



## Research Article

# Model of organisational competencies and capabilities for effective innovation management

Joaquim Jose Carvalho Proença<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Ph. D. program in Design and Management of Industrial Projects, Universitat Politècnica de València. E-mail: [carvaloproensa@gmail.com](mailto:carvaloproensa@gmail.com)

## ARTICLE INFORMATION:

Received: April 13, 2024  
Accepted: July 24, 2024  
Online: August 16, 2024

## Codes JEL:

O15, O31, O36, M14.

## Keywords:

Innovation management,  
organisational competencies,  
innovation programmes,  
capacity building,  
capacity development,  
innovation model.

## Palabras clave:

Gestión de la innovación,  
competencias organizacionales,  
programas de innovación,  
desarrollo de capacidades,  
modelo de innovación.

## ABSTRACT

**Introduction / objective:** Evaluating the effectiveness of innovation programmes, particularly in terms of their long-term impact on companies, is inherently complex. This study aims to develop a comprehensive measurement model that effectively captures the long-term innovation and sustainability outcomes of such programmes. By focusing on a broad spectrum of organisational competencies and capabilities, this model seeks to provide a holistic assessment of innovation effectiveness within participating companies.

**Methodology:** To construct the measurement model, a thorough literature review was conducted. Relevant articles were analysed to identify patterns and themes, leading to the classification of essential dimensions, processes, tools, and indicators of organisational competencies and capabilities that are critical for fostering innovation.

**Results:** The study proposes a reference model of organisational competencies, named the 8Cs, to evaluate companies' innovation performance and potential. This model includes 27 indicators across key dimensions: Cognisance/Knowledge Management, Critical Thinking, Creativity, Innovation Capabilities, Collaboration, Innovative Culture, Change Management and Communication.

**Conclusions:** The 8C model significantly enhances innovation management by providing a comprehensive assessment framework for companies' innovation practices and their long-term impact. It highlights specific competencies and capabilities essential for sustained innovation and competitiveness, enabling companies to identify focus areas, assess innovation sustainability, and allocate resources effectively.

## Competencias y capacidades organizacionales para una gestión efectiva de la innovación

## RESUMEN

**Introducción / objetivo:** Evaluar la efectividad de los programas de innovación, particularmente en términos de su impacto a largo plazo en las empresas, es inherentemente complejo. Este estudio tiene como objetivo desarrollar un modelo de medición integral que capture efectivamente los resultados de innovación y sostenibilidad a largo plazo de dichos programas. Al enfocarse en un amplio espectro de competencias y capacidades organizacionales, este modelo busca proporcionar una evaluación holística de la efectividad de la innovación dentro de las empresas participantes.

**Metodología:** Para construir el modelo de medición, se realizó una revisión exhaustiva de la literatura. Se analizaron artículos relevantes para identificar patrones y temas, lo que llevó a la clasificación de dimensiones, procesos, herramientas e indicadores esenciales de las competencias y capacidades organizacionales críticas para fomentar la innovación.

**Resultados:** El estudio propone un modelo de referencia de competencias organizacionales, denominado las 8C, para evaluar el desempeño y potencial de innovación de las empresas. Este modelo incluye 27 indicadores en dimensiones clave: conocimiento/gestión del conocimiento, pensamiento crítico, creatividad, capacidades de innovación, colaboración, cultura innovadora, gestión del cambio y comunicación.

**Conclusiones:** El modelo 8C mejora de manera significativa la gestión de la innovación al proporcionar un marco de evaluación integral para las prácticas de innovación de las empresas y su impacto a largo plazo. Destaca las competencias y capacidades específicas esenciales para la innovación sostenida y la competitividad, permite a las empresas identificar áreas de enfoque, evaluar la sostenibilidad de la innovación y asignar recursos de manera efectiva.

---

## Introduction

While control and systematic metrics in innovation programmes are complex, evaluating sustainable innovation within participating companies is even more challenging. There are several limitations, such as metrics that extend beyond immediate outcomes, the difficulty of evaluating effectiveness in subsequent years and the lack of detailed information on the areas where companies focus their efforts in innovation management. By identifying specific areas and stages where companies focus their innovation efforts, this research can highlight the unique needs of Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), facilitating the design of more effective, long-term innovation programmes.

