



Percepção de Valor em um Projeto de Negócios

Value perception in a Business Project

Bibiana Riveiro Quintans Sebold

bibianarqs@id.uff.br

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3907-9434>

Américo da Costa Ramos Filho

americoramos@id.uff.br

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4643-9767>

Lucas Werneck Louzada

lucas_louzada@id.uff.br

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7951-1732>



ABSTRACT

Context: Innovation has assumed an increasingly important role within organizations. Companies must remain innovative to stay competitive. Purpose: This paper seeks to understand how an entrepreneurial accelerator program impacts company strategy and how it develops intrapreneurship. Methodology: For this, besides a bibliographical study on the topics open innovation; entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship; strategy; startup and corporate accelerators, a questionnaire was applied, answered by six members of the top management of the company Souza Cruz, in which this study was conducted in its corporate accelerator program, Transforma Souza Cruz. Findings/value: It was possible to analyze, from the perspective of a company's top management, what the reasons are for developing an entrepreneurship acceleration program in a traditional company like the one analyzed, and how this affects the company's strategy, as well as to understand whether it develops concepts such as intrapreneurship in the company. Practical Implications: The practical impacts were the improvement of communication within the organization and the implementation of a culture of innovation, the development and strengthening of the concept of intrapreneurship. The program was considered a success within the organization and another acceleration opportunity is planned, proving that the company identified added value in the initiative. Research limitations: Obtain more information about the lessons learned from the processes and understand the improvements that could be made, in the opinion of the interviewees. Quantitative results on the success rate of the implementation of the proposals were not analyzed, since the program was not yet finalized.

Keywords: Innovation, Startup, Accelerators, Entrepreneurship, Intrapreneurship.



RESUMO

Contexto: A inovação tem assumido um papel cada vez mais importante nas organizações. As empresas devem manter-se inovadoras para se manterem competitivas. Objetivo: Este artigo busca entender como um programa de aceleração empreendedora impacta a estratégia da empresa e como desenvolve o intraempreendedorismo. Metodologia: Para isso, além de um estudo bibliográfico sobre os temas de inovação aberta; empreendedorismo e intraempreendedorismo; estratégia; startups e aceleradores corporativos. Foi aplicado um questionário, respondido por seis membros da alta direção da empresa Souza Cruz, na qual este estudo foi realizado em seu programa de aceleração corporativa, o Transforma Souza Cruz. Resultados/valor: Foi possível analisar, sob a perspectiva da alta administração de uma empresa, quais as razões para o desenvolvimento de um programa de aceleração de empreendedorismo em uma empresa tradicional como a analisada e como isso afeta a estratégia da empresa, além de entender se ele desenvolve conceitos como o intraempreendedorismo na empresa. Implicações práticas: Os impactos práticos foram à melhoria da comunicação dentro da organização e à implementação de uma cultura de inovação, o desenvolvimento e fortalecimento do conceito de intraempreendedorismo. O Programa foi considerado um sucesso dentro da organização e há previsão de outra oportunidade de aceleração, comprovando que a empresa identificou valor agregado na iniciativa. Limitações: Obter mais informações sobre as lições aprendidas com os processos e entender as melhorias que poderiam ser feitas, na opinião dos entrevistados. Os resultados quantitativos sobre a taxa de sucesso da implementação das propostas não foram analisados, pois o programa ainda não estava finalizado.

Palavras-chave: Inovação, Startup, Aceleradoras, Empreendedorismo, Intraempreendedorismo.



1. INTRODUCTION

In today's dynamic business environment, companies are increasingly driven to become more competitive. This shift is influenced by several factors, including globalization, cultural diversity, heightened market competition, and the evolving demands of consumers. Innovation has become the cornerstone of an organization's strategy, enabling it to overcome the challenges posed by rapid technological advancements. Companies that fail to innovate risk becoming obsolete quickly.

According to Chesbrough (2006), innovation can be pursued through two primary models: closed and open innovation. In closed innovation, companies seek solutions within their own organizational structure by investing in Research and Development (R&D). This approach is often costly and offers no guarantee of return, as large companies typically have established processes, standards, and rigid structures.

