Insuring Innovation

A diagnostic study of the innovation structure of Univé

Megan van der Pol

Master Thesis Business Administration – Organizational Design & Development

13-6-2022

Nijmegen
Information

Author: Megan van der Pol
Student number: s1065959

University: Radboud University
Faculty: School of Management Study
Master: Business Administration - Organizational Design & Development
Organization: Univé

Date: 13-6-2022
Supervisor: Dr. ir. L.J. Lekkerkerk
Second examiner: Dr. S. Schembera
Preface

I hereby proudly present to you my master thesis ‘Insuring innovation’. This master thesis has been written as part of the master’s specialization Organizational Design & Development at the Radboud University in Nijmegen and in collaboration with Univé. During the pre-master’s programme Business Administration, the course organizational design caught my attention and I immediately knew I wanted to specialize my knowledge in Business Administration on this topic. I did this by choosing this particular master’s programme. The professor of the course dr. ir. L.J. Lekkerkerk inspired me to do so and therefore, I was glad to see that he was going to be my supervisor. Writing my thesis about a topic that I found very interesting while putting my gained knowledge into practice, really motivated me to finish my master thesis.

Firstly, I would like to thank dr. ir. L.J. Lekkerkerk for all the feedback and support during the master thesis period. It was pleasantly to work with this supervisor because of the fast replies and novel insights. You can imagine it was very interesting and helpful to work with the creator of the theory I mainly used as the theoretical background of this master thesis. In addition, I would like to thank my second reader dr. S. Schembera for the feedback on my research proposal, especially on the scope of my master thesis. It was really helpful having someone look at your work objectively. I would also like to give my special thanks to all of the employees of Univé that helped me by participating in the interviews. Without your openness, this master thesis could not exist. Lastly, when there were moments of stress, I could always count on my family and friends and therefore, I would like to give special attention to them as well.

Looking back at the period, I had my ups and downs. I learned, for example, that doing qualitative research means a lot of transcribing and requires a lot of contact and collaboration with the organization you study. Nevertheless, I did enjoy the interaction with the organization and gained fruitful insights that personally interested me as well. Therefore, this period has been very meaningful to me on an academic but also on a personal level.

I hope you will find my master thesis interesting to read and hopefully, it inspires you to keep insuring innovation.

Megan van der Pol

Nijmegen, June 2022
Abstract

Innovation is necessary for organizations to remain viable. The insurance company Univé seeks to understand how to increase its innovation success. As structure is one of the factors affecting innovation success, this case study aims to diagnose and redesign the innovation structure of Univé. Innovation structure is incorporated into the organization structure and approached from a socio-technical design point of view. The Model Innovation and Organization Structure developed by Lekkerkerk (2012), referred to as the MIOS, provides functions to be fulfilled in order to have a proper structure. Moreover, theories about other success factors that could further increase innovation success have been studied as well. Deductive research enabled to diagnose the innovation structure and presence of other success factors at Univé. Empirical data provided insights into the current situation of Univé and has been collected via semi-structured interviews and the analysis of documents. Results on the innovation structure revealed which MIOS-functions need to be redesigned as they were not formally allocated, not sufficiently performing or a combination of both. This has been assessed on three levels: team innovation, regional Univé’s and the entire organization Univé. Most of the problems appeared on the level of the entire organization Univé. In addition, the results also provided insight into the currently missing success factors for innovations. These were: technology, experience, the price and quality of the new product and complementarity. Based on the comparison of theoretical insights with empirical results, it can be concluded that there is a “gap” between the current and desired situation concerning the innovation structure of Univé. Based on the diagnosis, recommendations are given in order to redesign the innovation structure of Univé. These recommendations are focused on formally assigning and increasing the performance of a number of the MIOS-functions. In addition, advice concerning the incorporation of missing success factors for innovation projects is also provided. Combined, all the recommendations should lead to an increase in innovation success at Univé.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

In this chapter, an introduction will be given to this research. The problem regarding this research will be formulated. Hereafter, the research objective, the research question and its theoretical, empirical and analytical sub-questions will be described. Lastly, the theoretical and practical relevance will be discussed.

1.1 Background

Innovation, organizations can no longer avoid it as it is crucial for their organizational success (Smith et al., 2008). A proper innovation structure, incorporated in the organization structure, affects the innovation capacity, enabling organizations to remain viable (Lekkerkerk, 2012). However, many organizations face problems concerning achieving innovation success. According to Lekkerkerk (2012), between 60% and 95% of innovation projects fail. Obviously, these numbers are way too high and this performance is not to be desired. Therefore, increasing innovation success at organizations is worth the attention. One of those organizations that want to increase the number of successful innovations is Univé.

Univé is one of the largest insurance companies in the Netherlands. In addition to being an insurer and an independent insurance adviser for the private and business markets, Univé is also an accredited mortgage adviser. By now, Univé has 8 regional Univé companies, 100 local stores, 2801 employees, 1.6 million customers and more than 4 million insurances. Univé has been named Best Business Insurer for years in a row. Due to the fact that Univé is a non-profit cooperative, its customers and employees are also its members and these members are more important than the pursuit of profit. Members receive positive organizational results through premium discounts and improved products and services (Univé, n.d.). The organizational chart of Univé is listed in appendix 1. One of the core values of Univé is that they want to give personal advice to their customers supported by the right expertise. This is expressed in their mission statement, which is as follows:

“Together, we provide security. We provide insight into your risks, at any time in your life. With expertise and personal advice. And you choose where, when and how” (Univé, n.d.).

To be able to give this personal advice and, as stated earlier, provide members with improved products and services, Univé has a specific Innovation department. This department consists of internal employees as well as external advisors and together they are mainly responsible for the innovation projects at Univé. Besides the department Innovation, there are also some regional Univé’s that have someone specifically assigned to innovation activities.
One of those regional Univé’s is Univé South-Netherlands. According to the manager of Univé South-Netherlands, some innovation projects succeeded but others failed. For instance, the project “Intelliflow” was a project regarding the creation of a new system and is now successfully implemented in all of the regional Univé’s. However, another innovation project called “IKhypotheek” failed. This project was supposed to deliver a new, easier and more personal way to apply for a mortgage online (A. Vos, personal communication, 2022).

As there are still innovation projects failing, there is room for improvement regarding the innovation success of Univé. As mentioned earlier, structure affects the success of innovations. Guidelines for a proper innovation and organization structure will help to improve the performance of the innovation activities of organizations (Lekkerkerk, 2015). A diagnosis and redesign of the structure could thus possibly enhance the number of successful innovations at Univé. Various socio-technical system design theories could be used to diagnose the organization and innovation structure. One of those socio-technical system design theories is from De Sitter and this theory specifies design principles that are crucial for having a proper organization structure (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2010). Based on this and other socio-technical system design theories, Lekkerkerk (2012) developed the Model Innovation and Organization Structure, also referred to as the “MIOS”. This theory adds to other socio-technical system designs concrete guidelines for the innovation structure as part of the redesign of the entire structure (Lekkerkerk, 2015). This theory seems to have the best fit for increasing the innovation success at Univé as it provides a normative framework for analysing and redesigning specifically the innovation structure. Nevertheless, it cannot be assumed that the innovation structure is the only factor affecting innovation success. Therefore, studying theories that provide other supporting success factors for innovations could even further enhance the innovation success of Univé.

1.2 Research objective and research question

The research objective is to give recommendations to Univé in order to improve their innovation success by means of analysing their innovation structure and the presence of other innovation success factors. This can be done by qualitative research showing which success factors for innovations are missing and how the innovation structure, according to the MIOS, of Univé is currently organized. After this diagnosis, the innovation structure can be redesigned by using the MIOS, which provides a normative framework for proper innovation structures. Furthermore, the incorporation of missing theoretically found success factors could further enhance innovation success. This leads to the following research question:

“To what extent could innovation success at Univé be increased by means of a redesign of the innovation structure supported by other success factors for innovations?”
In order to give an answer to this research question, sub-questions are formulated below. Based on the method of Verschuren and Doorewaard (2015), the sub-questions are divided into three categories: theoretical, empirical and analytical.

1. **Theoretical: What is currently known about innovation success in the literature?**
   a. How can innovations be defined?
   b. What are success factors for innovation projects?
   c. How could the innovation structure of Univé be analysed and improved?

2. **Empirical: Which theoretical key concepts for successful innovations are present in the current situation?**
   a. Which of the success factors for innovations are currently present?
   b. What does the innovation structure of Univé look like?

3. **Analytical: How could the innovation structure of Univé, based on theoretical and empirical insights, be redesigned in order to achieve more innovation success?**
   a. What is the gap between the current innovation structure and the theoretical guidelines regarding a proper innovation structure?

4. **Analytical: Which of the success factors for innovations could be incorporated to support the redesigned innovation structure to further increase the innovation success of Univé?**
   a. Which theoretical success factors were not yet present in practice and could be recommended to give attention to?

### 1.3 Relevance

#### 1.3.1 Theoretical relevance

Socio-technical system design theories and innovation theories have been existing for a very long period of time. Most of the time, socio-technical system design theories focus on improving the production structure, which in most cases is best suited for manufacturers. The MIOS is based on those theories but adds to this a normative framework for the innovation structure as embedded in the organization structure (Lekkerkerk, 2012). It is the practical implication of those theories that make this research a contribution to already existing theories. The theoretical relevance would be the application of the literature regarding success factors for innovations and the MIOS on the specific insurance company Univé. For the existing literature on the MIOS, this research adds a case study mainly based on the MIOS itself, making a future-comparative study possible.
1.3.2 Practical relevance

This research has practical relevance for Univé, because it will give the organization insight into its current situation regarding the presence of some innovation success factors and their innovation structure. As a result of this diagnosis, information is available in order to increase the success of their innovation projects. Furthermore, this study also provides recommendations to redesign the innovation structure of Univé into a proper and thus more efficient one. Those recommendations are based on innovation theory and the MIOS developed by Lekkerkerk (2012). If it turns out that the upcoming innovation projects are indeed successfully implemented and thus innovation success is increased, the organization will benefit from this. Practical implications can be directed towards the central organization first, where the department Innovations is located. The central organization can serve as a best practice for the other regional Univé’s. The other regional Univé’s could repeat the same analysis in order to achieve more innovation success for Univé as a cooperative.

1.4 Research outline

This master thesis consists of six chapters and starts with chapter 1, which gives an introduction and overview of the problem, followed by the research question, sub-questions and practical and theoretical relevance. Chapter 2 provides the formulated problem's theoretical background and presents different relevant theories for this research. In chapter 3, the research methodology will be addressed and argumentation will be provided on the choices for particular methods. Research strategy, case context, interviews, data collection, data analysis, research quality and research ethics will be discussed. Chapter 4 will discuss the results and analysis of the data. In chapter 5, the answer to the research question and recommendations for Univé will be presented. Lastly, chapter 6 provides a reflection and a discussion on the contribution to the theory, practical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.
Chapter 2. Literature review

This chapter will provide an overview of the theoretical background of this research and provides an answer to the theoretical sub-questions formulated in paragraph 1.2. Firstly, innovations will be defined and the success factors for innovation projects will be discussed. Hereafter, possible organization design theories to study will be addressed. Lastly, the MIOS from Lekkerkerk (2012) will be discussed as a tool for analysing and redesigning the innovation structure.

2.1 Defining innovations

Innovation can be defined as a firm’s tendency to develop and adopt new products and services, processes and business systems (Nybakk & Jenssen, 2012). Innovation is crucial for organizational success and this awareness caused a great number of studies on the subject of innovation (Smith et al., 2008).

A distinction can be made between different types of innovations: product innovations, process innovations and organizational innovations. Product innovations entail new products or services and are needed to meet the newly introduced needs of the market (Damapour, Szabat & Evan, 1989). Process innovations can be defined as changes in the production process or service operation. This type of innovation does not produce new products or services but could trigger the introduction of new products and services (Damanpour, Szabat & Evan, 1989). The focus of process innovations is more on changing the procedures for carrying out the daily tasks, roles and communication (Walker, 2004). In addition, Lekkerkerk (2012) also speaks about organizational innovations. This type of innovation is based on administrative changes.