Clearly, there is a problem when measuring whether innovation programmes are achieving their objectives of innovation sustainability, and these cannot be obtained with solely quantitative metrics of inputs used to measure innovation investments, such as budget, time, talent or outcome processes or metrics generated by innovation investments (return on investment, ROI of innovation activities and revenue growth through new products; *VIIMA Innovation Glossary*, 2024).

A specific reference model of organisational competencies called the 8Cs (cognisance, critical thinking, creativity, capabilities, collaboration, culture, change, communication) is proposed to evaluate the performance and potential of companies participating in or developing innovation programmes. This model is crucial for understanding the long-term impact of innovation on the sustainable creation of new products, services and processes, as well as the competitiveness it brings to these companies. The model includes capabilities indicators, not just technical skills, on which most innovation programmes tend to focus. It provides a comprehensive set of indicators that illuminate how companies integrate innovation into their strategies.

---

## Literature review

In a study on innovation capability, Iddris (2016) found that the majority of studies measure innovation capability

based merely on the companies' intentions to develop those capabilities. In contrast, this research aims to measure innovation management programmes based on these capabilities, a perspective that is often overlooked in the literature. Iddris' review focused on the main innovation capability dimensions investigated in the literature. The resulting weighted percentages for each of these dimensions are as follows: "knowledge management (7.69), organisational learning (5.13), organisational culture (5.13), leadership (4.40), collaboration (3.66), creativity (2.96), idea management (2.56), and innovation strategy (2.56)". Dimensions, defined as the characteristics or attributes of Service Innovation Capability, according to a Blommerde (2023), include the following categories: Areas of Activity (client-focused innovation capability and a marketing-focused innovation capability); Cultural (entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation and learning orientation); Capabilities (sensing, seizing and transformation); Technology (adoption of technology and the organisation's ability to innovate with it); Customer Involvement (service co-production).

According to Coutinho and Au-Yong-Oliveira (2024), the fundamental pillars impacting innovation performance in knowledge, technology and creativity that show a positive and statistically significant correlation are business sophistication and human capital and research. Business sophistication, defined as the state of technology utilised by highly qualified workers to enhance knowledge absorption and creation, significantly contributes to both knowledge and technology outcomes, as well as creativity, particularly through innovation partnerships and knowledge absorption. Similarly, education, research and development play a decisive role in innovation performance, influencing outcomes in both knowledge and technology, as well as creativity.

Vasconcelos et al. (2021) address the relationship between dynamic capabilities, which refer to a company's ability to internally integrate, build, and reconfigure its resources and skills in response to a changing environment, and how they can influence companies' innovation capacity. García-Ochoa et al. (2020), utilising a dynamic capabilities approach, explore how accelerators impact start-ups' ability to sense the market, identify viable opportunities, comprehend market dynamics and technological contexts, absorb

knowledge effectively, leverage external knowledge and networking opportunities, integrate new resources, adapt quickly and innovate by developing and commercialising innovative products and services.

Tamayo-Torres et al. (2016) describe Organizational Learning (OL) as the process of generating, disseminating and retaining knowledge within an organisation. They highlight a favourable correlation between OL and innovation, attributing OL as the groundwork for generating and executing innovative concepts and methodologies. They advocate for investments in developing capacities such as organisational learning and innovation, especially in dynamic environments where adaptation is essential for both survival and success. Learning capacity, primarily through the dimensions of information acquisition (via R&D departments, sales and the internet) and strategic alliances, concurrently with the development of adaptation capacity (technological innovation, human capital, organisational structure, leadership), influence the development of organisational and marketing innovation capacity (Beltrán-Díaz et al. 2023). Companies should customise innovation programme configurations to align with specific objectives, recognising the importance of creating a comprehensive framework that facilitates knowledge transfer and openness to external developments, as pointed out by Kötting and Kuckertz (2020).

Reyes-Gómez et al. (2023) explore the interaction between strategic orientations and innovation in achieving superior performance. The study underscores that integrating various strategic orientations with innovation is crucial for obtaining a competitive edge, creating customer value, and enhancing overall performance. While innovation's effect on a firm's performance can be influenced by numerous internal and external factors beyond strategic orientation, the link between strategic orientation and firm performance does not always involve innovation. Other elements, such as robust marketing or operational strategies, can also play significant roles.

