Business Excellence and Management
Volume 15 Issue 1 / March 2025

BUILDING INTERNAL INNOVATION CAPACITY IN LARGE ENTERPRISES: A STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE

Alexandra POPESCU-ZORICA
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania
alexandra.zoricapopescu@gmail.com

Abstract
This paper explores the necessity for large enterprises to develop robust internal innovation capabilities as a strategic imperative for sustaining long-term competitiveness. While 83% of global companies prioritize innovation, only 3% demonstrate high innovation readiness, highlighting a gap between ambition and execution. The study employs a literature review and case study analysis to examine the structural and cultural barriers that hinder corporate innovation, including risk aversion, hierarchical decision-making, and a focus on operational efficiency over exploration. The research further evaluates leading innovation governance models, including Deschamps & Nelson's governance structures and Brouwer's hierarchical, market-driven, and hybrid models, as well as practical innovation frameworks such as the Ambidextrous Organization Model and Doblin's Ten Types of Innovation. The findings suggest that companies must move beyond incremental improvements and acquisitions by implementing adaptive governance structures, cross-functional collaboration, and long-term strategic foresight. The paper identifies a set of best practices for developing innovation capacity, including the integration of intrapreneurship programs, AI-driven innovation, open innovation partnerships, and agile methodologies. The research concludes that organizations achieving a balance between governance structure, innovation frameworks, and strategic adaptability outperform competitors in growth and resilience. Recommendations include establishing leadership commitment, aligning innovation efforts with corporate strategy, and fostering a culture of experimentation to drive long-term business success.
Keywords: Innovation, Governance, Exploration, Exploitation, Ambidextrous.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24818/beman/2025.15.1-06

1. INTRODUCTION

Innovation is a top priority for corporations worldwide, yet many large enterprises struggle to develop effective internal innovation capabilities. Recent research indicates that while 83% of global companies rank innovation among their top three priorities, only 3% demonstrate high innovation readiness. This disconnect highlights the need for organizations to move beyond superficial innovation efforts and establish robust internal systems that foster continuous experimentation and transformation.

The purpose of this study is to examine the necessity for large businesses to cultivate internal innovation capabilities rather than relying solely on external acquisitions, partnerships or minor improvements

generated through efficiency initiatives or incremental developments brought to the existing business model. By analyzing the key barriers to innovation—including risk aversion, rigid corporate structures, and the prioritization of efficiency over experimentation—this research aims to provide actionable steps for overcoming these challenges. Significant progress has been made in understanding corporate innovation, with frameworks such as McKinsey's Innovation Readiness Model, BCG's Innovation-to-Impact Benchmark, Doblin's Ten Types of Innovation, The Lean Startup or Ambidextrous Model of O'Reilly and Tushman, to name fews, providing insights into best practices. Successful companies like Amazon, Microsoft, and Nvidia have demonstrated the benefits of integrating innovation into corporate strategy, putting US market on the map of the most innovative and research intensive economies. However, European enterprises continue to face unique obstacles due to a conservative approach to risk and regulatory constraints. This paper contributes to the ongoing discussion by offering an analysis of the innovation readiness gap and presenting actionable recommendations for large enterprises, particularly in Europe. By aligning innovation efforts with corporate strategy, businesses can enhance their resilience, sustain long-term growth, and drive competitive advantage in an increasingly dynamic market.

2. THE NEED FOR INNOVATION GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGY

Innovation governance refers to the system by which companies direct, oversee, and support innovation efforts at the highest levels. According to Deschamps & Nelson (2014) innovation governance should: define clear responsibilities for innovation within the leadership team; establish oversight mechanisms to ensure alignment between innovation and business strategy; balance efficiency (exploitation) with creativity (exploration); overcome short-term financial pressures and corporate inertia that stifle innovation. While there is no one size fits all model, there are several models recognized, that companies can use to define their internal structures that oversee innovation efforts. Each model comes with pros and cons, and as companies evolve, so should the governance model based on the maturity level of the innovation efforts.

