

Thesis Changes Log

Name of Candidate: Anja Tekic

PhD Program: Engineering Systems

Title of Thesis: Contextualized intellectual property management in co-creation: a configurational approach to strategy development

Supervisor: Prof. Kelvin Willoughby

Chair of PhD defense Jury: Prof. Clement Fortin *Email: c.fortin@skoltech.ru*

Date of Thesis Defense: 24 September 2019

The thesis document includes the following changes in answer to the external review process.

I have carefully studied all of the observations, comments, recommendations and changes proposed by the jury members. The thesis has been revised accordingly to incorporate the suggested improvements.

Reviewer: Prof. Clement Fortin

Thank you for the positive review of my PhD thesis and constructive comments. Here I provide my responses to the issues that you have raised regarding my PhD research.

The research question presented on page 25 is very broad: “What are the best practices for configuring IP management strategies across a variety of co-creation contexts?”... I suggest to possibly formulate the research question in more specific terms to indicate the focus of the work. This change would make the goal more precise and increase the effective relevance of the concrete results.

- I have revised my research question to make it more specific and focused. Hopefully the research question now encompasses the very nature co-creation and my research setting (page 27): What are the best practices for configuring IP management strategies across a variety of co-creation contexts determined by the specific characteristics of a company’s projects of collaborative innovation with individual external contributors?

The QCA method is based on a number of parameters including one called “core conditions” that is used extensively in the document... However, this important concept is never clearly defined in the document.

- To explain better why core conditions are important elements in the analysis of the QCA results, I have provided an additional description of these elements, by emphasizing their strong relationship to the outcome of interest and by contrasting them to the peripheral conditions (page 156).

Reviewer: Prof. Gloria Barczak

Thank you for the positive review of my research and for focusing my attention to the important issues related to the preliminary empirical study. Following your comments I have improved this part of my PhD thesis.

For the preliminary study, the use of actual co-creation projects was necessary and appropriate as was the focus on one industry. However, it is not clear exactly how an “internet search for co-creation projects, identifiable from within automotive companies’ corporate websites, corporate single project and multi-project platforms, and within intermediary open innovation platforms” yielded 168 cases. This description is quite vague. In addition, in Section 3.1.4.2 Case Clustering, although I can guess as to how the clustering was done, a brief explanation of the approach used should be provided.

- Recognizing the importance of these issues, I have incorporated significant changes in sections 3.1.3.1 Internet-based search (pages 98-99) and 3.1.4.2 Case clustering (pages 102-103). I have provided more detailed explanation of how data collection and data analysis have been conducted in the preliminary empirical study.

Reviewer: Prof. Katja Hutter

Thank you for the very positive review of my PhD thesis. Your affirmative comments on my research give me the confirmation that I am on the right track and encourage me to further investigate the issues related to IP management in co-creation.

Reviewer: Prof. Thomas Hustad

Thank you for the very positive review of my PhD research. The extensive suggestions for future research you have provided will serve as the guidance for me to get engaged into further discussion on the topic of IP management in co-creation.

For possible discussion of ways to extend the research (these are NOT criticisms of the dissertation’s content but only intended as possibilities for discussion)

a. Eventually it might be interesting to incorporate the degree of innovativeness in possible effect on IP strategies. Also, the nature of strategic intent could be interesting. Perhaps some IP is obtained and controlled for defensive purposes, not only to contribute to the identification of something for possible development/implementation.

b. Separately, it might be interesting in future research to examine the criteria used to determine the level of ownership or control sought with various practices. For instance, sometimes it may simply be to acquire total control to eliminate the possibility of future complications for enforcement or negotiations (in other words the possibility of an overall corporate bureaucratic policy rather than project-specific characteristics).

c. There may also be opportunities to study the motivation for participation as an external source for ideas or capabilities? It could, of course, be financial; however, for lead users it can simply involve a desire to be able to purchase a more appropriate product. Some may simply do this for stimulation and fun, with rewards simply becoming a symbol of respect for the contribution. Of course, I am only speculating.

- Following your comments, I have extended the section 5.2. Limitations and future research directions, by introducing additional potential venues of further research on IP management in co-creation (page 262), which lie out of the scope of the current PhD work.

Two very minor typographical errors for possible correction.

- The typos are corrected. Thank you very much for identifying them.

Reviewer: Prof. Maurizio Sobrero

Thank you for the extensive review of my PhD research. Your challenging comments have been very useful for me to further improve my thesis, and understand future prospects of my research on IP management in co-creation.

You should state clearly at the end (of the abstract) what are your distinctive contributions, why are they new and relevant, who could be interested in building on them for theory or practice.

- I have revised the last paragraph of the abstract, by stating clearly how my PhD research contributes to existing research on IP management in co-creation, and open innovation more generally, as well as how its results may be useful for project managers facing the challenges of IP management in co-creation.

After reading the whole document I think you cannot claim to be using a configurational approach as you do not consider the full logic of contingency approach. It has always encompassed three main components, since the seminal works in the sixties focused on macro organizational structures: the nature of the task, the organizational solution chosen and the performance reached. Here you interact three organizational solutions (how many co-creators are engaged, if they occur off.line or on-line and how IP strategies are articulated) and relate them to the project outcome.

- Recognizing your concerns related to the theoretical background of my PhD research, I have provided a more comprehensive and clearer explanation of how the main premises of contingency and configurational theories create the basis of my work. The complete sections focused on the theoretical background (namely, 1.3.1 Contingency theory and 1.3.2 Configurational theory) have been revised (pages 29-33), and now provide more profound explanation of the three key theoretical elements employed here, namely co-creation context (as exogenous variable), design of IP management strategies in co-creation (as endogenous variable), and co-creation project performance (as outcome variable). I put additional emphasis on explaining the “co-creation context”, which is internal to a co-creation project as it is engendered by the project’s characteristics – namely, company-to-one vs. company-to-many, and online vs. offline (pages 26-27). As such, the context in focus is distinct from the external contexts of the project (such as industry, company size, etc.).

With the aim of further improving the work done to achieve a significant publication on a top journal in the field I would recommend to consider several research design issue. First, at present the thesis lack a proper treatment of validity and reliability issues and the extent to which the choices made in the data collection process might be relevant or not in strengthening or weakening the results along these lines. Several details are not properly spelled out and a reader is left with more doubts than necessary.

- Thank you very much for focusing my attention to these issues. Descriptions of the data collection process have been improved for both the preliminary empirical study (by explaining more clearly the Internet-based search, pages 98-99) and the main empirical study (by adding a short explanation of the role of HYVE in development of IP management strategies, page 135).