Almeida (2022) highlights that start-ups frequently incorporate intrapreneurship into their organisational strategies. Intrapreneurship involves creating or enhancing innovative solutions that advance a company's operations. Despite challenges in allocating time and financial resources, start-ups offer essential characteristics conducive to intrapreneurial activities, such as management support, a flexible organisational structure and employee autonomy. Employees also play a crucial role in opportunistically advancing intrapreneurial practices within the organisation.

Bedoya et al. (2024) explored how Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) and Transformational Leadership (TL) positively influence the development of innovation capabilities. They identified risk-taking, proactivity and the assimilation and exploitation of internal and external knowledge as main challenges. The study suggests that adopting TL-based management practices where leaders encourage collaborators to freely and autonomously develop creative ideas can enhance innovation levels.

Tapia Mejía and Pico González (2023) found that personal attitudes, including motivation, creativity, leadership, decision-making and critical thinking, significantly im-

pact entrepreneurial intention. Entrepreneurs are primarily driven by their expectations and reasoning. Specifically, the self-perception of creativity skills positively influences entrepreneurial intention and enhances the perception of disruptive innovation abilities, confirming that creativity is a precursor to innovation.

The emergence of ecosystems is hampered by coordination and cooperation problems that markets and the price system cannot solve by themselves. Foss et al. (2023) provide insights into these specific coordination and cooperation problems and the types of capabilities leaders employ to overcome them. They identify three externally oriented, dynamic capabilities that enable ecosystem emergence: facilitating the formation of a shared vision (sensing), inducing others to make ecosystem-specific investments (seizing), and engaging in ad hoc problem-solving to create and maintain stability (reconfiguring/transforming).

Moqaddamerad and Murad Ali (2024) emphasise that strategic foresight can serve as an agile and innovative approach to enhancing Business Model Innovation (BMI). A higher level of strategic foresight correlates with greater BMI achievements. Strategic foresight clarifies the underlying structure and dynamics of the BMI system, supports resource accumulation, and facilitates informed decision-making for restructuring internal processes to operate new business models. It also enriches organisational learning by providing knowledge about future internal and external environments, promoting exploration and the generation of a broader range of business and technological opportunities, thus increasing the likelihood of novel opportunities that enhance value creation, proposition and capture. It indirectly influences BMI by sequentially impacting sensemaking and learning, thereby enhancing managers' cognitive structures and mental models.

Bashir et al. (2023) underscore that the skills and connections of top managers favourably influence BMI. This finding highlights the need for organisations to systematically enhance managerial skills through targeted training and capacity-building programmes. Firms with top managers possessing entrepreneurial skills are better positioned to manage BMI effectively. However, managerial skills alone are insufficient for BMI, unless channeled through both exploitative and explorative learning, which subsequently influence BMI. Additionally, robust relationships with financial institutions, suppliers, competitors, customers, government bodies, universities, and research centers are crucial for innovation, as they facilitate improved information flow about the business environment, leading to new ways of creating and capturing value.

Quinhoes and Lapão (2023) discuss the adoption of an innovation management system (IMS) as a high-level organisational decision aligned with strategic objectives. The IMS is a platform with subsystems, policies, activities, and tools that enable the collection and organisation of ideas, transforming them into opportunities. Based on Cooper's Stage-Gate model and enhanced with open innovation, collaborative networks and innovation ecosystems, this system guides companies in improving their innovation processes. It encompasses strategic and structural activities, includ-

ing environmental intelligence, knowledge management, intra-organisational communication and user/consumer perspective, change management, intellectual property management, fostering an innovative environment and new organisational culture, leadership roles, managerial competencies, incentive systems and risk management. This proposed IMS is beneficial for companies without a structured R&D or systematic innovation management system and for those wishing to enhance their innovation capacities. It serves as a guiding structure for enterprises aiming to improve their innovation processes, providing a comprehensive inventory of what the company should implement based on its innovation aspirations and capacities.