Deschamps & Nelson (2014) structure the governance models into 3 main categories: Leadership Driven Models (Top-Down Governance), Decentralized Models (Distributed Governance) and Hybrid and Adaptive Governance Models. In top down governance systems, innovation is led by higher authority, which can be the CEO, a Council of Executives or a designated Chief Innovation Officer. This model is suitable especially when a company just starts to innovate and needs strong buy-in and guidance from the leadership team, in order to inspire the change in the organziation. Decentralized models distribute innovation resonsibilities across different business units or teams and are often refered to as Business-Unit

Business Excellence and Management
Volume 15 Issue 1 / March 2025

Innovation Model, Cross-Functional Steering Groups or Open Innovation (eg. working with startups, universities or incubators to generate innovation). This type of governance is more suitable for organizations that have a track record of understanding and delivering innovation, where, for example, teams can self-organize based on a common vision. Some companies combine different models into an Adaptive Governance to achieve flexibility and responsiveness to market demands. Adaptive Portfolios for example balance incremental, adjecent and transformational innovation by allocating resources dynamically. In Venture Based Innovation Model, companies create different entities that they fund similar to how startups get funded from private investors.

The most effective organizations mix elements of multiple models depending on their size, industry, and innovation goals. Highly structured organizations (e.g., manufacturing, pharmaceuticals) benefit from centralized governance. Technology firms and startups thrive in decentralized and venture-driven models. Corporations seeking both efficiency and creativity often adopt hybrid governance structures. Similar conclusions appear in the research of Maria Brouwer (2008) published in her book Governance and Innovation: A historical view. Brouwer identifies 3 different governance models that corporations use to drive innovation: Market Driven or Descentalized, Hierarchical and Hybrid. Brouwer suggests that hybrid governance models are often the most effective for sustaining innovation over time. In the book Innovation Management: Context, Strategies, Systems and Processes, Ahmed and Shepherd (2010) provide a comprehensive perspective on the development of innovation strategies, emphasizing their dynamic nature and alignment with shifting market conditions. These innovation strategies need to be sustained by a governance that is not rigid, but rather suitable to the established strategic goals.

3. IMPORTANCE OF FRAMEWORKS AND STRATEGIES FOR CORPORATE INNOVATION

Having a governance model in place is not sufficient for success, so companies need to identify and utilize frameworks that help them get from strategy to results. Large businesses often face structural and cultural barriers to innovation. Unlike startups, which operate in an environment conducive to rapid experimentation and risk-taking, where the mindset is “all or nothing”, established enterprises tend to prioritize efficiency and stability. As a result, many rely on external acquisitions for growth, operational efficiency and minor improvements in the core business, rather than cultivating in-house innovation capacity. However, research highlights that companies with strong internal innovation systems outperform their peers in revenue growth, market share, and long-term sustainability.

Boston Consulting Group’s research on innovation readiness (2024) indicates that only 3% of companies are fully prepared to innovate, despite 83% ranking innovation as a top-three priority. This "innovation gap" underscores the need for frameworks that systematically guide organizations in balancing efficiency with

exploration.The good news is that the business world as well as the academic world are rich in examples of frameworks that can generate significant change in the ability of organizations to innovate and generate new value and growth.

3.1. Essential frameworks applied by large organizations worldwide

3.1.1 The Ambidextrous Organization Model (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004)

The Ambidextrous Organization Model, first published by O'Reilly and Tushman (2004) in Harvard Business Review, developed into the book Lead and Disrupt (2021, 2nd edition), is one of the most influential frameworks in corporate innovation research. It argues that large enterprises must balance exploitation (efficiency, optimization, and incremental improvements) with exploration (disruptive innovation and new market development). Exploitation refers to optimizing existing processes, products, and services. It focuses on efficiency, standardization, and incremental improvements. Exploration on the other hand, involves developing radical innovations, entering new markets, and experimenting with new business models. O'Reilly and Tushman (2004) propose two primary ways to achieve ambidexterity: (1) Structural Ambidexterity – Establishing separate teams or divisions to handle exploitation and exploration. As example, it is worth menitioning Amazon Web Services (AWS) which was developed separately from Amazon's e-commerce business, allowing it to function with a startup mindset while leveraging Amazon's infrastructure. (2) Contextual Ambidexterity – Encouraging individuals and teams within the same organization to engage in both efficiency-driven tasks and experimental projects. As example it si worth mentioning Google's 20% Time policy which allows employees to dedicate part of their work time to side projects, fostering innovation without disrupting core operations. Ahmed and Shepherd (2010) also highlight the significance of balancing exploitation, which involves incremental improvements to existing offerings, with exploration, which seeks novel breakthroughs and disruptive innovations. By effectively integrating both approaches, companies can optimize their innovation capacity and maintain strategic flexibility. Research shows that ambidextrous organizations outperform competitors in revenue growth and market adaptation, particularly in volatile industries. However, achieving ambidexterity requires strong leadership, a culture that embraces experimentation, and clear strategic alignment. This translates into long term commitment for building internal capacity for innovation.