Another distinction that can be made concerning innovations is between radical and incremental innovations or the degree of newness. According to Lekkerkerk (2012), radical innovations are innovations that are entirely novel, unfamiliar to the organization, new to the world and the target customers in the market. Radical innovations require a more iterative approach to managing this innovation. Whereas radical innovation is entirely novel for the market and the world, incremental innovations are more focused on improving the current situation familiar to the members of the organization. Incremental innovations are new to the organization, but usually not for the market. A more linear and phased approach will be applied for this type of innovation. The number of phases is determined by the size of the project (Lekkerkerk, 2012).
2.2 Success factors for innovations

As many innovation projects fail, it is interesting to study possible success factors for innovations. In their research, van der Panne et al. (2003) state that only one out of five innovation projects that were initiated remained viable. This is problematic because it is widely recognised that innovation is critical for the economic performance of the organization. Innovative organizations are more likely to grow quicker and make higher profits (van der Panne, et al. 2003).

There are many success factors to be found in the literature and therefore, structure is required in order to give a clear overview of all the factors. As van der Panne et al. (2003) conducted thorough research to compare 43 papers on success factors for innovations, their model is the most suitable as an overarching framework to give structure to compatible sub-factors found in other studies. Underneath, in figure 1, the model with factors for successful innovations created by van der Panne et al. (2003) is presented. A distinction can be made between factors that affect the technological viability and factors that have an influence on the commercial viability, which are both needed to achieve successful innovations. Only the factors that were most agreed upon among the studies are discussed. These factors are explained in the following sections and function as overarching categories for other success factors found in the literature.

![Diagram of critical factors for successful innovations](image)

Figure 1: Critical factors for successful innovations (van der Panne et al., 2003)
2.2.1 Technological viability

Four firm related factors regarding the technological viability of an innovation project are considered to be relevant for success. The firm’s culture, experience and strategy towards innovation will be discussed. Furthermore, the complementarity and management style as part of the project related factors will also be addressed. Before these factors will be explained, it is interesting to zoom in on some success factors for technological innovations.

Success factors for technological innovations
Posselt & Förstl (2011) stated that technology is a critical success factor for new service development and refers to the organization’s ability to use technology in developing and delivering new services. Other experts even state that the technology, as a success factor for the innovation context, that underlies an innovation is a major driving force for the organization. In order to commercialize an innovation, the technology should be at a certain maturity level. This implies that it should be free of errors and ready to be used before the market introduction takes place. These criteria must be met because the market does not tolerate errors that constantly need to be fixed (Wohlfeil & Terzidis, 2015).

An example of technological innovation at Univé is the development of the Univé App for contact reasons, claims and information about the insurances of the users (Univé, n.d.). It is likely that over a period of time, their systems and apps are in need of innovation. According to Chen et al. (2019), the trend is that service organizations increasingly develop mobile apps to expand their service channels. Following the theory of Chen et al. (2019), widespread resistance exists to the usage of those apps. Rejection of new or improved brand apps can be reduced by decreasing image and usage barriers. Design, utility, user interface graphics and using the advantages of the brand reputation for promoting reasons are only a few examples that can help achieve this.

Firm related factors
Firm culture
The culture of the firm is crucial to technological innovation in the long term. This is because the culture determines if there is an organizational-wide understanding that innovation is necessary for organizational survival. Resistance occurs when this is not the case and employees focus solely on their daily routines. This contradicts the collective nature of innovations (van der Panne et al., 2003). According to Posselt & Förstl (2011), a supportive culture could ensure collective ownership of knowledge. This knowledge transfer is necessary to achieve successful innovations. In addition, Wohlfeil & Terzidis (2015) state that culture is an essential factor regarding the preconditions for successful innovations.
It is crucial that there is tolerance for mistakes, which requires an innovation-friendly culture. They add that the culture needs to be characterised by an ambience of openness regarding change and novelty.

Trust and openness
Sub-factors that belong to the factor firm culture are trust and openness (Tidd & Bessant, 2013). This refers to the experience of emotional safety as people feel seen, competent and share similar values. If there is a strong level of trust present in the organization, all of the members dare to share their ideas and opinions without feeling judged. Therefore, knowledge sharing and joint problem solving occur. Besides this, communication needs to be straightforward and open. Another sub-factor added by Tidd & Bessant (2013) is having a shared vision within the organization to ensure the mindset required in order to have successful innovations.

Experience with innovation
Experience in innovation projects increases skills that are crucial for the course of the innovation project. Therefore, firms should not always choose for the specific type of projects that they have dealt with before. Learning-by-doing and learning-by-failing are advantages that come with experience with innovation projects. The latter is very important to discover what the weaknesses of the firm are (van der Panne et al., 2003).

Firm strategy towards innovation
According to Tidd & Bessant (2013), successful innovation is strategy-based. Firstly, it sets out a course for dealing with strategic challenges such as skills to develop (van der Panne et al., 2003). Strategically planned projects enable synergy between parallel innovation projects. Two main innovation strategies are defined in the literature: pro-active and re-active. Pro-active strategies aim to obtain leadership regarding new products and services, whereas a reactive strategy responds more to competing products or services of others. However, only half of the organizations that innovate have an explicit innovation strategy (van der Panne et al., 2003). Wohlfeil & Terzidis (2015) add to this the connection between innovations and the organization's overall strategy. They state that strategy indicates the general objectives for innovation creation, which form guidelines for innovation activities. When an innovation project does not fit this strategy, it should not be executed (Wohlfeil & Terzidis, 2015).
Organization structure

There is some debate among various studies on the design of an organization that has the most appropriate structure for innovation projects. An agreement, however, is that functional organizations are not considered appropriate. Their static processes and aim for control disturb the so-called “trial-and-error” process of innovation projects. Therefore, more flexible and organic structures have higher success rates (van der Panne et al., 2003). According to Tidd & Bessant (2013), an appropriate organization structure is needed to have successful innovations. They state that much literature recognizes that the nature of tasks performed in the organization influence the organizational structure. Successful organizations generally have the best fit between structure and operating contingencies (Tidd & Bessant, 2013). Wohlfleil & Terzidis (2015) add that flexible structures and low hierarchies are crucial for success. As this study focuses mainly on the improvement of the innovation structure of Univé, this success factor will be further elaborated in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4.

Project related factors

Complementarity

There is a causal link between technological viability and the innovation project’s compatibility with the resources of the firms. These could vary between management skills, sales and production facilities (van der Panne et al., 2003). Cooper (1983) states that skills and resources are key factors of success and synergy among those and the innovations are, therefore, decisive for the outcome of the innovation. Posselt & Förstl (2011) agree with this statement and mention that the new service needs to be compatible with the other products and services, capabilities and resources of the organization. Human resources specifically, according to Posselt & Förstl (2011), need to have the required expertise that is necessary in order to achieve the desired result of the innovation. Here compatibility between skills and the desired outcome of the new service is of great importance.

Innovation management style

The management style of an organization affects the success of the innovation project. Proper management of time, costs, information and decision-making determines 60% of the project’s viability (Cozijnsen et al., 2000). The study of van der Panne et al. (2003) distinguishes sixth phases to manage innovations that provide a guideline towards a successfully implemented innovation. Those phases: are planning, brainstorming, screening, evaluation, development and market research. During the planning phase milestones need to be formulated in order to streamline the innovation project into precise tasks. Furthermore, the evaluation phase is required in order to analyse viable and less viable innovation projects with each other. Skipping phases is a leading cause of failure, according to van der Panne et al. (2003). Bessant & Tidd (2013) add to this that in order to have successful innovations, an effective implementation mechanism is needed to get ideas put to reality. The process includes systematic problem solving and a clear decision-making framework.
This mechanism should also help to stop continuing projects when needed. Moreover, skills in project management are also required and attention needs to be paid to the management of the change process itself which includes, for example, the anticipation of those affected by the change (Bessant & Tidd, 2013).

**Effective internal and external linkages**

A sub-factor to innovation management style is effective internal and external linkages. This implies interaction with customers and competitors within the market, suppliers of technologies, strategic partners and internal organizational members. Posselt & Förstl (2011) state that the involvement of employees in the development process of innovations is a crucial success factor. Management should create cross-functional teams where the members of different functional areas come together. Here tacit knowledge can be transferred to explicit knowledge that is useful for developing novel and successful innovations (Posselt & Förstl, 2011). Internal linkage is seen as a success sub-factor to innovation management style as well by Tidd & Bessant (2013). They state that high involvement in innovation should positively affect innovation success (Tidd & Bessant, 2013). Every member of the organization then possesses the skills needed to innovate. This implies that there is a lot of innovative potential when these members use their abilities on a regular basis. Sums of incremental innovations can also have a significant impact. Linkages will provide learning opportunities as they present alternative perspectives (Bessant & Tidd, 2013). According to Bessant & Tidd (2013), an upcoming trend is “open innovation”, as networking and inter-organizational behaviours are becoming the superior mode of operation.

### 2.2.2 Commercial viability

Acknowledged by all the studies that van der Panne et al. (2003) reviewed are relative price and quality as product related factors. Furthermore, the concentration of the targeted markets and timing of market introduction as sub-factors of market related factors are seen as positively affecting the success of innovations.

**Product related factors**

**Relative price**

The price of a new product or service relative to substitutes is acknowledged to be a relevant factor for the success of the innovation. Important is the reduction the innovation can create on the total-cost-of-use of the customer. However, solely focusing on the reduction of total-costs-of results in less successful innovations. Organizations need to focus, in addition to reducing the total-cost-of-use, on after-sales services and backward compatibility (van der Panne et al., 2003).
Quality

All theories agree that quality is the most critical determinant of the innovation project's success (van der Panne et al., 2003). Posselt & Fröstl (2011) add that high quality contributes to having a unique or superior service, which is the main contributor to success.

Market related factors

Concentration of targeted market

The level of concentration of the market with potential buyers is a factor for the commercial viability of the innovation. This relationship is not linear; therefore, a high and a low concentration of the targeted market can influence the viability (van der Panne et al., 2003). Posselt & Förstl (2011) state that market orientation is fundamental to understanding the customers’ requirements and possible competitors for the new service. This factor contributes to gaining insights into market opportunities which in their turn affect the eventual success of an innovation.

Timing of market introduction

The timing of the introduction of new products and services is another market related factor. It is in some cases recommended to create short-cuts in the process of implementing innovations to speed up the introduction of the new product or service to the market. This advantage differs between radical and incremental innovations. Whereas incremental innovations are more likely to experience benefits from this fast introduction, more novel and radical innovations do not. Novel innovations require a longer time to develop the innovation extensively (van der Panne et al., 2003). Customer involvement could also lead to a more extended period before the new service is introduced to the market, according to Posselt & Förstl (2011). They state that customer involvement is a crucial factor when developing a new or improving an existing service. Especially in the stage of idea generation, inputs of the customers are of high value. In addition to this, involving customers significantly affects the service marketability, launch preparation and sales performances of the organization. Wohfeil and Terzidis (2015) mention that timeliness is a crucial criterion for innovation success, because if the market is entered too late, the targeted market may be already satisfied. However, entering the market too early can be problematic as well, as the market may not be ready to adopt the innovation.

2.2.3 Zooming in on organization structure

The objective of this research is to give recommendations concerning success factors for innovation success and redesigning the innovation structure of Univé in order to increase innovation success. As structure is one of the mentioned success factors in paragraph 2.2.1, the following paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 will further zoom in on the literature regarding this factor. However, Bessant & Tidd (2013) state that being an innovative organization implies more than structure and requires many more components
for innovation to flourish. Therefore, the focus is mainly on the success factor structure, but other possible success factors affecting innovation success are not neglected within this study.

2.3 Organizational design theories

As mentioned in paragraph 2.2.1, organization structure is one of the possible factors affecting innovation success. An interesting approach to innovation theory is to thus to study the potential effect of organization structure on innovation success. Achterbergh & Vriens (2010) state that organization structure affects the realisation of organizational goals. However, improper structures can have serious consequences regarding the meaningful survival of an organization. Therefore, it is needed to gain a deeper understanding of what proper structures could look like and how organizations can be redesigned accordingly (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2010).