---

## Identifying 8C dimensions

An organisation that wants to develop an innovation programme must use *knowledge management* to facilitate the creation of organisational value through the utilisation of knowledge within a company related to trends, user needs, competition and technological surveillance. To identify opportunities, organisations need to constantly scan, investigate and exploit the evolution of structures and markets, suppliers and competitors through technology and markets, analysis and knowledge and customer needs and technological alternatives (Teece, 2007); and, furthermore, through internal insights, product portfolios, customer experience (channels, satisfaction, loyalty), alliances and related creativity and culture, internal structure and change. Anand and Singh (2011) state that knowledge has an intrinsic association with action because while data is raw and facts unstructured, information is composed of organised data that is useful for analysis and decision-making. Knowledge is information integrated into a specific context, allowing it to be effectively applied in action. This action is the result of a combination of variables: the company's collective experience and the logical process of team projects. Interaction among people is an essential part of knowledge. Tacit knowledge depends on personal experiences, attitudes, and daily routines (Nanoka & Takeuchi, 1995).

Manassero-Mas et al. (2022) stress the significance of developing *critical thinking* skills and attitudes within innovation programmes. They argue that fostering these attributes can cultivate a mindset conducive to creative problem-solving, effective decision-making, and forward thinking strategies. Critical thinking emerges as a fundamental element for driving innovation and nurturing a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity. Justino and Rafael (2021) highlight the importance of adopting a student-centered approach to promote conscious critical thinking. This approach involves encouraging students to critically evaluate information, improve their ability to ask relevant questions, critically analyse problems and effectively apply knowledge. Such an approach is suggested to enhance both academic and professional performance.

This information feeds the creative processes that generate and develop new ideas at the individual level. Creativity is personal because it primarily comes from the subconscious

mind. Our subconscious minds are better at making associations and connecting diverse ideas than our conscious minds (Berkun, 2017). The level of creativity a person produces at a given moment is a function of the creativity components operating within and around that person (Amabile, 2012). These consist of three intra-individual components and a social environmental component. In organisations these components are different resources in the task domain, including expertise, skills in innovation management (similar to cognitive processes and personality conducive to novel thinking) and the motivation to innovate. Generating new ideas requires the organisation to foster creativity and the desire to be creative, which is achieved through curiosity, search, and application of knowledge and information, as well as through the use of creative techniques such as the Six Hats, brainwriting, and mind or conceptual maps. However, the generation and validation of new ideas are both at the individual level and at the organisational environmental level. Sogol and Henriksen (2018) emphasise the importance of incorporating creativity training into business programmes and professional development experiences. They contend that creativity involves more than just generating new ideas; it also requires a mindset conducive to creative thinking. Consequently, nurturing creative self-belief, which encompasses one's beliefs about their creative identity, mindset and self-efficacy, is crucial for enhancing an individual's creative capacity. They suggest integrating arts-based methods as a strategy to boost creativity within business programmes. Silveira et al. (2020) mention how creativity in prototype design enables the inclusion of new services and functionalities in them. They highlight specific techniques and their application to generate original ideas and tailor them to the specific needs of the organisation, thereby developing innovative and sustainable solutions. For Leadbeater (2006), seeking ideas in adjacent fields or disciplines can generate innovation when combined with one's own business sector. This process depends on and often involves people with different cultural backgrounds and disciplines, and spaces where ideas and people mingle. Creativity arises from interaction and dialogue between different ideas, not just from diversity alone.

A company's prowess in transforming concepts into novel and enhanced products, services or methodologies (Björkdahl & Börjesson, 2012) stands out as a pivotal driver in fostering *innovation capability*. Iddris (2016) introduces the Operationalisation of Innovation Capability 8 Dimensions Model, shedding light on the indispensable Idea Management dimension. This dimension encompasses pivotal elements such as establishing a comprehensive idea collection platform, encouraging employee input, fostering bottom-up idea generation, implementing feedback mechanisms, and recognising innovative contributions through rewards, all while integrating idea management seamlessly into the overarching strategy. Slater et al. (2014) stress the importance of a well-defined strategy in launching groundbreaking innovations, essential for effectively conveying the value proposition to target customers and for ensuring successful market adoption. They underline three critical competencies vital for mature radical product development:

discovery, incubation and acceleration, with a focus on efficiency and swift market entry. Cultivating a capability for radical product innovation demands strategic vision with ambitious goals, robust organisational backing, and a nuanced blend of skills that balance proactive and responsive orientations.