3.1.2 Ten Types of Innovation Framework

Developed by the Doblin Group, the Ten Types of Innovation Framework offers a structured approach to categorizing and implementing innovation efforts within large organizations. Unlike conventional models that focus primarily on product innovation or a single area of innovation, Doblin's framework emphasizes a

Business Excellence and Management
Volume 15 Issue 1 / March 2025

broader spectrum of innovation types that can drive competitive advantage. Larry Keeley, et.al, present in the book Ten Types of Innovation (2013) how the framework is divided into three categories and why it is important for organizations to aim for multiple innovation types in order to stay competitive:

Configuration Innovations (Business Model and Internal Structures): (1) Profit Model Innovation – Changing revenue models to capture new value (e.g., Netflix's subscription model). (2) Network Innovation – Forming strategic partnerships and ecosystems (e.g., Apple's app developer community). (3) Structure Innovation – Reorganizing internal talent and assets for efficiency (e.g., Google's flexible work structure). (4) Process Innovation – Improving operations and workflows (e.g., Toyota's lean manufacturing).

Offering Innovations (Product and Service Enhancements): (1) Product Performance Innovation – Enhancing product functionality and differentiation (e.g., Tesla's over-the-air software updates). (2) Product System Innovation – Creating complementary product ecosystems (e.g., Microsoft's integration of Office 365 with cloud services).

Experience Innovations (Customer Interaction and Market Engagement): (1) Service Innovation – Improving customer support and engagement (e.g., Zappos' customer service model). (2) Channel Innovation – Innovating distribution channels (e.g., Warby Parker's direct-to-consumer model). (3) Brand Innovation – Enhancing brand perception and identity (e.g., Patagonia's sustainability-driven branding). (7) Customer Engagement Innovation – Building deeper customer relationships (e.g., Nike's personalized experiences via its app).

This framework provides enterprises with a holistic approach to innovation, ensuring that they do not over-rely on product improvements alone but explore business model transformations and customer experience enhancements. Doblin's framework is essential for organizations that transition from one time or ad-hoc projects to a more structured, mature approach. An organization committed to an ambidextrous model should also diversify its innovation portfolio, and not remain stuck in only one area of potential growth, such as product or service innovation. A complex portfolio of innovations helps companies remain competitive for longer periods, making it harder for their industry pears to replicate their model. Produc features are the easiest to copy, whereas an innovation system that is built around several areas of innovation such as products, processes, brand and profit model, will be much more difficult to replicate.

3.1.3 Additional frameworks that contribute to the development of corporate innovation

McKinsey's Three Horizons Model – Helps companies allocate resources across short-term (Horizon 1), medium-term (Horizon 2), and long-term (Horizon 3) innovation projects. It also helps companies map their innovation portfolio against strategic ambitions, highlighting the risk-appetite of the organization. A company that concentrates efforts in Horizon 1 is a company with low appetite towards risk taking and a compnay less likely to disrupt its category. A company that focuses mainly on Horizon 3 risks high financial

losses without any gains in the mid-long term. Such a strategy migh weaken executive's and stakeholder's belief in the system of innovation. The best is to develop a portfolio of innovations balanced between the 3 areas, with most focus on Horizon 2.

Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., 2010) – A tool for designing and analyzing business models to identify new revenue streams and innovation opportunities. This framework facilitates teams to think outside product innovation and search for new business models or pricing models as well.

