How can the Relationship be a Motivator?
A qualitative study of Motivation towards Crowdsourcing
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This bachelor thesis aimed to describe how motivation is influenced by the relationship between an organisation and a crowd in a crowdsourcing process. The research therefore required qualitative insight, which would not have been possible to get without the help from the project leader and his colleague at IKEA, a lecturer at the Linnaeus University and students at the marketing program. We would hence take this opportunity to address a certain thank you to these people, for their time and effort.

Furthermore, this thesis was conducted in the final semester of the marketing programme at the Linnaeus University in Växjö, Sweden. We would also like to send our greatest gratitude to a number of people at the university, who helped out and gave feedback on this contribution. First, our tutor Dan Halvarsson who provided us with valuable recommendations in the progress of our work. The same goes for our examiner Åsa Devine, who during the seminars lifted issues and gave essential critique on the contents. Second, we would like to raise a special thanks towards Viktorija Kalonaityte, who’s expertise when it comes to qualitative methods assisted in the actual performance and approach of the project. Finally, we would like to thank our opponents and other friends, who generated valuable discussions throughout the whole thesis.

Växjö, 2014-05-30

Malin Karlsson Åsa Martinsson
ABSTRACT

Course/ Level: 2FE16E, Undergraduate, Bachelor Thesis

Authors: Malin Karlsson & Åsa Martinsson

Supervisor: Dan Halvarsson

Examiner: Åsa Devine

Title: How can the Relationship be a Motivator? A qualitative study of Motivation towards Crowdsourcing

Keywords: Crowdsourcing, the crowdsourcing process, motivation, motivation factors, relationship

Background: Successful crowdsourcing cannot be accomplished without a motivated community of participants. Hence, organisations need to use incentives that motivate the crowd to participate in crowdsourcing processes. Further, maintaining a working relationship between the organisation and the crowd throughout the duration of a project is a challenge with crowdsourcing. Thus, it creates difficulties in monitoring the quality of the outcome, which is the motivator for the organisation. However, previous studies have not covered the area of how the relationship between the organisation and the crowd influence their motivation.

Purpose: Describe how motivation is influenced by the relationship between an organisation and the crowd in a crowdsourcing process.

Research questions: RQ1: How do an organisation and a crowd describe the relationship during the crowdsourcing process? RQ2: How do an organisation and a crowd describe their motivation during the crowdsourcing process? RQ3: How do the relationship between an organisation and a crowd influence motivation during the crowdsourcing process?

Methodology: A single embedded case study, semi-structured interviews

Conclusion: It is highly important that a company and a crowd have a good relationship in crowdsourcing, because it goes hand in hand with having a high motivation. It ought to be hard to state which term that influences the other, if it is the relationship that influences the motivation or if it is the motivation that influences the relationship. Thus, the result of this thesis explains that the relation between them is dynamic.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PRESENTATION OF THE PHENOMENON

The rise of virtual social environments makes companies able to communicate with and engage customers and other stakeholders more than ever before (Li & Bernoff, 2011; Bonson & Flores, 2011). As a product of this interactive paradigm shift a new problem solving approach has been developed called *crowdsourcing* (Howe, 2006). Brabham (2013) explains crowdsourcing as a way of tapping the consumers, symbolising the crowd, on information and ideas by involving them in the business. The knowledge gained from the consumers is argued to be essential for an organization’s growth (Nooteboom, 2000) because initiatives among users could outperform internal and professional activities for new product ideas and problem solving (Poetz & Schreier, 2012; Moreau & Herd, 2010). Moreover, it is said that consumers rather than internal designers may benefit firms in new product development, because the resulting products effectively satisfy consumer needs (Fuchs, et al., 2013; Hoyer et al. 2010; Moreau & Herd, 2010).

Furthermore, Surowiecki (2004) agree that consumers’ summed up opinions are more trustworthy than the opinion of a few, even if the few are professionals. This is also explained as the wisdom of the crowd (Ibid.), which was the precursor of crowdsourcing. Hence, the power of many peoples’ wisdom is worth taking into consideration during the innovation process and when communicating with the customers (Li & Bernoff, 2011). The term crowdsourcing was coined by Howe (2006) for such a co-creation phenomenon, in 2005. Henceforth, companies tap the wisdom of the crowd by outsourcing tasks to different communities in order to get creative solutions (Afuah & Tucci, 2012; Brabham, 2008).

After more years of research, Brabham (2013) has come up with characteristics to determine a crowdsourcing process. First, he suggests that an organization should have a specific task it needs performed (Ibid.). This in comparison to open innovation where the crowd could come up with any suggestion in an open forum (Sloane, 2011). Second, there should be a voluntary crowd that is willing to perform the task given by the company, along with an online environment for the interaction to take place (Brabham, 2013). Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara (2012) further explain that the crowdsourcer will benefit from the work of the crowd, from its experience and from its knowledge. Both Howe (2006) and Brabham (2008; 2013) mean that the crowd is a number of individuals in a community, asked to
participate in a crowdsourcing activity. Finally, Brabham (2013) means that there should be a mutual benefit for the organization and the crowd. Hence, the company should be given valuable and potential solutions and the crowd should be rewarded with a price or the satisfaction of being involved in the crowdsourcing task with the company.

Furthermore, a crowdsourcing task can for example be done by creating an online contest to involve the customers to come up with new business ideas as campaigns or slogans (Ibid.). Sloane (2011) argues that compared to other theories about involving the crowd into the innovation process, crowdsourcing is argued to be the best for tapping the wealth of knowledge online. Uniquely, it combines a bottom-up, open and creative process with top down organizational goals (Brabham, 2013). This combination has created a buzz effect around crowdsourcing, both in the research and the business world, moreover it is a buzz effect that is growing and here to stay (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012; Zwass, 2010; Brabham, 2013).

1.2 PROBLEM DISCUSSION

However, performing crowdsourcing has its difficulties because there are few organisational structures and incentive systems modern enough to handle crowdsourcing (Sloane, 2011). While there is mostly a positive hype around innovation through crowdsourcing, so far there has been little reliable and research-informed empirical evidence on its effectiveness, on best practices and on the challenges this mode of innovation presents (Brabham, 2013; Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Additionally, the outcome of crowdsourcing is critically dependent on the amount of participants, since there is a greater chance of getting a useful result if there are many different contributions (Sloane, 2011; Brabham, 2012). Howe (2009) attests this by arguing that a successful crowdsourcing activity cannot be accomplished without a vibrant, motivated community of participants. Hence, the company needs to motivate the crowd to participate in a crowdsourcing process (Ibid.). In essence, motivation explains why someone engages in a particular behaviour and is feeling motivated to wants to do something (Barkley, 2010). In relation to this it is important that both the organisation and the crowd is motivated in a crowdsourcing activity (Brabham, 2013).

Furthermore, previous researchers in the field also explain the motivation behind crowdsourcing from the crowd’s perspective and how people in the crowd become motivated
by different things (Brabham, 2012). Moreover, what motivates one person might not motivate another, and especially not when dealing with a crowd compared to more like-minded employees in a company (Boudreau & Lakhani, 2013). Brabham (2012) agrees by explaining that the motivation for participation in these many user-generated, online, collaborative projects are diverse, and no single motivator is prominent across all cases. However, there are some common motivators (Brabham, 2012) usually divided into intrinsic and extrinsic motivators (Sloane 2011; Brabham 2012). Thomas (2000) define extrinsic factors as physical rewards such as a cash prize or products, whereas intrinsic rewards are richer in nature and comes to people directly from the work they do, such as satisfaction of social belonging and enjoyment. Intrinsic motivation has grown important, because research results suggest that intrinsic motivation can indeed improve the quality of workers’ output (Rogstadius et al., 2011). But the result does not make extrinsic motivation unimportant; instead they support each other (Thomas, 2000; Sloane, 2011; Rogstadius et al., 2011). Although, Sloane (2011) explains that determining the mix and the specifics of the motivation factors is a problematic dilemma with crowdsourcing from both researchers’ and companies’ perspective.

However, crowdsourcing is usually not a short and simple task, but rather a relationship between the crowd and the company evolving throughout an entire process (Sloane, 2011). In relation to this, Sloane (2011) argue that there are many different keys for tapping the motivation of crowd in the relationship. For example being directed and guided as a participant by the company during the entire crowdsourcing process, and made to feel a valued part of the community, is crucial for keeping the crowd focused on what the organisation wants them to do. Hence, in some ways feeling like part of the community is a part of the compensation for the crowd participation and therefore a motivator (Ibid.). Sloane (2011) further explain that it is not enough to set up a community online and assume participation will take off on its own. In relation to this, Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway (2012) explain that critics of crowdsourcing argues that maintaining a working relationship with the participants throughout the duration of a project is a challenge with crowdsourcing, which also create difficulties in monitoring the quality of work.

Moreover, it is vital to keep the participants motivated throughout the whole crowdsourcing process to end up with contributing results (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Since the company’s motivation behind crowdsourcing is to improve their innovativeness with new
ideas to gain competitive advantages, their motivation throughout the process might influence the crowd’s motivation to perform (Sloane, 2011). This is attested by Djelassi and Decoopman (2013) and Afuah and Tucci (2012) by explaining that consumer involvement in crowdsourcing ought to influence the organisation’s and the crowd’s motivation. In relation to this, there is a need for a better understanding of the motivation behind participating in crowdsourcing, both from the organisation’s perspective and the crowd’s (Sloane, 2011; Brabham, 2013).

However, the motivation factors for a specific group of people to participate in crowdsourcing have already been investigated (e.g. Haichao, Dahui, & Wenhua, 2011; Brabham, 2010; Rogstadius et al., 2011). Brabham (2010) for example explains how four primary motivators for participation in a crowdsourcing community emerge from the data collected in their survey; the opportunity to make money, the opportunity to develop one's creative skills, the potential to take up freelance work and the love of the community. In Haichao, Dahui, and Wenhua’s (2011) research, they found that intrinsic motivation for a crowd was more important than extrinsic when introducing a crowdsourcing competition. In relation to this Rogstadius et al., (2011) concluded in their study that intrinsic motivators generated a higher quality of work from crowds compared to extrinsic motivators. However, these studies have not covered the area of how the relationship between the organisation and the crowd influence motivation. Hence, investigating how an organisation’s and a crowd’s motivation is influenced by the relationship between them throughout the whole crowdsourcing process is a relevant approach to take in the research field.

1.3 PURPOSE
Describe how motivation is influenced by the relationship between an organisation and the crowd in a crowdsourcing process.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
RQ1. How do an organisation and a crowd describe the relationship during the crowdsourcing process?
RQ2. How do an organisation and a crowd describe their motivation during the crowdsourcing process?
RQ3. How do the relationship between an organisation and a crowd influence motivation during the crowdsourcing process?
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the existing literature in the field of motivation in the crowdsourcing process and is based on a thematic structure; first explaining the crowdsourcing process with its different parts and paths. Second, considering the relationship between the organisation and the crowd in crowdsourcing to later investigate how it is affecting the theoretical concept of motivation in crowdsourcing, which is the final part in the review. Lastly, the concept are summarised in a table in the end of the chapter.

2.1 THE CROWDSOURCING PROCESS

Researchers have many different models and ideas on how to perform crowdsourcing (Sloane, 2011; Brabham 2013; Saxton, Oh & Kishore, 2013), and Penin and Burger-Helmchen (2011) explain that practically the structure of the process and of the reward heavily varies depending on the firm and the activity. Estellés-Arolas and González-Ladrón-de-Guevara (2012) argue that the characteristics depend on the proposed initiative and Brabham (2013) further explain that the problem being solved in the crowdsourcing activity is what decides the type of process and model to approach. The problem can for example be to find a solution for a new product idea or to find the unknown solution to an existing scientific and theoretical problem (Ibid).

In relation to this, researchers have come up with many different types of approaches for crowdsourcing (Brabham, 2013), for example Geiger et al. (2011) proposed 19 different types of ways to crowdsource based on the intersection of several dimensions during the process. Whereas Schenk and Guittard (2011) put forth a typology based on the integrative or selective nature of the process. However, in 2008 Brabham (2008) came up with four different types of crowdsourcing models anchored in the problems to solve with help of crowdsourcing and these models have also been used and considered relevant by other researchers in the field (Sloane, 2011; Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012; Brabham, 2013). The first model described is the knowledge discovery and management approach and it is about tasking a crowd with finding and organising existing knowledge spread out, often on the Internet (Brabham, 2008). Another one is the broadcast search approach, which often is applied to task a crowd with potentially empirically provable problems, often scientific (Ibid.). Remaining, the peer-vetted creative production approach is tasking a crowd with generating and sorting through design ideas, and finally the distributed human intelligence tasking which is handling
a crowd with analysing vast amounts of data when computers are incapable of doing so efficiently (Ibid.). Except the problem to solve, the differences between the approaches are the level of interaction needed between the organisation and the crowd, which also affect the crowdsourcing process as a whole (Ibid.).

2.1.1 THE BROADCAST RESEARCH APPROACH

Despite its difficulties, researchers have tried to create and describe an overall model with the main characteristics for the crowdsourcing process (Brabham, 2008; Geiger et al., 2011; Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Brabham (2008) concisely explain the process as follow; a company posts a problem online, a vast number of individuals offer solutions to the problem, the winning ideas are awarded some form of a bounty, and the company mass produces the idea for its own gain. Relative to his explanation, Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway (2012) are the only ones that have created a more developed conceptual model for the crowdsourcing process, which explain the different stages in the process in detailed namely the input, process, output and outcome, visualized in Figure 1 (Ibid.). The overall model was conducted by reviewing existing crowdsourcing cases limited to the broadcast search approach explained by Brabham (2008). Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway (2012) decided to only focus on this type of model because is the most common way to crowdsource, which also differs from the others including a higher level of interaction with their crowd.

Figure 1 explain the relationship between the solution seekers and solution providers and how they interact on the web or via a so called broker organisation who act as an intermediary in-between the two actors enabling the crowdsourcing activity to occur (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Further, the model also summarises how crowdsourcing can be carried out, either via a broker organisation, or directly coordinated by solution seekers (Ibid.). However, the model has its limitation, the chain of causation need not always run from left to right, as the visualisation implies (Ibid.). Formulated differently, the model is too linear, for example as the process stage of crowdsourcing evolves, there can be feedback to the input (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012).

*Figure 1. Stages and key players in the crowdsourcing process (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012, pp. 325)*
2.1.1.1 INPUT

The first stage in the model is the input stage (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). The main inputs into the process comprise problem definition, advertisement of the innovation challenge and the identification of potential solution providers (Ibid.). Sloane (2011) argues about the importance of picking the right crowd and offer them the right incentives. Further he explains that only a small percentage of the crowd will actually participate fully and it is therefore critical to start with the right incentives and a large number of people (Ibid.). Furthermore, another key tenet is to keep the activity simple and break it down into the smallest manageable components, this to get participation (Ibid.). The task must be small, simple and fun enough to fit into a participant’s spare time that they are not devoting to anything else (Sloane, 2011).

2.1.1.2 PROCESS

Further the next stage, the process involves organising, managing and coordinating different aspects of the innovation activity (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Compared to social media, one difference is simply that crowdsourcing involves the management of a community to elicit the community’s knowledge and skill sets (Saxton, Oh & Kishore, 2013). Brabham (2013) further argues that the interplay between a crowd and an organisation is crucial for crowdsourcing processes, which ensure a mutually beneficial outcome that probably could not have existed without the co-creative efforts. Connected to this, Sloane (2011) explain that when the crowd is involved in the crowdsourcing project it is important for the company to offer them guidance and directions as a part of the activity. Hence, being guided, and made to feel a valued part of the community, is in some ways a part of the compensation, as an incentive, for crowd participation (Ibid.). Relative, it is important to remember that if a crowd is dissatisfied with the crowdsourcing organisation or activity, they are free to leave which can make the whole application to collapse entirely (Brabham, 2013). Further Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway (2012) explain that critics of crowdsourcing argue that maintaining a working relationship throughout the duration of a project is a challenge with crowdsourcing, which in turn create difficulties in monitoring the quality of work.

2.1.1.3 OUTPUT

Continuing, the third stage, the outputs of the crowdsourcing activity, is the primary and potential solutions created by the crowd and given to the solution seeker, normally referred to as the organisation (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). As well as the potential rewards for the crowd, which can be financial or non-financial (Ibid.).
2.1.1.4 OUTCOME

This output, will under perfect conditions generate economic and social benefits as for example, increased productivity, greater wealth, improved quality of life, or an enhanced environment, which is the outcome and goal of the process (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Additionally, the outcome of crowdsourcing is critically dependent on the amount of participants, since there is a greater chance of getting a useful result if there are many different contributions (Sloane, 2011; Brabham 2012). In relation, Brabham (2013) argue the importance of a mutually beneficial outcome to keep both parties motivated to approach crowdsourcing again in the future. Zwass (2010) attested by Chen, Marsden and Zhang (2012) also explain this stage as the forth factor in his value co-creation model and name it the co-created value, which is measured by the co-creators’ contribution level and quality of contribution.

2.2 THE RELATIONSHIP IN CROWDSOURCING

Building a strong relationship between the company and the consumers is considered highly important in the marketing literature (Yang & Peterson, 2004; Ivares, Casielles & Martin, 2011). Yang and Peterson (2004) further explain that focusing on maintaining a strong relationship helps a firm get satisfied and loyal customers, which consequently improves their economic and competitive position in its markets. Additionally, it is therefore the company’s task to structure the process and governance of crowdsourcing and determine the availability of support and any form of incentives for co-creators (Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012). Connected to crowdsourcing, there is value not only for the companies, but also for the consumers when it comes to the relationship in crowdsourcing (Djelassi & Decoopman, 2013). Moreover, it is proven that the interaction in a crowdsourcing activities help strengthening the bonds and to create relationships between companies and the consumers (Payne & Frow, 2005; Vargo & Lusch, 2008; Hoyer et al., 2010; Saxton, Oh & Kishore, 2013). In relation to this Djelassi and Decoopman (2013) supported by Afuah and Tucci (2012), explain that when companies specify the scale and nature of consumer involvement in the business process, consumers that have the necessary skills to solve the problems become motivated to do so. Moreau and Herd (2010) add that when letting consumers compete against professionals in crowdsourcing activities, firms could maximize consumer involvement and participation.
2.3 THE MOTIVATION IN CROWDSOURCING

Tapping the collective intelligence of consumers for various purposes has gained the attention of both business practitioners and researchers (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012; Zwass, 2010; Brabham, 2013). However, in order to do so in crowdsourcing, the crowd should be motivated by the company to yield a broad set of participants that are willing to contribute (Zwass, 2010). Sloane (2011) even argues that the success of a crowdsourcing task is directly relying on having a clear understanding of the participants’ motivation. Armstrong and Kotler (2011) explain motivation as different needs, which become motives if the level of intensity is sufficient. It is the drive of seeking satisfaction subconscious or consciously, and they further argues that it is important for organizations to understand the motives to be able to meet the consumers’ needs (Ibid.).

Moreover, to grasp the understanding of motivation Zwass (2010) argue that the company need to understand that motivation is divided into intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic is the personal, where participation and motivation comes from a genuine interest without any rewards from another party (Zwass, 2010; Hars & Ou, 2002). Whereas extrinsic motivation is the external, building on rewards in the form of a cash prize or social acceptance etcetera (Ibid.). In relation to crowdsourcing Rogstadius et al. (2011) suggest that intrinsic motivation can improve the quality of participants’ output, and that there is a synergistic interaction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. It is also stated by Hars and Ou (2002) that intrinsic motivation and altruism play a strong role towards motivation for participating in open-source projects, and it is most likely that participants with internal motives are hobbyists or students. Extrinsic factors, such as direct compensation, are also significant and attract a salaried crowd to a bigger degree (Ibid.).