Companies often emphasize conformity, which can boost efficiency but may undermine organizational sustainability by limiting employee risk-taking, adaptability, and further innovation. Gino (2016) highlights the importance of conformity in the workplace, which can manifest in various ways, such as following the behavior of others in similar positions, expressing appropriate emotions, dressing appropriately, agreeing with managers' opinions, yielding to suboptimal team decisions, among others. To counteract conformity, the author proposes individual attitude changes towards autonomy, questioning standard procedures, posing hypothetical scenarios, introducing novelties outside one's comfort zone, seeing problems from different perspectives and evaluating data instead of relying on predominant opinions. Barroso-Tanoira (2017) suggests that delegating responsibilities and empowering individuals are recognisably effective strategies for fostering creativity and innovation. Quandt et al. (2019) highlight the importance of structured initiatives in soliciting, evaluating, and implementing new ideas, while also emphasising the role of company culture, behavior, and processes in driving innovation outcomes. While idea management initiatives positively influence innovation results, they must be supported by a conducive organisational environment that promotes learning, knowledge sharing and collaboration.

The strategy in which companies compete in their ability to collaborate with partners and external actors to create value for the customer involves creating networks and alliances (Reeves & O'Dea, 2022). Alänge et al. (2022) emphasise the importance of collaboration as a key factor for the success of innovation programmes, particularly those involving corporate start-up partnerships.

Sroufe (2017) mentions that drivers of change can be both external and internal, encompassing factors such as stakeholder demands, regulations, customer expectations and organisational culture. According to O'Reilly and Tushman (2008) and Raisch et al. (2009), implementing an innovative approach in an organisation may also require structural change related to the idea of ambidexterity. Patricio et al. (2019) maintain that the organisation is capable of simultaneously managing both exploration (focused on creating new things, research, discovery, autonomy, innovation and variation) and exploitation (focused on the organisation's internal processes, efficiency, increased productivity, control, certainty and reduction of variation). Morris (2015b) highlights that effective innovation leaders possess the key skills of being perpetual learners, curious and question formulators. Additionally, he mentions four other dimensions: the workplace, effective collaboration, social tools, open innovation and the innovation ecosystem (Morris, 2015a), both within and outside an organisation.

Barroso-Tanoira (2017) suggests that training efforts in business firms often prioritise technical competencies, ne-

glecting cross-cutting competencies such as creativity, critical thinking and communication. Storytelling plays a pivotal role in conveying innovative concepts, garnering backing from stakeholders, inspiring team members to innovate and highlighting the triumphs of innovation endeavors (Sergeeva & Trifilova, 2018). It serves as a potent tool for enriching communication within organisations, exerting persuasive influence, and catalysing action (Schwabe et al., 2019). Nonetheless, while well-crafted narratives on social media platforms can augment comprehension of innovations, a continuous narrative approach may impede understanding and engender adverse perceptions towards the innovator (Weber & Grauer, 2019).

Do small and mid-sized businesses have resources that allow them to adopt and capitalise on these competencies to take advantages of these innovation programmes? Would companies with this model evolve more rapidly from a condition of non-innovation, strict innovation (focusing on products/services) or broad innovation (process innovation) towards the creation of an innovation project portfolio?

---

## Methodological design

### Research design

This study employs a qualitative methodological approach to develop a comprehensive measurement model. The model aims to evaluate the competencies and capabilities within organisations that drive sustainable innovation. The research process involves the following key steps: literature review, data analysis and indicator development.

### Literature review

An extensive literature review was conducted. Sources included recent peer-reviewed Scopus journal articles and industry reports. The method of gathering relevant articles involved using keywords such as "innovation management", "organisational competencies", "innovation programmes", "capacity development", "capacity building", and "innovation model" within the fields of business, management and accounting.

### Data analysis

The qualitative data was analysed and recurring themes and patterns were identified. The findings from this analysis informed the development of the 8C model, which encompasses eight dimensions critical to fostering innovation within organisations and to contributing to a comprehensive framework for assessing and enhancing innovation competencies and capabilities within organisations.

### Development of indicators

Based on the literature review, a set of 27 indicators was developed, each corresponding to one of the eight dimensions of the 8C model. These indicators were designed to be

measurable and to reflect the specific skills, knowledge and abilities that contribute to innovation at both individual and organisational levels.