Innovations can be seen as systems of interactions between human resources in order to achieve a particular goal. Therefore, for this research, the most fitting approach would be to zoom in on socio-technical system design theories as they are applicable to everything that can be perceived as a system (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2019). The social interactions are necessary for organizational performance and therefore, viewing organizations as systems rather than social systems as a whole would, according to Achterbergh & Vriens (2010), be too simplistic. Socio-technical system design theories provide tools to diagnose and redesign the structure of an organization into a proper one. Mintzberg (1980), for example, distinguished five types of organizational designs which he refers to as configurations. These different configurations are characterized by one dominant part of the organization. The parts that Mintzberg (1980) mentioned are the strategic apex, middle line, operating core, technostructure and support staff. Support staff, among others, consists of R&D employees who are relevant for innovations within the organization.

Another socio-technical system design theory is from De Sitter. De Sitter defines an organizational structure as the grouping and coupling of transformations into tasks and the required relations between these tasks (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2010). De Sitter provides specific design principles for a proper structure that has low levels of disturbances and high levels of regulatory power. Regulatory power enables employees to react to disturbances in their daily operations immediately and thus “innovate” when necessary. De Sitter provides parameters for the production structure, the separation between control and production and the control structure. The control structure consists of strategic control, design and operation control. This theory follows the theory of Ashby by incorporating the function regulation by design in the control structures of organizations (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2010). Achterbergh & Vriens (2010) refer to this as the innovation structure of an organization which requires some kind of innovation structure. In the next paragraph, functions for this innovation structure are provided on the basis of the MIOS developed by Lekkerkerk (2012).
2.4 Model Innovation and Organization Structure (MIOS)

One way to assess the organization structure, as well as the innovation structure, is the MIOS, developed by Lekkerkerk (2012). The abbreviation MIOS stands for the Model Innovation and Organization Structure. It is a normative functional model that can be used for research purposes, as a diagnostic tool and as a guideline for designing new innovation and organization structures in practice. The MIOS is applicable to any organization that wants to remain viable and fits well in the field of innovation management. The MIOS is based on and an addition to modern socio-technical system design theories stating that organizations consist of production- and control structures. The MIOS, however, emphasises the innovation structure within those structures (Lekkerkerk, 2012).

The MIOS is based on theories from Beer with his Viable System Model (VSM), In ‘t Veld with the innovation model and the steady-state model and De Sitter with his modern socio-technical approach, also referred to as “MST”. MST from De Sitter focuses on diagnosis and improvement of mainly the production structure in organizations (Lekkerkerk, 2012). Furthermore, these other socio-technical system design theories lack norms and prescriptions for organizations to follow to remain viable. According to Lekkerkerk (2012), when using the MIOS, it is possible to diagnose and give structure to innovation projects and how this structure is related to all other sorts of tasks, which eventually results in successfully implemented innovations. The MIOS is, therefore, a more complete model that has a great fit with the research objective and research question. Hence, it will be used as theoretical background to give answer to the research question. The objective of this research is to improve the innovation success of Univé. Determining the formally or informally allocation of the tasks for each function and the performance of this function provides an overview of the innovation- and organisation structure of Univé. This insight can be used to find out which structural aspects possibly affect innovation success at Univé. In addition, the MIOS is also related to the innovation theories that are described earlier in this chapter resulting in a coherent theoretical background that serves as the foundation for this research.

2.4.1 The MIOS explained

The MIOS consists of 12 functions that are needed to stay viable for any organization. In a later paper by Lekkerkerk (2015), another function was added, which led to a model consisting of 13 functions. This function is called continuous improvement. According to Lekkerkerk (2012), viable means “able to maintain its separate existence”. If all the functions of the MIOS are incorporated into the structure of the organization, under the condition that competent employees fulfil these functions, it is likely to continue being viable (Lekkerkerk, 2012). The model itself is presented in figure 2. All the functions in the model are connected to each other. Some functions are related to the environment of the organization as well due to the fact that it is an open system model.
This is visualised by arrows that form the input and output of the model. The functions in the MIOS are categorized into three groups and labelled with a code. The first group is related to the primary process and is labelled with a “V”. The functions in the second group together make sure innovations are being realized. These functions are labelled with the letter “I”. The third group are central functions that connect the functions for the primary process with the innovation functions. This group is labelled as “C” (Lekkerkerk, 2012). Below an explanation that is primarily based on the English Summary in Lekkerkerk (2012) will be provided on the three groups and their functions.

Figure 2: “The Function model or MIOS” (Lekkerkerk, 2012, Fig. S.1)
Functions for the primary process

- **Supply product/service (V1)**
  This is the actual transformation from input to output and this transformation is divided into subsystems.

- **Regulate supply (V2)**
  This function is all about the operational regulation of the primary process and the coordination of the different elements, taking care of norms for audits and evaluations in order to improve the primary process.

- **Propose improvement (V3)**
  Making project proposals for the best opportunities, including continuous improvement.

- **Search improvements (V4)**
  Searching for and finding ways of improving the exploitation of the current markets, products, facilities etc.

Functions for the innovation process

- **Innovate (I1)**
  This is the execution of all sorts of innovation projects.

- **Regulate innovations (I2)**
  The operational regulation of the innovation project and the management of the whole portfolio consisting of innovation projects. Next to that, also the coordination of the different elements, taking care of the regulation norms, auditing, evaluation and improvement regarding the innovation process.

- **Propose innovation (I3)**
  Making project proposals for the best options in the future for innovations which are received from I4.

- **Search future new options (I4)**
  The exploration of the environment and search for future options for innovation, which are aimed at new and already existing markets.

Central functions

- **Remember (C1)**
  Organizational memory that stores codified knowledge that is relevant to the organization.

- **Tune (C2)**
  Tuning C1 and I1 to enable a smooth implementation of innovations and tuning the other functions to contribute to the strategic planning process.
- **Balance (C3)**
  Balancing the project portfolio by strategically choosing in which proposals from V3 & I3 should be invested and which of the projects in progress should be continued, paused or aborted.

- **Define mission (C4)**
  Defining the mission, vision and strategy for the company and from there derive lower-level strategies for supply and innovation, which include performance indicators and budgets.

- **Continuous improvement**
  Improvements on a small scale or so-called ‘kaizen’ activities within the operational regulation of each function (Lekkerkerk, 2015).

### 2.4.2 Defining innovations and improvements

In order to understand the MIOS explained earlier, it is essential to make a clear distinction between innovations and improvements. Innovation can be defined as the result of innovation projects and is executed by a temporary and multidisciplinary project team. It could entail the development of technical, organizational or social changes. Incremental innovation, also referred to as improvements, should be part of each employee’s job and therefore, it is not in need of a specific project team. It is something that needs to happen continuously but stays within a particular department and does not necessarily need formal approval (Lekkerkerk, 2015).

### 2.4.3 The innovation structure

The innovation structure is formed by the functions: “Search improvements-V4”, “Search future new options-I4”, “Propose improvement-V3”, “Propose innovation-I3”, “Balance-C3”, “Innovate-I1” and “Regulate innovation-I2” (Lekkerkerk, 2012). This is visualized in figure 3. The above-described elements of the MIOS can be used to diagnose and redesign the current innovation structure of Univé into a proper one. Via this model, it is possible to determine how the functions are currently assigned and performing within the organization. When this becomes clear, it can be compared to the proper innovation structure according to the MIOS and redesigned accordingly to enhance the innovation success of Univé.
Figure 3: “The general innovation process” (Lekkerkerk, 2015, Fig. 3)

2.5 Conceptual model

The conceptual model is presented in figure 4 and provides a visual representation of the relationship between the different theoretical key concepts. As shown in the figure, the expectation is that innovation success could be positively affected by key concepts from the literature. These are a proper organization and innovation structure, referring to the implications of the MIOS developed by Lekkerkerk (2012) and other success criteria for innovations. According to the literature, innovation success could be positively affected when combing these two.
Chapter 3. Methodology

This chapter discusses the research strategy, case context, interviews, data collection, data resources, research quality and research ethics.

3.1 Research strategy

In order to achieve the objective of this research, a good fit between the research question, theoretical background and methodology is of high importance. The objective of this research is to formulate recommendations regarding the improvement of the innovation success of Univé.

To achieve this, in-depth research is necessary, resulting in the choice for qualitative research. Interviews will serve as the most important data source to get a thorough understanding of the current innovation structure and the presence of success factors for innovation projects at Univé. Because this research is building on already existing theories, the research type is considered to be deductive. Deductive research usually starts with existing theory and the researcher would like to observe how this theory unfolds in practice. Therefore, such research also has characteristics of practice-oriented research (Bleijenbergh, 2015). However, this research aims to examine the innovation structure of Univé in practice and is thus next to practice-orientated research, diagnostic research. Furthermore, a distinction can be made between diagnostic research and design-oriented research. The focus of the first is to analyse a social situation, whereas the latter tries to come up with recommendations and solutions to solve the problem (Bleijenbergh, 2015). In this research, a combination of both types of research is required to answer the central research question.

3.2 Case context

Univé specifically allocated employees to innovation activities and has attempted to implement various innovations already. However, as there are still innovations failing, there is room for improvement concerning innovation success. An example of this, mentioned in paragraph 1.1, is the failure of the project IK-Hypotheek of Univé South-Netherlands. In order to increase the number of successful innovations, factors affecting innovation success needed to be studied. According to the literature, one of those factors is the organization and innovation structure. Overcoming some design problems regarding the innovation structure could thus possibly increase innovation success at Univé. As Univé is a large cooperative and specifically assigned employees to innovation tasks, diagnosing and redesigning its structure seems a suitable approach to increase innovation success. Nevertheless, structure is not likely to be the only factor affecting performance in innovation. Therefore, other theoretically found success factors were not neglected in this research.
3.3 Interviews
According to Symon & Cassell (2012), interviewing is a reliable and useful method to gather knowledge about a specific subject. Open interviews are part of qualitative research and can, according to Bleijenbergh (2015), be divided into two categories: semi-structured interviews and unstructured interviews. Within this research, semi-structured interviews will be used to collect data. Choosing this type of interview means that the researcher uses theoretical key concepts to develop leading open-ended interview questions beforehand. However, these questions are not entirely definite and can be altered during the interview to create a more in-depth conversation about interesting topics. This also applies to the order of the interview questions. To ensure that all the questions regarding the diagnosis of the innovation structure were answered, enough time was scheduled. The researcher did not finish the interview before all the functions of the MIOS were discussed and general questions about the success factors had been answered.

One of the benefits of semi-structured interview questions is that the researcher can guide which information or topics are being discussed. In addition, all of the interviews with the respondents started with the same questions, which improves the reliability (Bleijenbergh, 2015). However, there are disadvantages as well for semi-structured interviews. Bleijenbergh (2015) states that a disadvantage of structuring the interview beforehand is that the researcher could steer the conversation in a certain direction. This implies that there is less room for a thorough discussion about certain topics compared to unstructured interviews, which negatively influences the validity of this research (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Reliability and validity within this research will further be discussed in paragraph 3.6 regarding the research quality. To make sure the interviews provided valid and complete information, it was important that the respondents had at least some knowledge about the research beforehand. Therefore, an interview guide was created consisting of information about the research, its theoretical background and formal information concerning anonymity and confidentiality.

The interview guide was sent by e-mail to the respondents to give them the opportunity to ask questions about the document before the interviews started. The interview guide is included in appendix 3. Eventually, there were only some questions about the theory, which were explained by the researcher during the interview, before starting with the actual interview questions.

3.4 Data collection
For this research, the department Innovation at Univé is the main research object, because the following research question needs to be answered:

“**To what extent could innovation success at Univé be increased by means of a redesign of the innovation structure supported by other success factors for innovations?**”
The organizational chart of Univé is included in appendix 1 and shows the Innovation department that deals with innovation as their daily task. These employees were most likely in possession of the information needed to give an answer to the research question and were, for that reason, selected as relevant data resources. In the preliminary investigation, it became clear that two of the regional Univé’s had an Innovation ‘department’ of one person as well. As they are also contributing to innovation success within Univé, they were also included in this research to gain a broader understanding of how to increase innovation success within entire Univé. As the respondents of the interviews were employees that deal with innovation projects as their daily work, the innovation structure within the MIOS developed by Lekkerkerk (2012) fell entirely within the scope of this research. In addition, measuring the dependent variable “Innovation success” also was within the scope of this research and could be answered well by the selected respondents. However, due to the scope, the complete production structure was not analysed in sufficient detail. Only preliminary research and analysis of documents made it possible to collect somewhat data on two of the functions regarding the production structure. In addition, concerning the concreteness of this research, it was not possible to study every separate success factor in sufficient detail. Therefore, only general questions about which success factors were ‘readily’ caught in earlier innovation projects or desired in future projects to increase innovation success were included in the interviews.