However, Zwass (2010) noted that the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators do not capture the whole wide spectrum of motivation. Correspondingly, Brabham (2012) attested by Estellés-Arolas and González-Ladrón-de-Guevara (2012) explains that the crowd’s motivation for participation in crowdsourcing is diverse, and no single motivator is prominent for all tasks. Although, some common motivators appear many times across different cases (Ibid.). Sloane (2011) agree and has divided the motivation factors into four different categories, namely Cause, Achievement, Social and finally Learning. Hence, this chapter has the same structure to get a clear understanding of what motivates consumers towards crowdsourcing.
2.3.1 CAUSE
Initially, Sloane (2011) suggest that individuals in the crowd are motivated to see improvement in something of personal interest. A participant’s *cause* could for example be to improve a product of personal use (Ibid.). Furthermore, Zwass (2010) mean that the motivation is built by individual emotion or an altruistic behaviour, and Etgar (2008) adds that creative contributions should enhance the sense of pride and acting creatively enhances enjoyment of contributing (Nambisan & Baron, 2009; Brabham, 2010). The aim for the participants is in such case to come up with interesting ideas and share effort without getting any form of extrinsic rewards out of it (Hoyer et al., 2010). Howe (2009) agree by saying that people participating in crowdsourcing usually want to satisfy needs like creativity, spontaneity and problem-solving. Participants are usually end users of the specific products and do not receive direct social or economic value from their contributions (Cheung et al., 2009). When such value is missing, more intrinsic factors of the inner motivation of individuals have been found to be effective (Ibid.).

2.3.2 ACHIEVEMENT
Sloane (2011) further mean that *achievement* is powerful when creating innovation energy of a target group. He further explain that the competition against benchmarks or other participants could accomplish a goal of personal interest to get a solution, and that the ways for motivating such behaviour could be everything from a cash prize or a product to status and publicity (Ibid.). Hoyer et al. (2010) correspondingly say that some crowds are motivated by financial rewards. Either directly in the form of monetary prizes, or indirectly, through the visibility that they could get from engaging in crowdsourcing competitions (Ibid.). This is also supported by Brabham (2012) and Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara (2012) who say that making money and advancing one’s career are motivational factors for crowdsourcing. Moreover, Rogstadius et al. (2011) support the importance of adequate payment when crowdsourcing. It was shown in their study that competitions with a higher cash prize attracted participants at a higher rate, and those participants also completed more contributions (Ibid.). Rogstadius et al. (2011) concluded that higher payment and a simplified task to be crowdsourced lead to more participants and quicker results. However, if monetary rewards are absent it is argued that reputation gains may explain individuals’ contribution behaviour (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). In such case it is said that feedback from the
company is a main reputation builder because it could be a reflection of the company’s perception of a participant’s performance (Ibid.)

2.3.3 SOCIAL
Sloane (2011) also mean that there are social motivations for the crowd to participate in crowdsourcing. He suggests that the task should fit with the respondents’ own social identity and that crowdsourcing opens up for interactions between participants with a similar interest (Ibid.). Likewise, Brabham (2012) explains that social motivations are to meet new people, socialize and to contribute to a collaborative effort. Furthermore, Nambisan and Baron (2009) demonstrate that social benefits could be in the form of increased social esteem and strengthening of ties with others, along with feelings of a good citizenship. Moreover, if there is a high level of peer feedback the quantity of contributions may increase and further stimulate participants to stay active in the crowdsourcing process for a longer duration (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). However, Sloane (2011) point out that if there are high achievement motivations in the crowdsourcing competition they could make the social motivations fade.

2.3.4 LEARNING
The learning motivations according to Sloane (2011) are the opportunities to use the existing skills towards a goal and at the same time learn new things. In addition, Brabham (2012) means that it is a motivation to challenge oneself with a difficult task and to express oneself, and Sloane (2011) further explain that the learning and strive towards a goal is measured partly by receiving feedback on the contribution from the company, which is attested by Cheung et al. (2009). Furthermore, studies have shown that the company’s feedback to the participants has an impact on the quality of the crowdsourcing contributions (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). The presence of feedback is also said to provide an indication that the company is taking part of the ideas submitted and has a serious view of the process (Ibid.). Consequently, this could provide positive motivation to participants. Correspondingly, Moon and Sproull (2008) show the impact of given feedback and mean that positive feedback get participants to stay with the task throughout the whole process, while negative feedback could change their behaviour or drop out from the crowdsourcing. Moreover, Chen, Marsden and Zhang (2012) add that an influencing factor of the contribution level and also the active duration of participation is how fast the company respond with feedback. The responsiveness
positively influences participants’ contribution of ideas in crowdsourcing, at the same time as a delay in responses has negative effects on motivation (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). Hence, the quicker a company responds to an individual’s ideas, the more likely it fulfils the individual’s sense of belonging and thereby encourage continued participation in crowdsourcing (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012).

2.4 SUMMARY OF THE THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

Table 1. Summary of the theoretical concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL CONCEPT</th>
<th>SUMMARIZED DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The crowdsourcing process</td>
<td>Brabham (2008) concisely explain the process as follow; a company posts a problem online, a vast number of individuals offer solutions to the problem, the winning ideas are awarded some form of a bounty, and the company mass produces the idea for its own gain (Marjanovic, Fry &amp; Chataway, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The broadcast search approach</td>
<td>The model is applied to task a crowd with potentially empirically provable problems, often scientific (Brabham, 2013). Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway (2012) have divided the model into four stages; (1) the input stage comprising the problem definition, construct the task and identification of a potential crowd. (2) The process stage involves guiding the participants, organising and managing different aspects during the activity, which will end up in (3) the output stage, the primary and potential solutions and rewards. Finally, the output will generate economic and social benefits in the (4) outcome stage, which is the goal with the crowdsourcing activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship in crowdsourcing</td>
<td>The level of interaction and involvement in crowdsourcing activities help strengthening the bonds and to create relationships between companies and the consumers (e.g. Payne &amp; Frow, 2005; Vargo &amp; Lusch, 2008). Afuah and Tucci (2012) explain that when companies specify the scale and nature of consumer participation in the business process, consumers that have the necessary skills to solve the problems become motivated to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in crowdsourcing</td>
<td>Howe (2009) explains that crowdsourcing cannot be accomplished without motivated participants. Brabham (2012) further explains that the crowd’s motivation for participation in crowdsourcing is diverse, and no single motivator is prominent for all tasks. Sloane (2011) has divided the motivation factors into four different categories; (1) cause including intrinsic factors as creativity, spontaneity and problem solving (Hoyer et al., 2010), (2) Achievement are more extrinsic with everything from a cash price or a product to status and publicity and (3) social factors as meeting new people, socialize and to contribute to a collaborative effort (Sloane, 2011). Finally, (4) Learning are about the motivation to use the existing skills towards a goal and at the same time learn new things and get feedback (Ibid.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. RESEARCH MODEL

This chapter applies as the theoretical framework for the thesis and is visualized in a research model based on the reviewed literature. The model is constructed by the authors and aims to show the relationship between the organisation and the crowd in the crowdsourcing process.

The purpose of the thesis is to describe how motivation is influenced by the relationship between an organisation and the crowd in a crowdsourcing process. Hence, to be able to understand the relationship between the two actors and how it influences the motivation, a model of the process was created to explain when the interaction between the organisation and the crowd occurs. The first part of the designed research model, the foundation of the model, therefore clarifies the different stages in the crowdsourcing process, which is based on the literature review and mainly Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway’s (2012) four stages, input, process, output and outcome. Step one in the model is visualized in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Step 1 is inspired by Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) model for the crowdsourcing process.](image)

In the input stage the interaction between the crowd and organisation ought to occur when the task is formed and asked to be performed by the crowd. It could hypothetically be considered a crucial interactive moment, because it will show if the crowd is motivated enough to participate (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012; Brabham, 2013). During the process stage, the interaction between the two actors ought to be more intense since the organisation is supposed to give the crowd guidance and support during the crowd performance (Sloane, 2011), which insinuates that the interaction could be consistent during the whole process stage. Finally, in the output and outcome stage the task is completed and the interaction between the crowd and organisation ought to decrease. However, the remaining
communication between the two should occur when the solutions are given to the organisation and when the rewards are given to crowd in the output stage (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Brabham (2013) argue the importance of a mutually beneficial outcome to keep both parties motivated to approach crowdsourcing again in the future, which argues for the value in the last outcome stage. In relation to this the final stage will also reveal how well the crowd have performed the task, its contribution level and quality of contribution (Zwass, 2010), hence how motivated the crowd have been during the whole process.

Furthermore, to explain and visualize the relationship between the two actors in the crowdsourcing activity they are placed on each sides of the model, following throughout the four stages and the whole process, visualized in Step 2 in the model 2.1. On the top is the organisation side, in Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) model described as the solution seekers, and on the bottom is the crowd side, also described as the solution providers (Ibid.). The top and bottom placement has no significant meaning to the model.

![Figure 3. Step 2 visualizes the relationship between the two actors in the crowdsourcing activity](image)

Further, in each stage in the model some kind of interaction occurs between the actors (Sloane, 2011), visualized with help of the interaction arrows. Moreover, to be able to describe how this interaction affect the motivation, the research need to get a deeper understanding of the interaction in each stage and investigate how the different motivation factors, as intrinsic and extrinsic (Zwass (2010; Brabham, 2012) explained in the literature review along with cause, achievement, social, efficiency and learning (Sloane, 2011), are affected.
4. METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains an explanation over how the thesis was conducted. The selected approaches, methods and strategies used in the research are justified with help of existing theories in the field of methodology in business research. To conclude there is a summary of the approach taken in the end of the chapter.

4.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

Inductive and deductive research are two major approaches to take in research, anchored in different opposing philosophical perspectives (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Inductive research is grounded in constructionism, interpreting the world as “becoming”, whereas deductive research is grounded in objectivism explaining the world as “being” (Ibid.). Connected to this, the major difference between them is the way of approaching and viewing theory (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011). The inductive approach bases its knowledge in collected data and develops theory as a result of the data analysis (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Bryman and Bell (2011) further explain that the theory often evolves from case specific to general and expands back and forth in an interactive nonlinear process. On the other hand, in the deductive approach theory is instead the foundation of the research (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). The approach follows a logical and linear process and Robson (2011) have listed five sequential stages of progress to follow; (1) first the researcher has to deduct a testable hypothesis from theory. (2) Second the hypothesis has to be operationalized and broke down into measurable terms. Next, (3) the hypothesis has to be tested to be able to move to the (4) forth stage for examining the specific outcome, which either should be accepted or rejected. Lastly, in the (5) firth stage, if necessary the theory is modified (Ibid.). Moreover, a deductive approach is often used when explaining causal relationships between variables, which make a quantitative research study preferable. However, it does not exclude the use of a qualitative data collection method (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). In contrast, inductive research is more characterised by a qualitative research study, resulting in more in-depth data (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2009) argue that one research approach might not exclude the other. They argue that it is fully possible to combine the inductive and deductive research, and often even more advantageous (Ibid.). Dubois and Gadde (2002) explain that a mixture of deductive and inductive approaches is to be seen as the abductive approach. Further they
argue that an abductive approach is fruitful if the researcher's objective is to discover new things, other variables and other relationships. Compared to inductive research, abductive is argues to yield more because of its possibilities of capturing and taking advantage not only of the systemic character of the empirical world, but also of theoretical models (Dubois and Gadde, 2002).

This thesis is going to use the abductive approach because a mix of inductive and deductive research is needed to investigate the chosen objectives and meet the purpose. The abduction was implemented because the research was grounded in theory and measured with help of operational terms, which is typical for the deductive approach. Although, the theoretical concept motivation is argued to be complex to understand, including many different factors varying from person to person (Armstrong & Kotler, 2011). Therefore a more in-depth and rich data collection method than the deductive approach is needed, moving the study towards characteristics of an inductive approach. Additionally, since the thesis is focused on understanding how the relationship between the crowd and organisation in the crowdsourcing process affect both parties’ motivation, an abductive approach is suitable. Dubois and Gadde (2002) also attest this reasoning by arguing that an abductive approach is appropriate when discovering relationships, as is the case in this study.

4.1.1 QUANTITATIVE OR QUALITATIVE FRAMEWORK

There are two main frameworks to use when conducting research, namely the quantitative and the qualitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Quantitative research emphasizes quantification in the collection and analysis of data, which often comes down to numbers and statistics (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The aim with a quantitative study is to make statistical generalizations of the results (Yin, 2014), and the approach has been criticized for the exact same reason (Bryman & Bell, 2011). When generalizing statistically it namely becomes hard to distinguish people and when dealing with numbers it is said to give a static view of social life (Ibid.). Correspondingly, this hinders the application in everyday life (Ibid.), which is something considered needed for this thesis, hence, a quantitative research framework do not ought to meet the requirements for the purpose of this thesis, which brings this discussion further to the qualitative framework.
Qualitative research namely focus on understanding the meaning that people have constructed and how they make sense of the surroundings and their experiences (Merriam, 1998), which is more suitable for this study. Moreover, words rather than numbers are important, which leads to the logic that a qualitative study often is carried out in forms of interviews and focus groups (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The qualitative research framework is not as formal as quantitative research and is applied to describe complicated situations (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It strives to gain deep knowledge and to reveal how all the parts work together to form a whole (Merriam, 1998).

Because of the above mentioned, this study has a qualitative research framework because the aim is to describe what influences the motivation in a relationship and to see what motivates two parties within a process, in which rich information was needed to get a contributing outcome. However, since the framework is not very formal it has got critique from quantitative researchers, namely that the approach is too subjective and therefore hard to follow and replicate (Merriam, 1998). In this thesis an operationalization has been used to minimize these risks, as suggested by Yin (2014). However, a qualitative approach still has problems when it comes to generalization, because a smaller number of respondents are not likely to be as representative for the population than if using a larger number. Although, the results of qualitative research aim to generalize theory in an analytic generalization, and not populations as in statistical generalizations (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Yin, 2014). Correspondingly, the goal with this study was to move towards a generalization of theory when it comes to the relationship between motivation and crowdsourcing, which justifies the choice of the qualitative framework.

Further, the rich information from the respondents was the view and experience of the process, which would have been difficult to get from a quantitative study, because numbers would not have been relevant for studying motivation in a relationship. Armstrong and Kotler (2011) explain that the term motivation research refers to qualitative research designed to understand consumers’ hidden and subconscious motivations. They further explaining that a qualitative research method gives the researcher a deeper and richer collection of data, compared to quantitative research method (Ibid.). Armstrong and Kotler (2011) also argue that people do not know why they act as they do, what motivates them, and that a qualitative research therefore is needed to understand the factors behind the motivation (Ibid.).
4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design could be seen as a plan researchers use to answer the research questions, which makes the design vital for the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). When formulating a purpose there are three paths to choose from, namely the exploratory, descriptive and the explanatory (Bryman & Bell, 2011). An exploratory study is about seeking new insights and aims to clarify an understanding of a problem (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). If conducting exploratory research the researcher need to be able to change the direction of the study if the result of new data gives new insights (ibid.). In comparison, a descriptive study is there to show an accurate profile of persons, events or specific situations (Robson, 2002). Essential aspects for a descriptive design are the ability to be analytic and that it is based on previous research (Grønmo & Winqvist, 2006). Finally, when conducting explanatory research the researcher is interested in a single problem or situation in order to establish causal relationships between variables (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

Since the purpose of the thesis was to describe how the motivation is influenced by the relationship between an organisation and the crowd in a crowdsourcing process, an accurate profile over specific situations in the process would be preferable, which is in line with the descriptive purpose (Robson, 2002). Additionally, motivation and consumer relationship are two qualitative concepts needing in-depth analytical investigations be to understand properly, which a descriptive purpose also provides. On the other side, an exploratory purpose could also be preferable since it aims to clarify an understanding of a problem, however the above reasons explain that a descriptive study is even more preferable. Moreover, even though the relation between motivation and the relationship between the organisation and the crowd could be unknown the two concepts on their own are well researched. Further, an explanatory purpose is however not a good choice because the relationship between motivation and consumer relationship in a crowdsourcing process is fairly unknown and unsearched. The study could instead be seen as a forerunner to a piece of exploratory research, or a more in-depth piece of an explanatory research, as mentioned by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009).
Furthermore, Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) argue that the research questions are the cornerstone in research, which will affect the choice of method and final outcome of the study. Further they explain that it is important to avoid constructing research questions that will not generate new insight. In relation, determining the research questions are about selecting the questions most on topic and to gain some precision when formulating them (Yin, 2014). Moreover, to get precision when formulating the questions Yin (2014) explain that the basic categorisation scheme for research questions is including “who”, “what”, “where”, “how” and “why” questions. Henceforth, since the purpose of this study is descriptive “how” and “why” questions are more suitable (Yin, 2014). If the research questions mainly are “what” questions the research is normally exploratory with the goal of exploring unknown theories (Ibid.).

4.3 DATA SOURCE

There are two different types of data sources, primary data and secondary data (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Secondary data gives the researcher the opportunity to reanalyse data that already have been collected for other reasons than solving the problem specific to the research questions (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). The advantages with secondary data is that it is less time and money consuming and useful not only for solving the research problem, but also to get a better understanding of the research problem by reviewing the background information needed to grasp the research area (Bryman & Bell, 2011). On the other hand, primary data is needed when investigating a specific research problem, which requires new information specific to the case and research design (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). The primary data will supply the study with data that is to the point and naturally needed when investigating a new area (Bryman & Bell, 2011), which is why this thesis solely relies on primary data collected through a qualitative approach, although it is time consuming to collect (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

The reason behind only using primary data is because conducting research within a qualitative concept like motivation, which varies from person to person, requires tailor-made information specific for the research problem (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Further, since the study aims to describe a relationship between two concepts in a specific context, which not have been investigated to a big extent before, there is not enough secondary data for answering the research questions.
4.4 RESEARCH STRATEGY

No research strategy is superior or inferior to any other (Bryman & Bell, 2011), but the choice of strategy is still of big essence since it will enable or disable the researcher to answer particular research questions and meet the objectives (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Foremost the research strategy will be guided by the research questions, but the extent of existing knowledge, philosophical underpinning and amount of time available are also important (Yin, 2014). Further, Yin (2014) describes five different types of research strategies to use; experiment, survey, archival analysis, history and case study. Moreover, it should be remembered that these strategies are not to be thought of as mutually exclusive (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Yin, 2014). However, since a survey is more suitable for collecting quantitative data and archival analysis and history usually involve secondary data (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009), which is not specific enough to meet the research questions of this thesis, they were not used in this study. The same applies for experiment, which could have been suitable for this thesis because it allows the researcher to investigate the relationship and possible change between different variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, a case study was considered more appropriate to this thesis.

Case study is a research design that entails the detailed and intensive analysis of a single case or multiple cases (Yin, 2014; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Yin (2014) explains that conducting a case study, compared to other research strategies, are preferable when (1) the main research questions focus on how and why, (2) the researcher has little or no control over behavioural events and (3) when the focus of the study is contemporary, which matches with this thesis. In relation to this, Morris and Wood (1991) recommend researchers to use a case study strategy when searching for an understanding of the context and the process being enacted, like in this thesis with a crowdsourcing process. Robson (2002) further explain that a case study involves empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, also to get an in-depth and extensive description of some social phenomenon (Yin, 2014).

Yin (2014) further explain that even though many social scientists believe that case studies only are appropriate for an exploratory investigation, he argue that a descriptive and explanatory case study can be even more suitable. Some of the most famous case study researches have been descriptive, in other words, it is not about excluding options, it is about finding the best fit for the research (Ibid.) The key issue with the design is that the nature of
case study evidence is comparable to the issue of generalizability. Typical research forms are qualitative intensive studies by ethnographic or qualitative interviewing of single cases, for example an organization, but also quantitative survey research, even though qualitative is preferable because of its richness in the data (Bryman & Bell, 2011) which also is an argument to why this qualitative study has taken use of the case study as research strategy.

Moreover, Yin (2014) explains that a case study is based on two different dimensions; single and multiple cases, as well as holistic and embedded cases. A single case is usually used because it is typical for the objective studied and continually because it provides the researcher with an opportunity to observe and analyse the phenomenon (Ibid.). Multiple cases are on the other hand when a comparative study between cases is needed to investigate (Ibid.). The case study used for this thesis was a single case study because a case specific to a crowdsourcing process was needed to be able to conduct the study, which could be attested by Yin (2014). Furthermore, in a holistic dimension the researcher is treating the organisation from a holistic perspective, whereas embedded dimensions only involve sub-units as departments and work groups, where more than one unit is investigated. Connected to this thesis, the study aims to investigate the relationship between the organisation and the crowd, which made them act as sub-units, and naturally gave the study an embedded dimension.