In contrast, the open innovation model involves companies searching for new market solutions through external inputs and outputs. This often occurs through collaborations with startups, which connect with companies through business acceleration programs within organizations. With the growing importance of innovation both inside and outside organizations, an innovation ecosystem is emerging. This ecosystem aims to attract startups by offering growth conditions in exchange for innovative and often rapid solutions to problems that corporations cannot solve or would take too long to research.

Based on this brief contextualization, the main question that this article seeks to answer is: How does a corporate acceleration program impact the company's strategy and how does it foster intrapreneurship? This work is justified by the objective of contributing to the literature on the topic of innovation, entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, contemporary business models - startup, as well as the contribution to the labor market and the organization targeted by this research.

The results of this article were an improvement in communication within the organization, in addition to the solutions already developed and those to be implemented in the first acceleration cycle. As a long-term result, we can mention the initiation of a culture of innovation open to mistakes, as well as the development and strengthening of the concept of intrapreneurship. In addition, organizations are increasingly concerned with staying up-to-date and innovative, as traditional and archaic structures no longer align with the reality of the increasingly competitive business environment. Not innovating means losing business opportunities or, even worse, facing bankruptcy.



2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The theoretical background is divided into five stages. The first stage consists of the presentation on Open Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship, Strategy, Startup and Entrepreneurial Acceleration with the objective of obtaining the theoretical basis for the empirical analysis.

2.1 Open Innovation

The theme of innovation is constantly discussed in organizations. In a world driven by novelties, not innovating means losing business opportunities, competitive advantage, and consequently, money. For Bessant and Tidd (2009), the need for innovation is clear in corporate mission statements and strategy documents.

The study considered is called Global Competitiveness Report, produced by the World Economic Forum (WEF) and based on the GCI index (Global Competitiveness Index), which includes 12 dimensions that evaluate the institutions, factors and policies for economic prosperity.

According to this report, Brazil ranked 80th in 2017. Analyzing the data on innovation, we can observe a significant improvement in innovation capacity (19 positions),

improvement in the quality of scientific research institutions (9 positions), companies' spending on Research and Development (12 positions). These variables are evaluated by the interviewed executives, so they are a subjective perception of the data. As such, this analysis reflects more optimism and willingness to invest in innovation.

Innovating in an open way requires implementation processes. For Gassmann and Enkel (2004), there are three ways to put this process into practice. The first is called "outside-in". In this process, the company develops new technologies through integration between suppliers, customers, partners, thus facilitating the creation and flow of knowledge. It is generally used in companies with low technological capacity that have to resort to other companies to license patents and develop technologies. Thus, with this integration, the company is able to add value to its product.

The second process is called "inside-out", the exact opposite of the first process. In it, the company develops the technology and gains from the value of the intellectual property. It is a process most commonly used in technology industries that are able to patent their technologies and license them to companies that are interested in them.



The third process is called "coupled", that is, it is a combination of the two ways of innovating. In this context, as mentioned earlier, there are two ways to innovate, through open innovation and closed innovation. For Chesbrough (2006), open innovation is the antithesis of closed, traditional, and vertical innovation. In it, ideas can come from inside or outside the organization and can go to the internal or external market.

Ideas come not only from within the company, but also from the external market. Competitive companies are not proud to say that a technology was completely developed within their business environment, because, the results obtained with open innovation tend to be much better (BURCHARTH. 2015).

2.2 Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship

Currently, the term entrepreneurship has been discussed much more frequently, and the global trend of fewer jobs is noticeable, generating an urgency to create new jobs, as well as a workforce ready to readapt to every change. It can be said that innovation is the key to the functioning of large companies. For Said (2013), society is moving from the second wave of the industrial revolution to the third wave, which is based on the information revolution. In it, there is the supremacy of knowledge which is shown as the main asset.

