
34
35 Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American*
36 *Psychological Review*, 49(2), 149–164.
37
38 Harrison, D. A., McLaughlin, M. E., & Coalter, T. M. (1996). Context, cognition, and common method
39 variance: Psychometric and verbal protocol evidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
40 *Decision Processes*, 68(3), 246–261.
41
42 Haspeslagh, P. C., & Jemison, D. B. (1991). *Managing acquisitions. Creating value through corporate*
43 *renewal*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
44
45 Haunschild, P. R., Moreland, R. L., & Murrell, A. J. (1994). Sources of resistance to mergers between
46 groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(13), 1150–1178.
47
48 He, Z.-L., & Wong, P.-K. (2004). Exploration vs. exploitation: An empirical test of the ambidexterity
49 hypothesis. *Organization Science*, 15(4), 481–494.
50
51 Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T. K., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Diamantopoulos, A., Straub, D. W., ...
52 Calantone, R. J. (2014). Common beliefs and reality about PLS: Comments on Rönkkö and
53 Evermann. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(2), 182–209.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). *Advances in international marketing*. Bingley:
4 Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
5
6 Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational
7 contexts. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121–140.
8
9
10 Homburg, C., & Bucerius, M. (2006). Is speed of integration really a success factor of mergers and
11 acquisitions? An analysis of the role of internal and external relatedness. *Strategic Management*
12 *Journal*, 27, 347–367.
13
14 Hulland, J. (1999). Use of partial least square (PLS) in strategic management research. A review of four
15 recent studies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2), 195–204.
16
17 Iacobucci, D. (2010). Structural equation modeling: Fit indices, sample size, and advanced topics. *Journal*
18 *of Consumer Psychology*, 20, 90–98.
19
20
21 Jansen, J. J. P., Tempelaar, M. P., van den Bosch, F. a. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2009). Structural
22 Differentiation and Ambidexterity: The Mediating Role of Integration Mechanisms. *Organization*
23 *Science*, 20(4), 797–811.
24
25 Jansen, S. A. (2008). *Mergers & acquisitions: Unternehmensakquisitionen und -kooperationen. Eine*
26 *strategische, organisatorische und kapitalmarkttheoretische Einführung* (5th ed.). Wiesbaden,
27 Germany: Gabler Verlag.
28
29 Jemison, D. B., & Sitkin, S. B. (1986). Corporate acquisitions: A process perspective. *The Academy of*
30 *Management Review*, 11(1), 145–163.
31
32 Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1983). *Mental Models. Towards a cognitive science of language, inference, and*
33 *consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
34
35 Junni, P., Sarala, R. M., Taras, V., & Tarba, S. Y. (2013). Organizational ambidexterity and performance:
36 A meta-analysis. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*.
37
38 Junni, P., Sarala, R. M., Tarba, S. Y., Liu, Y., & Cooper, C. L. (2015). The role of human resources and
39 organizational factors in ambidexterity. *Human Resource Management*, 54(S1), 1–28.
40
41 Junni, P., Sarala, R. M., Tarba, S. Y., & Weber, Y. (2015). The Role of Strategic Agility in Acquisitions.
42 *British Journal of Management*, 26(4), 596–616.
43
44
45 Kamien, M. I., & Schwartz, N. L. (1975). Market structure and innovation: A survey. *Journal of*
46 *Economic Literature*, 13(1), 1–37.
47
48 Kauppila, O.-P. (2010). Creating ambidexterity by integrating and balancing structurally separate
49 interorganizational partnerships. *Strategic Organization*, 8(4), 283–312.
50
51
52 Kellermanns, F. W., Floyd, S. W., Pearson, A. W., & Spencer, B. (2008). The contingent effect of
53 constructive confrontation on the relationship between shared mental models and decision quality.
54 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(1), 119–137.
55
56 King, D. R., Covin, J. G., & Hegarty, W. H. (2003). Complementary resources and the exploitation of
57 technological innovations. *Journal of Management*, 29(4), 589–606.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 King, D. R., Slotegraaf, R. J., & Kesner, I. (2008). Performance implications of firm resource interactions
4 in the acquisition of R&D-intensive firms. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 327–340.
5
6
7 Kitching, J. (1967). Why do mergers miscarry? *Harvard Business Review*, 45(6), 84–101.
8
9 Kostopoulos, K. C., & Bozionelos, N. (2011). Team exploratory and exploitative learning: Psychological
10 safety, task conflict, and team performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(3), 385–415.
11
12 Koza, M. P., & Lewin, A. Y. (1998). The co-evolution of strategic alliances. *Organization Science*, 9(3),
13 255–264.
14
15 Krishnan, H. A., Miller, A., & Judge, W. Q. (1997). Diversification and top management team
16 complementarity: Is performance improved by merging similar or dissimilar teams? *Strategic*
17 *Management Journal*, 18(5), 361–374.
18
19 Kumar, N., Stern, L. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1993). Conducting interorganizational research using key
20 informants. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1633–1651.
21
22
23 Kusewitt Jr, J. B. (1985). An exploratory study of strategic acquisition factors relating to performance.
24 *Strategic Management Journal*, 6(2), 151–169.
25