According to Bleijenbergh (2015), triangulation occurs when the researcher uses more than one data source. Besides people, literature and documents were also essential data resources in this research and therefore, triangulation occurred in this research. Literature is an important data source since the goal is to improve the innovation success of Univé based on the MIOS and success factors for innovations. Next to this, internal documents were used as a data source to give an answer to the sub-questions and to check whether the gathered data from the interviews could be confirmed or not. The analysed documents can be found in the document “Supplementary documents”. In appendix 5, an overview is given regarding the respondents and documents analysed per variable.

3.5 Data analysis
After the data had been collected, it needed to be analysed properly to give an answer to the research question. The interviews were, with the consent of the respondents, recorded and the researcher made notes during the interviews as well. After the interviews were transcribed, the document was sent to the respondents to check if it was in line with what they spoke about in the interviews. All of the respondents approved the transcripts without further comments. An example of an e-mail that proves this is listed in appendix 6. After this, the coding process started in order to transfer data into useful information needed in order answer to the research question.
Bleijenbergh (2015) states that while conducting deductive research, the researcher creates the coding scheme beforehand based on the theoretical framework. This has been done by listing the functions of the MIOS as codes which guided the coding of the transcribed interviews. Documents were analysed in the same manner. Quotes of the respondents regarding success factors were coded by the list of success factors found in the literature.

### 3.6 Research quality

The research quality of qualitative research can be measured by means of the reliability and validity of the research. Reliability is more important for quantitative research, where the number of observation units is more extensive related to qualitative research. Therefore, a qualitative researcher will often replace reliability with the criterion of verifiability of the data collection (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

**Reliability**

Firstly, as earlier mentioned, the choice of semi-structured interviews comes with advantages and disadvantages. One of the advantages of this type of interview is that all of the respondents from Univé will have the same questions to start with. Therefore, the interviews can easily be repeated (Bleijenbergh, 2015). In order to improve the verifiability, the researcher has sent the transcribed interviews to all the individual respondents to check whether the document corresponded with what they spoke about in the interview. Furthermore, according to Bleijenbergh (2015), the triangulation of data resources will also contribute to a higher level of reliability within this research. However, a limitation regarding the reliability of this research could be that the interviews were not entirely consistent due to indefinite research questions. Another general risk regarding reliability could be that certain topics will be discussed with some of the respondents and not with others. This would not be the case when using a survey.

**Validity**

Due to the fact that multiple data resources were being used, we can speak of triangulation. This increases the internal validity of the research because the chance is higher that the researcher actually measured what was meant to be measured (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Moreover, as stated earlier, the transcribed interviews were sent to the respondents, which improves the reliability as well as the validity of the research. A high level of external validity is impossible to achieve because every organization has different and unique organization and innovation structures. Recommendations that were given to Univé are specifically for this organization with their own problems and context and can, therefore, not be applied to another organization. Even when this organization has similar problems, it will still have its own particular innovation structure that needs to be analysed first. Another limitation in this research regarding the validity is the usage of semi-structured interviews.
Due to the fact that for this type of interview the questions are defined beforehand, the interview can be steered towards a direction the researcher does not want it to go. Therefore, there is a chance that important topics may be left undiscussed. When using unstructured interview questions, this would not be a risk (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

3.7 Research ethics

Ethical research is based on the understanding that conducting research is not solely based on the collection of data but is also concerned with the well-being and treatment of the participants and their dignity, rights and safety. This understanding needs to be incorporated by all the people that are involved in the research (Stuart & Barnes, 2005). Another definition from Symon & Cassell (2012) is that ethical research can be defined as research that incorporates ethical practices in the research process. Those ethical practices can be divided into procedural, situational, relational and exiting. Procedural practices are for instance institutional rules and situational ethical practices are specific actions that fit within a certain context. In addition, the exiting ethical practices are the way the researcher executes actions to give an answer to the research question and the relational practices refer to the personal actions of the researcher. Procedural ethical practices are in this research taken care of via the “Research Integrity Form”, included in appendix 2. To give attention to the exiting ethical practices mentioned earlier, the researcher ensured that the respondents clearly understood the research's objective. Sometimes, participants think their job security will be improved and therefore feel obligated to take part in this research. Thus, the researcher needed to be very clear about the fact that participation is entirely voluntary and there was always a possibility to step out if the participant felt uncomfortable, without any consequences (Stuart & Barnes, 2005). Next to this, a description of the research objective and the theory it builds on was provided before the interviews were going to take place. This was included in the interview guide listed in appendix 3.

Another way to apply research ethics within this research was by giving attention to anonymity and confidentiality (Bell & Bryman, 2017). Within this research, the real names of the participants were not used and replaced by respondent A, respondent B and so on. Before the interview took place, the researcher asked if the participant still gave permission for the researcher to analyse the data gathered from the interview. The researcher did not share the transcribed interviews with other respondents and made sure that the confidential data remained private. Only the supervisor and second examiner had access to the transcribed interviews. However, if the participants were interested in the results of the research, they could receive a version of the research report where the transcripts are being excluded.
Chapter 4. Results and analysis

This chapter will give an answer to the empirical sub-question stated in paragraph 1.2. Based on the method of Verschuren and Doorewaard (2015), this sub-question itself is divided into sub-questions which are once again listed below.

**Empirical: Which theoretical key concepts for successful innovations are present in the current situation?**

a. Which of the success factors for innovations are currently present?
b. What does the innovation structure of Univé look like?

In order to answer the empirical sub-questions, a distinction is made between the results of the interview questions regarding the functions of the MIOS and the presence of other success factors. The functions of the MIOS will be separately discussed on different organizational levels. The success factors that appeared to be present will be listed and compared to the success factors that were found in the literature. Firstly, results on the dependent variable “Innovation success” as included in the conceptual model, figure 3 in paragraph 2.4, are presented.

### 4.1 Innovation success

In paragraph 2.1, innovations are defined and the theory regarding success factors for innovation projects is provided in paragraph 2.3. As mentioned, “Innovation success” is a dependent variable in this study and is thus measured as well. What does innovation success mean in practice according to Univé employees? Most of the respondent’s state that the interpretation of innovation success is twofold (respondent A, B, C, D, E, F, G). Firstly, by looking at what benefits the innovation brought to the organization. Are the objectives achieved and key performance indicators met (respondent A, B, C, D, E, F, G)? Respondent E and respondent F mention that an innovation becomes a success when it is embraced by the entire organization and contributes to the overall strategy of Univé. Respondent F thinks overall innovation success is when all the members of the organization have an innovative mindset. Secondly, innovations are also successful if you came to the conclusion that the projects need to be discontinued in order to save investments (respondent B, C, F). The learnings on this project also contribute to innovation success (respondent A, C, D).

### 4.2 Success factors

For the purpose of discovering success factors for innovation success at Univé, it was necessary to interview employees that are part of the innovation processes. Chapter 3 describe the basis for those interviews and how data was transformed into results.
The results are structured by making a distinction between empirically found success factors and theoretical success factors. In the summary of this paragraph, both will be compared and presented in table 1. The success factors mentioned by the respondents are structured in the same manner as the theoretical success factors in paragraph 2.2.

4.2.1 Technological viability

Firm related factors

In paragraph 2.2.1, success factors for technological innovations were presented. These factors were not found in the empirical results.

Firm culture

A success factor that was only brought up by respondent E was the culture of the organization. However, this was linked to openness and sharing knowledge across the organization, which not only respondent E referred to as a success factor but was also mentioned by respondent F. This respondent states that the visibility of projects still could be improved in order to achieve more innovation success (respondent F).

Experience with innovation

None of the respondents mentioned experience as a success factor for innovation projects.

Firm strategy towards innovation

One success factor that is mentioned by most of the respondents, 4 out of 7, is a strategy in order to achieve joint organizational objectives (respondent D, E, F, G). According to respondent F, collaboration on innovations enables the organization to work smarter concerning aligning efforts. In addition, respondent G states: “Yes, and also defining common goals, in which you can go much faster, because you can also assign dedicated people to it.”. Respondent B agrees with this by saying that collaboration and aligning efforts that contribute to achieving overall organizational goals could be possible success factors for innovation projects. Respondent E also mentions that involvement and collaboration could positively influence innovation success.

Organization structure

Having a simple organization structure has been found as a success factor as respondent B, E and G mention that the complex structure of Univé causes problems concerning innovation success. Respondent G states that the corporate model of Univé affects the execution of innovations negatively in comparison with other organizations.
A quote from respondent B that illustrates this is: “By being a central organization with those regional Univé’s next to it, if you want to make a mark, but everything has to be overlooked first by many people, that is counterproductive for innovating and experimenting quickly.”.

**Project related factors**

**Complementarity**
Compatibility among resources of the organization was not found to be a success factor for innovation projects by the respondents.

**Innovation management style**
The overarching success factor innovation management style is mentioned multiple times by the respondents. Below, the sub-factors for innovation management style mentioned by the respondents are listed. Smaller sub-factors mentioned in paragraph 2.2.1 are labelled separately in this results section.

**Internal and external support base**
An internal and external support base was found to be a success factor by 4 respondents (respondent A, C, E, G). Respondent G mentions that support from top management and the organization as a whole is very important and respondent A adds that externally you also need to show that responding to something is a logical step. In addition, the involvement of regional Univé’s was labelled as a success factor by 4 respondents (respondent B, D, E, G). More and more people are working on innovation within the total organization, thus within the Regional Univé’s as well and according to respondent G, this is a good thing. Respondent B states that the involvement of the regional Univé’s is so important, because they are the closest to the customer. Respondent D indicates that having someone available that regulates between the regional Univé and Team innovation could contribute to having more innovation success in the whole organization. A sub-factor added by respondents A and B is including a business owner from the regional Univé at the start of the project team.

**Portfolio management for the entire organization**
An interesting success factor, according to respondents B, E, F, and G was having portfolio management for the whole organization. This requires skills in project management, as mentioned in the literature. Two quotes that illustrate the need for this success factor were given by respondent G: “And I think the next step is to develop a portfolio together” and respondent E: “Ehm I think it would be good to have portfolio management on all innovation projects.”. Respondent B states that having a comprehensive insight into where everyone is working on could also improve the innovation success at Univé.
Respondent F specifies this by giving an example where the regional Univé and team innovation are working parallel on the same type of project. According to respondent F, that is something you want to find out at an earlier stage.

One standard process for innovations across the organization
As mentioned in the theory, processes are needed to manage innovations. There were 3 respondents that said that having one standard process for innovations across the organization could be a possible success factor (B, F, G). Respondent F brought up that having a good process provides the guidelines needed in order to execute the innovations. A quote from respondent B illustrates this success factor: “If we innovate together in the same way, we can exchange things much more easily and we can accelerate.” Another sub-factor for having a standard process is the duration of the process itself. Respondents C, E, and G defined a short duration of the innovation process as a success factor. According to respondent C, speed in the process could bring more energy and, in turn, affect the internal support base. Respondent E mentions that a short duration is needed. Otherwise, decisions will never be taken.

4.2.2 Commercial viability

Product related factors
Relative price and quality of the product
The sub-factors relative price and quality of the product were not mentioned by the respondents as success factors for innovation projects.

Market related factors
Concentration of targeted market
None of the respondents indicated that concentration of the targeted market is one of the success factors for innovation projects. However, in the results of the MIOS-functions in paragraph 4.3, it is stated that searching for market opportunities is part of the standard innovation process. Therefore, sufficiently attention is paid to this success factor.