## Findings

A comprehensive measurement model was consolidated, capturing a total of 27 indicators within the 8C dimensions. This model is structured around eight key dimensions of

competencies and capabilities (Table 1), each of which plays a crucial role in understanding and fostering long-term innovation within the organisation: 1) Cognisance/Knowledge Management, 2) Critical Thinking, 3) Creativity, 4) Innovation Capabilities, 5) Collaboration with Stakeholders, 6) Innovative Culture, 7) Change Management, 8) Communication and Storytelling. Competencies refer to the specific skills, knowledge and abilities possessed by individuals or groups within the organisation. Capabilities refer to the organisation's ability to perform certain activities or tasks effectively.

**Table 1. Competencies and capabilities indicators**

Dimensions	Process/Practice	Tool	Indicators
<i>Cognisance/Knowledge Management</i>	Content creation	Wikis / Internal knowledge base / Content management systems / Data visualisation software	1. Number of documents, reports created and updated 2. User engagement metrics
	Knowledge sharing sessions	Workshops / Webinars / Forums / Expert interviews	3. Attendance rate 4. Feedback score
	Search and retrieval	Enterprise search tools (secondary and primary sources) / Document management systems	5. Efficiency of finding relevant information through internal search
<i>Critical Thinking</i>	Problem-solving frameworks	Analytical tools / Fishbone diagrams / SWOT analysis / Root cause analysis / Decision trees / 5 whys scenario planning	6. Identification of underlying issues 7. Problem resolution time 8. Effectiveness of solutions
	Data driven decision-making	Business intelligence tools	9. Proportion of decisions based on data analysis and reports
<i>Creativity</i>	Ideation processes	Mind mapping tools / Brainwriting / Idea boards / 6 thinking hats / Scamper / Idea management platforms / Digital whiteboarding	10. Number of new ideas generated
	Experimentation	Prototyping tools	11. Rate of innovation adoption, validation
<i>Capabilities Innovation</i>	Development programmes Designing, testing, iterating and piloting new innovations	Design thinking / Agile methodologies / Hackathons Innovation management platforms	12. Investment and participation 13. Number of experiments conducted and successful new product/service launches 14. Number of patents filed
	External partnerships	Online courses and tutorials / Mentorship programmes / Training workshops / Certification programmes	15. Continuous learning
	Competencies related to project management	Project management software, file sharing and synchronisation tools	16. Project completion rates
<i>Collaboration</i>	Team meetings	Project management platforms / Video conferencing software	17. Team productivity metrics
	Cross-functional collaboration	Collaboration software with analytics features	18. Number of cross-departmental projects or initiatives undertaken and their success rate
	Joint ventures, open innovation and co-creation	Co-creation workshops	19. Number of alliances with suppliers, customers, universities, and research institutions
<i>Culture</i>	Employee engagement	Employee engagement surveys / Employee feedback platforms / Employee wellness programmes	20. Employee sentiment towards the organisation's values, mission, and overall work environment; Career development plans
	Recognition and rewards programmes	Performance recognition software	21. Recognition of innovative ideas and risk-taking
	Diversity and inclusion initiatives	Bias training	22. Representation of diverse employees at all levels of the organisation, employee perception of inclusion

(Continued)

Dimensions	Process/Practice	Tool	Indicators
Change	Change communication plan	Communication tools (email, presentations)	23. Effectiveness of communication regarding managing resistance and promoting adoption of change
	Employee feedback on change	Surveys, focus groups, pilot projects	24. Employee understanding and acceptance of implemented changes
Communication	Internal communication channels	Communication apps, WhatsApp, Slack, email, web conferencing software	25. Employee engagement with internal communication channels
	Transparency initiatives	Open Data platforms, blogs, podcasts, newsletters, webinars	26. Stakeholders trust levels 27. Frequency of leadership updates

Source: own elaboration.

## Discussion

There are two limitations to consider. Firstly, there may be concerns regarding the generalisability of the model across various industries, organisational sizes, and cultural contexts. Future research could explore the model's applicability in diverse settings to evaluate its robustness. Secondly, despite efforts to comprehensively identify dimensions and indicators, there could still be limitations in the measurement validity of certain constructs within the model. Therefore, it would be beneficial for future studies to concentrate on refining and validating the measurement model through empirical testing, ensuring its accuracy and reliability.