In Brazil, entrepreneurship presents a specific characteristic. According to Natsume (2004), entrepreneurship is often generated out of necessity. The above-mentioned worldwide trend towards reduction of jobs makes self-employment a viable alternative to ensure the family's subsistence, but the lack of planning and the urgency to receive profits can generate non-lasting businesses.

Opportunity entrepreneurship, on the other hand, occurs when the entrepreneur decides to undertake the business despite the fact that there are other sources of income available. Since he is not dependent on the immediate profits of the company, he can think about his business more calmly and has more resources to create and conduct the business.

For Bessant & Tidd (2009) and Dornelas (2016), entrepreneurship happens at different stages, and it can be applied in startups, with small structures and in early stages of development, but it can also be applied in large and established companies, which have to look for ways to update the way they create and deliver value to their customer. For this reason, defining the term is a difficult task, as there are different approaches. Dornelas (2016) states that entrepreneurship is to do something new, different, to change the current situation and seek new business opportunities with a focus on innovation and value creation.

In addition, Said (2013) argues that the entrepreneur needs to overcome external obstacles, such as lack of resources, changes in the economy, and lack of support from others.



Intra-entrepreneurial challenges are more related to internal barriers, such as bureaucracy, traditional management, and lack of openness to change.

The first definition of the term intrapreneurship was given by Pinchot (1989), which is understood as all activities in the organization, including administrative functions that are not connected to the business. Prior to his studies, it was believed that an individual could only be an entrepreneur if he was outside the formal structure of a company.

Such a viewpoint resulted, according to Said (2013), from the economic dynamics itself that ended up limiting this viewpoint. Companies increasingly base their operation on the concept of Enterprise Management, being the main factor of innovation within these structures.

In intrapreneurship, the employee is expected to act as an owner of the company, seeking innovative solutions even if these are outside his or her scope of work. For Said (2013), an intrapreneurial organization is "(...) an organization that recovers the entrepreneurial spirit that reigns in the company in its infancy, when it is more creative, dynamic, audacious (...)", that is, that keeps alive the entrepreneurial spirit within an already established company. Corroborating the authors, Morais et al (2020), intrapreneurial behavior involves not only stimulating the generation of ideas and innovations, but also providing resources and autonomy to employees so that they can create greater value, through the creation of conditions that allow employees to make participatory or decentralized decisions, share objectives and goals, integrate into cohesive work groups and have access to specialized knowledge in innovation (Lauriano & Ferreira, 2022).

2.3 Strategy

Adcock (2000) proposes that "strategy can be described as a link between the objective and the implementation necessary to achieve those objectives." Thus, the objective is the definition of what the company wants to achieve and the strategy is how these objectives will be achieved.

The moment when the school of strategic thinking achieved the greatest importance was in the year 1970. In this school, strategy is based on the analysis of internal and external environments, seeking efficiency and effectiveness. Nowadays, with the increase in competitiveness, it is not enough just to develop a strategy, but also to closely monitor its execution, adjusting it if necessary. The study by Worimegbe et al. (2022) revealed that coopetition is a fundamental strategy for leveraging resources, accessing new technologies and reducing risks. The inputs are the inputs of strategic management. The core of the system is based on the Administration pillars: planning, coordination, organization and control. The outputs are the results obtained from the implementation of this strategy. It is therefore up to the company to establish its main guidelines, such as mission, vision and values, since it is through them that opportunities will be identified and actions taken to achieve the objectives.



A wrong strategy cannot be corrected by a well-executed tactic and operation. Once you have a reliable strategy, tactics and operation are the elements that must be modified most often.

2.4 Startup

It is a very broad concept that can be defined in different ways. Taborda (2006) proposes that it is a company in the initial phase of implementation and organization of its operations. Blank and Dorf (2012) propose that it is a temporary organization, seeking a repeatable and expandable business model. According to Ries (2012), it is a company made up of people, acting in various fields of activity, focused on creating a new product or service that makes a major impact on the market and operating in a scenario of extreme uncertainty.

Thus, the main points that define a startup are: being formed by people with common interests; having the goal of creating an innovative product or service; acting in an environment of extreme uncertainty.