Timing of market introduction
The right timing for implementing innovation projects and being strict regarding the selection of external partners seems to be mentioned only by one of the respondents (respondent A). This respondent experienced that some of the innovation projects came too early for the organization Univé.
4.2.3 Summary success factors

To provide a clear overview of the theoretical success factors that were empirically supported, the results described in the previous paragraphs are summarized in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical success factor</th>
<th>Empirical support</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm culture</td>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with innovation</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm strategy towards innovation</td>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>A, D, E, F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization structure</td>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>B, E, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation management style</td>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of targeted market</td>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>Paragraph 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of market introduction</td>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of the results regarding success factors
4.3 MIOS-functions

In order to gain a better understanding of the innovation structure of Univé, interviews were held with 5 employees and 2 managers. A distinction can be made between employees from the department Innovation itself and employees from regional Univé’s. The first one applies for 5 of the respondents and the latter one for 2. Chapter 3 describes how the interviews were conducted and how the transcripts of the interviews were coded and analysed. To structure the results, each function of the MIOS relevant for this research is separately discussed. In the summary of this paragraph, the functions are all scored on formal allocation and performance on three organizational levels. These are the department Innovation located at the central organization of Univé, Regional Univé’s and the entire organization Univé.

4.3.1 Functions for the primary process

As stated earlier in chapter 3, this research focuses mainly on the innovation structure of Univé. This implies that the functions for the primary process were not discussed in the interviews, as all of the respondents were an innovation manager or an employee of the Innovation department and regional Univé’s. They did not have the specific knowledge about the primary processes of Univé to examine the MIOS-functions that belong to the primary process. Therefore, only a short overview will be given, based on the organizational chart and preliminary investigation at Univé South-Netherlands, on the functions “Supply product/ service-V1” and “Regulate supply-V2”.

**Supply product/ service-V1**

The primary process of Univé is to provide customers with insurance packages. The process starts with a customer who contacts the contact centre of Univé, comes to one of the many Univé stores or applies for an insurance online. Hereafter, an insurance adviser gives advice on which package suits the customer best and then sends a proposal to the department Acceptation for examination. The process ends when Acceptation approves the insurance application.

The organizational chart, listed in appendix 1, shows the supporting and preparatory departments. For example, HR, IT and Enterprise Risk Management. This could imply that there is a distinction between the tasks regarding preparing, supporting and execution. Within every regional Univé, a difference is made between private and business customers and based on this, teams have been made. Insurance advisers handle all sorts of insurances for their own type of customer. So, if a private customer ends up having contact with someone that is from the business department, there is a delay. This employee is not allowed to handle this customer and needs to contact the private department first.
Regulate supply-V2

Zooming in on the operational and daily regulation of the regional Univé South-Netherlands, every team has junior advisers that answer to the senior advisers. The senior advisers answer to the managers of the departments and they, in their turn, answer to the managers of the regional Univé. The function “Regulate supply-V2” also includes implementing smaller improvements concerning the primary process and supporting processes. Based on preliminary research and participative observation, the operational employees appear not to be a part of the execution of this function as it is the responsibility of the senior advisers and managers. If something goes wrong in the primary process or, for example, team administration gets to deal with a complaint, the senior adviser needs to be informed and is responsible for taking further care of this. In addition, incremental improvements within the daily operations are the formal responsibility of the managers. However, this is not sufficiently studied and empirically supported. Therefore, this needs to be further investigated in order to give a valid and reliable judgement on the presence and application of this function within Univé.

4.3.2 Functions for the innovation process and central functions

The results for the MIOS-functions for the innovation process and the central functions are discussed in sequential order of the innovation process.

Search future new options-I4

This function is part of the daily tasks of team Innovation. The document of the standard process the “DUIM” also shows that researching the future is part of the innovation process. Team Innovation refers to this as basic research or explorative research (respondent B, E). All respondents stated that they always search for totally new ideas or work on totally new projects and propositions aimed at the future (respondent A, B, C, D, E, F, G). They search for new technologies or movements that could be interesting for Univé (respondent A, E). Otherwise, it would not be the responsibility of employees of Innovation as it concerns more minor improvements (respondent D). The team searches for options by organizing ideation sessions (respondent A).

Within the regional Univé’s it differs who is responsible for this function. Respondent D has transferred this function to team Innovation. Respondent C fills in this function together with the management and board of directors of their regional Univé.

Based on the above, this function is formally present within the organization as team Innovation is assigned to this function. Within the regional Univé’s, it differs and is thus informally allocated. However, the function is sufficiently present on both levels and thus can be concluded as sufficiently present on the organizational level as well.
**Propose innovation-I3**

The function “Propose innovation-I3” is the responsibility of team Innovation. The employees propose innovations by scoring new ideas on a matrix to decide if it becomes an innovation project proposal and thus goes to the concept phase (respondent A, B, D, E, F, G). The document that confirms the above-mentioned method to propose innovations is the idea-matrix. This document reveals indeed various criteria for everyone to score ideas on. Scoring ideas is part of the standard process, the “DUIM”. Every phase of the process needs to be validated in order to examine the feasibility of the project (respondent D, E). In most cases, when the innovation is proposed and goes to the concept phase, the official project team is put together. The temporary staffing of the project team after the idea phase consists of one or two employees of team Innovation. The actual project team generally consists of Innovation employees, a business owner from a regional Univé and optionally other internal and external stakeholders (respondent A, B, E, F, G). Respondent D is an employee of a regional Univé and confirms this by mentioning that he/she only becomes a part of the project team when there already is a straightforward project proposal.

Some of the regional Univé’s are responsible for this function themselves, as respondent C states that he/she decides on intuition if an idea can follow through to the concept phase. Respondent D, however, states that this is done by team Innovation and the input of the regional Univé comes only after the preliminary stage. This regional Univé chose to become a part of the project team led by a member of team Innovation.

The function “Propose innovation-I3” is the responsibility of team Innovation and the innovation employees at the regional Univé’s and is, therefore, also formally present and adequately performing within the entire organization Univé.

**Balance-C3**

The function “Balance-C3” is a team effort within the department Innovation. According to respondent A, B, D, E, F and G, every month, the so-called iteration meeting is held with team Innovation. In this meeting, the team discusses the status of the innovation projects that are proposed or currently running. The “DUIM” provides criteria for an innovation project to move to a new phase and based on those criteria, the team decides if a project continues or needs to quit. This is a team effort but the managers of team Innovation are formally the ones that are eventually responsible. They make the information boards for the meetings and collect the correct information (respondent A, B, E, F). The managers are formally responsible for portfolio management at the team level. They put this into practice by creating a business plan that serves as a basis for balancing innovation projects (respondent B).
Another way the Innovation department puts this function into practice is by creating quarterly reports of all the current projects and ideas the team is working on (respondent A, B, E). The document indeed shows all of the current innovation projects per category. Based on this, the function “Balance-C3” is formally present and sufficiently performing as the team itself is responsible and carries out in a systematic manner.

Within the regional Univé’s, portfolio management is generally the responsibility of respondents C and D. Respondent C, however, adds that the board of directors of his/her regional Univé also has an overview of the projects within their own organization. Therefore, it is not formally allocated. Respondent G mentions that he/she thinks that every regional Univé has its own Transformation department and that they are likely to be in charge of this function. According to respondent G, this department balances all types of projects. Furthermore, respondents D and C state that they are responsible for balancing projects and keeping a clear overview of different projects they are in charge of. Respondent B indicates that on the level of the regional Univé, this function is present, but respondents F and D add to this that there are some regional Univé’s that keep information about their innovation projects rather private.

There is only one respondent (G) that states that the function of “Balance-C3” or portfolio management is fulfilled on the level of the entire organization. In other words, that there is a clear overview and management of all the innovations, radical or incremental, across entire Univé. Respondent G mentions that the department Transformation is responsible for this and that there is also a department called Commerce and Innovation, which discusses all the current projects. However, this is not supported by any of the other respondents (A, B, C, D, E, F). Respondent E, in contradiction to respondent G, mentions that the department of Commerce and Innovation does not spend much attention on innovation projects at all and that this is a point of critique directed at this department. Manager B states: “We don’t have, I have stated this earlier, there is no total portfolio within Univé, there is not a total innovation portfolio available.”.

In conclusion, the function of “Balance C-3” is only formally allocated and adequately performing in the Innovation department. As there is no agreement on the allocation of this function, it is less formally but present in the regional Univé’s. The function is thus present in separate parts of the organization but there is most agreement on not having this function fulfilled on the level of the whole organization of Univé by the respondents.
Based on the interviews, it can be concluded that the department Innovation mainly executes innovation projects. Respondent A states that within the department Innovation, everyone has the same function, which is the function of innovation manager. This is confirmed by looking into the organizational chart of Univé, listed in appendix 1. Next to this, there are two managers of the whole team Innovation. All the respondents state that the innovations they execute are project-based and mainly concern projects for completely novel innovations (A, B, C, D, E, F, G). The composition of the project team is the responsibility of team Innovation itself and is part of the function “Propose innovation-I3”. According to respondent F, the employees of team Innovation are always available to become a part of the project team, but the official project team is composed in the conception phase of an innovation. Therefore, further elaboration can be found in the results on the specific function mentioned above.

Other departments, such as IT or regional Univé’s, can be in the lead of an innovation project as well (respondent A, E). Generally, there is only one person in the regional Univé responsible for innovations. Respondents C and D state that it is only their responsibility to execute innovation projects within their own regional Univé. Respondent C wants to maintain speed and, therefore, operates independently of the department Innovation, whereas respondent D works on national Univé projects in collaboration with the Innovation department. Manager E adds that team Innovation asked some of the innovation employees from regional Univé’s to become part of the team in order to work together on projects.

Furthermore, there are 6 out of 7 respondents (A, B, D, E, F, G) that indicate that they execute innovation projects and develop new propositions by following steps in the standard process. This process is referred to as the “DUIM”. This is an abbreviation for the Univé innovation method. Employees of the department Innovation are allocated to their own projects for new propositions and operate as project leaders. Respondent G explains that they operate as a team, but everyone independently runs their own projects with their project team, which consists of different type of internal and external stakeholders.

It can be concluded that the standard innovation process is being captured. A document exists with a summary of this process and shows the various steps in the process. The researcher also checked and confirmed that each step in the process had documents attached on the internal SharePoint. Thus, the documents prove the points that were made by the respondents about the standard process. As function “Innovate-I1” is the responsibility of team Innovation and the two innovation managers at the regional Univé’s, it is also formally and sufficiently present within the entire organization.
Regulate innovations-I2

It differs for Univé, who is responsible for the function “Regulate innovations-I2”. Within team Innovation, all the respondents agree on having a lot of freedom and responsibility in the Innovation process (respondent A, D, F, G). Team Innovation is mostly a self-managing team with a lot of freedom in their daily tasks and thus deal with difficulties and malfunctions within the innovation projects on their own. Respondent E illustrates this by the following quote: “But you can imagine that it is a team of very independent professionals who do not need to be led on a daily basis at all.” However, eventually, if something goes wrong, there will be eyes pointed at the managers. Therefore, the managers are formally responsible for this function within the team Innovation (respondent B, E).

According to respondent F, when a pilot is not successful and is not meeting the criteria of the pilot phase of the “DUIM”, the project team decides to quit the project themselves. As mentioned by respondents A, B, F, and G, if the pilot succeeds, they transfer it to a business owner who has been part of the project team from the start. The business owner and the board of directors need to give permission to actually make something out of it (respondent F). This implies that after the pilot phase, more regulation from the top is experienced. Respondent G provides a practical example of this by the following quote: “We initially worked with a regional Univé, that was the business owner, so they also had influence on what was going to happen with the project.”

Respondent A mentions that innovating can become a challenge because every regional Univé is a small company itself with its own control. This implies that the regulation of the innovation is not always formally allocated and different control structures are present at various regional Univé’s. Respondent G adds that sometimes, regulating innovations is hard, because of the context of a corporate company and the need to always have a business owner of a regional Univé to approve and pick up the project later on. A summarizing quote by respondent D on this topic: “As soon as it has to be implemented, it has to be agreed upon by all regional Univé’s and their board of directors. Yes, it may be decided that it will not be implemented after all.”

For the regional Univé, respondent C states that the board of directors is the only entity that requests innovation projects and is thus formally responsible for this function. However, respondent C highlights that there is a lot of freedom within the innovation process. Only at the phase of idea generation this respondent seeks approval from the board of directors and is further fully responsible for the execution of the innovation project. Respondent D confirms this.

