

collection took place under the Covid-19 pandemic social distancing restrictions. It is our perception that IT professionals have been dealing with a high workload at data collection time. We relied on attention check questions to increase the rigor and discard responses with any indication of reduced attention levels while responding the questionnaire.

It is also important to recognize that data was collected through a snowballing approach. We minimized the possible associated bias by actively pushing the survey to IT executives on groups outside the authors' relationship network.

For practitioners, our study can be leveraged by IT executives as a ruler to measure ITPA at a more foundational level, the learning, organizing, belonging, and performing dimensions of an IT project. This ability would facilitate the identification of specific areas with lower ambidexterity levels when dealing with projects and thus inform the IT executives about necessary course corrections to expedite the IT ambidexterity capacity development.

By offering a new construct, this study prepares the foundation for future investigations. It would be interesting to assess the ITPA influence on other constructs like the IT application orchestration capability, that ultimately influences firm performance [42]. While ITPA is conceptualized at the project level, some paradoxical tensions are expected to take place at the program level or at the program to project interface [14]. Analyzing these possible differences may open new avenues for research, including the expansion of the ITPA concept to these additional levels. The current research model could also be enriched through the addition of moderating factors. For example, we speculate that using a high level of contractor staffing in IT projects may reduce the influence of ITPA on ITA, meaning third party consultants that come and go according to the project lifecycle might leave a lower contribution to the overall IT function ambidexterity construction. Another possible moderator would be the project orientation level of a firm. We suspect the ITPA influence on ITA may be lower on highly project-oriented firms because this more mature methodological approach could potentially help reduce some of the paradoxical tensions in IT projects.

8. Conclusion

Organizations are increasingly exposed to paradoxes, and our study discusses how the ability to deal with them in IT projects influence the construction of an IT function capable of simultaneously emphasizing exploration and exploitation characteristics.

We conceptualized and tested a new construct, ITPA, and found it has a positive and significant influence on ITA. This is a crucial relationship because previous studies already demonstrated ITA favors organizational agility and business performance. In essence, we shed additional light on how to achieve these almost universal strategic imperatives.

We hope this study encourages other researchers to leverage the paradox theory in their investigations as the current environment is indeed full of paradoxical tensions. We also aspire to see the ITPA construct being used to help advance the information systems field and contributing to real-life digital transformation journeys.

10. References

1. Bennett, N. and G.J. Lemoine, *What a difference a word makes: Understanding threats to performance in a VUCA world*. Business Horizons, 2014. **57**(3): p. 311-317.
2. BNDES. *Company size classification (Classificação do Porte de Empresa)*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.bndes.gov.br/wps/portal/site/home/financiamento/guia/porte-de-empresa>.
3. Millar, C., O. Groth, and J.F. Mahon, *Management Innovation in a VUCA World: Challenges and Recommendations*. California Management Review, 2018. **61**(1): p. 5-14.
4. Seow, P.S., G. Pan, and G. Koh, *Examining an experiential learning approach to prepare students for the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) work environment*. International Journal of Management Education, 2019. **17**(1): p. 62-76.
5. Thoren, K. and M. Vendel, *Backcasting as a strategic management tool for meeting VUCA challenges*. Journal of Strategy and Management, 2019. **12**(2): p. 298-312.
6. Nwankpa, J.K. and Y. Roumani. *IT capability and digital transformation: A firm performance perspective*. in *2016 International Conference on Information Systems, ICIS 2016*. 2016.
7. Rossmann, A. *Digital maturity: Conceptualization and measurement model*. in *International Conference on Information Systems 2018, ICIS 2018*. 2018.
8. Kane, G.C., et al., *Aligning the Organization for Its Digital Future*. MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte University Press, 2016(Summer).
9. Warner, K.S.R. and M. Wäger, *Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal*. Long Range Planning, 2019. **52**(3): p. 326-349.
10. Schad, J., et al., *Paradox Research in Management Science: Looking Back to Move Forward*. Academy of Management Annals, 2016. **10**(1): p. 5-64.
11. O'Reilly III, C.A. and M.L. Tushman, *Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma*. Research in Organizational Behavior, 2008. **28**: p. 185-206.