4.5 DATA COLLECTION METHOD

Data collection is about asking, watching and reviewing (Merriam, 1998), and when collecting data there are many methods to choose from, where the five most common are surveys, in-depth interviews, observations, focus groups and content analysis (Yin, 2014; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Although, for a study like this one, with a qualitative approach, the methods of in-depth interviews, observations and focus groups are most used and recommended because they open up for collecting rich and deep data from the respondents (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Among these three methods for collecting data in qualitative research, interviews are the most employed one, perhaps because of its flexibility (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Flexibility was considered important in this thesis because the emphasis was on what the respondents’ viewed as important, and less focus on what the researchers found important. If a study has such a focus, Bryman and Bell (2011) mean that conducting in-depth interviews is the best method
for data collection. Observations could have opened up for collecting actions in real time (Yin, 2014), but since this study concerns motivation, which is both a subconscious and conscious drive (Armstrong & Kotler, 2011), it would be difficult to get correct results since it would be hard to observe and thereby excluded from this study. Furthermore, the use of focus groups as a data collection method was considered for this research, since they can open up for specific attention to a respondent’s personal rendition of an event (Yin, 2014). However, a focus group including several participants would open up for interactive discussions which could lead to a common thought among the group (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009), which was not desired in this study. Instead the aim for this thesis was to extract personal reasons for the decisions that the respondents took in the context of the specific case, which could be done through the use of in-depth interviews (Ibid.). Therefore, in-depth interviews were considered the best choice of data collection method for this study. Yin (2014) also argues that interviews are one of the most important sources of case study evidence, which further justifies the choice of interviews since this study aim to collect primary data from a case study.

There are several ways of conducting interviews, where the most common is unstructured and semi-structured interviews in qualitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In an unstructured interview the researcher might only have one single question to ask, in order for the respondent to freely direct and answer the question. The researcher could lead the interview by follow up on worthy points mentioned, which makes it similar to a normal conversation (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In contrast, the researcher has a list of questions within a relatively specific topic in semi-structured interviews. Although, the respondent has got room for influencing the reply, and at the same time the researcher can add questions as the interview go along (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). In this study, semi-structured interviews were considered the best of the alternatives because the abductive approach opened up for an operationalization, which gave empirical measures that were important to include. Therefore, unstructured interviews would not have been structured enough to contribute with the specific information the researchers wanted to gain. Semi-structured interviews, however, enabled specific questions to be asked in line with the operationalization, which in turn gave the kind of information relevant for this thesis.
Interviews can further be held either face-to-face or via the telephone (Bryman & Bell, 2011). There are positive and negative aspects of both procedures; the face-to-face interview is more used in business research, partly because the interviewer can see the respondent and therefore look for reactions along the interview and be certainly sure that the correct person answers the questions (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). In a telephone interview anybody could take the respondent's place without being noticed (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, interviews by the telephone are cheaper than face-to-face interviews, easier to manage, and variations in response can be avoided since the respondent is not influenced by the interviewer's race, gender and age etcetera (Ibid.). The researchers aimed to hold the interviews face-to-face, because of Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill’s (2009) reasoning about the interviewer being able to look for reactions along the interview and being sure that the correct person is replying. Although, one of the interviews (with an individual who participated in the competition) was held via the telephone because of a long term stay in another country, which would have made the interview time consuming and costly if held face-to-face.

4.5.1 OPERATIONALIZATION

Operationalization is the process of transforming and deducing abstract theories into measurable concepts and material for a research (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). This is done in order to obtain relevant empirical information, but also to draw accurate conclusions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). There are four basic steps involved in an operationalization; the theoretical insights, listing potential variables, selecting the variables and collecting data (Holme & Krohn, 1997). Moreover, to be able to get to the last stage of collecting data in a descriptive research, typical for this thesis, Conceptual definitions (see the column in Table 2. Operationalization) of the theories from the literature review was needed (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Therefore, the crowdsourcing process with its four stages, the relationship in crowdsourcing and the four motivational factors in crowdsourcing; cause, achievement, social and learning were defined in the operationalization table.

The next column in the operationalization focus on creating operational definitions of the theories to get an understanding and being able to measure the theories in reality (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). The operational definitions for the different stages in the crowdsourcing process concentrates on gaining an objective understanding on how the stages were managed by the organisation. Additionally, the operational definition for the relationship in
crowdsourcing focus on understanding the qualitative relationship in the different stages, and the motivation factors focus on gaining an understanding on the reasons behind the motivation in the different stages. With this done, the operationalization landed in empirical measurements (Bryman & Bell, 2011). For example the consumer relationship were measured and broken down into the level of interaction and involvement between the organisation and the crowd. This measurable variable later served as the foundation for the interview guide. The operationalization is visualized in Table 2. Operationalization.
Table 2. Operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL CONCEPT</th>
<th>CONCEPT DEFINITION</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL DEFINITION</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL MEASUREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The crowdsourcing process: Input stage</td>
<td>The <em>input</em> stage comprises the problem definition, construction the task (Marjanovic, Fry &amp; Chataway, 2012) and identification of a potential crowd (Sloane, 2011).</td>
<td>To get an understanding on how the input stage was managed by the organisation.</td>
<td>The construction of the task: small, simple and fun enough to fit the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The selection of a potential crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crowdsourcing process: Process stage</td>
<td>The <em>process</em> stage involves guiding and interacting with the participants (Sloane, 2011; Brabham, 2013; Saxton, Oh &amp; Kishore, 2013) as well as organising and managing different aspects during the activity (Marjanovic, Fry &amp; Chataway, 2012).</td>
<td>To get an understanding on how the process stage was managed by the organisation.</td>
<td>The level of guidance for the crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The level of interaction between crowd and organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organising, managing and coordinating different aspects of the activity during the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crowdsourcing process: Output stage</td>
<td>In the <em>output</em> stage the primary and potential solutions are given to the organisation and rewards are given to the crowd (Marjanovic, Fry &amp; Chataway, 2012).</td>
<td>To get an understanding on how the output stage was managed by the firm.</td>
<td>The primary solutions from the crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The primary rewards given to the crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crowdsourcing process: Outcome stage</td>
<td>The output will be transformed to economic and social benefits in the <em>outcome</em> stage, which is the goal with the crowdsourcing activity (Marjanovic, Fry &amp; Chataway, 2012). Brabham (2013) argues for the importance of a mutually beneficial outcome.</td>
<td>To get an understanding on what outcome the organisation and the crowd were given by the crowdsourcing activity.</td>
<td>The benefits gained by crowdsourcing; social and economic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The level of a mutual benefit for the crowd and organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship in Crowdsourcing</td>
<td>The level of interaction and involvement in crowdsourcing activities is strengthening the bonds and relationships between organisation and the consumers (e.g. Payne &amp; Frow, 2005; Djelassi &amp; Decoopman, 2013; Vargo &amp; Lusch, 2008; Hoyer et al., 2010; Saxton, Oh &amp; Kishore, 2013), which should lead to consumer satisfaction (Yang &amp; Peterson, 2004).</td>
<td>To get an understanding of the relationship between the organisation and the crowd by gaining deeper knowledge about the interaction and involvement during the different stages in the crowdsourcing process</td>
<td>The interaction between the crowd and organisation in the different stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The crowd and organisation involvement in the different stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The level of consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in Crowdsourcing: <strong>Cause</strong></td>
<td>The cause behind crowdsourcing is to come up with interesting ideas (Hoyer et al., 2010; Sloane, 2011; Cheung et al., 2009), to satisfy needs like creativity, spontaneity, problem-solving, improvement of products for personal use and altruistic behaviour (Howe, 2009; Zwass, 2010). The cause is also argued to enhance the sense pride and enjoyment of contributing (Nambisan &amp; Baron, 2009; Brabham, 2010).</td>
<td>To get an understanding on what motivated the organisation to crowdsource and the crowd to participate in relation to investigate if the participants were involved because of the cause behind the activity.</td>
<td>The level of satisfaction of the needs like creativity, spontaneity and problem solving. The level of the improvement in products for personal use and/or the level of altruistic behaviour expressed. The level of the sense of feeling pride and enjoyment of contributing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in Crowdsourcing: <strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td>Achievements are normally extrinsic factors and can be everything from a cash price, a product, (e.g. Hoyer et al., 2010; Rogstadius et al., 2011), advancing one’s career (Brabham, 2012; Estellés-Arolas &amp; González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012) or/and to get status and publicity which is accomplished by competing against others (Sloane, 2011; Hoyer et al., 2010).</td>
<td>To get an understanding on what motivated the organisation to crowdsource and the crowd to participate in relation to the achievements gained by being involved in the activity.</td>
<td>The level of satisfaction from cash price, a product, advancing one’s career or/and to get status and publicity. The level of satisfaction from competing against benchmarks or other participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in Crowdsourcing: <strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Brabham (2012) explains that social motivations are to meet new people, socialize and to contribute to a collaborative effort, attested by Chen, Marsden and Zhang, (2012). The task should fit with the respondents’ own social identity (Sloane, 2011). Further, Nambisan and Baron (2009) include increased social esteem and strengthening ties with others, along with feelings of a good citizenship.</td>
<td>To get an understanding of what motivated the organisation to crowdsource and the crowd to participate in relation to the social factors of being involved in the activity.</td>
<td>The level of satisfaction from meeting new people, socialize and contribute to a collaborative effort. How well the task fitted the respondents’ social identity. The level of increased social esteem and strengthening of ties with others, along with feelings of a good citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in Crowdsourcing: <strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>The learning motivation include the opportunity to use existing skills to challenge oneself with a difficult task towards a goal and at the same time learn new things (Sloane, 2011) by getting feedback from the organisation (Moon &amp; Sproull, 2008; Cheung et al., 2009; Chen, Marsden &amp; Zhang, 2012).</td>
<td>To get an understanding on what motivated the organisation to crowdsource and the crowd to participate in relation to the learning factors.</td>
<td>The level of satisfaction from using existing skills to meet a goal, learn new things and get feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 INTERVIEW GUIDE

An interview guide is help for researchers to use when conducting interviews, most often with questions and issues for the respondents to answer or talk around when it comes to semi-structured interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Moreover, it is important that the questions and issues are in line with the purpose, to serve as tools for solving the research problem and cover the relevant areas (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). Hence, to be able to meet the purpose of this study, questions, which covered the areas of the crowdsourcing process, the motivation and the relationship in crowdsourcing was made for the interviews. The questions in the interview guides were conducted according to the operationalization and the *Empirical measurements* in particular, before the interviews were held, as recommended by Bryman and Bell (2011).

The first interview guide was made for the interview with the responsible project manager at the organisation (see APPENDIX A). The aim was twofold for that interview compared to the following ones, namely both to get information about the crowdsourcing process, and to get information about the project leader’s view on the motivation and relationship with the participants broker organisation. The second guide was made for a project colleague at the organisation who took part in the crowdsourcing process (see APPENDIX B). Here the aim was to get the member’s view of the motivation and relationship with the participants.

The third interview guide was developed for one respondent within the broker organization, the person who sent out the competition to the crowd (see APPENDIX C). The questions focused on the person’s relationship with IKEA and the crowd in the crowdsourcing competition as well as the person’s perception of the motivation.

The fourth interview guide was conducted for the participants in the crowdsourcing process (see APPENDIX D). Questions for them focused on their motivation towards the crowdsourcing process in relation to their relationship with the organisation. And finally, the fifth guide was made for the non-participants, who still were aware of the competition in the same crowdsourcing process (see APPENDIX E). In these interviews the aim lied in understanding why the non-participants did not become motivated enough to participate, in relation to their relationship with the organisation.
4.6 SAMPLING

It is money and time consuming, and sometimes not even possible, for a researcher to investigate a whole population, which is why a sample instead is selected to represent the population (Holme & Solvang, 1997). Therefore, the sample can be explained as a part of the population that is chosen for a certain study (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

In this thesis, the sample of the company IKEA was chosen primarily because they performed a crowdsourcing activity at Linnaeus University in December 2013, which therefore was well known by the authors of this thesis. After a phone conversation and a meeting with the project leader for the crowdsourcing activity at IKEA it was confirmed that their case would be suitable for this thesis. This was based on Brabham’s (2008) idea of how a crowdsourcing process is formed, videlicet that a company posts a problem online, a vast number of individuals offer solutions to the problem, the winning ideas are awarded some form of a bounty, and the company mass produces the idea for its own gain. In relation, the project leader at IKEA explained that their crowdsourcing process was formed as a competition and posted on the University’s intranet for students to participate in to help IKEA to improve their online support on the website, and as a reward the winning students were given a day at IKEA’s head office. During the dialogue, the authors explained the purpose of the thesis and the project leader was positive about cooperating and letting IKEA’s crowdsourcing activity work as the case for this thesis. Since some parts of the thesis required full insight from within the organization and in the relationship between the organisation and the crowd, the authors were promised access to the information required. Typical for this kind of information was the contact details to the participating students in the competition to be able to grasp not only the organisation’s view of the relationship in the crowdsourcing but also the crowd’s.

Another reason of choosing IKEA as the sample was because they were ranked as one the most successful companies in the world (Ranking the Brand, 2014) and was argued to be the most innovative company in Sweden by SIFO (2014). Henceforth, to cooperate with a famous and professional company like IKEA aims to give this study more credibility. Further, Djelassi and Decoopman (2013) explain in their study that consumer goods companies practicing crowdsourcing are the clear forerunners in the field and are therefore a good sample to include in a research about crowdsourcing. Relative to the thesis, this attests the
reason for involving IKEA as a consumer goods company and the management behind the crowdsourcing competition.

4.6.1 SAMPLING FRAME

The population consists of all the entities that the researchers choose to sample from and can for example be chosen on the basis of nations, cities, schools or companies (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The listing of all units in the population from which the sample was selected is described as the sample frame (Bryman & Bell, 2011). When collecting a sample frame two major different techniques are available, probability sampling or non-probability sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In probability sampling each case of the population has an equal chance of being selected and the cases also have to be known by the population (Ibid.). On the contrary, in non-probability sampling the sample do not have an equal chance of being selected because all individuals are not appropriate to interview, thus it would not lead to answering the research questions (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Instead, a narrower sample frame is needed in order to just ask the individuals that were connected to the case studied (Ibid.). Since only the individuals that had something to do with the same crowdsourcing competition at IKEA was suitable to answer the questions in the conducted interview guide, those were within the sample frame, and the units needed to be selected non-randomly in a non-probability sample.

Furthermore, Miles and Huberman (1984) argue that sampling from a qualitative study, familiar to this thesis, differs from a quantitative study because a qualitative researcher appears to work with a smaller sample and tend to be more purposive rather than random (Miles and Huberman, 1984). Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) explain this non-probability sample as purposive sampling, which refers to that the sample is being selected based upon how the researchers find people with expertise, special knowledge or experience within the investigated subject. Neuman (2005) declares that purposive sampling is normally used when working with smaller and more informative samples, as in case studies, which attest the reason of using the sample technique in this thesis.

However, a purposive sample is not free from bias and it is therefore important to ensure that the sample is reliable and has the competence needed to generate useful data (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Although, as explained before, Yin (2014) means that a qualitative study
allow the researcher to do analytic generalization of the sample. Hence, the same theoretical propositions can be applied in other situations where the same concepts and constructs might be relevant (Ibid.).

Moreover, Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) explain that even if the researchers use a case study strategy and conduct interviews, as in this thesis, it is still important to select case study units within the sampling frame, representing the people included in the case to interview. Therefore, in this study there were three units to be able to meet the purpose, namely (1) the management at IKEA who worked with the crowdsourcing competition, (2) the lecturer for the marketing program at Linnaeus University who sent out the competition to the students, also explained as the broker organisation connecting the two segments (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012), and finally, (3) students at the marketing program at Linnaeus University. The students were further split in two, namely into the ones who participated in the crowdsourcing competition and the students who read the task but chose not to participate in the crowdsourcing competition. To continue, in order to get rich and in-depth information it was vital that people with the right expertise or experience of a crowdsourcing task was interviewed. Henceforth, a purposive sample was selected for all the three segments, which ensured that the data collected was reliable and relevant for this thesis.

The first and the third unit characterizes the two different participating sides in a crowdsourcing activity and were included to understand the relationship between them and how it affected their motivation. The samples were highly needed because of their unique knowledge and experience of participating in the same crowdsourcing process. The second sample, the broker organisation, was included to see if there were any interaction of relevance with him, IKEA and the crowd which could have affected the crowd motivation.

Lastly, the non-participants were included to get a deeper understanding on what did not motivate them to participate. In relation, Djelassi and Decoopman (2013) explain that their study had some limitations because it only included consumers who participated in the crowdsourcing operation. Further, they argue that including consumers who are aware of these types of crowdsourcing activities, but actively choose not to participate, could be meaningful in terms of identifying the obstacles to participation (Ibid.). Thus, the individuals who did not participate were included in this study on the recommendation from Djelassi and Decoopman (2013).
4.6.2 SAMPLING SELECTION AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Since semi-structured interviews are flexible (Bryman & Bell, 2011) a few of the questions in the interview guides (see APPENDIX A - APPENDIX E) were overseen in some interviews because the same respondents in previous questions already answered them. Moreover, Bryman and Bell (2011) explain that the researchers should put emphasis on how the respondents frame different experiences. Therefore, some questions were added during the interview to get thorough answers. It was important to stay with a similar wording from respondent to respondent (Ibid.). However, only two of the respondents were English speaking, namely two individuals who participated in the crowdsourcing process, which made those interviews different from the rest where the respondents were Swedish speaking. Therefore, the interview guides for those respondents had to be translated to their preferred language so that they would be able to fully explain their experience of the motivation and the relationship (Bryman & Bell, 2011). After the data collection the Swedish data had to be translated back to English by the researchers.

4.6.2.1 INTERVIEWS WITH THE ORGANISATION

The first interview was conducted with the project leader for the crowdsourcing process at IKEA, who’s assignments were to be in charge of the process and being the contact person for the students if they had any questions during the competition. He also received the contributions and compiled the information and the ideas with a colleague. That interview concerned questions about the crowdsourcing process, relationship with the crowd and motivation. Second, the project colleague was interviewed with questions concerning relationship and motivation only. The reason why the project leader got to talk about the process was to get a somewhat objective insight in how the crowdsourcing process was conducted, and that was done with the help of questions based on Table 2. Operationalization and further, The Crowdsourcing process. Moreover, the project leader was asked about the relationship between him and the participants with help of the questions about consumer relationship and motivations. Also them formed from Table 2. Operationalization, for more details see the interview guide in Appendix A. The time for the interviews with the management was booked three weeks in advance to ensure participation, and they were held in a pre-booked conference room at IKEA Hemma’s head office in Älmhult, and took 45 minutes.
Directly after, a second interview was held with the project colleague working at IKEA, which took about 35 minutes. The questions asked in that case are found in APPENDIX B. Both the interviews were conducted face to face, and the two managers were given a lot of space to talk freely (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). The respondents had before the interviews been informed about the purpose of this thesis and been given some basic information about crowdsourcing. These two managers gave valuable information, which were recorded with their approval. Recording a qualitative interview is recommended by Bryman & Bell (2011) to cover as many different analysis factors as possible. After the interviews both managers were told that they were not going to be mentioned by name in the thesis, however, they were aware that since they were so few having a responsibility of the competition, their anonymity could not be certain.

Furthermore, one more interview was conducted with a consultant who was a part of the project group and considered an expert in the research field. This interview was conducted over the phone with help of the interview guide in APPENDIX B, and was ended after 15 minutes. Unfortunately the interview with the consultant did not give as valuable information, as the ones with the managers at IKEA, because the consultant had not been involved in the competition with the crowd to the extent needed for answering the questions in the interview. Therefore the interview was not included in the thesis, since it would not contribute to answering the research questions.

4.6.2.2 INTERVIEW WITH THE BROKER ORGANISATION

When having received information about that it was a lecturer at the Linnaeus University who sent out the task to the students, it was decided to conduct an interview with this person as well. Thus, the lecturer could have affected the relationship and the motivation between IKEA and the students. The questions for the specific interview are found in APPENDIX C, which also them were built of the measurements in Table 2. Operationalization about the relationship and motivation. As can be seen, the questions focused on the relationship and lecturer’s thoughts of IKEA’s and the student’s expectations to a big degree.

The interview was booked one and a half week in advance and held in the lecturer’s office at the university. It took just over 15 minutes. The lecturer had before the interview been informed about the purpose of the interview and was given some basic information about
crowdsourcing in the beginning of the interview. Valuable data was collected, which was recorded with his approval.