Lean Startup Methodology (Ries, 2011) – Emphasizes rapid experimentation, MVPs (Minimum Viable Products), and customer-driven development. It is a methodology suitable for product development and technololgy development. Nevertheless, the philosophy behind the framework can be applied to any innovation challenge, as the basic idea of testing fast, cheap and early in the process is valid for any type of innovation.

TRIZ - Theory of Inventive Problem Solving (Savransky, D. 2000) – A systematic methodology for solving complex and inventive problems. Unlike traditional brainstorming or trial-and-error methods, TRIZ provides structured tools and principles that guide problem solvers toward breakthrough innovations efficiently.

Design Thinking (Lewrick, M., 2022) – A customer centric innovation methodology developed by Stanford University and Hasso Platner Institute, is used by most organizations to better understand customer needs and pain points. It is known as the framework that allows innovators to deeply emerse themselves into customer feelings, providing superior understanding of the customer needs.

Jobs to be Done – Focuses on understanding the functional, social and emotional jobs customers need to get done. The framework was developed by Harvard Professor Clayton Christensen (2003, Innovator's Solution), in his attempt to finding out why customers buy certain products and how can a company increase its sales and revenues. His insights came from a famous Mc'Donalds experiment where his team was trying to figure out why people buy milkshakes. The Jobs to be Done framework helps companies identify underserved and overserved customer segments and develop product strategies to reach them.

Each organization has its unique needs, strengths and struggles, therefore frameworks need to be adapted to fit the context. Several frameworks may be combined to obtain a tailored one, and frameworks can be adjusted in time, to fit with different stages of innovation maturity of the organizations.

3.2. Structural barriers to innovation in large enterprises

Structural barriers arise from organizational design, decision-making processes, and resource allocation practices that inhibit agility and experimentation. These barriers often emerge due to the scale and complexity of large enterprises, which prioritize operational efficiency over exploratory innovation.

Business Excellence and Management
Volume 15 Issue 1 / March 2025

Bureaucratic Decision-Making and Hierarchical Structures. Most large enterprises operate within rigid hierarchical structures, where decision-making is centralized at the senior management level. This slows down the approval process for innovative ideas and limits the ability of employees at lower levels to experiment with new concepts. Research done by Marc Stickdorn et.al (2018) and detailed in the book This is Service Design Doing: Applying Service Design Thinking in the Real World, highlights that companies with highly bureaucratic decision-making processes experience 30-50% longer innovation cycles compared to agile organizations.

As example, Nokia's rigid hierarchical structure contributed to its inability to adapt to the smartphone revolution, as middle management filtered out disruptive ideas to avoid internal conflicts. Companies like Amazon and Google use decentralized decision-making, empowering small, cross-functional teams to innovate without requiring top-down approvals.

Short-Term Financial Gains and ROI Expectations. Innovation often requires long-term investments, yet many corporations prioritize short-term financial performance over long-term value creation. A research by Boston Consulding Group (2024) found that 70% of executives plan to focus on process optimization, while only 30% reported planning to revisit their innovation strategy. As example, Kodak developed digital photography technology in the 1970s but deprioritized it in favor of its film business due to concerns about immediate financial performance. This reluctance to embrace disruptive innovation led to its decline. On the opposite spectrum, companies like Tesla reinvest a significant portion of their revenues into R&D, demonstrating that long-term innovation can yield substantial returns.

Siloed Departments and Lack of Cross-Functional Collaboration. Siloed departments are one of the most significant barriers to corporate innovation. Research highlights that organizations where departments operate in isolation experience reduced knowledge sharing, slower decision-making, and misaligned innovation priorities. These silos often emerge due to rigid corporate structures, a lack of cross-functional collaboration, and an overemphasis on efficiency rather than adaptability. One of the core issues with silos is that they limit the flow of ideas across different business functions. When R&D, marketing, operations, and sales teams work independently, innovations developed in one unit may not align with customer needs or market trends, leading to poor commercialization of new products.