Moreover, conducting comparative studies that analyse the effectiveness of different types of innovation programmes (e.g., accelerators, incubators, corporate innovation labs) could offer valuable insights into identifying best practices and extracting lessons learned. This comparative approach would aid in understanding the relative strengths and weaknesses of various innovation programme models, ultimately contributing to the optimisation of innovation strategies.

## Conclusions

The 8C model has several practical implications for businesses. The model provides a robust tool, enabling businesses to assess and enhance their capacity for innovation and performance measurement. By identifying specific indicators and dimensions, a comprehensive assessment of companies' innovation management practices is possible. The model not only focuses on technical competencies but also encompasses organisational and cultural aspects, providing a holistic view of innovation management. Through the model, it becomes possible to understand where companies concentrate their efforts in the innovation process, identify areas for improvement, anticipate their ability to generate constant innovations, and evaluate the sustainability of their innovation endeavors. This understanding is essential for assessing the effectiveness of innovation programmes, efficiently allocating resources and fostering collaboration among various actors in the innovation ecosystem. By diagnosing companies' innovation capabilities, the model facilitates the development of tailored strategies to enhance their innovation performance and competitiveness.

## Financing

No funding received.

## Conflict of interest

No conflict of interest.

## References

- Alänge, S., Steiber, A., & Corvello, V. (2022). Evaluating corporate-startup collaboration: A government perspective. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 95, 102176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2022.102176>
- Almeida, F., & Miguel-Oliveira, J. (2022). The role of intrapreneurship in Portuguese startups. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, 30(1), 70-79. <https://doi.org/10.3311/PPso.17796>
- Amabile, T. (2012). *Componential theory of creativity* (Working Paper 12-096). Harvard Business School. To appear in *Encyclopedia of Management Theory* (Eric H. Kessler, Ed.), Sage Publications, 2013.
- Anand, A., & Singh, M. D. (2011). Understanding knowledge management: A literature review. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology (IJEST)*, 3(2), 926-939.
- Bashir, M., Naqshbandi, M., M., & Yousaf, A. (2023). Impact of managerial skills and ties on business model innovation: The role of exploitative and explorative learning. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2021-0441>
- Barroso-Tanoira, F. G. (2017). Motivation for increasing creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship. An experience from the classroom to business firms. *Journal of Innovation Management*, 5, 55-74. [https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-0606\\_005.003\\_0005](https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-0606_005.003_0005)
- Bedoya, M. A., Pérez, E. O., Zapata-Molina, C., Baier-Fuentes, H., & Hernández, B. Y. (2024). Entrepreneurial orientation and transformational leadership for the development of innovation capabilities. *Quality Innovation Prosperity*, 28(1), 174-192. <https://doi.org/10.12776/qip.v28i1.1895>
- Beltrán-Díaz, A., Alvarez-Melgarejo, M., Rincón, I. C., & Chaparro, J. E. (2023). Capacidades dinámicas como determinantes de la capacidad de innovación en Colombia. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, XXIX(2), 255-276.
- Berkun, S. (2017). *Dance of the possible* (1st ed.).
- Björkdahl, J., & Börjesson, S. (2012). Assessing firm capabilities for innovation. *International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies*, 5(1-2), 171-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/ijkms.2012.051970>
- Blommerde, T. (2023). Service innovation capability: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *The Service Industries Journal*, 43(15-16), 1197-1227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2023.2249830>
- Coutinho, E., M., O., & Au-Yong-Oliveira, M. (2024). Innovation's performance: A transnational analysis based on the global innovation index. *Administrative Sciences*, 14, 32. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14020032>