2.5 Business Accelerator

The concept of business accelerator is directly linked to that of open innovation, discussed earlier, which states that the company starts looking for innovation outside its structure. The role of accelerators is to attract and select companies with great potential for impact and, through a well-structured support program, enable and assist in the search for value generation. (CAMPOS apud ABREU E CAMPOS NETO. 2016)

According to Abreu and Campos Neto (2016), the function of accelerators is to help startups obtain resources, financial and human; build their initial product; and identify the customer segment. Generally, these acceleration programs have an average duration of three months and rely on the guidance of specialized personnel. In addition to being coached by this resource, the owners of the startups also network with people on the ground.

For the present study, the most important thing is to understand the concept of a corporate accelerator. According to Kotler (2016), corporate accelerators are limited-duration corporate-backed programs that support cohorts of startups during the new venture process through mentorship, education, and company-specific resources with the goal of helping entrepreneurs achieve higher performance more quickly by pushing them down a path that they may not naturally choose on their own, possibly due to information constraints (Leatherbee and Katila, 2020). They generally share the following characteristics: An open application process; A focus on small teams rather than individual founders; Time-limited support, including company interactions and mentoring; and Cohorts of start-ups rather than individual companies. Furthermore, according to Kohler apud Travers and Teixeira (2017), this category of accelerators is characterized by being supported by companies. Through this interaction, the



company can, through the business accelerator, select startups that offer solutions to problems experienced by the company.

3. METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

This research adopts an exploratory approach, utilizing literature review and data collection from individuals with practical experience related to the problem (Kauark et al., 2010). The methodology includes two primary procedures: a literature review and a case study. According to Yin (2001), a case study allows for an investigation that preserves the holistic and significant characteristics of real-life events, such as individual life cycles, organizational and administrative processes, changes in urban regions, international relations, and the maturation of certain industries.

The company selected for this case study is Souza Cruz. A questionnaire was administered to six members of the company's management team to gather insights into the effectiveness of the Transform Program and its alignment with the theoretical framework of strategy and open innovation. The questionnaire was distributed online via Google Forms, and the participants were chosen based on their involvement in the development and implementation of the program.

The main objective of the questionnaire was to understand the effectiveness of the Transform Program and its relationship with the key aspects of the theoretical framework: strategy and open innovation. The questionnaire was structured based on Table 1: Summary of the Theoretical Framework and consisted of six questions:

- What was the motivation for creating the Transform Program at Souza Cruz?
- How is the Program aligned and linked to the company's strategy?
- Entrepreneurship expects employees to act as entrepreneurs, seeking innovative solutions even when these are outside their scope of work. Do you believe that the program strengthens and stimulates employees to develop this behavior? In what way?
- Closed innovation is developed inside the company, while open innovation seeks innovations outside the company structure, for example through startups. Do you believe that this Program was effective for this purpose?
- What results were observed in the interaction between startups and Souza Cruz?
- General comments and considerations.

The questions were designed to first understand the motivations behind the creation of the program and the problems observed by the company members that prompted this action. Subsequently, the questions aimed to explore how these actions were linked to the company's strategy and how they generated value for the organizational structure. Additionally, the questions sought to determine if there was a strengthening of the entrepreneurial spirit and if, in the respondents' opinion, there was an increased demand for open innovation within the



organization. Finally, respondents were given the opportunity to provide general comments related to the program.

For data processing, the researcher theorized the data and compared the theoretical approach with the field data, correlating the results (Teixeira, 2003). One of the challenges of this type of research, according to Minayo (apud Teixeira, 2003), is the researcher's illusion regarding the conclusions, which involves thinking that the data are clear from the beginning, leading to simplified data and superficial conclusions. To mitigate this, the author carefully analyzed the data to ensure a thorough and accurate interpretation.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In its first edition in 2019, the Transform Souza Cruz Programme received 243 applications from start-ups for the development of a Minimum Viable Product and a Proof of Concept. Of these 243, five were selected and for four months they were accompanied by 30 company executives and underwent more than 20 mentoring sessions.