26 Langan-Fox, J., Wirth, A., Code, S., Langfield-Smith, K., & Wirth, A. (2001). Analyzing shared and team
27 mental models. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 28, 99–112.
28
29 Larsson, R., & Finkelstein, S. (1999). Integrating strategic, organizational, and human resource
30 perspectives on mergers and acquisitions: A case survey of synergy realization. *Organization*
31 *Science*, 10(1), 1–26.
32
33
34 Lavie, D., Stettner, U., & Tushman, M. L. (2010). Exploration and exploitation within and across
35 organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 109–155.
36
37 Levinthal, D. A., & March, J. G. (1993). The myopia of learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(2),
38 95–112.
39
40 Lewis, M. W., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Paradox as a metatheoretical perspective: Sharpening the focus and
41 widening the scope. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 50(2), 127–149.
42
43 Liang, H., Saraf, N., Hu, Q., & Xue, Y. (2007). Assimilation of enterprise systems: The effect of
44 institutional pressures and the mediating role of top management. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 59–87.
45
46
47 Lim, B. C., & Klein, K. J. (2006). Team mental models and team performance: A field study of the effects
48 of team mental model similarity and accuracy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), 403–418.
49
50 Liu, Y., & Deng, P. (2014). Chinese cross-border M&A: Past achievement, contemporary debates and
51 future direction. *Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions*, 13, 85–107.
52
53 Lubatkin, M. H., Simsek, Z., Ling, Y., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Ambidexterity and performance in small-to
54 medium-sized firms: The pivotal role of top management team behavioral integration. *Journal of*
55 *Management*, 32(5), 646–672.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lupina-Wegener, A. A., Schneider, S. C., & van Dick, R. (2011). Different experiences of socio-cultural
4 integration: A European merger in Mexico. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24(1),
5 65–89.
6
7
8 March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1),
9 71–87.
10
11 Marcoulides, G. A., & Chin, W. W. (2013). You write, but others read: Common methodological
12 misunderstandings in PLS and related methods. In H. Abdi, H. H. Chin, V. Esposito Vinzi, G.
13 Russolillo, & L. Trinchera (Eds.), *New perspectives in partial least squares and related methods* (pp.
14 31–64). New York, NY: Springer New York.
15
16 Marsh, R. M., & Mannari, H. (1981). Technology and size as determinants of the organizational structure
17 of Japanese factories. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 33.
18
19 Mathieu, J. E., Heffner, T. S., Goodwin, G. F., Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Salas, E. (2005). Scaling the
20 quality of teammates' mental models: Equifinality and normative comparisons. *Journal of*
21 *Organizational Behavior*, 26(1), 37–56.
22
23 Mathieu, J. E., Heffner, T. S., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). The influence of
24 shared mental models on team process and performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2),
25 273–83.
26
27
28 Mathieu, J. E., Rapp, T. L., Maynard, M. T., & Mangos, P. M. (2009). Interactive effects of team and task
29 shared mental models as related to air traffic controllers' collective efficacy and effectiveness.
30 *Human Performance*, 23(1), 22–40.
31
32
33 Maynard, M. T., & Gilson, L. L. (2014). The role of shared mental model development in understanding
34 virtual team effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 39(1), 3–32.
35
36 McIntosh, C. N., Edwards, J. R., & Antonakis, J. (2014). Reflections on partial least squares path
37 modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*.
38
39 Meglio, O., King, D. R., & Risberg, A. (2015). Improving acquisition outcomes with contextual
40 ambidexterity. *Human Resource Management*, 54(S1), S29–S43.
41
42 Meyer, C. B., & Altenborg, E. (2007). The disintegrating effects of equality: A study of a failed
43 international merger. *British Journal of Management*, 18(3), 257–271.
44
45 Mohammed, S., & Dumville, B. C. (2001). Team mental models in a team knowledge framework:
46 Expanding theory and measurement across disciplinary boundaries. *Journal of Organizational*
47 *Behavior*, 22, 89–106.
48
49 Mohammed, S., Ferzandi, L., & Hamilton, K. (2010). Metaphor no more: A 15-year review of the team
50 mental model construct. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 876–910.
51
52
53 Monin, P., Noorderhaven, N., Vaara, E., & Kroon, D. (2013). Giving sense to and making sense of justice
54 in postmerger integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1), 256–284.
55
56
57 Nielsen, B. B. (2010). Strategic fit, contractual, and procedural governance in alliances. *Journal of*
58 *Business Research*, 63, 682–689.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nikandrou, I., & Papalexandris, N. (2007). The impact of M&A experience on strategic HRM practices
4 and organisational effectiveness: Evidence from Greek firms. *Human Resource Management*
5 *Journal*, 17(2), 155–177.
6
- 7 O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb of variance inflation factors. *Quality &*
8 *Quantity*, 41(5), 673–690.
9
- 10 Paruchuri, S., Nerkar, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2006). Acquisition integration and productivity losses in the
11 technical core: Disruption of inventors in acquired companies. *Organization Science*, 17(5), 545–