4.6.2.3 INTERVIEWS WITH THE PARTICIPANTS

There were five contributions sent in to IKEA, split on six students that participated in the crowdsourcing competition. After getting their contact information by the project leader at IKEA, the authors made contact with them over Facebook by sending each a private message explaining the purpose with the interview and that their contributions would be highly valuable. Each of them chose to take part in the interviews. Since all of the participants were sampled, it would not have been possible to get more respondents. However, the respondents answered the questions in a quite similar pattern, which could mean that the six respondents had a big enough level of saturation, as recommended by Marshall et al. (2013). Although, some of them came up with own valuable information, which contributed to the study. The questions of the six interviews covered the areas of relationship and motivation, and they also got to explain the outlay of the task and thoughts around that. The certain questions are to be seen in APPENDIX D. The focus was to obtain information about why they chose to participate, and what made them continue participating during the whole process.

The interviews were held during two weeks in order to match the time that suited the respondents the best. They were noticed three weeks in advance that there was going to be an interview around a certain date, and then the exact times were set in between one week of advance to only two days. Totally depending on the students, so that they would have time to answer the questions deeply and not rush through the interviews. The group of two students was split, so that all the interviews could be held one to one, face to face. However, one of the respondents was situated abroad, which made one of the interviews a telephone interview. The other interviews were held in closed group rooms in the university library, pre-booked in advance to ensure that the interview would not be disturbed by noise etcetera. The interviews took between 30 and 45 minutes and were also recorded in order to portray the data as good as possible in the empirical investigation. Moreover, because there were only six respondents they could not be guaranteed to be totally anonymous, since it would be obvious that one of them said a certain thing, even though the exact person who said it would not be revealed. Although, they were told that their names would be excluded from the thesis so that they would have the courage to speak freely about their experiences.
4.6.2.4 INTERVIEWS WITH THE NON-PARTICIPANTS

The competition was sent out to all students in the marketing program of the Linnaeus University, however, since that unit is large, the respondents were handpicked through a convenient sample from the researchers peer students on the marketing program, as suggested by Lekvall, Whalbin and Frankelius (2001) who also mean that such an approach is favourable when there is only a small amount of time and resources. That was done since it only was interesting to interview students who had read the task, therefore, people in the first, second and third year were asked if they had read the task, and if they said yes they were further asked if they would consider to participate in a 15 minute interview. Moreover, Marshall et al. (2013) argues that the sample size of a qualitative study is determined during the process of collecting the data. That is because the researchers have to decide whether the level of saturation is accomplished so that the purpose of the study could be answered (Marshall et al., 2013). Hence, in this study a total of eight students who did not participate were enough to find saturation since many of them repeated the same information as previous respondents. Further, more respondents were not considered valuable or more contributing to meet the purpose of this study.

The focus of the interviews was on why the students chose not to participate, and the questions handled the relationship with IKEA and motivation. The questions are available in APPENDIX E. The interviews were held on different quiet spots in the K-building of the Linnaeus University. Three of them were held on the spot just after asking a student if they had read the task, and five were scheduled to a time in a close future of the next day or the day after. The interviews, which also were recorded, took between ten and 20 minutes depending on how much information the non-participants wanted to share. In addition, the non-participants were told that they would be anonymous since the task was sent to a big amount of people, and it would not be possible to know who said what in the interviews.

4.7 ETHICS IN RESEARCH

Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that ethics in business research is about the roles of the values in the research process and how they can become ethical issues. Diener and Crandall (1978) have divided ethical issues in business research into four different areas, whether there is harm to the participants in the research, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy and whether deception is involved. In relation to this thesis, which involves in-depth interviews
about qualitative concepts as motivation and relationships, it is important to make sure that the respondents are not harmed, and Bryman and Bell (2011) explain this potential harm as; harm to participants development or self-esteem; stress; harm to career prospects and future employment. The harm is also connected to invasion on the respondents’ privacy, which can be avoided by having respect to the individuals’ values. In order to avoid these risks the respondents were not mentioned by name in this study, which they were informed about before they decided to participate. Deception was also avoided by informing the respondents about the purpose of the interviews before and after the interviews. They were also encouraged to asked questions before participating, if they had any, to minimize the risk of lacking informed consent. The respondents were also promised to take part of the result of this thesis when it was completed, which also ought to give credibility to the study.

4.8 ANALYSIS METHOD

After collecting the data the researchers need to code the empirical data connected to the purpose of the study, which is done in the analysis chapter (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Since this research collected qualitative data from in-depth interviews the amount of data was large, which made it challenging to present it in a clear way (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Further, since the purpose of this thesis was to describe how motivation is influenced by the relationship between an organisation and the crowd in a crowdsourcing process, it could be necessary to reduce superfluous data to understand this relationship, which Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) explain is a part of the analysis process. Moreover, in the analysis of case study evidence, particular to this thesis, the course of action can be formulated in many different ways because there are few fixed guidelines to follow (Yin, 2014). Instead it depends on the researchers’ empirical thinking, consideration of alternative interpretations and the presentation of evidence (Ibid.).

However, Yin (2014) argues for the need of a general analytical strategy which follows a cycle involving the research questions, the data, the researchers’ justified interpretation of the data and drawing conclusions and stating findings. One analysis strategy can be to use the theoretical propositions from the literature review (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009), which was the ground for the case study in the beginning of the study and served as the foundation for the research questions. Henceforth, the propositions would have shaped the collection of data and therefore given analytic priorities (Yin, 2014). In the case of this thesis
the theoretical propositions later help to structure the whole analysis, pointing out the relevant findings and to describe how they were connected, which Yin (2014) attests is a possible approach to take.

When the strategy is set, Yin (2014) further recommend the use of any of the five different analytical techniques; pattern matching, explanation building, time-series analysis, logic models and cross-case synthesis. Since time-series analysis is about on-going tracing changes over time (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and explanation building is more suitable for explanatory research (Yin, 2014), they were not applied in this thesis. The same applies for the cross-case synthesis since it is for analysing multiple cases (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004). However, the pattern matching was relevant to this thesis since the descriptive conditions were defined in line with the purpose before the data collection (Yin, 2014). Trochim (1989) explains pattern matching as a comparison between the empirical based patterns and the predicted patterns described before the collection of empirical material, further explained in the literature review and research model in this study.

Remaining, the technique logic models are also explained as a type of pattern matching since they are about matching empirically described events with theoretically predicted events (Yin, 2014). Although, it is about finding patterns by operationalizing a complex process into different stages to be able to see the cause and effect in each stage and how the stages are related (Ibid.). For this thesis a logic model is conducted in chapter 3. Research Model, showing how the crowdsourcing process is connected as a chain with the four different stages of input, process, output and outcome. In each stage the relation between the concepts relationship and motivation will be investigated to see their cause and effect relation. Put differently, to investigate what effect the interaction between the crowd and organisation will have on the motivation and eventually its cause. Yin (2014) explains that the outcome of this type of technique can help to evaluate the event, which is superior to the purpose of this study. At last, the described techniques are especially needed to handle the problems of internal validity and external validity, explained further in 4.8 Quality Criteria.

4.9 QUALITY CRITERIA

It is always important to ensure that a study is valid, reliable and solid (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, researchers have put varied emphasis on how detailed the validation should
be, where for example Lather (1991) is very exact in explaining different factors and Wolcott (1990) mean that validity in research neither guide or inform the work. Although, even Walcott (1990) address that identifying a broad perspective of critical elements in the study is important for the reader to understand, rather than being convinced, what was going on in the research. Moreover, the aim was still to define the strength and credibility in the study (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003), and the results needed to be covered with reliable and validated sources to become credible (Silverman, 2013). As a help to do so, the quality of a study is measured by the concepts of validity and reliability (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Yin, 2014). Validity basically shows whether a study investigates what it intends to investigate, and reliability shows the stability of the measurement instrument (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Hence, content, construct and external validity as well as reliability (Ibid.) was used and presented in this study to ensure the quality.

4.9.1 CONTENT VALIDITY

Content validity helps the researcher to ensure that the measures reflect the concepts investigated (Bryman and Bell, 2011). One way to raise this is to let a person with expertise or knowledge about the subject review the interview guide before interviewing the respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Hence, the content validity for this study was established by letting an expert in qualitative research and a tutor with specialization in marketing communication, both within Linnaeus University, give feedback on the interview guides and the operationalization, and recommendations for the actual interviews as well as for the coding of the collected data. This helped improving the quality of the study, since the questions were seen as relevant for answering what the study aimed to measure in line with the operationalization, according to the experts.

Pretesting is about testing the questions that will be asked in the interview to make sure that they are understandable, which also can give the researcher an indication of the outcomes of the principal interview guide (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Pre-testing an interview schedule can also provide the interviewer with more confidence gain by some experience of using it (Ibid). Bryman and Bell (2011) also suggest that a pre-test of the questions in the interview guide, with respondents equal to the targeted sample, also can strengthen the content validity. A pre-test could namely help the researchers to identify questions that could be misunderstood, and further detect if some questions are too broad (Ibid.). Pretesting an interview schedule can
also provide the interviewer with more confidence gain by some experience of using it and
could also be seen as an indication of the outcomes of the principal interview guide (Ibid.).

Therefore, pre-tests of the questions conducted for the interviews were held. The questions in
the interview guides APPENDIX A - Interview guide for the responsible project manager at
the organisation and APPENDIX B - Interview guide for a project colleague at the
organisation was conducted with an independent marketing manager from Cellbes AB, with
much knowledge and experience within crowdsourcing activities. Moreover, the questions in
the guides APPENDIX C - Interview guide for the participants and APPENDIX D - Interview
guide for the non-participants was held with two peer students in the Marketing program at
Linnaeus University. The feedback collected from these pre-tests were valuable for the real
interviews, since it lead to some changed questions both when it comes to sentence
construction and the order in which the questions were asked.

Moreover, to give the respondents a better chance of expressing themselves the interview
guides and the data collected from those respondents had to be translated to their preferred
language, in this thesis Swedish, so that the respondents would be able to fully explain their
experience of the motivation and the relationship (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, Xian
(2008) explains that in the translation process the translator interacts with the data, which
could affect the concepts and terms to be interpreted differently from its meaning. Further she
explains some main problems with translation, which had been avoided in different ways in
this research. For example the linguistic problem, which means that the researcher shall avoid
using word that has no equivalent meaning or grammatical structure in the English language.
She also adds that since the translation process indirect involves the researcher knowledge,
social background and personal experience the translation has to be as objectives possible
(Ibid.), something that the researchers were aware of and therefore avoided in this thesis.

4.9.2 CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

The construct validity of a measure means that the researcher should deduce information from
a theory that is relevant to an actual concept (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This kind of validity is
used to show the extent to which the measurement questions actually measure the presence of
those constructs they were intended to measure (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).
Although, working with the construct validity is even more important for a case study than for
any other design, since it is argued that researchers do not operationalize the concepts properly into sufficient measurements and that the researchers include subjective judgements, which conform to their personal interests (Riege, 2003; Yin, 2014). In this study, the above was ensured not to happen by having the concepts clearly operationalized, as further suggested by Gray (2009). Further Gray (2009) attests that the results could be built on the researchers’ personal impressions in a case study. Therefore, the construct validity was highly considered in this study, and maximized through the use of clear empirical measurements (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Riege, 2003; Yin, 2014). Furthermore, the questions in the interview guides were formed through the several empirical measures conducted for each relevant concept in the operationalization to provide deep understandings. This suggests that the study had multiple sources of evidence as described by Yin (2014) and Gray (2009). They further mean that researchers should provide a chain of evidence, and that key informants should review a draft from the case study report (Yin, 2014; Gray, 2009). This information was considered by letting a tutor at Linnaeus with specialization in communication review on the collected data.

Furthermore, the result of this study was the respondents’ view of how they interpreted their experience of the crowdsourcing process four months after participation. In relation to this, the researcher for this thesis where aware of the memory problems that could come with it (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Further Bryman and Bell (2011) recommends the researcher to not rely too much on stretching the respondents’ memories to the extent that the answers for many of them are likely to differ from each other. They further explain that events that happen over one year ago are with all likeliness difficult to remember for the participants and Bryman and Bell (2011) therefore recommend asking question more closely to one month back in time. The researchers for this thesis were therefore very attentive on this issue and controlled it by regularly comparing the respondents answers on question that were predicted to generate the same answer. The answers showed a clear pattern, which indicates that the respondents’ memories were sharp enough. Relative to this, Djelassi and Decoopman (2013) have also conducted in depth interviews to investigate crowdsourcing participants’ motivation towards participating after the crowdsourcing competition was finished. They thereby asked the respondents about an initial behaviour, after they had gone through the whole process (Ibid.), which also the case in this study.
4.9.3 EXTERNAL VALIDITY

The external validity deals with whether or not the study can be generalized (Bryman & Bell, 2011). When conducting a case study it would be misleading to talk about statistical generalization and analogy among a population, which is done when conducting quantitative studies (Yin, 2014). When dealing with small samples, as often in a case study like this one, the generalizability and thereby the external validity is highly affected (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Moreover, Yin (2014) means that samples from case studies are not intended to deliver statistical generalizations, instead, analytic generalizations are applied to qualitative research and Riege (2003) adds that it shows transferability.

Moreover, analytic generalization is not generalization to a defined population as in quantitative studies, but to a theory that may have a broader applicability than the particular case studied (Yin, 2014). Yin (2014) also argues that this argumentation could further be divided into two steps to follow when conducting a study. First, a researcher should show how the findings have contributed to the relation between theoretical concepts and construct. Hence, this study aimed to contribute with analytic generalizations, possibly showing a relation between motivation and the relationship theory and participation in crowdsourcing. Second, the researchers should show how the same theoretical propositions could be applied in similar situations where the same concepts and constructs might be relevant (Yin, 2014). This could allow particular findings from this study concerning IKEA to be generalized on some broader theory (Riege, 2003) and might thereby become adapted in other cases.

4.9.4 RELIABILITY

Reliability discusses if the measurements are trustworthy and consistent and in other words, if the study was made again by other researchers the results would be the same (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). Although, if the measures are considered reliable it does not always mean that they are valid for the study (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). That is why both validity and reliability is essential in research (Bryman & Bell, 2011), and to establish the reliability of a qualitative study the researcher should document the whole procedure of how the study is conducted (Ibid.). The previous is applied in this study by presenting detailed methodology, which should provide other researchers with enough information to be able to conduct the study all over again, also with another case sampled. Researchers could in such case have use for the operationalization in paragraph 4.5.4 to make the concepts measurable for their specific context, and for the interview guides in APPENDIX A to E. But even though
the researchers ensured that others could follow the exact procedures, other researches could get different outcomes (Riege, 2003). However, such a diff does not have to be negative since it could provide valuable sources of information for this specific research area (Ibid.).

4.10 SOURCE CRITICISM

Thurén (2005) define source criticism as a collection of methods to find out what is true with a source, thus to evaluate the level of reliability. A source can be described as the origin of knowledge and can either be written, verbal or physical (Ibid.). When writing a paper it is important to understand how trustworthy the sources are (Ibid.). With the help of source critical criteria it is possible to assess if a source is reliable or not (Lnu 1, 2013). In this thesis the researchers asked themselves the following critical questions, recommended by the Linnaeus University (Lnu 1, 2013), to get a deeper understanding about the source credibility:

- Is it possible to find information about the author?
- Is there a clear and relevant purpose of the source?
- Is the text reliable and is it possible to find other references in the text?
- Does the article give an unbiased view of facts?
- Was it published within the relevant timeframe?
- Is it the newest version of the article? (Lnu 1, 2013)

If the answer was yes to the six questions, the article was considered scientific and relevant to apply in the literature review. Since the majority of the sources used in the literature review are scientific articles in order to give the paper a high validity and trustworthiness, the researchers also looked for the following criteria in each article; how many times the article had been cited, if the journals behind the articles were considered scientific according to the online library directory Ulrichsweb and if it included abstract, introduction, method, and result or conclusion (Lnu 2, 2013). Only the articles that contained all these criteria were considered scientific.

Although, there are a few different kinds of scientific articles (Lnu 2, 2013). For example articles can be conceptual or theoretical and in such case; perhaps not including a methodology chapter (Ibid.). Hence, the criteria mentioned above have exceptions in this study, some of the articles that did not live up to all these goals but were still considered significant and trustworthy enough for the purpose of this study. Some articles in the literature
review are only included to attest what other, more scientific articles, argued. As an example a conference conducted by Geiger et al. (2011) was included because it attested what other research said without being the core source in the literature review. This also applies for (Rogstadius et al., 2011) conference. The literature review also includes two books Brabham (2013) and Sloane (2011). Both of the researcher are pioneers in the research filed of crowdsourcing and have conducted the books to serve as a guide for further research in the field. Therefore it is considered to have a high value and contribution to this thesis. Finally, Armstrong and Kotler’s (2011) book was also included only to define what motivation is at a basic level in the marketing literature and did therefore not have a weighty role in the review.
### 4.11 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Table 3. Summary of the methodology chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PRESENTATION OF CHOSEN PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Approach</td>
<td>- Abductive approach, objective is to discover new things, other variables and other relationships (Dubois and Gadde, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Qualitative framework, deeper and richer collection of data (Bryman &amp; Bell, 2011), Analytic generalization of theory (Yin, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>- Descriptive purpose, an accurate profile over specific situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>- Primary data, to supply the study with data that is to the point and naturally needed when investigating a new area (Bryman &amp; Bell, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>- Case study, understanding of the context and the process enacted, single case study because a case specific to a crowdsourcing process was needed, aimed to investigate the relationship between the organisation and the crowd, or sub-units, which naturally gave the study an embedded dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
<td>- Semi-structured interviews, the aim was to extract personal reasons for the decisions that the respondents took in the context of the specific case (Saunders, Lewis &amp; Thornhill, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- See Table 2. <em>Operationalization</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Five interview guides were conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>- Single case study, IKEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-probability sample, purposive sampling - people with expertise, special knowledge or experience within the investigated subject was needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Four samples, the management at IKEA, the lecturer, the participants and the non-participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics in Research</td>
<td>- Anonymity, respondents are anonymous in this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deception avoidance, informing the respondents about the purpose of the interviews before and after the interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informed consent, encouraged to asked questions before participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Method</td>
<td>- Theoretical propositions, to structure the analysis, pointed out the relevant findings and described how they were connected (Yin, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pattern matching, descriptive conditions were defined in line with the purpose before the data collection (Yin, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Criteria</td>
<td>- Content validity, to ensure that the measures reflect the concepts investigated the interview guide was reviewed before interviewing the respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Ghauri &amp; Grønhaug, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construct validity, the concepts were clearly operationalized (Gray, 2009) and a tutor reviewed the collected data (Yin, 2014; Gray, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- External validity, analytic generalization (Yin, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reliability, documented the whole procedure of how the study is conducted (Bryman &amp; Bell, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Criticism</td>
<td>- Six questions, to evaluate the level of reliability in the sources (Lnu 1, 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

This chapter includes a summarised version of the primary empirical findings from the in depth interviews and is structured with the data collected from the four different samples; the managers, the broker organisation, the participants and the non-participants. All the different aspects mentioned by the respondents were included. Finally the chapter is summarised in a table with the key findings from each sample.

5.1 DATA FROM THE MANAGERS AT THE ORGANISATION

5.1.1 THE PROJECT PROCESS

The project leader and the project colleague meant that a lot within IKEA is solved internally today, and for this project with the aim of improving the self-serving services online, they wanted to take help from external sources such as consumers. Furthermore, students at the Linnaeus University were selected as the consumers and encouraged to come with creative solutions or suggestions to add some drive. The students played a role as wildcards for the project according to the project leader, they might namely be customers and moreover they could have important input in the form of critical thinking and experiences since some of them study within the field.

Furthermore, there were three different cases in the competition, following individuals with different problems to be solved, which should have been possible to solve via instructions on the customer pages as they were at the present. When it came to the language in the instructions in the task, the project leader further argued that they only wanted the students to be clear about the purpose of the project, without putting the goal straight to them, because that according to the project leader could influence the contributing ideas to a big extent. Accordingly, they tried to be as open and unspecific as possible when constructing the task.

In addition, the project leader expressed that he hoped that it was interesting for the students during the competition when solving the task and to participate in the competition. Although, he declared that after entering the customer pages it could not have been completely clear for the students what IKEA wanted out of the competition. The total period for the students to bring up a solution was during Christmas from the 10th of December until the 20th of January. Hence, the project leader explained that more time and at a different point in time would have been better. However, the project leader estimated that it would take around four
hours for the students to solve the problems, depending on how they chose to present it. One paper was 40 pages long, and the project leader argued that it was too much and meant that they cannot handle that amount of information. He would have preferred something around two pages of text.