The following answers were taken from the questionnaire applied inside Souza Cruz, answered by six members of the top management. No names or positions will be mentioned in order to preserve the identity of the respondents.

The answers are from people directly involved with the Program, either in its conception or as mentors in the process.

The presentation and analysis of the results will be done as follows: first, a compilation of the answers to the question presented will be made, and then a consolidation of what was commented will be presented.

Question 1: What was the main motivation for setting up the Transform Souza Cruz Programme?

For the respondents, the Programme arose from a business need based on a number of different factors.

The first of these was to challenge the status quo of the company, in other words, to think of new ways of doing the same thing. A company like Souza Cruz, with a history of 116 years of operational excellence, needs to reinvent itself and seek new ways of generating value for its customers through solutions focused on them, improving consumer experiences and ensuring the success and sustainability of its business.

The second is related to the first because it is linked to the need to create an innovative



environment and to develop this culture within the company. Traditional organizations tend, over the years, to focus only on the execution of their tasks, not challenging their employees to think differently. The interaction between the startup and the company causes a new way of thinking to be developed and strengthened within the company.

The third factor is related to the previous one, making it possible, with the establishment of this relationship, to keep the organization abreast of technological innovations in a faster and uncomplicated way.

The fourth factor is the search for solutions to critical and immediate problems. With this lack of innovation culture and focused only on execution, the company ends up facing very specific problems that are difficult to solve. Startups appear as a more agile way to solve this, because, for the most part, they have reduced structures and focus on specific problems. Thus, this interaction seems to offer solutions to problems that previously could not be so easily solved.

The fifth factor is to develop a faster and more agile way of working, based on the innovative structures of startups. Traditional companies with rigid and defined processes can be an obstacle to innovation, because until an idea is developed it has to go through different approvals.

Thus, the main motivation for setting up the Programme was the quest for innovation which, as mentioned earlier, is the central axis of corporate survival, for without it, the company loses its competitiveness to its competitors.

This innovation was the main motivation for the development of the Transform Souza Cruz Programme, seeking both to develop the organizational structure, in order to obtain a more updated and competitive model, and innovations outside the company.

Question 2: How is the Program aligned and connected with the company's strategy?

The company states on its website (www.souzacruz.com.br) that to ensure its long- term and sustainable growth it is necessary that the entire production chain is developed together. Therefore, it is the company's duty to generate shared value for its stakeholders. For the respondents, the generation of shared value is done both locally and globally, through different mechanisms.

Locally, the company develops within its structure a programme called Souza Cruz Attendance, which is designed to establish goals and objectives for business development. This establishes an innovation pillar that fits in perfectly with the Transform Souza Cruz Programme.

In addition, the company is undergoing a process of transforming its internal organisation and its human capital development strategies. In addition to introducing innovative solutions for



the way in which Souza Cruz works, the Transform Souza Cruz Programme is important for strengthening intrapreneurship and the development of new skills for its employees, which are essential for today's working environment.

Globally, it is aligned with the strategy of its holding company, British American Tobacco (BAT), which has encouraged the search for disruptive solutions and the simplification of processes made possible by the development of this program. In addition, BAT recently created its business acceleration area, in order to facilitate the collaboration and acquisition of startups.

Abdalla et al. (2019) defines that strategy is the link between the goal and the implementation needed to achieve it. The Program is aligned with the business strategy locally and globally. This is because it seeks to encourage the development of interpersonal skills of its employees, defined as key concepts for business development in its strategy, as well as greater interaction between innovative structures, talking to its strategy of creating an area that has this function within its global structure.

Question 3: Intrapreneurship expects the employee to act as the owner of the business, seeking innovative solutions even if these are outside their scope of work. Do you believe that the program strengthens and encourages employees to develop this behavior? In what way?

All respondents agreed that the Program strengthened intrapreneurship within the organization and that this happened in different ways.

First, the program showed that there is room for innovation, even in a mature company like the one that was analyzed. It is possible to implement new ways of working and incorporate new technologies into the process, as well as seeking a less bureaucratic and faster decision making process, as in the case of startups.