12. Lee, O.-K., et al., *How Does IT Ambidexterity Impact Organizational Agility?* Information Systems Research, 2015. **26**(2): p. 398-417.
13. Nwankpa, J.K. and P. Datta, *Balancing exploration and exploitation of IT resources: the influence of Digital Business Intensity on perceived organizational performance.* European Journal of Information Systems, 2017. **26**(5): p. 469-488.
14. Gregory, R.W., et al., *Paradoxes and the Nature of Ambidexterity in IT Transformation Programs.* Information Systems Research, 2015. **26**(1): p. 57-80.
15. Schad, J., M.W. Lewis, and W.K. Smith, *Quo vadis, paradox? Centripetal and centrifugal forces in theory development.* Strategic Organization, 2019. **17**(1): p. 107-119.
16. Smith, W. and M. Lewis, *Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing.* Academy of Management Review, 2011. **36**(2): p. 381-403.
17. Jarzabkowski, P., J.K. Lê, and A.H. Van de Ven, *Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve.* Strategic Organization, 2013. **11**(3): p. 245-280.
18. Cunha, M.P.E. and L.L. Putnam, *Paradox theory and the paradox of success.* Strategic Organization, 2019. **17**(1): p. 95-106.
19. March, J.G., *Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning.* Organization Science, 1991. **2**(1): p. 71-87.
20. Cao, Q., E. Gedajlovic, and H. Zhang, *Unpacking organizational ambidexterity: Dimensions, contingencies, and synergistic effects.* Organization Science, 2009. **20**(4): p. 781-796.
21. Levinthal, D.A. and J.G. March, *The myopia of learning.* Strategic Management Journal, 1993. **14**(2 S): p. 95-112.
22. Raisch, S. and J. Birkinshaw, *Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators.* Journal of Management, 2008. **34**(3): p. 375-409.
23. Jarvenpaa, S.L. and A. Wernick, *Paradoxical tensions in open innovation networks.* European Journal of Innovation Management, 2011. **14**(4): p. 521-548.
24. Christensen, C.M., et al., *Disruptive Innovation: An Intellectual History and Directions for Future Research.* Journal of Management Studies, 2018. **55**(7): p. 1043-1078.
25. Tushman, M.L. and E. Romanelli, *ORGANIZATIONAL EVOLUTION: A METAMORPHOSIS MODEL OF CONVERGENCE AND REORIENTATION.* Research in Organizational Behavior, 1985. **7**: p. 171.
26. O'Reilly III, C.A. and M.L. Tushman, *Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future.* Academy of Management Perspectives, 2013. **27**(4): p. 324-338.
27. Holotiuk, F. and D. Beimborn, *Temporal Ambidexterity: How Digital Innovation Labs Connect Exploration and Exploitation for Digital Innovation,* in ICIS 2019, AIS, Editor. 2019: Munich, Germany.
28. Gibson, C.B. and J. Birkinshaw, *The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity.* Academy of Management Journal, 2004. **47**(2): p. 209-226.
29. Brinkhues, R.A., et al. *IT ambidexterity, organizational agility and information management capability: A Brazilian case.* in 25th Americas Conference on Information Systems, AMCIS 2019. 2019.
30. Zhou, J., et al., *Understanding employee competence, operational IS alignment, and organizational agility – An ambidexterity perspective.* Information & Management, 2018. **55**(6): p. 695-708.
31. Koryak, O., et al., *Disentangling the antecedents of ambidexterity: Exploration and exploitation.* Research Policy, 2018. **47**(2): p. 413-427.
32. MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff, and N.P. Podsakoff, *Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques.* MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems, 2011. **35**(2): p. 293-334.
33. Chen, Y., et al., *IT capability and organizational performance: the roles of business process agility and environmental factors.* European Journal of Information Systems, 2017. **23**(3): p. 326-342.
34. Abbey, J.D. and M.G. Meloy, *Attention by design: Using attention checks to detect inattentive respondents and improve data quality.* Journal of Operations Management, 2017. **53-56**: p. 63-70.
35. Tallon, P.P., *A Process-Oriented Perspective on the Alignment of Information Technology and Business Strategy.* Journal of Management Information Systems, 2007. **24**(3): p. 227-268.
36. Nations, U. *International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC), Rev.4.* 2008; Available from: https://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/seriesm/seriesm_4rev4e.pdf.
37. Faul, F., et al., *G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences.* Behavior Research Methods, 2007. **39**(2): p. 175-191.
38. Hair, J.F., et al., *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM).* 2nd edition ed. 2017, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
39. Hulland, J., *Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: A review of four recent studies.* Strategic Management Journal, 1999. **20**(2): p. 195-204.
40. Henseler, J., C.M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *Testing measurement invariance of composites using partial least squares.* International Marketing Review, 2016. **33**(3): p. 405-431.
41. Hair, J.F., et al., *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM),* 2nd edition ed. 2018, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
42. Queiroz, M., et al., *The role of IT application orchestration capability in improving agility and performance.* The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 2018. **27**(1): p. 4-21.