Accordingly, the project leader said that the students did contribute by suggesting old improvements that was already on the page. Thereby, he continued, if university students could not find certain information on the customer support pages, the question of how old people or individuals with just little computer experience would find the information. Basically, the managers meant that they got a confirmation from the students that the pages needed improvement, and the colleague added that they got quite many candidates who shared their opinions, namely six individuals and five papers handed in.

5.1.2 THE RELATIONSHIP

Moreover, the project leader said that the lecturer was a helping contact person. In the initial contact with the lecturer, the project leader meant that the lecturer was sent a draft of the task and that they with the lecturers help constructed the competition. Furthermore, the managers added that it was a lecturer from the Linnaeus University who got the mission to reach the students in the initial phase, and he did that via a class forum on the web. Furthermore, the project leader said that he himself was the contact person in case the students had any questions during the competition, and also the person to receive the contributions when sent in. Hence, the project leader’s contact information was included in the task and it was written in the instructions that if any help was needed when solving the task, they should contact him. The project leader also mentioned that he got some questions via email from two students asking about the task in the beginning of the competition, but not during the competition.

Moreover, the students did get a confirmation from the project leader about having received the ideas straight away, and then another email to the winners was sent out a couple of weeks after. The managers expressed that they hoped that the project leader had replied to every single student with information about who the winners were. Although, the project leader said that he was bad at connecting back to the students with feedback, he explained that he only confirmed that he had received the contributions. Henceforth, the persons who did not win did not get any feedback at all, and the project leader meant that even though it is not an excuse,
they had so much to do at the office, which did not leave time to give feedback. Only the winners got a little bit of comments about the main purpose on their contribution, but not in detail. However, he continued, when they come for a visit they will be able to see the new customer pages and reflect about if there are more to improve, and if they can see the changes in their ideas. He genuinely hoped that they accept that kind of feedback instead.

Furthermore, there were two groups who won, but the project leader had not yet decided a date for them to come and visit since one of the winners was in Germany for exchange studies, according to the project leader. He further said that he had to move the day a bit because they had so much to accomplish during March. Instead they were going to try to meet up during May. As stated by the project leader, the waiting when it came to the prize was because of the time frame, and a down in priority from IKEA’s side where the regular work had to continue at the side of the project.

In addition, the project leader expressed that if done again, the project would not have been executed as it was, but rather held as a workshop with the students at the university. Moreover, he said that he would definitely have worked more with direct feedback and explaining the problems specifically because of the many components to understand. In essence, he would have worked closer to the students, or at least with two-way communication in some way. Moreover, both of the managers thought that more communication would also have attracted more students to participate in the competition.

5.1.3 THE MOTIVATION

The project leader’s and the project colleague’s expectations on the competition were similar. They both expressed that they wanted to have fun and that it also was fun to introduce this type of contest. Further the project leader argued that socializing with the students was an expectation from the beginning. The project colleague further filled in that it was a fun thing to contact students and in that way doing something different. He also meant that there was no concrete goal on how many participants that there should be, but since the Linnaeus University is quite big he expected to get about twenty contributions.
Furthermore, the project colleague had a small expectation of learning something about the student thoughts and solutions. However, for the project leader it was not a drive to learn anything from the competition, although he suggested that the project could learn from it. They namely wanted publicity for the project, and when starting it up it was just a thing for IKEA in Älmhult, but it grew to leaders in IKEA all over Sweden, so that was a big drive to get publicity.

In addition, they expected to get some really crazy suggestions from the students. The project leader continued with explaining himself as being a bit crazy, and if he had participated then he would have come up with something like a presentation, which would not have been a document with different headlines. That is something he hoped that the students would do, and therefore he expressed a bit of disappointment of the level of craziness in the end. The project colleague, although, said that the participants really put great effort and energy into giving the best solutions, and that it was fun and impressive to see.

Those were the views of the expectations before the competition, but the project leader explained that the motivation around the project was changed for him personally, not towards the students at the university, but the motivation towards finishing the project since it took some steps back with not having enough time. The project colleague agreed and said that before they had the expectations that many suggestions would come in, but then it was realized that the students did not have much time during that period either. The above lead to the feeling for the managers that the competition did not live up to the initial expectations, and they both meant that they could have done better. The project leader was however satisfied with the target group of students, even though he thought that more than six contributions would reach them. Moreover, the project leader suggested that they should have communicated creativity a bit more in the task instructions, because when receiving the ideas they were very strict, like a school paper. Finally he thought that he missed out a little bit on socializing because he would have wanted to be at the university in person.

The project leader did not think that the participants’ motivation affected him in any way, but if the competition was done differently and if they would have got much more contributions then he would have been more motivated, since in such case they were able to reach many students, he said. However, the project leader does think that his motivation affected the participants’ motivation. Although, the project colleague thought the opposite. He meant that...
the participants’ motivation affected him because many individuals had been so ambitious and came up with suggestions on things all between heaven and earth, and that he thought was a big drive and triggering to see that the students had put so much time into developing these solutions.

5.2 DATA FROM THE BROKER ORGANISATION

5.2.1 THE RELATIONSHIP

The lecturer at the Linnaeus University meant that his involvement in the competition was initiated by a question via email from the project leader at IKEA, asking whether it would be possible to include a project in a course. The project was according the lecturer an open question, aiming to improve the support on IKEA’s homepage, and after some discussion via both email and telephone it was decided to make a competition out of it.

The lecturer’s assignment was moreover to send out the task to the students. He did that via the Marketing Program’s group on Facebook, for all years’ students within the marketing program at the Linnaeus University to take part of. Furthermore, it was posted on the intranet, also for all classes within the Marketing Program, and when posting it there the students should get an email to their inbox. He also said that he promoted the competition in the classrooms while lecturing. After a few weeks he explained that he also got a couple of questions from students via mail about the competition. Although, he could not answer them, which lead to redirections of the emails to the project leader. Furthermore, the lecturer expressed that there was no further contact with the students regarding the project at IKEA.

According to the lecturer, there was no communication at all between him and IKEA during competition. Furthermore, the project leader did not come back to the lecturer after the deadline of the competition, even though he said that he would. Therefore, the lecturer sent a mail to the project leader after the deadline, asking how the competition turned out. By means of the lecturer, the project leader replied that they were going to start reading the contributions, and that they had not had time to do it before, and that the project leader was going to inform the lecturer when they had a result in the competition. The lecturer further expressed that he had not heard anything after that email. Lastly, the lecturer argued that IKEA should have been better at coming back with information after the competition,
although he said that the contact they had in the initial phases of the project was of good quality.

5.2.2 MOTIVATION

The lecturer did not think that IKEA had high expectations on the competition, since he experienced that it was the first time IKEA tried this kind of competition. Instead, he thought that they were just curious to test this way of innovation and development work. Further, he believed that IKEA wanted the competition to be fun for students, for them to be creative and spontaneous. However, he guessed that their main expectations were to get interesting inputs for future solutions, and he hoped that the students could contribute with that.

In addition, the lecturer thought that IKEA wanted to see the potential among students and what they are capable of doing. Furthermore, he guessed that a big motive for IKEA was to meet the winners and look for future employees. Although, if IKEA would have wanted to socialize with the students they would have come to the university to meet them, and they did not. Moreover, IKEA should have expected to gain new knowledge, and specially to get to know something that they had not thought of in the first place, according to the lecturer.

Furthermore, when it came to the students, the lecturer thought that they see potential in working at IKEA and to get in a foot or a reference within IKEA. In addition, it should have been challenging for them to solve the problems. He also meant that the students should have found it interesting that such a big company ask for help, and the students could help with their views and previous experience. Finally, the lecturer meant that the students really should have wanted to win the meeting with IKEA. However, he said, if some of them were not interested in IKEA as an employer, they would probably not have been interested in participating either.

5.3 DATA FROM THE PARTICIPANTS

5.3.1 THE RELATIONSHIP

The participants mutually explained that the first contact they had with the competition was through the email and the post on the student intranet MyMoodle, sent out by a lecturer at the Marketing program. One participant also explained that the same lecturer promoted the competition during a lecture as a fun and good thing to place at the CV if winning. Before
choosing to participate, almost all of the participants explained that they had some kind of interaction with IKEA. Two of them worked for the company at the present, and a few emailed questions about this particular competition to the project leader, while another one asked questions to the lecturer about it. Additionally, one participant had been involved with IKEA in another student project. Moreover, two participants who had contacted IKEA before choosing to participate further explained that the reply from the company was fast and with a nice and positive tone, which motivated them to participate. However, the other participants explained that they did not have any contact with IKEA until they had solved the task and emailed it to the project leader.

Although, all of the participants explained that they contacted IKEA after the task was completed, by sending in the performed task by email. Moreover, all of the participants explained some kind of dissatisfaction with the feedback they got from IKEA. All except one of the participants did get a reply shortly after sending in the task, explaining that IKEA thankfully had received their task and that they would announce the winner in a later reply. One participant further explained that he still had not got any comments on his work or information about if there was a winner, which he would have appreciated to get. Moreover, he would have liked to take part of the winning contribution to be able to compare it with his to learn from it. Another participant also explained this unsatisfied want of comparing the solutions and further added that he sent two or three emails before he got a reply a month later saying that he was not the winner. Additionally, he declared that he thought that the communication between him and IKEA was bad and that he wanted to get feedback about his suggestions.

Furthermore, two participants, who worked together with the task, and also were crowned winners, disappointingly explained that it took long time and many emails until they knew they were the winners. Further the email explained that they were welcome to visit IKEA in the end of March, but they did not hear from IKEA until they contacted them again in the beginning of April. This time the winners made contact with the project leader on Facebook where he replied with an apologising explanation about the communication. Continually, they added that it felt like IKEA had not cared about them or the competition, and if they would have known that from the beginning they would never have participated. Furthermore, the third winner explained that there had not really been any communication between her and
IKEA. She expressed that IKEA told her that she was one of the winners, but then she had not heard from them even though she emailed them in the end of April.

One participant described IKEA as a company that is nice, kind, treat everyone as equals and that everyone always are welcome. However, now after being involved in this competition he had changed his mind about that. That was also the case for another participant that explained that he thought that the communication at IKEA was good, but that it had not been good during the competition, which proved that IKEA is not good at communication. Another participant agreed by explaining that his view of IKEA had changed and that he was surprised of how the personnel acted and how the responsible persons have handled the communication. Moreover, one participant also added that he expected IKEA to be more structured and serious, not only sending out the task through a lecturer at the university.

5.3.2 THE TASK

Three participants mutually said that they directly knew that they would like to participate in the competition, mostly because they explained IKEA as a strong brand and a future potential employer. One added that even though he did not have much communication with them, IKEA as a brand motivated him to participate in the beginning. Another one hesitated to participate because he thought the task was unclear and two others also hesitated because of the timing, since the task was during Christmas and parallel with a school assignment.

Furthermore, more than half of the participants declared that they thought the task was easy to understand. However, a few of them mentioned that some parts of the task were unclear and confusing. For example, two participants complained about the lack of instructions about the format. Two others explained that the task was too long and took a while to complete. Furthermore, one participant explained that the task did not give any directions on how deeply they should have answered, which two more participants attested by expressing that it was too broad. One participant further explained that if there are many different problems in one assignment, it is hard to know what to focus on to have a chance to win. On the other hand, the initial two participants explained that the freedom of solving a broad task was positive, although, one of them selected only one case to focus on.
In addition, three of the participants said that they first thought it was going to be simple to solve the problems, but when starting up the information search on the homepage and coming up with new ideas, the difficulty rose and they realised that it was harder than expected. On the other hand, one explained that the expectations towards the competition sank because the customer pages were complete and better than he had thought from the beginning, which also made the task more difficult.

During the process of completing the task the majority of the participants explained that they thought it was fun and stimulating to do the task. In relation to this, two participants spent about eight hours completing the task, which was more than one of the participants had planned from the beginning. Another spent one day whereas another participant spend three to four days full time. The two winners working together spend about two five-hour days per week during six weeks.

Furthermore, after completing the task many participants thought that the task was formulated and designed well for them as students. In relation to this, one participant explained that he did not know whether it was designed for him or not, because he did not get any feedback on his contribution. Some other participants thought that a clearer task would have affected their motivation to participate in a more positive way. For example, one participant reckoned that it could have been better to only including one problem, and that the person who had the best solution for that single problem should be the winner.

5.3.3 THE MOTIVATION

Most of the participants explained that they wanted to participate in the competition because the task presented was fun and challenging. In addition, many participants said that they expected to be able to test their own capabilities and knowledge by solving the task. Furthermore, some others explained that they wanted to get feedback on their solutions from IKEA, where one of them wanted the feedback as a proof of having good ideas. In relation to this, one participant who did not expect to win participated just to get feedback and learn from it. However, he was the only one saying yes when asked whether he thought that he would learn something out of the competition. Two others explained that they did not expect to learn anything out of doing the task.
Furthermore, during the time of solving the problems within the competition, most of the participants expressed that they still had fun and that their expectation about that did not change a lot. However, one participant added that if he had received feedback, he would have got something important out of it instead of just having fun solving the problems. Although, other participants thought that the experience of working with a customer service webpage at a big company like IKEA was something valuable they got out of participating. Lastly, one participant explained that she, by being involved in this competition, did according to herself actually prove that she has good ideas since she was one of the winners.

Some other participants further added that they participated because they had expectations of competing with other students. Two others added that the prize to the winner seemed to be fun, although one added that if the prize was bigger, in form of money or similar, he would put more effort into the task. Further, one participant opined that the prize could have been improved towards being clearer, which he explained could have improved his motivation to contribute. Although, one participant did not finish the task to win the prize offered in the instructions, instead he described the reason to be that he worked with a real case. One participant that worked at IKEA explained that he should have mediated seriousness about IKEA as a co-worker, and he added that he did not even care about the prize. Instead, he wanted many people to do the task to feel a drive. However, one of the winners added that getting the prize to go to IKEA Explore was something that only the co-workers and invited persons were allowed to, which made him feel special.

Furthermore, all of the participants explained that since it was a real case experience they wanted to participate to be able to interact with the company and network with the co-workers. Two participants explained this reason as the primary one for participating. One participant further explained it as a chance to visit IKEA and meet different persons to bond and create contacts for the future. Three of them also expressed that they would like to work at the company in the future, and therefore thought that this was a good way of getting contact with them. Finally, now when the competition is over one participant thought that he hopefully got some contact with IKEA out of the competition.

The majority of the participants explained that they did not really have any expectations on IKEA as a task initiator from the beginning. However, after completing the task the majority explained that their expectations did not live up to their initial expectations. Instead, all of the
participants negatively explained that they had expected to get feedback on their work and that they thought that it would have been easier to get in contact with IKEA. Although, there was one exception explaining that the expectations were met since it was fun to contribute. Three participants further explained that they think that IKEA’s lack of motivation in the end of the competition affected their motivation in a negative way, and two explained that even though it was fun they would not participate again because of the bad information. In essence, all of the participants added that more communication, feedback and information overall from IKEA would have been appreciated.

5.4 DATA FROM THE NON-PARTICIPANTS

5.4.1 THE RELATIONSHIP
There was a mix in responses from the individuals who chose not to participate in IKEA’s competition when it came to how they became aware of the competition. One individual stated that he noticed an email from a lecturer with information, another said that she saw a post on MyMoodle, and some of them got the information from a lecturer during a lecture. Moreover, all the individuals ensured that they had read the task, and some of them had read it two times because they were interested and considered participation. Further, none of the non-participants contacted IKEA or the lecturer with questions.

5.4.2 THE TASK
Moreover, the individuals had somewhat fluctuating views on the outlay of the task to solve. One individual meant for example that it was clever and well described because of the differences when it comes to the various perspectives, which motivated him a lot. Another individual thought that the task was quite motivating since it was written in the instructions that IKEA would really appreciate participation. Further, another individual explained that there were no right or wrongs, which opened up for creative thoughts.

However, one individual argued that the task was quite weak in its appearance, and that IKEA did not specify exactly what they wanted to get out of it. He continued by explaining that IKEA said that they wanted to have a better customer page online, and in that way it was hard to think of ways to solve a problem according to the individual. Moreover, one individual said that the instructions were simple to understand and that the task seemed to be challenging, but
she also meant that she was not the kind of person that came up with very creative ideas in a hand turn.

Something all the individuals had in common was that they thought that the task was too big, and one respondent estimated that it would take him at least an entire weekend, for both information search and writing, to finish the task. Someone else thought that it would take longer than the month they put out for it to solve the problems in the task, depending on how serious the person is with getting a good result. One individual said that she would not hand in something that is not perfect, and especially not since she could see herself working at IKEA. One individual further explained that it was too much to take in at once, with too many problems all over the place.

Generally speaking, one individual said, the task was too broad. And the same person meant that he has a hard time scaling down. Someone else thought that it would have been better to have only one case about the student, which was the easiest to relate to. She also thought that the text was too long, with too many different parts to be able to dig deep into one subject. On the contrary, one individual expressed that the assignment was quite narrow, and needed to become broader to open up for more creativity.

5.4.3 THE MOTIVATION

Furthermore, they all explained that they hesitated about participation in the contest. Two expressed that it was too demanding for the prize that was presented. However, the time issue was something that all respondents came back to, namely that it would take too long time to finish it. One individual also meant that if she had put herself more into the task than she did, she would have been more motivated to participate. Although, she did not give herself time to put effort into the task since she decided to prioritise the Christmas holiday in front of the competition.

Moreover, it was pointed out by two individuals that they thought that a lot of people had gotten the information about the competition, which would make it too many participants to have a chance to win the competition. There should have been a certain number of people who got the opportunity to participate, so that there would have been a chance of actually winning, according to another individual. If there would have been a bigger focus on how
many people who got this opportunity to participate in the competition, it would also have been more fun because then the participant would have felt much more competitive to beat the people in the same class.

Further, one individual explained that a combination of regular school assignments and Christmas made it hard to participate, and the prize of a day at IKEA was not good enough for it to become a priority. However, another individual said that she would have wanted a day at IKEA since it is a good prize in the form of a networking prize. Furthermore, one individual argued that participation depended on the prize, for example if a cash prize was offered for contributing it could be seen more as a big competition, and that would be motivating for her. She continued by stating that persons always have time for things they want to have time for. Finally, one participant thought that it was too much of a standard prize, and it felt like IKEA could have been more innovative and creative with the prize than they were. Another individual meant that IKEA should have more resources to give something more than a visit.

Most of the individuals expressed that they got expectations to get in contact with IKEA if they would have participated. One individual said that simple expectations such as being able to have an open dialogue via email and get response on questions from IKEA were important. He further meant that even though a person does not win it is a nice way of the company to still show appreciation for the time spent on solving the task. However, one individual said that his expectations was not to socialize with IKEA if joining the competition, because he meant that it was only the winners who could go there and interact with IKEA.

Moreover, another individual said that if IKEA would contribute with feedback, then it would be possible to learn from participation, and that would in turn also have been fun. It all would depend on the feedback. However, he continued, if many people participated IKEA would not have had time to give feedback, which would have led to the fact that if there were few participants, the competition should have been better than if there were many participants. Likewise, almost all of the individuals saw the possibility to learn something new and to try their existing skills by participating in the competition. Two individuals mentioned the opportunity to practice problem solving and critical thinking, and a third person mentioned that practicing creativeness opens up with the help of the competition. Furthermore, one individual added that it was good fun to get the opportunity to work with real life cases and to meet new people, instead of working with fictive things as in school.
Lastly, many of the individuals thought that IKEA’s motivation affected them towards participation, even though they chose not to participate in the end. One individual suggested that IKEA’s image and attitude as a big company affect in a positive way. However, one of the individuals attested that IKEA is a big company, but added that there are several big companies nowadays. He continued and said that IKEA has never been a goal to have as an employer.
### Table 4. Summary and connection of the empirical key findings about the Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL CONCEPT</th>
<th>MEASUREMENTS</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The crowdsourcing process | **Input** = the constructed task and selected crowd.  
Process = guidance, interaction and managing.  
Output = primary solutions, primary rewards  
Outcome = social and economic benefits, a mutual benefit for the crowd and organisation. | - **Input**: Marketing students at the Linnaeus University were selected because they could be customers, be critical thinking and have experiences within the field. The task was as open and as unspecific as possible to not lead the participants in any directions. It could have been clearer about how big the contributions should be.  
- **Process**: There were no interactions between them or the participants during the competition. Further they add that it could not have been clear for the students what IKEA wanted out of the competition during the performance.  
- **Output**: They got five different task solutions, some explained to be not crazy enough, too long and and few in numbers compared to their expectations. The reward was a day at IKEA, not yet given to the winners, which were two groups with total three people.  
- **Outcome**: They got a confirmation from the students that the pages needed improvement. Total six participants, explained to be a lot. |
| Relationship in crowdsourcing | Involvement, interaction and satisfaction in the different stages. | - **Input stage**: It was a lecturer from the Linnaeus University who should make the initial contact with the crowd, although the project leader at IKEA was the contact person and he got questions about the task via email from two students.  
- **Process stage**: No email from the crowd or the lecturer and therefore no interaction/involvement.  
- **Output stage**: The project leader said that he was bad at connecting the students with feedback because they had too much to do at the office. He only sent a conformation of receiving the solutions and a later email only to the winners.  
- **Outcome stage**: The winners have not been given their rewards because of the lacking time frame. The management plan to give feedback when the winners get their prize. If done again the management would be better at two-way communication and with direct feedback. |
| Motivation in crowdsourcing | Cause, achievement, social, efficacy and learning in the different stages. | - **Input**: They wanted to have fun, socializing with the students, had a small expectation of learning something about the student thoughts and solutions, although it was not a drive to learn. Further they wanted publicity for the project and expected crazy suggestions from the students.  
- **Process**: The motivation towards finishing the project was changed because of not having enough time to focus on the competition. |
Output: The solutions were funny, although not crazy enough and few in numbers compared to their expectations. If getting more contributions the project leader would have been more motivated. Although, the project colleague thought that the participants had been ambitious which were a trigger and drive for him.