According to Alexander Osterwalder et.al (2020), author of the book The Invincible Company, innovation teams in siloed organizations often struggle to access critical resources, such as customer insights, brand leverage, and technological expertise. These constraints make it difficult for organizations to experiment with and scale new business models effectively.

Additionally, research from BCG's Innovation Systems Report (2024) found that 32% of executives cited siloed innovation as one of their top three challenges. This suggests that many organizations recognize the detrimental impact of silos but have yet to implement effective countermeasures. As example, General

Electric struggled with siloed innovation, where different business units worked independently without knowledge transfer. In contrast, companies like Apple integrate innovation across all functions, from design to marketing, ensuring that new ideas are executed effectively.

Rigid Performance Metrics and KPIs. Traditional corporate performance metrics often prioritize efficiency and cost-cutting over creativity and innovation. Employees are evaluated based on predictable outcomes, which discourages risk-taking. Metrics such as Return on Investment, Return on Net Assets, Profit Margin or Internal Rate of Return measure the immediate performance of businesses, making them unfit to evaluate projects with a high degree of uncertainty. A second performance evaluation system, suitable to measure innovation progress, needs to exist in parallel with business as usual KPIs. Example of Innovation Specific Metrics: R&D Expenditure, Number of Patents, Idea conversion Rate, Experimentation Rate, Number of qualitative interviews for problem validation, Validate Learning Rate, Number of employees involved in innovation, Number of Minimum Viable Products, Pivot Rate, Pirate Metrics, etc. Companies should implement innovation-specific KPIs, to measure long-term innovation impact and fomalize them along with traditional KPIs.

Lack of Expertise in Strategic Foreseight. In times of rapid change and evolution, forecasting approaches based on extrapolations from the past are unliekly to deliver qualitative and reliable insights to support in the development of the future strategy. Competitive organizations however, bring together advanced analytics, trends and creativity to build strategic foresight. Strategic foresight is the ability to stop looking inwards for answers and start scanning the horizons for potential signals, and from those signals develop a perspective of what might be next.

Foresight leaders make this discipline of foresighting essential to their strategy and to the company's culture. They also understand that now their strategy no longer relies on past data but on assumptions that need a process of rapid testing and validation. And that strategy is fluid not fixed, meaninig that it has to continously adapt to the findings in the environment.

Ahmed and Shepherd (2010) argue that leaders need to develop internal capacity for Strategic foresight, scenario planning, and industry forecasting as critical tools for positioning a company within its technological and business landscape and ensuring long-term competitiveness.

3.3. Cultural barriers to innovation in large enterprises

Cultural factors play a crucial role in shaping an organization's innovation capacity. Many large enterprises have deeply ingrained traditions and norms that discourage experimentation and risk-taking. Most internal processes and reward systems are organized around the factor of efficiency and predictability, making it almost impossible for employees who have the drive for innovation, to succeed profesionally in a system

Business Excellence and Management
Volume 15 Issue 1 / March 2025

designed to punish failure. As innovation comes with uncertainty, failure is inevitable. Therefore employees feel deiscouraged to pursue ideas that step outside the productivity and predictability norm, even though one of those ideas might become the next growth engine of the organization.

Risk aversion and Fear of Failure. Many corporations operate with almost a zero-tolerance policy for failure, which discourages employees from taking risks. European companies, in particular, tend to be more risk-averse compared to their American counterparts. This results in incremental innovations rather than disruptive breakthroughs.

The Not Invented Here Syndrome. Many large enterprises resist adopting external ideas, leading to the "Not-Invented-Here" (NIH) syndrome, a reluctance to leverage external innovation sources. IBM initially dismissed cloud computing, allowing competitors like Amazon Web Services (AWS) to dominate the market. To not fall into this trap, companies should adopt open innovation practices, collaborating with startups, research institutions, and external partners.