12 562.
13
- 14 Pedhazur, E. J., & Pedhazur Schmelkin, L. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated*
15 *approach*. New York: Psychology Press.
16
- 17 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in
18 behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *The Journal of*
19 *Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.
20
- 21 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science
22 research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–69.
23
- 24 Puranam, P., Singh, H., & Chaudhuri, S. (2009). Integrating acquired capabilities: When structural
25 integration is (un)necessary. *Organization Science*, 20(2), 313–328.
26
- 27 Puranam, P., Singh, H., & Zollo, M. (2006). Organizing for innovation: Managing the coordination-
28 autonomy dilemma in technology acquisitions. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 263–
29 280.
30
- 31 Puranam, P., & Srikanth, K. (2007). What they know vs. what they do: How acquirers leverage
32 technology acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(8), 805–825.
33
- 34 Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational ambidexterity: Balancing
35 exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 685–695.
36
- 37 Ranft, A. L., & Lord, M. D. (2002). Acquiring new technologies and capabilities: A grounded model of
38 acquisition implementation. *Organization Science*, 13(4), 420–441.
39
- 40 Reus, T. H., & Lamont, B. T. (2009). The double-edged sword of cultural distance in international
41 acquisitions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40, 1298–1316.
42
- 43 Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2015). *SmartPLS3*. Boenningstedt: SmartPLS GmbH.
44
- 45 Rogelberg, S. G., & Stanton, J. M. (2007). Understanding and dealing with organizational survey
46 nonresponse. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(2), 195–209.
47
- 48 Rönkkö, M., & Eyermann, J. (2013). A critical examination of common beliefs about partial least squares
49 path modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(3), 425–448.
50
- 51 Sarstedt, M., Henseler, J., & Ringle, C. M. (2011). Multigroup analysis in partial least squares (PLS) path
52 modeling: Alternative methods and empirical results. *Advances in International Marketing*, 22,
53 195–218.
54
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Schwarz, N. (2010). Measurement as cooperative communication: What research participants learn from
4 questionnaires. In G. Walford, E. Tucker, & M. Viswanathan (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of*
5 *measurement* (pp. 43–59). London: SAGE Publications.
6
7
8 Schweiger, D. M., & Goulet, P. K. (2005). Facilitating acquisition integration through deep-Level cultural
9 learning interventions: A longitudinal field experiment. *Organization Studies*, 26(10), 1477–1499.
10
11 Schweizer, L. (2005). Organizational integration of acquired biotechnology companies into
12 pharmaceutical companies: The need for a hybrid approach. *Academy of Management Journal*,
13 48(6), 1051–1074.
14
15 Shah, R., & Goldstein, S. M. (2006). Use of structural equation modeling in operations management
16 research: Looking back and forward. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24(2), 148–169.
17
18 Slangen, A. H. L. (2006). National cultural distance and initial foreign acquisition performance: The
19 moderating effect of integration. *Journal of World Business*, 41(2), 161–170.
20
21 SmartPLS GmbH. (2016). *SmartPLS 3*. Boenningstedt.
22
23
24 Smith-Jentsch, K. A., Campbell, G. E., Milanovich, D. M., & Reynolds, A. M. (2001). Measuring
25 teamwork mental models to support training needs assessment, development, and evaluation: Two
26 empirical studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(2), 179–194.
27
28 Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational*
29 *Research Methods*, 9(2), 221–232.
30
31 Stadler, C. (2007). The 4 Principles of Enduring Success. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(7/8), 62–72.
32
33 Stahl, G. K., & Voigt, A. (2008). Do cultural differences matter in mergers and acquisitions? A tentative
34 model and examination. *Organization Science*, 19(1), 160–176.
35
36 Stock, G. N., Greis, N. P., & Fischer, W. A. (2002). Firm size and dynamic technological innovation.
37 *Technovation*, 22(9), 537–549.
38
39 Stout, R. J., Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Salas, E., & Milanovich, D. M. (1999). Planning, shared mental
40 models, and coordinated performance: An empirical link is established. *Human Factors*, 41(1), 61–
41 71.
42
43
44 Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1973). Effects of time and memory factors on response in surveys.
45 *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 68(344), 805–815.
46
47
48 Tanriverdi, H., & Venkatraman, N. (2005). Knowledge relatedness and the performance of multibusiness
49 firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 97–119. <http://doi.org/10.1002/smj.435>
50
51 Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic*
52 *Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
53
54 Ullrich, J., & van Dick, R. (2007). The group psychology of mergers & acquisitions: Lessons from the
55 social identity approach. *Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions*, 6, 1–15.
56
57 van Dick, R., Ullrich, J., & Tissington, P. A. (2006). Working under a black cloud: How to sustain
58 organizational identification after a merger. *British Journal of Management*, 17(S1), S69–S79.
59
60