In summary, the function “Regulate-I2” is formally allocated and, overall, sufficiently performing within the department Innovation and the regional Univé’s and thus within the entire organization. Nevertheless, based on the above-mentioned required agreement of all the regional Univé’s, it cannot be neglected that improvements can be made.
**Tune-C2**

The function “Tune-C2” within team Innovation is easy to execute as they have a clear overview of their current projects. Respondent B states that everything for team Innovation is transparent when it comes to which projects are in progress and, therefore, makes it easy to regulate these projects. The contributions of functions within time are generally steady as most of the time, employees from team Innovation are the project leaders. These project leaders themselves are responsible for gathering the right people from the right departments that contribute to the innovation projects and include them in the project team (respondent A, B, C, D, E, F, G). Respondent B states that the innovation ecosystem is the basis for tuning the functions. This respondent explains that you must allocate the right skills and create the right environment to experiment. When it is time to actually implement the innovations, there is a business owner assigned within the regional Univé to further implement the innovation in the operational areas. This business owner was included in the project team but is also the internal customer of the innovation project (respondent A, B, F, G). Therefore, the function “Tune-C2” is formally present and sufficiently performing within team Innovation and regional Univé’s.

According to the respondents, there is no clear overview of all the projects currently running within the entire organization of Univé. As described in the results of the function “Balance-C3”, there are only separate innovation portfolios for team Innovation and the regional Univé’s (respondent A, B, D, E, F). Respondent E thinks that this function is not sufficiently allocated for the entire organization. How could someone tune contributions of all the functions when there is no overview of the running projects?

Only respondent G states that the department Transformation and the department Commerce and Innovation have knowledge about this. So, for the level of the organization Univé it is hard to say if the function “Tune-C2” is sufficiently present as only one respondent (G) confirms this. Therefore, the judgment on the performance of this functions is insufficiently and the function is not formally filled in within the entire organization Univé.

**Remember-C1**

Within the Innovation department, everyone in the team is responsible for the function “Remember-C1”. Employees from the Innovation department are mainly project leaders and they state that they all share the documents and information on their current projects in MS Teams and on SharePoint (respondent A, B, E, F, G). Therefore, information about current and completed projects is easily accessible to stakeholders. Respondents B, E, and F mention that the standard process they use, which is called the “DUIM”, requires capturing all the information and knowledge about every step in the innovation process. However, according to respondent G, not everyone in the whole organization uses the “DUIM”, while this has been made available for everyone to use.
This implies that team Innovation makes their knowledge and documents accessible to the whole organization. The ICT infrastructure of Univé makes this possible. The summary document for the “DUIM” does not indicate that capturing knowledge for each step is necessary. However, on the internal SharePoint page, this was mentioned and thus present. Therefore, the documents present the same information as gathered from the interviews. All of the respondents mention that the information on discontinued or successful projects is still available and thus documented (respondent A, B, C, D, E, F, G). Respondent A states that evaluations are given at the end of each project to all the stakeholders. Another way to inform the members of the team and the stakeholders of the projects is through the so-called quarterly report (respondent A, B, E). This report summarises every innovation project that belongs to a specific category, what has been done already and what is on the planning for the next period. For this particular report, the management is responsible for checking whether all the information is complete (respondent B).

As respondents C and D are the only ones that are responsible for innovation at their regional Univé’s, they are responsible for the “Remember-C1” function themselves. Respondent C states that he/she does not use the “DUIM”. Respondent C does capture knowledge in order to inform the stakeholders of the innovation project. Respondent D mentions about this function “Remember-C1”: “Ongoing projects are always captured, yes I capture all the investigations as well.”.

On the organization level, knowledge is, according to respondent G, accessible via SharePoint and the Univé Innovation Academy. Some respondents state that this function could still be improved by means of providing detailed information about innovation projects more accessible to the whole organization (respondent G, F, E).

Based on the above, the function “Remember-C1” is within the regional Univé’s and the Innovation department formally allocated and sufficiently performing. This judgement applies to the entire organization Univé as well.

**Define mission-C4**

On the level of team Innovation, according to respondents A, B, E, F and G, is team Innovation itself responsible for formulating the mission, vision and objectives. Overall, most of the respondents of team Innovation mentioned that the defined mission and vision are the basis of the choice between innovation proposals (respondent A, B, F, G). According to respondent B, it is also one of the criteria to score ideas on, so if it contributes to the strategy of Univé. Some innovation projects are labelled as a higher priority since they contribute the most to the strategy of Univé (respondent A).
The regional Univé’s formally assigned this function to their own board of directors and the management team (respondent C, D). Respondent C states that the mission, vision and strategy provide guidance in order to keep steering in the right direction. Respondent D claims that the mission, vision and strategy influence the choice for some specific innovation projects.

The function “Define mission-C4” is within entire Univé managed by all the board of directors of the regional Univé’s and the board of directors of the central organization (respondent A, B, C, D, E, F, G). Here, team Innovation is only a part of this function by delivering input in the form of research reports (respondent A, G, E). Currently, all of these organizational levels came together to create the “One mission, three strategies and six objectives” method that is incorporated in the overall strategy “Samen zetten wij de toon”. It is everyone’s responsibility to directly contribute to the vision, mission, strategy and objectives (respondent A, E, G).

The function of defining the mission, vision and objectives is thus formally present at all levels of the organization, referring to the Innovation team, the regional Univé’s and Univé as the entire organization.

**Continuous improvement**

Innovation is promoted actively within the organization Univé, mainly by the Innovation team. One of the objectives of the department Innovation, according to 3 respondents out of 7, is to make the organization as a whole more innovative (B, E, G). This regards radical innovations as well as incremental innovations. They state that they need to ensure that the organization has a more innovative mindset and has to act accordingly. This is aimed at a change of culture. A couple of examples that the respondents gave to promote innovation in the organization were: online training courses for innovation skills at the Univé Innovation Academy (respondent A, D, F, G), knowledge-and inspiration sessions (respondent E, G), workshops (respondent F, G), providing tools for innovation, such as the pitch format (respondent E, A) and being available in person or via e-mail for questions and information regarding current innovation projects and knowledge about innovations in general (respondent G). To check whether this happens in practice, the document pitch format has been analysed to check if this corresponded with the data from the interviews. The document aims to structure the new ideas employees come up with. This implies that everyone in the organization can share their ideas with the central department Innovation in order to get help if needed on any innovation matter. Furthermore, the researcher had private access to the SharePoint of the organization and can confirm that the Univé Innovation Academy exists and provides training courses.

However, two respondents said that continuous improvement and innovation should be more present in the daily tasks of the employees of Univé (respondent E, G).
Respondent E states that team Innovation stimulates independent departments but thinks that the organization should be more connected on this matter and that more collaboration is needed. Respondent G states that there is always room to improve. However, none of the respondents specifically mentioned something about kaizen-activities in order to improve their own daily work. They follow the “DUIM” and did not mention anything about further improvements to this process. The examples of the respondents to improve the innovative mindset of the organization are mainly focused on adding more innovation projects to the portfolio rather than improvement for the primary and supporting processes. The fact that the team has come up with many initiatives to activate the employees of Univé to innovate as part of their daily work could also indicate that continuous improvement is insufficiently present in the organization. In conclusion, this factor is thus not sufficiently present in the whole organization of Univé, within de regional Univé’s and team Innovation.

4.3.3 Summary MIOS-functions

Below three tables are presented in order to give a summary of the analysis of the results regarding the presence of the MIOS-functions. Table 2 presents the results for the MIOS-functions within the team Innovation of the central organization of Univé. Table 3 shows whether the functions are present and how they are performing at the regional Univé’s that have someone responsible for innovation. Lastly, an overview of the presence and performance of the MIOS-functions in the total organization Univé is given in table 4.
Team Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Judgement on performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply product/service-V1</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate supply-V2</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovate-I1</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate innovations-I2</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose innovation-I3</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search future new options-I4</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember-C1</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tune-C2</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance-C3</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define mission-C4</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of the results regarding the MIOS-functions for team Innovation

Regional Univé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Judgement on performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply product/service-V1</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate supply-V2</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovate-I1</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate innovations-I2</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose innovation-I3</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search future new options-I4</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember-C1</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tune-C2</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance-C3</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define mission-C4</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This applies to the two regional Univé’s that have someone specifically assigned to innovation activities

Table 3: Summary of the results regarding the MIOS-functions for the regional Univé’s
Table 4: Summary of the results regarding the MIOS-functions for the total organization Univé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Judgement on performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply product/ service-V1</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate supply-V2</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
<td>Not studied in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovate-I1</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate innovations-I2</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose innovation-I3</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search future new options-I4</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember-C1</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tune-C2</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance-C3</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define mission-C4</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5. Conclusion and recommendations

This chapter answers the central question and sub-questions of this study. After this, recommendations will be given in order to increase innovation success at Univé.

5.1 Conclusion

In paragraph 1.2, theoretical, empirical and analytical sub-questions were formulated in order to give an answer to the central question of this research, which is as follows:

“To what extent could innovation success at Univé be increased by means of a redesign of the innovation structure supported by other success factors for innovations?”

The answers to the theoretical sub-questions are provided in chapter 2. The definition for innovations is provided in paragraph 2.1 and success factors that can be found in the literature are presented in paragraph 2.2. Literature on the MIOS is described in paragraph 2.3 and has been used to analyse and redesign the innovation structure.

On the basis of the results provided in chapter 4, answer is given to the empirical questions. The empirical question regarding the presence of certain success factors for innovations is answered in paragraph 4.2. The results showed that 6 out of 11 theoretical success factors were empirically supported and thus present. This concerns the factors technology, experience with innovation, complementarity and the price and quality of a product.

The answer to the other empirical question concerning the current innovation structure of Univé is stated in paragraph 4.3. The analysis of the current innovation structure revealed the formally allocation and performance of the MIOS-functions. This diagnosis provided insight into the differences between the allocation of the tasks within the regional Univé’s, the department Innovation and the entire organization Univé. This has been made visual in paragraph 4.2.3, tables 2,3 and 4. Striking was that for the level of the entire organization Univé more functions were not sufficiently performing, formally allocated or a combination of both compared to the team Innovation and the regional Univé’s. Team Innovation and the regional Univé’s appeared to have a good performance on most of the MIOS-functions. Team Innovation performed better at the formal allocation of the functions than the regional Univé’s. Based on the results of chapter 4, it can be concluded that there is a difference between the desired and actual situation of Univé. Therefore, recommendations are required to steer the organization toward the desired situation.
The central question of this research is answered by providing recommendations to Univé. This has been taken care of in the next paragraph. The recommendations provide a basis to redesign the innovation structure within Univé by adjusting the allocation and improving the performance of the MIOS-functions that appeared to be insufficient on both. Furthermore, recommendations concerning the incorporation of the missing success factors are provided as well to support this.

5.2 Recommendations
The recommendations provide an answer to the earlier stated central research question. The recommendations also answer the analytic sub-questions formulated in paragraph 1.2 and aim to narrow the gap between the current and desired situation of Univé.

5.2.1 Recommendations success factors
In paragraph 4.2.3, table 1 provides a clear overview of the theoretical success factors found in practice. The success factors that were not mentioned and thus not empirically supported include technology, experience with innovation, complementarity and the market related factors price and quality. Moreover, as only one respondent mentioned that the timing of the market introduction is a success factor, more awareness of this factor is also desired. Paying attention to these success factors affecting innovation could support the new design of the innovation structure to further improve the number of successful innovations. The success factors that were not empirically supported are listed below and for each factor, recommendations are provided. Lastly, general advice about the implementation of these recommendations is given.

**Technology**
To incorporate the success factor technology, it is advised to seek more collaboration with the IT department as they possess specialist knowledge. This collaboration is needed to check whether the current technology is suitable to support innovations. In addition, when those departments work together on technological innovation, it could increase the quality of technology by being error-free and mature enough required for market introduction.

**Complementarity**
Compatibility of technological viability and all the firm’s resources can be achieved by formally allocating the MIOS-function “Tune-C2”. Further recommendations to do so are provided in the next paragraph regarding the redesign of the innovation structure. At the project level, this success factor implies that for every innovation regarding a new product or service, compatibility between other products and brand image Univé should be checked and needs to become a step in the standard innovation process referred to as the “DUIM”.
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Experience with innovation
Actively involving more employees within the entire organization to work on innovations increases the total experience with innovation. Innovation is a matter of learning by doing and this experience increases skills for the innovation project needed to increase innovation success at Univé.