- Foss N. J., Schmidt J., & Teece, D. J. (2023). Ecosystem leadership as a dynamic capability. *Long Range Planning*, 56(1), 102270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2022.102270>
- García-Ochoa, C. P., De-Pablos-Herederó, C., & Blanco Jiménez, F. J. (2020). How business accelerators impact startup's performance: Empirical insights from the dynamic capabilities approach. *Intangible Capital*, 16, 107-125.
- Gino, F. (2016). Let your workers rebel. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Iddris, F. (2016). Innovation capability: A systematic review and research agenda. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 11, 235-260. <https://doi.org/10.28945/3571>
- Justino, J., & Rafael, S. (2021). Critical thinking focus applied on student-centered approach. *Innovation and New Trends in Engineering, Science and Technology Education*. Conference (IETSEC), Amman, Jordan, pp. 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IETSEC51476.2021.9440492>
- Kötting, M., & Kuckertz, A. (2020). Three configurations of corporate innovation programs and their interplay. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 23(1), 90-113. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-07-2018-0142>
- Leadbeater, C. (2006). *The ten habits of mass innovation*. Provocation 01. Nesta.
- Manassero-Mas, M. A., Moreno-Salvo, A., & Vázquez-Alonso, A. (2022). Development of an instrument to assess young people's attitudes toward critical thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 45, 101100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101100>
- Moqaddamerad, S., & Murad Ali, M. (2024). Strategic foresight and business model innovation: The sequential mediating role of sensemaking and learning. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 200, 123095.
- Morris, L. (2015a, June 2nd). *Four tools to support creativity and innovation*. <https://innovationmanagement.se/2015/06/02/four-tools-to-support-creativity-and-innovation/>
- Morris, L. (2015b, May 28th). *Key abilities of effective innovation leaders*. <https://innovationmanagement.se/2015/05/28/key-abilities-of-effective-innovation-leaders/>
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating companies - How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 185-206.
- Patricio, V. S., Pereira, L. F., & Santos, J. (2019, June). *Dynamic capabilities trends: A brief review of the state of the art*. Conference: 2019 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC).
- Quandt, C. O., Silva, H. F. N. S., Ferraresi, A. A., & Roberto Frega, J. R. (2019). Idea management and innovation programs: practices of large companies in the south region of Brazil. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 18(2), 187-207.
- Quinhões, T., A., T., & Lapão, L.V. (2023). Strengthening the innovation management: insights from the Stage-Gates model. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-27242023000200091>
- Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational Ambidexterity: Balancing exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 685-695.
- Reeves, M., & O'Dea, A. (2022, June 7). *6 factors driving changes to today's corporate strategies*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2022/06/6-factors-driving-changes-to-today's-corporate-strategies>
- Reyes-Gómez, J.D., López, P., & Rialp, J. (2023). The relationship between strategic orientations and firm performance and the role of innovation: a meta-analytic assessment of theoretical models. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 1355-2554. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-02-2022-0200>
- Schwabe, G., Richter, A., & Wende, E. (2019). Special issue on storytelling and information systems. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(6), 1122-1125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12258>
- Sergeeva, N., & Trifilova, A. (2018). The role of storytelling in the innovation process. *Creativity & Innovation Management*, 27(4), 489-498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12295>
- Silveira, C., Reis, L., Santos, V., & Mamede, H. S. (2020). Creativity in prototypes design and sustainability – The case of social organizations. *Advances in Science, Technology and Engineering Systems Journal*, 5(6). <http://dx.doi.org/10.25046/aj0506147>
- Slater, S. F., Mohr, J. J., & Sengupta, S. (2014). Radical product innovation capability: Literature review, synthesis, and illustrative research propositions. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31, 552-566.
- Sogol, H., & Henriksen, D. (2018). Creativity in business education: A review of creative self-belief theories and arts-based methods. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 4(55). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/joitmc4040055>
- Sroufe, R. (2017). Integration and organizational change towards sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 162, 315-329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.05.180>
- Tamayo-Torres, I., Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez, L. J., Llorens-Montes, F. J. & Martínez-López, F. J. (2016). Organizational learning and innovation as sources of strategic fit. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(8), 1445-1467. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-12-2015-0518>
- Tapia Mejía, E., & Pico González, B. (2023). Creativity and disruptive innovation in entrepreneurial intention: Mexico and Spain. *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia*, 28(104), 1535-1547. <https://doi.org/10.52080/rvgluz.28.104.10>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Weber, P., & Grauer, Y. (2019). The effectiveness of social media storytelling in strategic innovation communication: Narrative form matters. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 13(2), 152-166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2019.1589475>
- Vasconcelos, R. B. B. de., Santos, J. F. dos., & Andrade, J. A. de. (2021). Innovation in micro and small enterprises: Resources and capabilities. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 25(2), e190106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021190106.en>
- Innovation glossary (2024). Viima 100+ innovation related terms and their definitions <https://www.viima.com/innovation-glossary>