- 1
2
3 van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., Monden, L., & de Lima, F. (2002). Organizational
4 identification after a merger: A social identity perspective. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41,
5 233–252.
6
7
8 Very, P., Lubatkin, M., Calori, R., & Veiga, J. (1997). Relative standing and the performance of recently
9 acquired european firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(8), 593–614.
10
11 Vuuren, M., Beelen, P., & de Jong, M. D. T. (2010). Speaking of dominance, status differences, and
12 identification: Making sense of a merger. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*,
13 83, 627–643.
14
15 Weber, Y., Shenkar, O., & Raveh, A. (1996). National and corporate cultural fit in mergers/acquisitions:
16 An exploratory study. *Management Science*, 42(8), 1215–1227.
17
18 Weber, Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2011). Exploring integration approach in related mergers: Post-merger
19 integration in the high-tech industry. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 19(3), 202–
20 221.
21
22
23 Williams, L. J., Edwards, J. R., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2003). Recent advances in causal modeling methods
24 for organizational and management research. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 903–936.
25
26 Xing, Y., & Liu, Y. (2015). Linking leaders' identity work and human resource management involvement:
27 the case of sociocultural integration in Chinese mergers and acquisitions. *The International Journal*
28 *of Human Resource Management*, 5192(November), 1–28.
29
30 Xing, Y., Liu, Y., Tarba, S., & Cooper, C. L. (2016). Servitization in mergers and acquisitions:
31 Manufacturing firms venturing from emerging markets into advanced economies. *International*
32 *Journal of Production Economics*, (December 2015), 0–1.
33
34
35 Zhang, J., Ahammad, M. F., Tarba, S. Y., Cooper, C. L., Glaister, K. W., & Wang, J. (2015). The effect of
36 leadership style on talent retention during Merger and Acquisition integration: evidence from
37 China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(7), 1021–1050.
38
39 Zollo, M. (2009). Superstitious learning with rare strategic decisions: Theory and evidence from corporate
40 acquisitions. *Organization Science*, 20(5), 894–908.
41
42 Zollo, M., & Singh, H. (2004). Deliberate learning in corporate acquisitions: Post-acquisition strategies
43 and integration capability in U.S. bank mergers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 1233–1256.
44
45
46 Zueva-Owens, A., Fotaki, M., & Ghauri, P. (2012). Cultural evaluations in acquired companies: Focusing
47 on subjectivities. *British Journal of Management*, 23(2), 272–290.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Relative size	%	Industry growth	%	Annual sales of consolidated business in €	%
< 25%	47.7	> -15%	3.6	< 25 million	11.8
25% - 49%	34.9	-15% to -5%	7.2	25-49 million	15.3
50% - 74%	11.6	-4% to +/-0%	9.6	50-99 million	12.9
75% - 100%	1.2	1% to 5%	36.1	100-249 million	21.2
> 100%	4.7	6% to 10%	36.1	250-499 million	15.3
		11% to 20%	6.0	500-1.000 million	9.4
		> 21%	1.2	> 1.000 million	14.1