Lack of Leadership Commitment to Innovation and Long Term Growth. Innovation requires strong leadership support, yet many executives fail to prioritize it. A McKinsey report – Achieving Growth: Putting leadership mindsets and behaviours into action (2024) – shows that leaders allocate only 22% of their time and effort to long term initiatives, the rest being dedicated to short and medium term projects. Another research (Jacqueline B., 2024) also shows that in times of uncertainty and high pressure, people tend to return to what they know, even though doing the same thing does not solve the situation. The role of leaders is even higher in helping the organization tranzision towards adaptability and experimentation. A company's collapse risk increases if leaders also turn to what they know not being able to distinguish between need of efficiency and the need for adaptability. Microsoft's transformation under Satya Nadella highlights the importance of leadership in driving innovation. By shifting the company's focus towards AI and cloud computing, Microsoft revitalized its growth.

4. STRATEGIES TO OVERCOME BARRIERS AND INCREASE INNOVATION CAPACITY AND OUTPUT

To successfully build internal innovation capabilities, companies must experiment with governance models, innovation frameworks and address both structural and cultural barriers. Starting off by choosing a Governance model creates accountability and expectations from the beginning, while giving clear directions to the innovation team. However, the governance model needs to be fluid and adaptable, especially if executives find themselves for the first time in such a new role. Learnings need to be captured in order to adapt based on market and organizational feedback. Frameworks play a significant role as well,

as they bring new ways of working to the organization. Finding the right framework takes time, but it is an essential step in making progress from governance to results. A good governance without a good framework leads to poor execution. Structural and cultural barriers will hinder innovation efforts. Good governance, good execution and good results will not on their own address barriers, so the executive team havs to take into account the necessary time this kind of change requires. Ahmed and Shepherd (2010) argue that innovation strategies have to evolve over time, in response to competitive pressures, technological advancements and changes in customer prefereances. A firm's ability to formulate a proactive strategic orientation, characterized by aggressive innovation, responsiveness to market demands, and the anticipation of emerging trends, determines its ability to sustain a competitive edge.

Necessary steps in developing innovation readiness: (1) Define innovation's role in corporate strategy; (2) Choose the right governance model; (3) Establish clear leadership structures for accountability; (4) Establish first innovation ambitions; (5) Choose the right framework to execute on the ambitions; (6) Create an innovation funding system to sustain projects; (7) Encourage cross-functional collaboration; (8) Monitor innovation outcomes with clear innovation metrics; (9) Capture learnings and continously adapt; (10) Continously communicate the need for change, the importance of innovation and progress, in order to gain employee traction and buy-in.

In addition to choosing an innovation governance model and implementing a structured framework, companies can adopt a variety of strategies to enhance their innovation capacity and output. These strategies focus on organizational culture, leadership, processes, and external collaborations to drive sustained innovation.

Culture. Companies must create an environment that encourages risk-taking, experimentation, and creative problem-solving. Key actions: Encourage psychological safety; Reward experimentation and risk-taking; Promote learning from failure; Ensure leadership buy-in.

Innovation Processes. Adopting agile methodologies and lean startup principles enables companies to iterate quickly, reduce risk, and accelerate time-to-market. Key actions: Use the Lean Startup approach to create Minimum Viable Products and test them before development; Apply agile workflows for rapid iteration cycles; Create fast decision loops to reduce bureaucracy and empwer teams to make innovation related decisions rapidly; Use Design Thinking or Jobs to be Done as frameworks to develop superior customer understanding and use those insights to create customer centric products and services.

Cross Functional Innovation Teams. Innovation often fails because departments work in silos. Cross-functional collaboration ensures that ideas are developed with input from diverse expertise. Key actions: Create Innovation Task Forces – Teams should include members from R&D, marketing, finance, and operations; Assign Cross-Department Innovation Leaders; Host Cross-Team Brainstorming Sessions.

Business Excellence and Management
Volume 15 Issue 1 / March 2025

Digital and AI. Emerging technologies like AI, big data, and automation can enhance R&D capabilities and streamline innovation processes. Key actions: Use AI to analyze market trends and consumer preferences; Free up employee time for creative work by automating routine operations; Use collaborative platforms for the exchange of ideas and insights; Encourage employees to experiment with tools and technologies that can enhance their day to day activity and free up time for innovation.

Intrapreneurship. Large corporations can tap into internal entrepreneurial talent by creating programs that allow employees to develop new business ideas within the organization. Key actions: Establish Internal Startups by providing funding and resources for employees to work on innovation projects; Support dedicated innovation labs for employees to test new concepts; Offer Equity or Revenue Sharing.