Outcome: Their project grew to leaders in IKEA all over Sweden, thus it was a big drive to get publicity. Although, the competition did not live up to the initial expectations, and they both meant that they could have done better if spending more time on socialising, interacting and communicating creativity.

Table 5. A summary of the empirical key findings about the Broker organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL CONCEPT</th>
<th>MEASUREMENTS</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relationship in crowdsourcing | Involvement, interaction and satisfaction in the different stages. | **Input:** The communication between IKEA and the lecturer was good in the initial phase and both via mail and telephone. The lecturer sent the task to the students via the intranet, Facebook and promoted it in some marketing classes. He also got questions from students via mail, which he could not answer and redirected to the project leader.  
**Process:** No contact with the students or IKEA during the competition regarding the project.  
**Output:** No contact with the students after the competition. The project leader did not come back to the lecturer after deadline, which he said he would. The lecturer sent an email asking how the competition turned out and the project leader replied that they had not decided the winners and that they would come back with more information, which they have not done.  
**Outcome:** No contact with the students or IKEA regarding the outcome of the project. He thought IKEA should have been better at coming back with information after the competition. |
<p>| Motivation in crowdsourcing | Cause, achievement, social, efficacy and learning in the different stages. | The lecturer did not think that IKEA had high expectations. He guessed that their main expectations was to get interesting inputs for future solutions, and he hoped that the students could contribute with that. Further, he believed that IKEA wanted the competition to be fun for students, for them to be creative and spontaneous. He thought that a big motive for IKEA was to meet the winners and look for future employees. Although, if IKEA would have wanted to socialize with the students they would have come to meet them. The lecturer thought that the students see potential in working at IKEA and to get a reference there. He also meant that the students should have found it interesting that such a big company ask for help. Finally, the lecturer meant that the students really should have wanted to win the meeting with IKEA. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL CONCEPT</th>
<th>MEASUREMENTS</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relationship in crowdsourcing  | Involvement, interaction and satisfaction in the different stages.           | **Input:** Almost all of the participants explained that they have had some interaction with IKEA. Two worked at the company, one were involved in other school projects with them and a few others sent mails to the project leader with questions about the task. One sent a mail to the lecturer. The reply from the IKEA was fast and with a nice and positive tone, which motivated them.  
**Process:** No contact with the company or the lecturer when completing the task.  
**Output:** All the participants sent their solutions to IKEA by email and the majority got a reply thanking for their solutions and that IKEA would come back with more information about the winner later. Thereafter the response was low to absent and all of them express dissatisfaction with the communication and absent feedback.  
**Outcome:** The winners have not received their prize yet because of the lacking communication. The view of IKEA has changed to worse and one participant was surprised of how the personnel acted and how the responsible persons have handled the communication. |
| Motivation in crowdsourcing    | Cause, achievement, social, efficacy and learning in the different stages. In all the different stages. | **Input:** They thought it would be fun and challenging and they wanted to test their own capabilities and knowledge by solving the task and get feedback. The majority wanted the prize. One participant that did not want the prize instead explained that he wanted to work with a real case. Further the participants expected to interact and network with the employees at IKEA. Further, they explained IKEA as a strong and nice brand and a future potential employer.  
**Process:** The majority though it was fun and stimulating to do the task and some explained that it was harder than expected. Further, their expectation about the competition did not change a lot during completing it.  
**Output:** The majority explained that their expectations on the competition did not live up to their earlier expectations. Instead all of the participants negatively explained that they had expected to get feedback and better contact with IKEA. Although, one participant’s expectations were met since it was fun to contribute and work with a big company like IKEA. Some explained that if the prize was bigger and clearer they would have put more effort to it. Although a winner explained that he will feel special by getting the prize.  
**Outcome:** IKEA’s lack of motivation in the end of the competition affected their motivation in a negative way, and two explained that even though it was fun they would not participate again because of the bad information. The competition partly destroyed one participant’s picture of IKEA as a company. |
Table 7. A summary of the empirical key findings about the Non-Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL CONCEPT</th>
<th>MEASUREMENTS</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship in crowdsourcing</td>
<td>Involvement, interaction and satisfaction in the different stages.</td>
<td>- <strong>Input:</strong> They got information about the competition through the intranet, email and in their classes. No one of the non-participants contacted IKEA or the lecturer with questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in crowdsourcing</td>
<td>Cause, achievement, social, efficacy and learning in the different stages.</td>
<td>- <strong>Input:</strong> They explain that it could be fun to put oneself into IKEA’s problems within the organization, as a real life scenario. Further, there were no right or wrongs, which opened up for creative thoughts. In relation, the non-participants got expectations to get in contact with IKEA and feedback if they would have participated. Almost all of the individuals saw the possibility to learn something new and to try their existing skills by participating. Additionally, many of the individuals thought that IKEA’s motivation affected them towards participation because of IKEA’s image and attitude, even though they chose not to participate. <strong>Thus they thought the task was too big, too broad and too time consuming compared with the prize that was presented. The number of participants the competition was sent out to was also unclear.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. ANALYSIS

This chapter contains an interpretation and pattern matching of the empirical findings in relation to the theoretical concept. The structure of the analysis follows the three research questions for this thesis, with the aim of answering them. Hence, the analysis is therefore divided into three parts; The relationship during the crowdsourcing process, The motivation during the crowdsourcing process, which finally is brought together in the last part, The relationship’s influence on the motivation.

6.1 THE RELATIONSHIP DURING THE CROWDSOURCING PROCESS

6.1.1 INPUT

The organisation explained that they picked students as the crowd partly because they assumed that the students already were customers at the organisation. Interpreted, this could mean that the organisation assumed that the crowd have had some kind of interaction and involvement, thus a relationship (Payne & Frown, 2005; Vargo & Lusch, 2008), with them from before the competition. Moreover, to have a relationship with the crowd from the beginning should have given the organisation a preferable start, since relationships foster satisfied and loyal customers (Yang & Peterson, 2004). Henceforth, this could also be attested with empirical findings, explaining that the majority of the participants namely have had some kind of interaction with the organisation before deciding to participate in the competition in the initial input stage. Some of the participants even had contact with the organisation before the competition through work experience and other student assignments. This indicated that the level of interaction between the two actors in the relationship was, and had been, higher compared to the other participants and specifically the non-participants. Additionally, the non-participants and organisation did not interact with each other at all before or in the input stage and it could therefore be assumed that they might not be customers at the organisation as predicted by the organisation, which naturally explain that they did not have a relationship. However, even though the non-participants could have been customers, the low or absent level of interaction explained indicated that they did not have a relationship with the organisation.
Moreover, a higher level of interaction and involvement between the organisation and the crowd in crowdsourcing could be argued to strengthen the bonds in a relationship, which is a sign for a strong relationship with satisfied consumers (Moreau & Herd, 2010). Moreover, the email contact that occurred between the participants and the organisation also ought to have given a higher level of interaction and involvement, which could have affected the relationship in a positive direction and strengthened the bond. Hence, the relationship between the organisation and the participants that had contact with the organisation in the input stage ought to have been good.

Moreover, according to the organisation, the initial contact with the crowd was taken care of by the lecturer, the broker organisation, but at the same time the project manager at the organisation was the contact person for the competition. To have two different contact persons from two different organisations could have confused the crowd to not know whom to contact. Additionally, this is attested by a participant explaining that it was unserious of the organisation to use a broker organisation to take care of the communication. Connected to this, the broker organisation in this crowdsourcing process, explained that he got questions from the crowd that he could not answer and that he instead had to redirect the emails to the project manager. Henceforth, this ought to have strengthened the fussiness, about who to contact, which could have lowered the level of interaction and involvement with the organisation, and accordingly affected the relationship in a negative way. In relation to this, it is also important to have a clear task for the crowd to perform (Sloane, 2011), which in this case ought to be lacking which could also have been an affecting factor to the absent level of interaction in the next process stage.

6.1.2 PROCESS

During the process stage, when completing the task, there were no signs of interaction or involvement from the crowd, the organisation or the broker organisation’s side. This ought to have affected the relationship between them in a negative way during the process stage. Hence, crowdsourcing should involve the management of a community to elicit the community’s knowledge and skill sets (Saxton, Oh & Kishore, 2013) and this should be done by guiding and coordinating the crowd in the process stage (Sloane, 2011). Moreover, this interplay between crowd and organisation is crucial for co-creation crowdsourcing processes, something that has been non-existent in this crowdsourcing stage. Further, this could have
affected the crowd to interpret the task in the wrong way, which the empirical findings also attest when the project manager estimated that the solutions to the task would be about two pages and take around four hours to complete. Whereas the participants spent at the minimum one day to maximum 60 hours, and were up to 40 pages long. Further the organisation added that it could not have been clear for the crowd what the organisation wanted out of the competition during the performance. Hence, this lack of interaction along with different expectations ought to have affected the quality of their work, and the relationship negatively in the following stages.

6.1.3 OUTPUT
Moreover, even though the empirical findings explain that the level of interaction increased from the process stage to the output stage, the communication did not seem to be enough to improve the damages on the relationship created in the previous stage. Further, in the output stage the potential solutions should be given to the organisation and correspondingly the potential rewards to the crowd (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012). Relative to this, the empirical findings explained that the organisation received the potential solutions by email from the crowd. However, it could be said that the crowd did not get their expected rewards, since they did not get any feedback on their solutions. This could be attested by the organisation explaining that they had too much to do at the office, which did not leave them time to go through the participants’ work, communicate with them and provide feedback. Further, the winners had not got their prize either, which again point out the low involvement from the organisation. Thus, the lack of interaction from the organisation’s side in the output stage ought to again have affected the consumer satisfaction in an even more negative way compared to the process stage, hence the relationship as well. This could be attested by the empirical findings from the crowd, explaining their frustration about not getting any reply on their email and that it took too long time to get any information, which affected the trustworthiness towards the competition negatively.

The lack of interaction from the organisation’s side was also explained by the broker organisation in the output stage, which also ought to have affected their relationship in a negative way. This could be attested by the broker organisation explaining that in the beginning he was happy about the initial communication with both telephone and email contact, but this changed to disappointment because of the non-response by email from the
organisation. Hence, this proves that the relationship changed relative to the lower level of interaction, and further how crucial involvement and interactive communication is for a relationship to work (Payne & Frow, 2005).

6.1.4 OUTCOME
Furthermore, the interplay that should have occurred between the organisation and the crowd in the process and output stage should correspondingly have ensured a mutually beneficial outcome for the organisation and the crowd in the outcome stage (Brabham, 2013). However, since this interplay has been absent during most of the crowdsourcing process, it can be argued to be reflected in the outcome of the crowdsourcing activity. Additionally, since the crowd had not gotten their rewards, and some had not even got a reply on their emails, the outcome for them could be argued to be little or even non-existent. Whereas the organisation ought to have got an outcome, attested by the empirical findings explaining that the organisation got a confirmation from the participants that the pages needed improvement. Even though it was explained to not be as good as expected. Moreover, the lower level of interaction and involvement ought to have minimized the co-created value (Zwass, 2010) in the outcome stage.

In addition, some participants’ thoughts of the organisation seemed to have changed in a negative direction during the crowdsourcing process because of the lacking relationship. The empirical investigation demonstrated this with one participant who from the beginning thought that the communication at the organisation was good, but since it had not been good during the competition, it proved to him that the organisation is not good at communication. Another participant agreed by explaining that his view of the organisation had changed and that he was surprised of how the personnel acted and how the responsible persons handled the communication. In relation to the outcome of the crowdsourcing activity, this can negatively affect the organisation socially and economically in the future. Hence, this declared what impact the relationship could have on a crowdsourcing activity and expressed how important it is to have a working relationship.

However, critique about crowdsourcing explain that maintaining a working relationship throughout the duration of a project is a challenge with crowdsourcing (Marjanovic, Fry & Chataway, 2012), which was visualized clearly in this crowdsourcing competition. Although,
the organisation seemed to be aware of the lacking interaction and involvement in the crowdsourcing process, seen in retrospect. Moreover, this was attested by the empirical findings declaring that both of the managers thought that more communication would have attracted more participants to participate in the competition. Furthermore, the project manager explained that he would have liked to work closer to the crowd, or at least with more two-way communication. Moreover, that ought to have explained that the organisation knew that it is important with interaction in a relationship (Payne & Frow, 2005). However, their behaviour in the whole crowdsourcing process could indicate that they did not know how important it is, and further what affect the outcome could have on the competition.

6.2 THE MOTIVATION DURING THE CROWDSOURCING PROCESS

6.2.1 INPUT

CAUSE MOTIVATION

The organisation expressed in the input stage that they expected to have fun during the project. Moreover, the level of feeling enjoyment by participating in a crowdsourcing process (Nambisan & Baron, 2009; Brabham, 2010) is an intrinsic motivation factor (Hars and Ou, 2002). Further, that showed that the management at the organisation was partly motivated by the cause since motivation came from a genuine interest (Zwass, 2010). The crowd also expressed expectations of having fun when completing the task, which visualized that they also were trigged by intrinsic motivation factors from the cause. In addition, the broker organization thought that the organisation wanted the competition to be fun for the crowd, for them to be creative and spontaneous, which ought to have been well connected with how they actually experienced the task.

Accordingly, one non-participant explained that there were no rights or wrongs when it came to the instructions of the task, which opened up for creative thoughts which in turn enhanced enjoyment of contributing (Nambisan & Baron, 2009; Brabham, 2010). In relation, this further attested that cause and intrinsic factors motivated the crowd (Sloane, 2011; Zwass, 2010). Moreover, the crowd should be motivated to see improvement in something of personal interest (Sloane, 2011), which could be done by practicing problem solving, critical thinking and creativeness. This could also be attested by the empirical findings explaining that the crowd mentioned the opportunity to practice problem solving, critical thinking and creativeness, which also are drivers for crowds to participate in crowdsourcing (Howe, 2011).
Further, participants should have had the opportunity of satisfying those needs, including *spontaneity* by the participant who chose to only solve one of the three cases because she felt that the task would have been too broad otherwise. If all the non-participants had been as spontaneous as that participant, perhaps a bigger part of the crowd would have participated in the crowdsourcing process. Because most of the respondents mentioned that the task was too big and would take too long to accomplish.

Furthermore, by means of the empirical chapter, the organisation chose to select students as the crowd in the competition for the project in order to get *creative* solutions or suggestions. The organisation could by that have meant that if the students were going to come up with creative solutions, which contributed to the project of improving the customer pages, they could further have added *cause motivation* for the organisation towards the project. However, it only ought to be so if the crowd was motivated enough to contribute, and the motivation should partly have come from the organization itself (Zwass, 2010), which did not go hand in hand with the organisations thoughts about the crowd automatically sharing their creativity.

**SOCIAL MOTIVATION**

In addition, in this case a *broker organization* was used as a help to reach the crowd in the *input stage*, and thereby also to promote the competition to motivate the crowd to participate. Moreover, the broker organisation promoted the competition in the classrooms while *lecturing*, which could have had a positive effect on the crowd’s motivation, because one non-participant expressed that the broker organisation that posted the competition was motivated and wanted everyone to join. However, one participant expressed that the organisation was expected to be more structured and serious, and not sending out the task through a lecturer at the *University*. The lecturer could not answer the questions he got, which lead to redirections of the emails to the project manager at the organisation anyway. It is important for organisations to understand the consumers *motives* to be able to meet the needs (Armstrong and Kotler, 2011), and it was clear in the empirical investigation that the crowd in this case would have wanted direct *contact* with the organisation, hence *social motivational factors*, so perhaps it was not a good choice to add the lecturer in the specific process. Instead the management at the organisation could have gone to the University and explained the task thoroughly, because *social motivations* for crowdsourcing are to *meet new people, socializing and strengthening ties with others* (Brabham, 2012; Nambisan & Baron, 2009), as attested by one participant and the organization.
THE TASK

As explained by the organisation and the crowd in the empirical investigation, there were three different cases in the competition. However, the task in crowdsourcing should be *small, simple* and *fun enough to fit into a participant’s spare time* to get many participants (Sloane, 2011). Although, as attested by both the participants and the non-participants, the task was too big to motivate the crowd. In other words, many of the participants stated that the task was too long and that it took a while to complete, or that it was too broad to know what to focus on in order to perform according to their own standards. Furthermore, it was suggested by the crowd to cut the task into just one case to make it smaller, which should have been good since an organisation should break the task down into the *smallest manageable components* to get participation (Sloane, 2011). Anyhow, making it *smaller* was also seen as an indication of the task being too demanding. In essence, the task did not ought to have motivated the crowd as much as it could have done if it was smaller.

The task also have to be *simple* in its appearance to motivate the crowd to participate (Sloane, 2011), however, there were split opinions about the difficulty both when it came to the organisation, the participants and the non-participants’ views. This diversity of opinions also attested that people are motivated by different things and perceive *challenges* differently, and further are triggered differently by the intensity of *achievement* and *learning motivations* (Brabham, 2012). The organisation meant that the task should have been possible to solve via instructions on the customer pages as they were at the present. However, the management did not want to influence the crowd with putting the goal straight to them, which ought to have led to that a few of the participants mentioned that some parts of the task were unclear and confusing.

Although, more than half of the participants declared that they thought the task was easy to understand, attested by one of the non-participants. Such a statement was positive because it meant that the task had a *simple* appearance and that it woke *cause motivations* among the crowd. However, one of them meant that it was hard to think of ways to solve a problem with such weak instructions. Although, to sum up it shows that it was the organisation’s intentions to have a broad and unspecified task, but it was not appreciated by most of the crowd, which ought to have had negative effects on the motivation to participate and to do well in the competition.
ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

Henceforth, the negative effect on participation was shown in the low number of only six contributions out of the many students within the three-year Marketing Program. As mentioned earlier, the crowd have to be motivated by the company in order to get many participants that are willing to contribute (Zwass, 2010), but as seen that was not the case, or at least not enough, in this crowdsourcing process. Some participants expressed an issue when it came to the number of individuals in the invited crowd to participate in the competition. They thought there would be many who participated and expressed that their chances of winning the prize was small, which showed traces of extrinsic behaviour because they even hesitated on participating themselves if they only had small chances of winning (Zwass, 2010; Hars & Ou, 2002). Furthermore, this meant that they really wanted the prize, which showed that their motivation was fuelled by achievement (Hars & Ou, 2002). However, one participant said that it would be fun to know if it only were people in his class who could participate, because then he would have found it exciting to compete with the students in his class. When having a drive to compete with others it is also achievement motivation (Sloane, 2011).