Price and quality of the product
Attention could be given to the price and quality of the new product or service. Seeking the best combability between the desired price and the price that customers are willing to pay for the new product or service should become part of the validation phase earlier described. In addition, a list of quality measures could be created to continuously check the quality of the new product or service in development.

Market introduction
As the timing of the introduction is crucial and differs for incremental and radical innovations, Univé should pay attention to this factor. Beforehand it should be decided if customers are involved in developing a new product or service, as this requires a later market introduction than not involving customers. The timing of market introduction should thus become part of the innovation project proposals.

Implementation recommendations success factors
In order to increase the innovation success of Univé by incorporating the success factors for innovations, team Innovation could be formally assigned. They need to ensure that the success factors and their corresponding recommendations will be implemented. For the purpose of knowledge sharing, they should also make the success factors for innovations visible to the organization, so all the other organizational members can also put them into practice. As SharePoint is the online knowledge base of Univé, here documents can be shared. This contributes not only to the overall innovation success but also ensures continuous improvements regarding innovation projects.

5.2.2 Redesign of the innovation and organization structure
The recommendations regarding the redesign of the structure of Univé are based on the functions that are currently not formally present, sufficiently performing or a combination of these two. These functions can be found in paragraph 4.3.3, tables 2, 3 and 4.
Organization structure
As the organization structure has been found to be a critical success factor for innovation success, it is highly recommended to further diagnose the structure of Univé by looking at the production structure in detail. Hereafter, it needs to be redesigned accordingly. A tool for the organization to do so is combing the MIOS-functions with the parameters for an appropriate production structure of De Sitter cited in Achterbergh & Vriens (2010).

Innovation structure
Many of the functions that were insufficiently performing or only informally present were found at the results of the level of Univé as the entire organization. Based on that, it is not surprising that most central functions of the MIOS scored relatively weak. For those factors, specific recommendations are given to redesign the innovation structure.

Continuous improvement
Univé should gain more knowledge about kaizen-type of activities in order to improve the score on the later added function “Continuous improvement” of the MIOS. As it is one of the objectives of team Innovation to ensure a shared innovative mindset among all the members of Univé, they could start with a project to stimulate kaizen-type of activities. They could use tools they are already using to encourage a more innovative Univé. Team Innovation could, for example, start by sharing knowledge about this on SharePoint and providing online and physical workshops on this topic. Moreover, they could also improve their continuous improvement by applying kaizen-activities within their own processes. Hereafter, the function “Continuous improvement” could then be formally allocated to all employees, including the operational employees of the primary process and supporting processes.

Regulate innovation-I2
The function “Regulate innovation-I2” is formally allocated at the different levels examined. However, some respondents complained that before the implementation of innovations, all of the board of directors of regional Univé’s need to give permission first. The project teams across the organization are thus not completely responsible for regulating the innovation. As most innovation projects are led by employees of the department Innovation, they are the ones that have the most expertise. They need to be trusted to implement the innovation without the permission of all the board of directors. In conclusion, the function “Regulate innovation-I2” should be formally allocated to all Innovation employees individually.
Balance-C3
As “balance C-3” was not formally assigned within the regional Univé’s, the first step is to assign this function formally. There were some signs that the department Transformation could be responsible for this; the function can now be officially assigned to the employees of that department. In general, the regional Univé’s should strive for transparency and share more about their own innovation projects with the entire organization. Sharing this contributes to the performance of “Balance-C3” on the level of the entire organization Univé. “Balance-C3” is not perceived as formal allocated for the entire organization by the respondents and its current performance is rather weak. A few respondents mentioned that the department Commerce & Innovation should take care of this but does not adequately. As just mentioned, the Transformation departments will be allocated to this function at the level of regional Univé. The managers of team Innovation are assigned to do this within the central organization, where the Innovation department is located.

The function “Balance-C3” needs to become a team effort. This team should consist of representatives from the department Transformation of the regional Univé’, team Innovation and the department Commerce and Innovation. One or more team members must collect the portfolios of the Regional Univé’s and team Innovation of the central organization to make an overview of all the possible and running projects. This is needed in order to make well-considered choices between innovation project proposals. The name for this team of representatives could be “Joint business development”. Moreover, this was also found to be a theoretical success factor for innovations by the respondents. This implies they find this important and are likely to have the motivation to improve this function.

Tune-C2
Not having a clear insight into all of the projects within Univé, makes it currently harder to tune all the corresponding functions. The function “Tune-C2” could be improved for the entire organization Univé by formally assigning the same representatives of the team “Joint business development” described above in the recommendations for “Balance-C3”. These employees then could come together in a standard meeting to discuss the capacities needed for all the innovation projects within the entire organization Univé.

Define mission-C4
The overall judgement on “Define-mission-C4” was that it was performing sufficiently and was adequately allocated. However, there are still suggestions to improve this function further. Including more Innovation employees within the process of defining the mission, vision and strategy could enhance the performance of the function “Define mission-C4”.
This is because these employees are primarily responsible for researching future new options required to formulate the organization’s future objectives. In addition, it is the objective of the department Innovation to ensure an innovative mindset across the entire organization. Therefore, it seems more than logical for team Innovation to add suggestions to the mission, vision and strategy that function as a basis to achieve that innovative mindset.
Chapter 6. Discussion and reflection

This chapter includes a discussion about the contribution to the theory, practical implications, limitations of this study, suggestions for further research and reflection.

6.1 Contribution to the theory

This research contributes to the theory by adding a specific case study mainly based on the MIOS-theory to the already existing studies on this topic. Insights of the study of the insurance company Univé could be input for a future comparative case study. Furthermore, this study also contributes to the theory by testing the presence of certain success factors in practice and adding success factors found at a large corporate insurer. Thus, the findings of this study not only show that improving the structure could increase innovation success but also includes other success factors that could do so. For this reason, this research also contributes to the theory by providing a broader understanding of increasing innovation success rather than only the interplay between structure and innovation success.

6.2 Practical implications

A practical implication for the organization is the gained knowledge about the MIOS developed by Lekkerkerk (2012). This provides a normative framework to keep improving the organization and highlights the importance of structure in relation to innovation success. The innovation structure and part of the production structure of Univé have been analysed and insights were gained into the present and missing success factors for innovation success. Furthermore, the most important practical implication is that this research gives an answer to the question:

“**To what extent could innovation success at Univé be increased by means of a redesign of the innovation structure supported by other success factors for innovations?**”

Univé could implement all of the recommendations that were given in paragraph 5.2 in order to increase its innovation success.

6.3 Limitations and suggestions for further research

In paragraph 3.4, the scope of this research was discussed. Due to the scope of this research and the type of respondents, some functions of the MIOS were insufficiently studied. These were the functions that were related to the production structure. Only “Supply product/service-V1” and “Regulate supply-V2” were briefly reviewed based on the organizational chart of Univé and the preliminary research conducted at a specific regional Univé, Univé-South-Netherlands. The other functions, regarding “Search improvements-V4” and “Propose improvement-V3”, were not included in the study at all.
The main reason for this was that this research focuses explicitly on innovation success and the innovation structure that affects this. In conclusion, the production structure was not adequately studied, which limits the contribution to the theory and the practical implications for Univé as well. The scope and time period of this study were thus a limitation. As the production structure is an important part of the MIOS and studying structure-related problems, it is recommended to conduct further research on this aspect of the MIOS within Univé. This could be done by interviewing different types of respondents connected to the primary process, thus also respondents responsible for the support and preparatory tasks.

Most of the MIOS-functions that were insufficiently scored on performance were based on the level of the entire organization Univé. It seemed that the regional Univé’s currently operate as independent islands. Therefore, future research regarding synergy in a corporate environment could be interesting in order to further increase innovation success and overall improvement of organizational performance. Lastly, further research based on the MIOS-theory is always recommended to gather even more cases for a future comparative study. As Univé gained knowledge about the MIOS developed by Lekkerkerk (2012), it might cause the spread of the theory, for example, to partners of Univé. This could also inspire them to study their innovation- and organization structure and redesign it accordingly.

Another aspect not included in this study is the external environment of Univé. Paragraph 2.2.2 mentions that market-related success factors also affect innovation success. Therefore, the external environment could be further researched as well. Moreover, separate innovation projects at Univé could be studied to add more data to the already existing results of this study concerning the MIOS-functions and the presence of success factors.
6.4 Reflection
As mentioned in paragraph 3.6, Bleijenbergh (2015) states that there are generally two critical criteria to assess qualitative studies. These are the reliability and validity. Underneath, a reflection is given on the reliability and validity of this research. In addition, a reflection is provided on the overall research process.

6.4.1 Reliability and validity
As stated earlier in paragraph 3.6, this research’s most important data resources were semi-structured interviews. Due to the semi-structured character of the interviews, not every respondent got the exact same questions. Some respondents had more to say about certain topics than others and the researcher anticipated this by asking more questions on that topic. Therefore, it is harder to duplicate the way the interviews were handled by future researchers, which negatively affects the reliability of this research. In addition, sometimes, the conversation steered in a different direction than answering the specific question about a certain MIOS-function. This affected the validity of the results of the interviews that were held. With the researcher's understanding now, more control should be taken over this to keep the conversation on the right track.

However, the researcher tried to improve the reliability and validity by sending the transcribed interviews to all the individual respondents. As there were no comments and only agreements on the transcripts, it can be concluded that the transcript corresponded with what was discussed in the interviews. Documents were also analysed in order to have triangulation and confirm the data gathered from the interviews. This supported and strengthened the findings as well.

6.4.2 Research process
Looking back at the research process, I have learned a lot along the way. I did not expect that arranging the interviews would be challenging at all. This assumption delayed the research process as it actually was a challenge to gather respondents for interviews in a busy cooperative. This is something that I would take into account for qualitative research I might conduct in the future. Nevertheless, I did get to speak to inspiring people and gained experience in diagnosing the organization- and innovation structure of a well-known large organization. On my turn, I got to inspire the people of Univé to take a closer look at their structure and hopefully inspired them to stay innovative. Therefore, this research contributed to my professional as well as my personal development.
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Interview guide

Introductie
Allereerst bedankt voor het meewerken aan dit interview! Dit interview zal bijdragen aan een onderzoek naar het innovatie succes binnen Univé. Het blijkt namelijk dat niet alle innovatie initiatieven succesvol zijn geïmplementeerd. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om de innovatiestructuur van Univé te verbeteren en daarmee de kans op meer succesvolle innovaties te verhogen.

Aangezien ik de master Organizational Design & Development aan de Radboud Universiteit volg, zal er vanuit een structurele invalshoek gekeken worden naar hoe de innovatie initiatieven een nog hogere slagerskans krijgen. Vanuit dat oogpunt is er gekozen om het MIOS-model te gebruiken om de innovatiestructuur te verbeteren.

Definities
Om dit model goed te begrijpen en spraakverwarring te voorkomen, zou ik graag eerst twee definities onderscheiden voor innoveren en verbeteren.

“Innoveren” omvat het projectmatig ontwikkelen en realiseren van zowel technische als organisatorische of sociale vernieuwingen en de beleidsmatige aansturing ervan.

“Verbeteren” moet iedereen continu doen en is soms ook wel vernieuwend, maar de invoering verloopt niet projectmatig, blijft binnen een afdeling en vereist meestal geen formele goedkeuring.

MIOS-model
Het MIOS staat voor Model Innovatie-en Organisatiestructuur. Het model schrijft voor wat een goede innovatiestructuur zou zijn en welke functies daarvoor ingevuld moeten worden. Dit is nodig om als organisatie te kunnen blijven voortbestaan. Er zijn in totaal 12 functies voor het uitvoeren van het primaire proces, voor het innovatieproces en overige centrale functies. Verder is er later nog een 13e functie toegevoegd, dit betreft continu verbeteren. In figuur 1 is het gehele model te zien met alle 12 functies. Figuur 2 geeft een omschrijving per functie van het MIOS.