In addition, the solutions brought by startups in the Program are not limited to traditional departmental structures, forcing employees to work beyond the boundaries of their duties to enable the development and implementation of initiatives. This makes the employee feel much more like the owner of the action, reinforcing their intrapreneurial spirit.

The Program also generates a curiosity factor that, according to one of the respondents, provokes the feeling of: "we've been trying this for years...how did they do it in two months?", cultivating the feeling of making it happen and seeking the renewal of the organizational structure, as mentioned earlier, to eliminate procedural barriers of the large corporation. This curiosity factor was also pointed out as a reason for change even outside the Transform Souza Cruz Programme, as it motivated the curiosity of other areas to seek alternative solutions and partners in order to develop simpler solutions that are less costly for the organization.



Said (2013) argues that stimulating intrapreneurship is related to the entrepreneurial spirit, which was the same at the beginning of the organization, making its structures more creative, dynamic and audacious.

Analyzing the answers, we can conclude that this Program played an important role in the development of this concept within the organization, stimulating, mainly through the implementation, albeit initial, of an environment and culture of innovation, instigating experimentation, and eventually error and leaving a little aside the rigid and departmental structures of a traditional structure.

Question 4: Closed innovation is developed within the company, while open innovation seeks innovations outside the company structure, through startups, for example. Do you believe that this Program was effective for this purpose?

According to Chesbrough (2006), open innovation is the opposite of closed and traditional innovation. Through it, ideas come from inside or outside the organization, ensuring the dynamism of the process and contact with new ways of thinking. This dynamism reduces costs with the process, in addition to reducing the time invested in such action.

Classifying the Transforma Souza Cruz Program, by the model of Gassmann and Enkel (2004), that the process used was the “from outside to inside”. In it, new technologies are developed through the integration of agents external to the organization, in this case represented by the startup. For the interviewees, the program reached its ultimate goal of promoting this category of innovation within the company and brought results that would not be achieved in the traditional way, due to time and competitive costs. In addition, it has developed skills and capabilities, while providing rapidly tested solutions with proven implementation effectiveness to the business.

Question 5: What are the results observed in the interaction between startup and Souza Cruz?

For the respondents, one of the main outputs of this interaction was that when it comes to open innovation and corporate acceleration, the company must have maturity, seriousness and commitment. First, because a review of your bureaucratic processes and flows is necessary in order to allow projects to flow more quickly. This also concerns the involvement of the company's board of directors directly in decisions, so that projects can be implemented more quickly, following the model of startups. In addition, innovation must be disconnected from Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and from bonuses, such as profit sharing, for example. This makes innovation stop being a step to be accomplished in order to gain these benefits or achieve goals and become a mindset of the organization.

A key factor pointed out to the company by almost all respondents and with immediate



observation within the communication. Because startups have a fast and fast process structuring, the structuring of processes ends up being a traditional structure of the company. Therefore, the company needs to review its processes, as previously mentioned, and adapt the way of communication and operation of these structures.

Considering that startups have a fast and uncomplicated structure, the main result of this interaction was the adaptation of the communication of a traditional and rigid company to a simpler and cruder model. It is also noteworthy that an open innovation implementation strategy needs attention and commitment from the organizational structure to achieve its ultimate goals.

Question 6: General comments and considerations

This question was opened to the participants so that they could make comments if they believed to be relevant to the subject.

For the respondents, the responses to the Program were very positive and generated learning for all those involved in terms of the company. The Program activated as initial editions and new initiatives and initiatives within a similar model are already under discussion.

In addition, the corporate delivery program is linked directly with the company's Transformation Program and is important to the company's transformation of strategic plans.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The present study sought to understand, based on a project in a specific company, which has a consolidated market value and a defined organizational structure, how the value of interaction between companies and startups is perceived, whether through strategic alignment or entrepreneurial orientation. In other words, and more specifically, how the Souza Cruz Corporate Acceleration Program was able to leverage entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship within the organizational structure.

The contributions of this article, from a marketing and academic perspective, were the theoretical discussions on the themes that permeated the question and objectives of this article, as well as how the Souza Cruz Business Acceleration Program was able to leverage entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship within the organizational structure.