Table 1: Sample descriptives

Industry Experience	%	Job Tenure	%	Position	%
< 5 years	25.7	< 1 year	5.7	CEO	42
6-10 years	32.7	2-4 years	20.5	CFO	23
11-15 years	18.8	4-6 years	15.9	Head of M&A Department	28
16-20 years	8.9	6-8 years	11.4		
21-25 years	6.9	8-10 years	17.0	Head of Firm-Function	7
> 25 years	6.9	> 10 years	29.5		

Table 2: Information on the respondents

Construct and Items	Loadings
<i>Task SMM (AVE = .80; CR = .94)</i>	
... employees' understanding of their own working processes	.87
... employees' understanding of company processes	.90
... employees' understanding of the company strategy	.92
... employees' understanding of tasks from other departments	.89
<i>Team SMM (AVE = .69; CR = .90)</i>	
... the role managers play for the employees	.76
... employees' mutual support	.85
... employees' understanding of their team member's abilities	.89
... employees' understanding of their team members' personal background (e.g., family, hobbies, habits)	.82
<i>Exploration (AVE = .76; CR = .93)</i>	
... we were better in introducing new product generations	.91
... we were better in extending our product ranges	.90
... we were better in opening up new markets	.86
... we were better in entering new technology fields	.82
<i>Exploitation (AVE = .66; CR = .89)</i>	
... we could improve existing product quality	.85
... we could improve production flexibility	.82
... we could reduce production costs	.82
... we could improve yield and/or reduce material consumption	.76
Structural Integration	
<i>Marketing Integration (AVE = .79; CR = .92)</i>	
Distribution channels	.88
Sales / aftersales service	.88
Marketing programs	.90
<i>Production Integration (AVE = .78; CR = .88)</i>	
Production	.97
Sourcing	.79
<i>Systems Integration (AVE = .72; CR = .83)</i>	
Strategic Planning Systems	.99
Financial Systems	.66
<i>Relative Size</i>	<i>single item</i>
<i>Industry Growth</i>	<i>single item</i>
<i>Annual Sales</i>	<i>single item</i>
<i>Transaction Type</i>	<i>single item</i>
<i>Prior Acquisition</i>	<i>single item</i>
<i>Acquisition / Merger</i>	<i>single item</i>

Table 3: Psychometric Properties of the Scales

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Annual Sales (1)	<i>1</i>												
Exploitation (2)	-.04	.87											
Exploration (3)	.03	.52	.81										
Industry Growth (4)	.22	.00	.12	<i>1</i>									
Marketing Integration (5)	-.09	.28	.28	.17	.89								
Merger/Acquisition (6)	.01	.25	.03	.22	-.12	<i>1</i>							
Prior Acquisitions (7)	.28	.02	.03	-.05	-.02	.07	<i>1</i>						
Production Integration (8)	-.21	.12	.10	.05	.62	-.09	.06	.88					
Relative Size (9)	.06	.09	.07	.10	.07	.42	-.16	.00	<i>1</i>				
Systems Integration (10)	-.03	.02	.05	.00	.49	-.07	.07	.39	-.07	.85			
Task SMM (11)	.03	.38	.23	.05	.17	.06	-.01	-.06	-.03	-.02	.90		
Team SMM (12)	-.05	.40	.27	.02	.16	-.04	-.10	.06	-.08	-.04	.71	.83	
Transaction Type (13)	-.02	-.12	-.06	-.17	-.09	.46	-.11	-.12	-.13	.03	-.06	-.06	<i>1</i>
Mean	3.94	4.43	4.55	4.17	4.64	1.87	2.73	4.29	1.80	5.29	3.31	3.21	1.32
STDV	1.77	1.19	1.46	1.08	1.46	0.32	1.25	1.64	0.94	1.47	.92	.86	0.51