Mocht u verdere interesse hebben in het MIOS-model, kunt u via de bronvermelding het proefschrift vinden. In de samenvatting wordt in 3 pagina’s de kern uitgelegd.
Figuur 1: Het MIOS

Figuur 2: Beschrijving van de functies in het MIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>naam</th>
<th>Omschrijving van de bijdrage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>voortbrengen</td>
<td>het primaire proces, de transformatie van invoeren tot product, dienst of combinaties, inclusief de bij de orders horende administratieve en technische voorbereidende activiteiten en de niet aan orders gekoppelde facilitaire ondersteunende diensten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>regelen</td>
<td>de operationele, dagelijkse besturing van het primaire proces inclusief invoeren kleinere verbeteringen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voortbrenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>plannen</td>
<td>de betere opties die V4 vindt, nader bekijken en er een project- of investeringsvoorstel van maken als het een goede optie is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>verkennen</td>
<td>zoeken naar mogelijkheden om de bestaande producten en kennis beter te exploiteren, bijv. meer omzet bereiken, andere geografische markten benaderen, …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>innoveren</td>
<td>het meestal gefaseerd uitvoeren van alle gekozen innovatieprojecten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>regelen</td>
<td>de operationele regeling van elk innovatieproject en elk ander (niet zo innovatieve) investeringsproject EN regelen over alle projecten heen (portfolio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>innovatie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>plannen</td>
<td>de betere opties die I4 vindt, nader bekijken en er een innovatieprojectvoorstel van maken als het een goede optie blijft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toekomst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>verkennen</td>
<td>exploratie en zoeken naar mogelijkheden om de bestaande markten met nieuwe technologie en andere kennis beter te bedienen of nieuwe markten daarmee te betreden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toekomst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>onthouden</td>
<td>een geheugenfunctie, die alle kennis in het bedrijf toegankelijk moet vastleggen. Ook over projecten die ‘in de ijskast’ zijn gezet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>regisseren</td>
<td>een regiefunctie, die bijdragen van alle functies in de tijd op elkaar moet afstemmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>balanceren</td>
<td>stelt periodiek een gebalanceerd uitvoerbaar beleidsplan vast en kiest daarbij uit nieuwe voorstellen van V3 en I3 en uit de onderhanden projecten van I1 de beste combinatie o.b.v. doelen van C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>doelbepalen</td>
<td>formuleren van missie, visie en doelstellingen voor de langere termijn, zodanig dat (periodiek) C3 heldere keuzes kan maken en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anonimiteit en vertrouwelijkheid

Binnen dit onderzoek wordt er aandacht besteed aan anonimiteit en vertrouwelijkheid. Uw eigen naam zal nergens kenbaar gemaakt worden in dit onderzoek. Met uw toestemming wordt enkel uw functie benoemd in het onderzoeksrapport. Verder zal het interview, wederom met uw toestemming, opgenomen worden om deze later te transcriberen.

Er zal met gepaste voorzichtigheid omgegaan worden met de data voortkomend uit uw interview. De data zelf zal uitsluitend in het bezit zijn van de onderzoekster. Om te bevestigen dat wat besproken is overeenkomt met het transcript, zal de onderzoekster deze achteraf per e-mail naar u versturen. Het eindrapport wordt intern gedeeld met Univé. Mocht u ook interesse hebben om deze te ontvangen, kunt u dat aangeven.

Ten slotte bent u niet verplicht en is het geheel vrijwillig om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek. Het is daarnaast ook mogelijk om op elk moment te stoppen met het meewerken aan dit onderzoek.

Referentie
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Interview vragen

Formaliteit
Bent u akkoord met het opnemen van dit interview en dat de data hieruit voortkomend gebruikt zal worden in het interview? Heeft u de interview guide gelezen m.b.t. anonimiteit en vertrouwelijkheid? Heeft u daar nog opmerkingen of vragen over?

MIOS
Het MIOS, ook wel model innovatie- en organisatiestructuur schrijft voor hoe de ‘ideale’ structuur eruitziet en welke 12 functies daarvoor ingevuld dienen te worden. Een projectgroep, met mensen uit verschillende afdelingen, kan bijvoorbeeld ook een functie invullen.

“Innoveren” omvat het projectmatig ontwikkelen en realiseren van zowel technische als organisatorische of sociale vernieuwingen en de beleidsmatige aansturing ervan.

“Verbeteren” moet iedereen continu doen en is soms ook wel vernieuwend, maar de invoering verloopt niet projectmatig, blijft binnen een afdeling en vereist meestal geen formele goedkeuring.

Het doel van dit interview is om te achterhalen hoe de functies binnen de afdeling innovatie van Univé zijn toegedeeld en in hoeverre dit formeel en informeel wordt gedaan.

Ik ga kort de functies laten zien in de volgende slide. Zoals je ziet zijn er functies voor het primaire proces, het innovatieproces en centrale functies.

Introductie vragen

V1: Wat is uw functie binnen Univé en hoelang werkt u al bij de organisatie?

V2: Welke formele functies zijn er binnen de afdeling innovatie?

V3: Kunt u uw dagelijkse werkzaamheden beschrijven?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Omschrijving</th>
<th>Vragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1-Voortbrengen</td>
<td>Primaire proces, de transformatie van invoeren tot product, dienst of combinaties. Inclusief de administratieve en technische voorbereidende activiteiten en overige facilitaire diensten.</td>
<td>- Hoe ziet het primaire proces van Univé eruit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bent u hierbij betrokken? Denk ook aan ondersteunde en voorbereidende taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is er een duidelijke scheiding in voorbereidende, ondersteunende en uitvoerende taken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is er veel afhankelijkheid tussen de afdelingen binnen Univé? Wat merkt u?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2-Regelen voortbrenging</td>
<td>De operationele, dagelijkse besturing van het primaire proces inclusief invoeren van kleine verbeteringen.</td>
<td>- Is het monitoren, beoordelen en ingrijpen van het primaire proces gescheiden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is continu verbeteren iets wat gedaan wordt binnen uw afdeling of dat u weet organisatiebreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stimuleert het management dit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3-Plannen heden</td>
<td>Opties (van V4) verwerken tot project- of innoveringsvoorstel mits de optie goed is.</td>
<td>- Wie vervult deze functie?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **V4-Verkennen heden** | Zoeken naar mogelijkheden om de bestaande producten en kennis beter te **exploiteren.** | - Hoe wordt beoordeeld of een optie het beste of meest haalbaar is?  
- Wie vervult deze functie?  
- Zijn dit vaak kleine verbeteringen of grote innovaties?  
- Is hier een standaardproces voor? |
|---|---|---|
| **I1-Innoveren** | Gefaseerd uitvoeren van innovatieprojecten; uitvoerende kern van het innovatieproces. | - Is er een standaardproces voor het uitvoeren van innovatieprojecten?  
- Is dit vastgelegd?  
- Wat doet u zelf in dit proces?  
- Zijn er duidelijke fasen te onderscheiden?  
- Wat betekent een succesvol innovatieproces voor u?  
- Gezien de definitie voor Innoveren, gaat het dan vaak wel echt om iets nieuws?  
- Wat kunt u zeggen over de omvang van dit soort innovatieprojecten? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I2-Regelen innoveren</th>
<th>De operationele regeling van elk innovatieproject/ elk ander investeringsproject en het regelen van alle projecten (portfolio).</th>
<th>- Is de afdeling innovatie de enige die dit doet?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kunt u zelf veel regelen binnen een innovatieproject waar u onderdeel van uit maakt? O.a. de mogelijkheid hebben om in zelfstandig in te grijpen als u merkt dat iets misgaat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wie is verantwoordelijk voor het resultaat van een innovatie- of investeringsproject?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3- Plannen toekomst</td>
<td>Opties van (van I4) uitwerken tot innovatieprojectvoorstel mits de optie goed is.</td>
<td>- Wie vervult deze functie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hoe wordt beoordeeld of een optie haalbaar is?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Worden veel opties voor innovaties uiteindelijk een innovatieprojectvoorstel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4- Verkennen toekomst</td>
<td><strong>Exploratie:</strong> naar mogelijkheden zoeken om bestaande markten met nieuwe technologie en andere kennis beter te bedienen of nieuwe markten te betreden.</td>
<td>- Wordt er binnen het team innovatie actief onderzocht naar nieuwe mogelijkheden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Doet iedereen dit of zijn daar mensen specifiek voor aangewezen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C1-Onthouden | Een geheugenfunctie, die alle kennis in het bedrijf toegankelijk moet vastleggen. Ook over projecten dit in de ‘ijskast’ zijn gezet. | - Is er iemand verantwoordelijk voor het vastleggen van kennis over innovatieprojecten? Wie?  
- Legt u zelf bewust dingen vast in uw werkzaamheden?  
- Is kennis, algemeen of specifiek over innovatieprojecten, toegankelijk binnen Univé?  
- Is er een soort kennisbank? |
| C2-Regisseren | Een regiefunctie, die bijdragen van functies in de tijd op elkaar afstemmen. | - Hoe vindt afstemming van de bijdragen van verschillende functies binnen de innovatieprojecten? |
| C3-Balanceren | Stelt periodiek een gebalanceerd uitvoerbaar beleidsplan vast en kiest daarbij uit nieuwe voorstellen (V3 & I3) en uit de onderhanden van projecten van I1 de beste combinatie o.b.v. doelen van C4. | - Aan wie of welk team is deze functie toegekend?  
- Weet u hoe de keuze gemaakt wordt tussen (grotere) innovatieprojecten of verbeteringsvoorstellen? |
| C4-Doel bepalen | Formuleren van missie, visie en doelstellingen voor de langere termijn, zodanig dat C3 heldere keuzes kan maken. | - Wie is verantwoordelijk voor het formuleren van de missie, visie en doelstellingen binnen Univé? |
- Bent u is de afdeling Innovatie hierbij betrokken?
- Hoe worden doelen specifiek op de afdeling innovatie bepaald?
- Is dit de leidraad voor het afstemmen van de innovatieprojecten?

| Continu verbeteren | Kleinschalige verbetering of zogeheten ‘kaizen’ activiteiten binnen een de operationele besturing van elke functie. | - Wat doen jullie aan het continu verbeteren binnen de organisatie?
- Wat doe jij zelf om te blijven verbeteren? |

**Succes factor vragen**

*V1: Als we het hebben over geslaagde innovatieprojecten, wat denkt u dat voornamelijk heeft bijgedragen aan het slagen? In vergelijking met innovatieprojecten die minder succesvol waren?*

**Afrondende vragen**

*V1: Heeft u nog algemene dingen die zouden kunnen bijdragen aan het verbeteren van het innovatiesucces (en/of de innovatie- en organisatiestructuur)?*

*V2: Heeft u verder nog aanvulling of opmerkingen?*

Dan zou ik u graag willen bedanken voor uw deelname aan dit onderzoek. Zoals in de interview guide besproken zal ik dit interview gaan transcriberen en ter controle naar u toesturen.
Appendix 5: Overview respondents and documents analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Date interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Innovation employee</td>
<td>13-5-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Manager Innovation</td>
<td>18-5-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Innovation employee</td>
<td>20-5-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Innovation employee</td>
<td>20-5-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Manager Innovation</td>
<td>23-5-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Innovation employee</td>
<td>24-5-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Innovation employee</td>
<td>1-6-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Documents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Success</td>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>- No documents were analysed for the dependent variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and innovation structure</td>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>- Standard process DUIM (document 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Idea-matrix (document 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pitch format (document 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Quarterly report (document 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Organizational chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success factors</td>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>- Organizational chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All the documents except the organizational chart are included in the separate document “Supplementary documents”. The organizational chart is listed in appendix 1 of this document.
Appendix 6: Example of check transcript

Transcript

Megan van der Pol <meganjmverderpol@gmail.com> 16:07 (14 minuten geleden)

In de bijlage is het transcript opgenomen van het interview dat we laatst gehouden hebben. Zou je een bevestiging willen sturen naar dit e-mailadres als het transcript volgens jou akkoord is?

Nogmaals super bedankt voor het meewerken aan het onderzoek!

Met vriendelijke groet,
Megan van der Pol

Hi Megan,

Ziet er goed uit, bedankt! Ik ben akkoord.
Succes met je onderzoek!