To this end, the theoretical background was conducted addressing the topics innovation; entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship; strategy; startup and business accelerator. In addition, the study also included a questionnaire applied to six members of the company's top management, responsible for the conception and execution of the program.



The answers to the questionnaire showed that the company's decision to develop the corporate accelerator program arose from the need to innovate and to update its organizational strategy to keep the organization competitive, in view of the numerous technological innovations and the growing competition.

Due to the maturity of the organization, it was necessary to challenge its current way of working, creating a culture of innovation among its employees and renewing the organizational structure to make it increasingly agile. Because it is inserted in a traditional context, with its 116 years of operation, many of its processes end up becoming bureaucratic. Hence the diagnosis that these processes no longer met the company's requirements and should be updated to reflect the current innovative and competitive environment.

These bureaucratic processes tend to hinder entrepreneurial attitudes within the organization, especially employee initiatives. With the strengthening of the relationship between company and startup it becomes much more evident to develop the concept of intrapreneurship, which generates a lot of value for the organization, but also generates value for the employee, since it is an expected competence in today's organizations. The development of this culture of innovation generates a win-win relationship for both the company and the employee.

Thus, the objective of the study, which was to define how the value of the interaction between company and startup is perceived, was achieved, according to the answers to the questionnaires presented above. The main immediate result of this relationship was the improvement of communication within the organization, beyond the solutions already developed and to be implemented in this first acceleration cycle. As a long-term result, we can cite the beginning of the implementation of a culture of innovation, open to error, and the development and strengthening of the concept of intrapreneurship. intrapreneurship.

Business acceleration continues to be a topic and, when analyzing the respondents' speech and the bibliography studied, it is clear that programs of this type generate much added value for the company and should continue to be studied and developed. This becomes an area of opportunity, both in the academic and organizational sphere, which should seek to develop this topic, as it tends to increase in importance as the years go by.

For the Transform Souza Cruz Programme, the quantitative results were not analyzed regarding the success rate of the implementation of the proposals, as the programme was not yet finalized, which is considered a limitation of this research. A suggestion for future research is an important point about obtaining more information about the lessons learned from the processes and understanding the improvements that could be made, in the opinion of the interviewees.

However, despite not having been based on quantitative data, as informed by the interviewees themselves, the Program has already been considered a great success within the organization



and a second round of business acceleration is already planned, proving that the company has identified added value in the initiative, considering an important practical implication for academia and management. Another area of opportunity would be the realization of a new work about the program, encompassing the learnings of the first round and with a quantitative analysis on the theme.

The suggestions for future work permeate the application of a quantitative methodology to have a more integrative analysis between the methods. It is also possible to apply the research in other already consolidated companies, such as the one discussed in this article, with the purpose of investigating whether an empirical pattern or systematization occurs, whether the effects of the empirical application are similar or what the differences would be for organizations belonging to other market segments.

In view of everything discussed in this paper, we can conclude that organizations are increasingly concerned about staying current and innovative, since traditional and archaic structures no longer correspond to the reality of the increasingly competitive business environment. Not innovating means losing business opportunities, or even worse, going bankrupt.

6. REFERENCES

Abreu, P. R., & Campos Neto, N. M. D. (2016). O panorama das aceleradoras de startups no Brasil. Centro de Estudos em Private Equity e Venture Capital (GVcepe).

Adcock, D. (2000). Marketing strategies for competitive advantage. Wiley.

ARUNDEL, A.; BLOCH, C.; FERGUSON, B.. Advancing innovation in the public sector: Aligning innovation measurement with policy goals. Research Policy, v. 48, n.3, p. 789-798, 2019

Bessant, J., & Tidd, J. (2009). Inovação e empreendedorismo. Bookman Editora.

Blank, S., & Dorf, B. (2020). The startup owner's manual: The step-by-step guide for building a great company. John Wiley & Sons.