Further, it is critical to start with the right incentives to get many participants (Sloane, 2011). The managers meant that they offered incentives just by the brand, and the fact that people want to be connected to the organisation, which the crowd also attested by explaining that the organisation was a brand that they had high thoughts of. At the same time the organisation promised a prize to the winners, which consisted of a visit to the organisation for one day. Those incentives were examples of extrinsic motivation factors because they offered something in return for the crowd’s contributions (Zwass, 2010; Hars & Ou, 2002). Furthermore, being connected with the organisation as a reward for contributing was seen as an achievement motivation to participate because it would lead to visibility that they could get from employees at the organisation (Hoyer et al., 2010). The expectations from the participants, and also mentioned by non-participants, was partly to advance one’s career (Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012) by handing in valuable contributions, which meant that the crowd also expected achievement rewards for participation. The prize to the winners could also be explained as an achievement reward, appreciated by some participants who mentioned that they would get in contact with the organisation when participating.
However, if monetary rewards are absent as in this case, it is argued that reputation gains may explain individuals’ contribution behaviour (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). One participant said that he did not at all participate to get the prize because he already was an employee at organisation. Instead, he was motivated by another kind of achievement since he expected status and publicity out of participation (Sloane, 2011) by showing the organisation what he was capable of doing and that he cared about the organisation. In such case it is said that feedback from the organisation is a main reputation builder because it could be a reflection of the their perception of the participant’s performance (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012), and the same participant equally mentioned that he expected to get feedback in return. Further, the organisation also explained they wanted publicity within the organisation for the project that they worked with, which attested that they correspondingly were motivated by achievement factors.

**LEARNING MOTIVATION**

Moreover, the project manager at the organisation did not expect to learn anything by working with the competition, however, crowdsourcing should open up opportunities to use existing skills towards a goal and at the same time learn new things (Sloane, 2011). That was more expected by the project colleague who said that he expected to learn about the crowd’s thoughts and different solutions. In addition, both the participants and the non-participants said to a big extent that they wanted to challenge themselves and test their skills (Brabham, 2012) if participating. The feeling of challenging oneself towards a difficult task increase motivation (Brabham, 2012), which should have been the case for the crowd. However, since the organization only conducted this competition for the crowd as wildcards for the project, it could have been that the organization did not feel that they had a challenging and difficult task in front of them (Brabham, 2012). Such a thought could have lowered the motivation for the organization.

Furthermore, all the participants mentioned that they expected feedback (Sloane, 2011) on their contributions, and the learning and strive towards a goal is measured partly by receiving feedback on the contribution from the organisation (Cheung et al., 2009). Additionally, that was attested by one participant who said that he wanted the feedback in order to learn from mistakes, and another one of them wanted feedback as a proof of having good ideas. These were all examples of learning motivations towards participation (Sloane, 2011). Moreover, a non-participant filled in and said that if the organisation would contribute with feedback, then
the participant would learn from participation, and that would in turn also have been fun. That point in the direction that it was fun to learn new things, which further could be drawn to the fact that if the organisation handed out feedback on the contributions, the competition would have been more fun to participate in. It could also be seen there that learning motivations could lead to cause motivations if the crowd enjoys learning new things.

**SOCIAL MOTIVATION**

Moreover, to socialize with the organisation could also be interpreted as social motivation factors, since meeting new people and contributing to a collaborative effort could also motivate the crowd to participate (Brabham, 2012). Further the organisation also expressed that they wanted to socialize with the crowd, which also attested that they were motivated by social factors. One participant further described the organisation as a company that is nice, kind, treat everyone as equals and that everyone always are welcome. These characteristics could be explained as personalities, which could fit as social identities for the crowd. Hence, this could be connected with a social motivation of feeling as a part of the organisation.

Moreover, two participants who had contacted the organisation before choosing to participate further explained that the reply from the company was fast and with a nice and positive tone. Hence, that should have motivated the participants further towards participation since the quicker a company responds to an individual’s ideas, the more likely it fulfils the individual’s sense of belonging. Hence, fulfilling the social motivational factors, which thereby encourage continued participation in crowdsourcing (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). If the respond from the organisation instead would have been slow or even non-existing, it would not have been likely that the participants actually would have participated in the competition, since delays in responses has negative effects on motivation (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012).

**A COMBINATION OF THE FOUR FACTORS**

Moreover, one non-participant mentioned a genuine interest and thereby cause motivation, by arguing that the task could not have been more fun for him, since he liked the areas of web and support. He therefore considered participation on the grounds of intrinsic motivation factors such as acting creatively within an area of interest to enhance enjoyment (Nambisan & Baron, 2009). He further meant that he saw the possibility to learn more about support pages online, and to try his skills, which both connect to the fact that learning was one motivation for him. Furthermore, he talked about that the task felt hard for consumers to solve, and that was also seen as a learning motivation (Sloane, 2011) to challenge oneself with a difficult
task (Brabham, 2012). However, he continued by stating that the prize would definitely be worth the effort to solve the task. That shows that the same person also was motivated by extrinsic factors and the achievement of getting a prize for contributing (Sloane, 2011). Moreover, he said that it was a networking prize and therefore a good prize, which meant that he should have been partly motivated to participate because he could gain status and publicity (Sloane, 2011) of networking with the organisation. In addition, the same non-participant mentioned that he wanted to socialize with the organisation, thus social motivation. Hence, the above showed that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors (Zwass, 2010) were present when the individual decided whether to participate in the competition or not, as well as the more narrow factors of cause, achievement, social and learning (Sloane, 2011).

It was shown that the organisation offered mostly achievement motivators for the effort of contributing, and if there are high achievement motivations in a crowdsourcing competition they could make the social motivations fade (Sloane, 2011). However, even though the social motivations faded, there were still other motivation factors to motivate towards participation. What the non-participants expressed was that they did not have enough time, but would have participated in the competition if the size of the task would have been smaller and easier, without that much research and creative work needed to solve it, or simply if the organisation would have changed the deadline to the middle of the spring. This showed that even though a person has a lot of motivation, it is vital to keep the task simple and break it down into the smallest manageable components to get participation (Sloane, 2011).

Moreover, the crowd expressed that their main expectation was to get in contact with the organization, and some of them mentioned that they wanted an advantage in future recruitment processes. Since they thought that that was the main expectation, it should also have had a sufficient intensity which in turn would have created enough motives for the crowd to continue participating in the competition (Armstrong & Kotler, 2011). However, the non-participants who did not reach the process stage of the crowdsourcing competition ought to have lacked the motives because of insufficient intensity of the need towards creating contact with the organisation (Armstrong & Kotler, 2011). This was further pointed out by the broker organisation, which thought that the individuals in the crowd who did not choose to participate should not have felt a strong desire towards working at the organisation. However, the non-participants themselves said that they wanted to get in contact with the organisation, although, perhaps not as much as the ones who chose to participate.
6.2.2 PROCESS

SOCIAL MOTIVATION

During the process when the participants worked on their solutions they did not have any contact with either the organisation or the broker organisation, and no such expectations was brought up neither. Although, this visualized that there was no improvement when it came to social motivations for participation, instead, the social motivation ought to have been worse than in the input stage, since some of the participants had some contact with the organisation at first. Moreover, even though it was not expected by the crowd, social motivation is important to increase and further stimulate participants to stay active in the crowdsourcing process for a longer duration (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). Furthermore, guidance and made to feel a valued part of the organisation is a part of the compensation, as an incentive for the crowd to continue the participation in the competition (Sloane, 2011). In such way, since interaction was non-existing in the process stage, the social motivation ought to have decreased the participants’ motivation towards finishing the task.

CAUSE & LEARNING MOTIVATION

Furthermore, most of the crowd who participated thought that the task was fun and stimulating to solve, and that their expectations about that did not change a lot, which pointed out that they still were motivated by the cause (Sloane, 2011). Moreover, the empirical investigation suggested that the task was both hard and easy, and that it felt easy in the beginning, but that there was more to it than expected from the beginning. That meant that the task was challenging for the crowd, and that they really had to use their skills to come up with solutions. Then again cause motivations were shown, together with motivations of learning.

6.2.3 OUTPUT

CAUSE MOTIVATION

When having received the crowd’s contributions in the output stage of the competition, the organisation thought that the ideas were fun and impressive, although not crazy enough, too long and few in numbers compared to their expectations. Therefore, just as explained by the managers themselves, the organisation’s expectations were not met compared to the initial ones in the competition. Furthermore, that showed that the organisation’s cause motivation was negatively affected because they had expected the crowd to be more creative and spontane (Howe, 2009). Moreover, the management’s achievement and learning motivation
could also have been reduced since they expected to get more solutions (Sloane, 2011) and to learn about the crowd’s thoughts.

**CAUSE & LEARNING MOTIVATION**

Another example of reduced learning motivation was from the crowd’s view, where one participant explained that he did not know whether the task was designed for him or not after completing it. Because he did not get the opportunity to measure his skills since he did not get any feedback on his contribution (Cheung et al., 2009). Henceforth, that could be connected to cause motivation, because people partly participate in these kinds of competitions to satisfy needs like problem-solving (Howe, 2009). However, as shown above, since no feedback was provided by the organisation, the crowd had a hard time knowing whether they actually solved the problem for the organisation. If the management would have given feedback the crowd could have enhanced the sense of pride for their creative contributions (Etgar, 2008). In turn, that should have improved the cause motivation because pride improves the feeling of enjoyment towards participation (Nambisan & Baron, 2009).

**SOCIAL MOTIVATION**

Correspondingly, the majority of the crowd explained that their expectations on the competition did not live up to their earlier expectations either. The social motivations were another part of the expectations that were not lived up to, because the crowd wanted a better contact with the organisation (Sloane, 2011). That could also be connected to the low level of feedback since the interactions that come with the feedback trigger the social motivational factors (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). However, the winners of the competition mentioned that they hoped to get contact with the organisation since their prize was to go and visit them at the office. Hence, the social motivation of the crowd who did not win ought to have been decreased, while the social motivation of the winners had not yet increased but could have increased in the future when receiving their prize. Moreover, the person who expressed that his social identity matched the organisation’s identity also ought to have changed towards not matching at all after participation. That was another proof of that the social motivational factors decreased in the output stage.

**ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION**

Moreover, some explained that if the prize had been bigger and clearer described, they would have put more effort into solving the problems. That indicated that the crowd was driven by extrinsic rewards, and achievement motivation. Although, one of the winners explained that he would feel special by getting the prize since not everyone had the opportunity to
experience the same things as he would. That pointed in the direction towards *extrinsic* behaviour and *achievement motivation*, because he ought to got more *status* by such a reward (Sloane, 2011). Although, it could also have meant that he felt special in the aspect of feeling *pride* of his accomplishments, which instead is an example of *intrinsic* behaviour and *cause motivation* (Etgar, 2008).

6.2.4 OUTCOME

**ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION**

It was shown in the empirical investigation that the organisation strived for an *outcome* driven by *achievement motivators*. They namely expected to get a *solution* to their problems, and they offered *extrinsic rewards* in form of visits to the head office for the winners (Sloane, 2011; Zwass, 2010). Furthermore, the organisation mentioned that their project grew to leaders in the organisation all over Sweden, thus it was a big drive to get *publicity* and *status* (Sloane, 2011). Although, the competition did not live up to their initial expectations, in terms of the number of participants and the quality of the contributions from the crowd. Since they focused on the *extrinsic motivators*, they would have needed a *cash-prize* to motivate the crowd to participate to a bigger extent, and that would also have improved the *quality* of the contributions (Rogstadius et al., 2011).

**A COMBINATION OF THE FOUR FACTORS**

However, the organisation meant that they could have done better if spending more time on socialising, interacting and communicating creativity through the process. Which showed a drive towards spending more effort towards *intrinsic factors* such as *cause* and *social motivators* (Zwass, 2010; Sloane, 2011). If that had been adapted to a sufficient extent, a cash-prize would probably not have been needed because most of the crowd expressed that they wanted to get in *contact* with the organisation and having *fun* during the process. Correspondingly, that is *social* and *cause motivation* (Sloane, 2011). Although, in such case feedback from the organisation is a main *reputation builder* to cover the *achievement motivation* among the crowd, because feedback could be a reflection of the company’s perception of the crowd’s performance (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). If feedback would have been provided, the *learning motivations* would also have been triggered, which would have caught all different motivation factors towards participation in crowdsourcing. Having all motivation factors represented ought to have attracted many participants as well, because a crowd’s motivation for participation in crowdsourcing is diverse, and no single motivator is
prominent for all tasks (Brabham, 2012; Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012).

Henceforth, one participant explained that even though it was fun they would not participate again because of the bad information. That ought to have explained that the outcome was not mutually beneficial, because if so they would probably have wanted to participate again (Brabham, 2013). Finally, the competition partly destroyed some participants’ pictures of the organisation, which further pointed in the direction that the organisation have to have a clear understanding of the crowd’s motivation to accomplish a good crowdsourcing competition with a mutual outcome for both parties (Sloane, 2011).

6.3 THE RELATIONSHIP’S INFLUENCE ON THE MOTIVATION IN THE CROWDSOURCING PROCESS

6.3.1 INPUT

Even before the input stage the participants explained that they had a relationship with the organisation, which ought to have affected the crowd’s motivation. In other words, the relationship seemed to have worked as a motivational factor to participate. Moreover, the relationship showed that they had some kind of tie to the organisation, and the social motivational factors are partly trigged by strengthening ties with others and socializing (Nambisan & Baron, 2009). Thus, that ought to have made the crowd want to participate in the input stage. In addition, having a relationship with the organisation before the competition could have been a fuelling factor for cause motivations in terms of wanting to see improvement in something of personal interest (Sloane, 2011). Hence, they ought to have had a personal interest in the organisation if they had a former relationship with them. Thus, both the two intrinsic motivational factors could be said to have affected the former relationship between the organisation and the crowd in a positive direction.

Although, the extrinsic motivational factors also seemed to have been affected by the former relationship in the case of achievements such as advancing one’s career (Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012). Relative, some respondents in the crowd namely explained in the input stage that they would like to work for the organisation in the future, which ought to have been based on their preconceptions of the company that should have
come along with the former relationship. Hence, this seemed to affect the crowd to be motivated by the *prize* of visiting the company and meeting the co-workers in person.

Moreover, the former relationship between the organisation and the crowd ought to have affected the organisation’s motivation as well. The empirical investigation explained that the organisation thought that the crowd were customers at the organisation, which ought to have triggered *social motivational factors* of wanting to strengthen their *bonds* with them. Thus, focusing on maintaining a strong customer relationship helps an organisation to get *satisfied* and *loyal* customers (Yang & Peterson, 2004). Consequently, such actions would also have improved the organisation’s *economic* and *competitive* position in their market (Yang & Peterson, 2004), which could be linked to *extrinsic motivational factors* as achievement. Formulated differently, the organisation seemed to have been affected indirectly by the *financial rewards* they could gain by maintaining the *relationship* with the crowd.

Furthermore, it could be said that the relationship was positive in the input stage among the participants and the organisation because the *interaction* and *involvement* was high. That could clearly be argued to have reflected the *motivation* in a positive direction in the input stage. Further, that was attested by the participants explaining that the fast reply form the organisation motivated them to participate. On the contrary, the level of interaction could also partly explain why the non-participants did not participate. Thus, the absence of interaction between them and the organisation in the input stage could be said to not give them the *social motivation* to participate.

Moreover, many of the non-participants explained that they did not participate in the crowdsourcing competition because they experienced the task as unclear and confusing. Henceforth, if the organization would have *interacted* and been more *involved* with the crowd in the input stage this could have made the task more clear for these participants, because more interaction tend to give more *motivation* and also better quality in the contributions (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012). Moreover the low level of interaction and unclear task ought to affect the crowd’s chances of winning the competition to get the *prize*, explained in the empirical investigation. This, ones again could have affected the *achievement motivational factors* in a negative way.
Further, the interaction that the crowd had with the broker organisation ought to have worsened the relationship between the crowd and the organisation. Moreover, it did not trigger the social motivational factors of socializing with the organisation, which is needed in a crowdsourcing process (Sloane, 2011). Moreover, even though different motivational factors motivate different people (Brabham, 2012) it was shown that without an interactive and involving relationship, none of these factors ought to be strong enough to get people motivated enough to participate or to keep the motivation stable and positive during the following three stages.

6.3.2 PROCESS
As already described, the interaction between the organisation and the crowd was absent in the process stage, which ought to have had an impact on the crowd’s motivation in the future two stages, output and outcome. The reason of this ought to have been the relationship’s and the motivation’s dynamic relations. Described more in detail, if the interaction was high, the relationship could normally be explained as positive, which ought to have affected the motivation in a positive way, attested by the relation in the input stage. Correspondingly, if the interaction and involvement was low, the relationship could have been affected in a negative way, which ought to have affected the motivation in a negative way.

Moreover, being guided by the organisation could also be described as a part of the compensation in crowdsourcing, in other words being a motivational factor for crowd participation (Sloane, 2011). Furthermore, since that guidance was absent for the crowd it ought to have affected their already minimized social motivational factors in a negative way. Hence, as mentioned before, the process stage in this crowdsourcing activity did not contain socialization. However, reversed it could be said that the organisation’s motivation in the process stage affected their level of interaction and involvement with the crowd. As already explained the empirical findings declared that the organisation did not have time to be involved in the competition due external priorities. In relation, even though the crowd explained that their motivation were not changed or affected by the organisation in the process stage, the absent level of interaction in the stage ought to be the leading factor and precursor for the lack of motivation.
6.3.3 OUTPUT

Moreover, it was a clear change in both the relationship and the motivation among the respondents in the output stage. After the crowd had sent in their contributions the interaction and involvement from the organisation’s side were low, which naturally damaged the social motivational factors. In relation to this, the crowd’s expectations of getting feedback to learn from their contribution, the learning motivational factors, ought to have been affected in a negative way. Hence, a delay in responses of feedback has negative effects on motivation (Chen, Marsden & Zhang, 2012; Morrison & Bies, 1991). Moreover, the learning motivational factors seemed to be depending on the relationship because learning is partly measured by receiving feedback on the contributions from the company (Cheung et al., 2009). Thus, some kind of interaction was needed to receive the feedback. This was also attested by the broker organisation explaining his disappointment of not getting feedback from the organisation in the output stage, which demonstrated the lack of interaction that affected the relationship in a negative way.

Even though the lack of feedback ought to be the major disappointment for the crowd’s motivation, the other three motivational factors also seemed to have been affected by the lack of interaction and involvement in this stage. The achievement motivational factors naturally went down since the crowd did not receive their rewards. Therefore, it appeared that their motivation was damaged. The winners’ motivation also ought to have been influenced by other negatively impacted motivation factors described earlier due to the lacking relationship. Although, it could be said that their motivation was not as harmed as the other participants’ because they still had hope about getting their reward and felt pride for winning. Moreover, the level of interaction between the winners and the organisation ought to have been higher compared to the other participants, which indicated that their common relationship should have been better and additionally their motivation.

Moreover, none of the motivational factors ought to have been met for the organisation either in the output stage, because of the lacking relationship. For example, as explained before, the organisation expected to learn about the crowd’s thoughts, which they naturally could not have done without communication. Correspondingly, they expected more contributions, which symbolised achievement, and that the contributions should have been more creative and spontaneous, connected to cause. By referring to the previous two stages, with lacking communication and guiding, the number of contributions as well as their quality could have
been explained as the product of the interplay between the crowd and the organisation. Thus, a good interplay fosters a high number of contributions as well as a high quality (Brabham, 2013). In other words, it fosters more creative ideas. Although, this crowdsourcing process did not involve a lot of interaction, which naturally lead to the opposite with a low number of contributions.

Although, the project colleague thought that the participants had been ambitious which were a drive for him in the output stage. However, since he was not the person responsible for the communication, it could explain that he was not as affected by the interaction as the project manager. Relative to this, the empirical findings explain that the organisation received the potential solutions from the crowd. It could therefore be said that the organisation’s motivation was not as damaged by the relationship as the crowd’s motivation since the organisation at least got something out of the output stage.

6.3.4 OUTCOME

It could be said that the outcome of the crowdsourcing activity did not make the crowd satisfied, which indicated that the relationship was not good in the last outcome stage. This was also attested by the empirical findings explaining that the crowd would not participate in a crowdsourcing activity again in the future, which further explained that their motivation was low (Brabham, 2013). An influencing reason for that was naturally that the crowd did not receive any feedback in this stage and that the winners had not got their prize yet. In addition, the crowd also explained that their picture of the organisation as a brand changed to the worse throughout this crowdsourcing experience because of the lacking communication. Hence, since it could be said that the customers were not satisfied it could affect the organization economically and their placement among competitors on the market in a negative way in the future (Yang & Peterson, 2004). This could further explain that the outcome of a crowdsourcing process can affect the organisation, although probably not in a critical way since the crowdsourcing competition involves such a small part of the organisations customers, only six people in this particular case.