Open Innovation. Companies that rely solely on internal R&D miss out on valuable external knowledge. Open innovation allows organizations to collaborate with universities, startups, and industry leaders. Key actions: Engage in Startup Accelerators; Crowdsource Innovation by using platforms like Innocentive or Kaggle to solve complex innovation challenges; Form Strategic Alliances and Partner with universities, suppliers, and even competitors to co-develop new technologies.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study highlights that large enterprises face significant structural and cultural barriers when attempting to foster internal innovation. Despite recognizing the importance of innovation, most organizations struggle with rigid hierarchies, short-term financial pressures, and a risk-averse corporate culture, limiting their ability to experiment and drive transformative growth. The governance models proposed by Deschamps & Nelson (2014) and Brouwer (2008) emphasize the necessity of structured leadership support, with hybrid governance models proving to be the most effective in sustaining long-term innovation efforts.

Furthermore, the application of innovation frameworks such as the Ambidextrous Organization Model, Design Thinking, and Doblin's Ten Types of Innovation enables organizations to develop structured approaches for managing both incremental and disruptive innovation. The research findings reinforce that companies must adopt cross-functional collaboration, open innovation strategies, and digital transformation initiatives to stay competitive in an increasingly dynamic environment. Ultimately, innovation success is not just about adopting best practices but creating an organizational culture that continuously adapts, learns, and evolves in response to market shifts. Companies that align governance, strategy, and execution will be best positioned to drive sustained innovation and long-term business resilience.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, P.K., Shepherd, C.D. (2010). Innovation management: Context, strategies, systems and processes. Prentice Hall.

Brassey, J., de Smet A. & Maor, D. (2024). Developing a resilient, adaptable workforce for an uncertain future. Retrieved February 1, 2025, from: https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/developing-a-resilient-adaptable-workforce-for-an-uncertain-future

Brouwer, M. (2008). Governance and innovation. A historical view. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Christensen, M.C. & Raynor, M. (2003). The innovator's solution. Harvard Business Review Press.

Deschamps, J.P. & Nelson, B. (2014). Innovation governance. How top management organizes and mobilizes for innovation. Jossey-Bass.

Keeley, L., Pikkel, R., Quinn, B. & Walters, H. (2013). Ten types of innovation. The discipline of building breakthroughs. John Wiley & Sons.

Lewrick, M. (2022). Design thinking for business growth. Wiley.

Manly, J., Ringel, M., MacDougall, A., Harnoss, J., Wolke-Petern, J., Backler, W., Gjerstad, K., Kimura, R. & Viner, B. (2024). Innovation systems need a reboot. Retrieved August, 20, 2024, from: https://media-publications.bcg.com/innovation-systems-need-a-reboot-layout.pdf#page=3

O'Reilly, A.C. & Tushman, M.L. (2021, second edition). Lead and disrupt: How to solve the innovator's dilemma. Stanford University Press.

O'Reilly, C.A. & Tushman, L.M., (2004). The ambidextrous organization, Harvard Business Review. Retrieved February, 1, 2025, from: https://hbr.org/2004/04/the-ambidextrous-organization

Osterwalder, A. & Pigneru, Y. (2010). Business model generation. Wiley.

Osterwalder, A., Pigneru, Y., Eiemble, F. & Smith, A. (2020). The invincible company. Wiley.

Ries, E. (2011). The lean startup. Crown Business.

Savransky, D.D. (2000). Engineering of creativity. Introdution to TRIZ methodology of inventive problem solving. CRC Press.

Stickdorn, M., Schneider, J., Hormess, M. & Lawrance, A., (2018). This is service design doing: Applying service design thinking in the real world. O'Reilly Media.

West, A., Kelly, G., Zucker, J., Siegel, K., Greco, L., Birshan, M., Doherty, R. & Lehmann, S. (2025). Achieving growth: putting leadership, mindsets and behaviours into action. Retrieved January 20, 2025, from: https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/growth-marketing-and-sales/our-insights/achieving-growth-putting-leadership-mindsets-and-behaviors-into-action