Burcharth, A. L. D. A., & Fosfuri, A. (2015). Not invented here: how institutionalized socialization practices affect the formation of negative attitudes toward external knowledge. Industrial and Corporate Change, 24(2), 281-305.

Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.). (2006). Open innovation: Researching a new paradigm. Oxford University Press on Demand.



Bessant, J., & Tidd, J. (2009). Inovação e empreendedorismo. Bookman Editora.

Blank, S., & Dorf, B. (2020). The startup owner's manual: The step-by-step guide for building a great company. John Wiley & Sons.

Burcharth, A. L. D. A., & Fosfuri, A. (2015). Not invented here: how institutionalized socialization practices affect the formation of negative attitudes toward external knowledge. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 24(2), 281-305.

Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.). (2006). Open innovation: Researching a new paradigm. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Dornelas, J. (2021). Empreendedorismo transformando ideias em negócios-8a. edição. Empreende Editora.

Gassman, O., & Enkel, E. (2004, July). Towards a theory of open innovation: three core process archetypes. In *Proceedings of the R&D Management Conference* (pp. 6-9).

Kohler, T. (2016). Corporate accelerators: Building bridges between corporations and startups. *Business Horizons*, 59(3), 347-357.

Kauark, F. D. S., Manhães, F. C., & Medeiros, C. H. (2010). Metodologia da pesquisa: um guia prático.

Lauriano, N. G., & Ferreira, M. A. M. (2022). Laboratórios de inovação em governo como intermediadores de problemas públicos na América Latina. *Internext*, 17(3), 413-429

Leatherbee M, Katila R. 2020. The lean startup method: Early-stage teams and hypothesis-based probing of business ideas. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 14(4): 570-593.

Morais, M. C. A.; et al. (2020). Quais as evidências do empreendedorismo no setor público? Uma análise da produção científica internacional. *Empreendedorismo, Gestão e Negócios*, 9(9), 454-474.

Natsume, A. J., & Souza, M. C. D. A. F. (2004). Empreendedorismo: oportunidade ou necessidade? A crescente importancia do empreendedorismo na sociedade moderna (Doctoral dissertation, [sn]).

Pinchot, G. (1989). Intrapreneuring: por que você não precisa deixar a empresa para tornar-se um empreendedor. Harbra.

TABORDA, A. (2019). O que é uma start up?. 2006. Acesso em 30 nov. 2022



Travers, P. K., & Teixeira, C. S. (2017). As características definidoras das aceleradoras e suas diferenças para outras organizações filantrópicas. *Revista Eletrônica do Alto Vale do Itajaí*, 6(9), 98-107.

Teixeira, E. B. (2003). A análise de dados na pesquisa científica: importância e desafios em estudos organizacionais. *Desenvolvimento em questão*, 1(2), 177-201.

Ries, E. (2012). *A startup enxuta*. Leya.

Carneiro, J. G. S. P. (2013). *Intraempreendedorismo: conceitos e práticas para a construção de organizações inovadoras*. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark Editora.

Signori, G. G., Martins, A. R. Q., Junior, M. S., Kalil, F., & Capelari, M. R. (2014, September). Startup e inovação: inovando na forma de pensar e decretando o fim das velhas ideias. In XXII Workshop Anprotec, Belém/Pará. sn.

Veiga, L. D., Costa, B. L., & Carneiro, C. B. (2006). Os desafios da inclusão social: programas de assistência para a infância e juventude vulnerabilizadas na administração municipal de Belo Horizonte. JACOBI, Pedro; PINHO, José Antonio
G. *Inovação no campo da gestão pública local: novos desafios, novos patamares*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV Editora.

Worimegbe, P. M.; et al. (2022). Coopetition and micro, small and medium enterprises performance. *Independent Journal of Management & Production*, 13(2): 771-790.

Yin, R. K. (2001). *Estudo de Caso-: Planejamento e métodos*. Bookman editora.

Artigo submetido ao SBIJournal em 22/07/2024.
1a rodada de avaliação concluída em 01/10/2024.
2a rodada de avaliação concluída em 02/01/2025.
Aprovado para publicação em 02/01/2025.