Square root of AVE in italics on the diagonal

Table 4: Latent Variable Correlations

Paths	Gradient	T-Statistic
<i>Task SMM → Exploitation</i>		
Low Relative Size	.43**	2.29
Mean Relative Size	.20	1.44
High Relative Size	-.03	.17
<i>Team SMM → Exploitation</i>		
Low Relative Size	.02	.11
Mean Relative Size	.24*	1.79
High Relative Size	.46***	2.53
<i>Team SMM → Exploration</i>		
Low Relative Size	.61**	2.32
Mean Relative Size	.30**	1.99
High Relative Size	-.01	.04
Significant at *p<.1, **p<.05, ***p<.01		

Table 5: Simple Slope Analysis

Paths	Estimate	T Statistics	VIF
<i>Main Effects Exploration</i>			
Task SMM → Exploration	-.08	.83	2.62
Team SMM → Exploration	.30**	2.08	2.56
Relative Size → Exploration	.07	.74	1.95
<i>Interaction Effects Exploration</i>			
Task SMM * Relative Size → Exploration	.04	.41	2.54
Team SMM * Relative Size → Exploration	-.31**	1.98	2.51
<i>Controls Exploration</i>			
Marketing Integration → Exploration	.33**	2.31	2.31
Production Integration → Exploration	-.13	1.11	2.04
Systems Integration → Exploration	-.09	1.02	1.43
Industry Growth → Exploration	.12	1.09	2.41
Annual Sales → Exploration	-.17*	1.67	2.08
Transaction Type → Exploration	-.05	.73	1.47
Prior Transactions → Exploration	.12	1.28	1.52
Acquisition / Merger → Exploration	-.08	.93	1.88
<i>Main Effects Exploitation</i>			
Task SMM → Exploitation	.20*	1.68	2.45
Team SMM → Exploitation	.24*	1.95	2.28
Relative Size → Exploitation	.12	1.27	1.95
<i>Interaction Effects Exploitation</i>			
Task SMM * Relative Size → Exploitation	-.23**	2.21	1.31
Team SMM * Relative Size → Exploitation	.22**	1.97	1.45
<i>Controls Exploitation</i>			
Marketing Integration → Exploitation	.21*	1.65	2.30
Production Integration → Exploitation	-.04	.41	2.04
Systems Integration → Exploitation	-.02	.24	1.43
Industry Growth → Exploitation	-.01	.16	2.41
Annual Sales → Exploitation	-.06	.77	2.04
Transaction Type → Exploitation	-.10	1.14	1.47
Prior Transactions → Exploitation	.08	.93	1.50
Acquisition / Merger → Exploitation	-.11	1.12	1.93

Significant at *p<.1, **p<.05, ***p<.01

Table 6: Estimates and T Statistics

Exploration	Q² (OD=8)	q²	R²	f² Effect Size
Full Model	.12		.22	
Model Without Task SMM	.12	.00	.22	.01
Model Without Team SMM	.09	.03	.17	.06
Model Without Relative Size	.08	.05	.16	.08
Model Without Controls	.06	.07	.12	.12

Table 7: q² and f² Effect Sizes for Exploration


Exploitation	Q² (OD=8)	q²	R²	f² Effect Size
Full Model	.12		.30	
Model Without Task SMM	.11	.02	.26	.07
Model Without Team SMM	.12	.01	.26	.06
Model Without Relative Size	.12	.00	.25	.07
Model Without Controls	.08	.05	.24	.10

Table 8: q² and f² Effect Sizes for Exploitation

Path	Estimate	95 % Bc CI	T Statistics
Task SMM → Exploitation	.20*	.02 - .49	1.68
Task SMM → Exploration	-.08	-.27 - .00	.83
Team SMM → Exploitation	.24*	.02 - .48	1.95
Team SMM → Exploration	.30**	.04 - .61	2.08

Significant at *p<.1, **p<.05, ***p<.01

Table 9: 95 % bias corrected confidence intervals



Significant at *p<.1, **p<.05, ***p<.01

Figure 1: Results




Figure 2: The Moderating Effect of Relative Size on the Relationship between Task SMM and

Exploitation




Figure 3: The Moderating Effect of Relative Size on the Relationship between Team SMM and Exploitation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4: The Moderating Effect of Relative Size on the Relationship between Team SMM and Exploration