Moreover, a good level of interplay between the crowd and the organisation is argued to create a mutual beneficial outcome, and if the outcome is not mutual it is explained to affect the crowd and organisations motivation in a negative way (Brabham, 2013). As already
described, the relationship between the crowd and the organisation did not result in a mutual outcome and as a result the crowd’s and the organisation’s motivation becomes negatively affected. Although, the outcome for the organisation could be described as partly positive anyway, since their project got publicity internally at the organisation. This symbolized that their achievement motivational factors were partly satisfied.

The crowd further mentioned that they would have wanted a cash-prize for their efforts, symbolising achievement and extrinsic motivation. Moreover, that could have led to more participants and quicker results (Rogstadius et al., 2011), which was something the organisation strived for. Therefore, if the relation between the crowd and the organisation is not good, a cash-prize could be relevant for an organisation to include. However, the bad relationship and low motivation ought to be the product of not involving enough intrinsic motivational factors. Hence, the lack of social motivation could be said to be the big issue in this process well connected to the relationship. Further, the motivational factors could be explained to fuel each other. Hence, intrinsic and extrinsic motivations support each other (Thomas, 2002; Sloane, 2011; Rogstadius et al., 2011).
7. CONCLUSION

The result of this thesis describe that there ought to be an influencing relation between the relationship among the crowd and the organisation, and their motivation during the crowdsourcing process. This was attested by the dynamic pattern in which the relationship and the motivation changed during the crowdsourcing process, from positive to negative.

As an illustration, it was shown in the input stage that the motivation between the organisation and the participants was high, and positively influenced by their interaction and involvement in the relationship. The relationship ought to mostly have affected the social motivation in a positive way, which in turn seemed to have fuelled the remaining three motivation factors in the same direction. The non-participants, however, did not interact with the organisation at the same level, which naturally could have influenced them to not become motivated enough to participate.

In the process stage the interaction and involvement in the relationship ceased, which could be explained by the lack of motivation from the organisation’s side. That in turn ought to have influenced the relationship in a negative way in the following output stage. In that stage it became clear that the low level of interaction and involvement in the relationship negatively influenced the motivation. The social motivation was naturally lacking because of the non-existing socialization which ought to have influenced the achievement motivation because the crowd was not given their rewards, the learning motivation because the absent feedback, and cause because enjoyment changed to disappointment. Lastly, the lack of interaction in the relationship throughout the whole process did not give the organisation or the crowd a mutual beneficial outcome, which explains that the motivation had been low.

However, it ought to be difficult to say which term that influences the other, if it is the relationship that influences the motivation or if it is the motivation that influences the relationship. Attested by the empirical findings, it ought to be both ways around, working like an interdependent loop. Hence, if the motivation between the organisation and the crowd is high it ought to trigger interaction and involvement, since the relationship between them ought to become good. Correspondingly, if the relationship between the organisation and the crowd is good the motivational factors ought to rise. This could further explain that the motivation is influenced by the relationship, and the relationship by the motivation. To conclude, it is highly important to have a good common relationship in crowdsourcing, because it goes hand in hand with having a high motivation.
8. DISCUSSION

This chapter provides limitations when it comes to the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, it presents managerial and theoretical implications to finally discuss directions for further research.

The findings and conclusions was limited to the relationship between one organization’s and one crowd’s relation, which ought to have affected their motivation. Correspondingly, it could be implied that the results only could be applicable for crowdsourcing processes at IKEA only. However, this research strived towards analytic generalizations according to Yin’s (2014) recommendation when it came to qualitative research with small sample sizes. Henceforth, the results of this thesis could be applied in other organisations, given that the situations are similar, namely that it should be a big and well known organisation where the same theoretical concepts could be relevant.

However, even though all parts of the management, the lecturer, the participants and non-participants were interviewed for this thesis, the small sample sizes could have had an impact on the results. Therefore, if a different case than the crowdsourcing competition hosted by IKEA would have been sampled, the findings could have differed. Although, the different could bring other valuable aspect to the research field. Since the participants were interested in getting contact with IKEA, they might have been noncommittal when describing negative actions from IKEA’s side just for the outcome of this thesis, since they were not absolutely ensured of anonymity because they were so few.

Moreover, since the empirical findings from the crowd and the organisation could be said to agree well with each other it could be said that the problems with translation were avoided, as well as the problems connected to the respondents memory. Furthermore, since the empirical findings also where highly comparable to the theoretical concepts it shows that the study had a high validity and reliability. For example, all the four stages in the crowdsourcing process were represented in this case as well as all of the four motivational factors. Hence, the study investigated what it was intended to investigate and the measurements were stable (Bryman & Bell, 2011).
8.1 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

However, this thesis provided empirical evidence of how IKEA managed their crowdsourcing process, and how that affected the motivation both among the crowd and among themselves. Moreover, it is shown that the organisation’s and the crowd’s relationship during the different steps in the process had impacts on the motivation, and that the motivation had impacts on the relationship. One finding was that it is important with guiding and feedback during the process and the output stage, to uphold a good interaction and strengthen the relationship. Moreover, it is essential to find the right incentives for the crowd by treating both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation factors, such as cause, achievement, social and learning motivations to attract a crowd towards participation.

These findings and results could work as guides for IKEA and other big and well known organisations to manage crowdsourcing processes. The empirical investigation and the analysis provide information of how IKEA managed the different steps in the crowdsourcing process, and further how they could have managed the process to get a better outcome. Hence, this single case of crowdsourcing was not completely successful in its implementation. However, the analysis includes solutions on what to focus on and how to act to conduct successful crowdsourcing. If followed, the guides ought to generate good suggestions on innovation and development for organisations. The results could moreover be seen as useful for the growth of using crowdsourcing as an innovation and development activity. While organisations could get informed of how to conduct the process of crowdsourcing, what the risks are and further what not to do, they ought to be more comfortable using it.

8.2 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The result of this thesis indicates that there is an influencing relation between the relationship among the organisation and the crowd, and their motivation. This relation is something that appears not to have been described before and is therefore a contribution to the research field of crowdsourcing. The theoretical findings of this thesis also shows how motivation and the relationship between an organisation and a crowd changes dynamically in similar directions during a crowdsourcing process treated according to Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) four different stages. The crowdsourcing case specific to this research is similar to the process explained by Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) and follows the input stage, process stage, output stage and outcome stage with their different characteristics. Correspondingly, this thesis supports Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) study and model.
Furthermore, the theoretical insights explain that the relationship ought to be dynamic and interdepending with motivation, hence if the relationship is good, the motivation go up and the other way around. This insight attests Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) study explaining that maintaining a working relationship in crowdsourcing is challenging, as well as deciding the right mix of motivational factors, described by Sloane (2011). In relation to this all of the four motivational factors cause, achievement, social and learning was represented in the empirical findings, which attests Sloane’s (2011) thought of the categories intrinsic and extrinsic not to being enough for measuring motivation. By applying analytical generalisation recommended by Yin (2014) it becomes clear that the findings in this research can be applied to existing theories, which explain that the theoretical insights found in this thesis are of value.

8.3 DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Since this study ought to be one of the first qualitative researches that have described how motivation is influenced by the relationship between the organisation and the crowd in a crowdsourcing process, more research is needed to further investigate the relation. Hence, this study can be seen as a forerunner to further research in the field and more empirical material is needed to attest the findings. It could be interesting to conduct multiple case studies with different crowdsourcing cases, to compare how the relationships in the different cases affect the motivation towards participation. For example comparing cases with a positive versus a negative outcome of the crowdsourcing process. Thus this would give a greater breath to the research field. Other researchers are also encouraged to do a quantitative research to give the research field and the relationship more statistical evidence, and not only theoretical.

Furthermore this thesis implies, in relation with Marjanovic, Fry and Chataway’s (2012) study, that maintaining a working relationship throughout the duration of a project is a challenge with crowdsourcing, which in turn create difficulties in monitoring the quality of work. Moreover, further research about how this relationship should be carried out through a crowdsourcing process is needed in the field. Moreover, this thesis only covers the motivation towards participation in the duration of a project. Hence, it could be interesting to conduct research about the problems of keeping up the motivation towards the quality of the contributions in a crowdsourcing process, and further, the problem of keeping up both the participation and the quality towards successful crowdsourcing processes.
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APPENDIX A

Interview guide for the responsible project manager at the organisation

Thank you for participating in our research with valuable contributions for our thesis. I’m going to ask you questions regarding the crowdsourcing activity that the organisation arranged for the crowd, and the interview will focus on how you experienced the competition before, during and after the whole process.

1. Motivation – What was the goal with the competition? Did the goal change during the competition? Now when the competition is over, do you think that the organisation reached the goal?

2. Relationship – In what way were you involved in the competition? Which were your assignments?

3. Relationship/Motivation – How was the task designed to attract participants? (E.g. The text, the difficulty, the size). During the process, what do you think that the participants thought of the task? (E.g. Hard/Easy, to small/to big.) Now after the competition, do you think that the task was formulated and designed to attract participants? Could it have been improved to increase their motivation?

4. Crowdsourcing process – What was your target group? Why? How many? Now after the competition, was it a good target group?

5. Crowdsourcing process - How long was the process, from sending it to the crowd to deadline?

6. Crowdsourcing process – How much time did you think that the participants would spend on the task?

7. Relationship – Describe the first communication between the organisation and the participants. Did you have any interaction when sending out the task?

8. Relationship – Describe the communication between the organisation and the participants during the competition.
   - Guiding and support
   - Feedback

9. Relationship – How did you communicate with the participants? (E.g. by E-mail, telephone.) Why?

10. Crowdsourcing process - How did you work with the process while waiting to get the participants’ contributions?

11. Crowdsourcing process - Did you do any changes in the competition during the process? Now after the competition, do you feel that you should have made any changes?

12. Relationship – Describe the communication between the organisation and the participants after the competition.
   - Receiving the contributions
- Feedback (How long did it take before you replied to the participants from the time you got the contribution?)
- Giving the reward (How long did it take before deciding who was the winner, how were the winners contacted? What was the prize? Have they got their prize yet?)

13. Relationship / Motivation – What was your expectations on the competition? Did the expectations change during the competition? Now after the competition is over, did the competition live up to your expectations?

   *Cause* - Having fun, be creative, working with problem-solving, be spontaneous, improve the website for personal use, behave altruistic, feel pride and/or enjoyment of contributing?

   *Achievement* – bring up a solution for the problem, get a price like money (salary) or a product, get publicity and status, get intellectual property for the ideas and/or advancing one’s career?

   *Social* – be able to meet people with the same interests, contribute to a collaborative effort, feel like a good citizen, interact and socialize?

   *Efficacy & learning* – gain new knowledge, use and try your skills, learn new things and/or get feedback on your performance?

14. Relationship / Motivation – What was your expectations on the participants? Did the expectations change during the competition? Now after the competition is over, did the participants live up to your expectations?

15. Motivation - Do you think that the participants’ motivation affected you in any way? In such case, do you think that your motivation affected the participants’ motivation?

16. Motivation – What do you think got the most of the crowd not to participate? Do you think that the task affected the number of participants? Do you think the prize affected the number of participants?

17. Relationship – Now after the competition, what do you think about the amount of communication between the organisation and the participants? Do you think that more individuals would have participated if there were more communication between you? Why?

18. Motivation - Have you been able to apply any of the contributions on the homepage?

19. Relationship/motivation - Is there something you would like to add when it comes to the communication or the relationship with the crowd and the participants?
APPENDIX B

Interview guide for a project colleague at the organisation

Thank you for participating in our research with valuable contributions for our thesis. I’m going to ask you questions regarding the crowdsourcing activity that the organisation arranged for the crowd, and the interview will focus on how you experienced the competition before, during and after the whole process.

1. Relationship – In what way were you involved in the competition? Which were your assignments?

2. Motivation – What was the goal with the competition? Did the goal change during the competition? Now when the competition is over, do you think that the organisation reached the goal?

3. Relationship/Motivation – How was the task designed to attract participants? (E.g. the text, the difficulty and the size). During the process, what do you think that the participants thought of the task? (E.g. Hard/Easy, to small/to big). Now after the competition, do you think that the task was formulated and designed to attract participants? Could it have been improved to increase their motivation?

4. Relationship – Describe the first communication between the organisation and the participants. Did you have any interaction when sending out the task?

5. Relationship – Describe the communication between the organisation and the participants during the competition.
   - Guiding and support
   - Feedback

6. Relationship – Describe the communication between the organisation and the participants after the competition.
   - Receiving the contributions
   - Feedback (How long did it take before you replied to the participants from the time you got the contribution?)
   - Giving the reward (How long did it take before deciding who was the winner, how were the winners contacted? What was the prize? Have they got their prize yet?)

7. Relationship/motivation – What was your expectations on the competition? Did the expectations change during the competition? Now after the competition is over, did the competition live up to your expectations?
   Cause - Having fun, be creative, working with problem-solving, be spontaneous, improve the website for personal use, behave altruistic, feel pride and/or enjoyment of contributing?
   Achievement – bring up a solution for the problem, get a price like money (salary) or a product, get publicity and status, get intellectual property for the ideas and/or advancing one’s career?
   Social – be able to meet people with the same interests, contribute to a collaborative effort, feel like a good citizen, interact and socialize?
**Efficacy & learning** – gain new knowledge, use and try your skills, learn new things and/or get feedback on your performance?

8. **Relationship/motivation** – What was your expectations on the participants? Did the expectations change during the competition? Now after the competition is over, did the participants live up to your expectations?

9. **Motivation**- Do you think that the participants’ motivation affected you in any way? In such case, do you think that your motivation affected the participants’ motivation?

10. **Motivation** – What do you think got the most of the crowd not to participate? Do you think that the task affected the number of participants? Do you think the prize affected the number of participants?

11. **Relationship** – Now after the competition, what do you think about the amount of communication between the organisation and the participants? Do you think that more individuals would have participated if there were more communication between you? Why?

12. **Motivation** – Do you think that the participants are satisfied with their reward? Why?

13. **Motivation** - Have you been able to apply any of the contributions on the homepage?

14. **Relationship/motivation** - Is there something you would like to add when it comes to communication or the relationship with the crowd and the participants?
APPENDIX C

Interview guide for the broker organisation

Thank you for participating in our research with valuable contributions for our thesis. I’m going to ask you questions regarding the crowdsourcing activity that you, as an intermediary, mediated to the crowd. The interview will focus on how you experienced the competition before, during and after the whole process.

1. Relationship – In what way were you involved in the competition? Which were your assignments?

2. Relationship - Explain the first communication between you and the organisation.

3. Relationship – Explain the communication between you and the organisation during the competition.

4. Relationship – Explain the communication between you and the organisation after the competition.

5. Motivation – What expectations do you think the organisation had on the competition?
   - Cause- Having fun, be creative, working with problem-solving, be spontaneous, improve the website for personal use, behave altruistic, feel pride and/or enjoyment of contributing?
   - Achievement – bring up a solution for the problem, get a price like money (salary) or a product, get publicity and status, get intellectual property for the ideas and/or advancing one’s career?
   - Social – be able to meet people with the same interests, contribute to a collaborative effort, feel like a good citizen, interact and socialize?
   - Efficacy & learning – gain new knowledge, use and try your skills, learn new things and/or get feedback on your performance?

6. Relationship - Which crowd were the competition sent out to?

7. Relationship – Describe the first communication between you and the participants. Did you have any interaction when sending out the task?

8. Relationship – Describe the communication between you and the participants during the competition.
   - Guiding and support
   - Feedback

9. Relationship – Describe the communication between you and the participants after the competition.

10. Motivation – What do you think made the crowd to participate in the competition?
    - Cause- Having fun, be creative, working with problem-solving, be spontaneous, improve the website for personal use, behave altruistic, feel pride and/or enjoyment of contributing?
Achievement – bring up a solution for the problem, get a price like money or a product, get publicity and status, get intellectual property for the ideas and/or advancing one’s career?
Social – be able to meet people with the same interests, contribute to a collaborative effort, feel like a good citizen, interact and socialize?
Efficacy & learning – gain new knowledge, use and try your skills, learn new things and/or get feedback on your performance?

11. Motivation – What do you think got the most of the crowd not to participate? Do you think that the task affected the number of participants? Do you think the prize affected the number of participants?

12. Relationship/motivation - Is there something you would like to add when it comes to communication or the relationship with the organisation or the participants?
APPENDIX D

Interview guide for the participants

Thank you for participating in our research with valuable contributions for our thesis. I’m going to ask you a few questions regarding the crowdsourcing activity and competition that you participated in. The interview will focus on how you experienced the competition before, during and after the whole process.

1. From the first place, how did you get to know that the organisation had a competition that you could take part in?

2. Motivation – Were you sure from the beginning that you were going to participate, or did you hesitate?

3. Relationship - Did you have any contact with the organisation before choosing to participate? Did you have any contact with the person who sent out the competition?

4. Relationship/Motivation – What do you think of the outlay of the actual task you had to solve? (E.g. the text, the difficulty, the size). During the process, how was it to solve the task? (E.g. hard/easy, to small/to big). How much time did you spend solving the task? Now after the competition, do you think that the task was formulated and designed for you as a participant? Could it have been improved to increase your motivation?

5. Relationship – Explain the first communication between you and the organisation (receiving the task).

6. Relationship – Explain the communication between you as a participant and the organisation during the competition.
   - Guiding and support
   - Feedback
   - Questions

7. Relationship – How did you communicate with the organisation? (E.g. by E-mail, telephone).

8. Relationship – Explain the communication between you as a participant and the organisation after the competition.
   - Sending in the contribution
   - Feedback (How long did it take to get the feedback from sending in the contribution?)
   - The reward (Do you know who won the competition? How long did it take to receive information about who won? Was that a reasonable time? How did you as a winner get the information? Have you got your prize?)

9. Motivation – What was it that made you participate in the competition? What expectations did you have? Did the expectations change during the competition? Now after the competition is over, did the competition live up to your expectations? Why?
*Cause* - Having fun, be creative, working with problem-solving, be spontaneous, improve the website for personal use, behave altruistic, feel pride and/or enjoyment of contributing?

*Achievement* – bring up a solution for the problem, get a price like money or a product, get publicity and status, get intellectual property for the ideas and/or advancing one’s career?

*Social* – be able to meet people with the same interests, contribute to a collaborative effort, feel like a good citizen, interact and socialize?

*Efficacy & learning* – gain new knowledge, use and try your skills, learn new things and/or get feedback on your performance?

10. Motivation - What did you think of the prize?

11. Relationship/motivation – What was your expectations on the organisation as a task initiator? Did the expectations change during the competition? Now after the competition is over, did the organisation live up to your expectations?

12. Motivation- Do you think that the organisation’s motivation affected you in some way?

13. Motivation – What do you think got most of the participants to not participate?

14. Motivation – What do you feel you got out of participating?

15. Relationship/motivation - Is there something you would like to add when it comes to communication or the relationship with the organisation?
APPENDIX E

Interview guide for the non-participants

Thank you for participating in our research with valuable contributions for our thesis. I’m going to ask you a few questions regarding the crowdsourcing activity and competition that you became aware of but did not participate in. The interview will focus on how you experienced the competition before the whole process.

1. How did you get to know that the organisation had a competition that you could take part in from the first place?

2. Relationship/Motivation – Did you read the task? What do you think of the outlay of the actual task you had to solve? (E.g. the text, the difficulty, the size). Do you think it should have been changed in some way?

3. Motivation - What was it that made you not participating in the competition? What expectations did you get? Why?
   Cause: Having fun, be creative, working with problem-solving, be spontaneous, improve the website for personal use, behave altruistic, feel pride and/or enjoyment of contributing?
   Achievement – bring up a solution for the problem, get a price like money (salary) or a product, get publicity and status, get intellectual property for the ideas and/or advancing one’s career?
   Social – be able to meet people with the same interests, contribute to a collaborative effort, feel like a good citizen, interact and socialize?
   Efficacy & learning – gain new knowledge, use and try your skills, learn new things and/or get feedback on your performance?

4. Motivation – Were you sure from the beginning that you were not going to participate, or did you hesitate?

5. Relationship - Did you have any contact with the organisation before choosing not to participate? Did you have any contact with the person who sent out the competition?

6. Motivation - Is there something that could have convinced you to participate in the competition? What do you think about the prize?

7. Motivation- Do you think that the organisation’s motivation affected you in some way?

8. Motivation – What do you think got the participants to participate in the competition?

9. Relationship/motivation - Is there something you would like to add when it comes to communication or the relationship with the organisation?