

## Chapter 8.13

# Managing Intellectual Capital and Intellectual Property within Software Development Communities of Practice

**Andy Williamson**

*Wairua Consulting Limited, New Zealand*

**David M. Kennedy**

*Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong*

**Ruth DeSouza**

*Wairua Consulting Limited, New Zealand*

**Carmel McNaught**

*Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

### INTRODUCTION

In this article, we will develop a framework for educational software development teams that recognizes the conflicts and tensions that exist between the different professional groups and will assist software teams to recognize the intellectual capital created by individuals and teams. We will do so by recognizing the inherent relationship between the tangible elements of intellectual

property and the intangible organizational assets that form the basis of intellectual capital and by discussing how knowledge generated by a project team can become an explicit asset.

### BACKGROUND

Universities are increasingly becoming developers of complex software-based applications. In-house

development ranges from teaching aids and online learning resources to large information systems products that could ultimately become successful commercial ventures. Increased product complexity is easily recognized, yet research shows that the organizational aspects of a software development project are more likely to affect performance and outcomes than technical issues (Xia & Lee, 2004). Successful development and deployment of today's complex educational systems and environments comes with an imperative for an array of different and unique skill sets for the various stages of each project. One can view a software development team as a microcosm of the wider community of practice of software development professionals who work in information and knowledge management in higher education. As Wenger (1998) observes, such communities of practice are not random but constructed around required skills and through a process of negotiation based on mutuality and accountability.

Workforce mobility has increased: academic staff members regularly and easily move between institutions; development and design staff have many opportunities for contract-based work, move to other academic institutions or into the private sector. The ideas that lie behind a successful process or product are increasingly drawn from a wider pool of talent and, as people move around, these ideas are being taken with them and disseminated through informal and new work practices into a wider community of practice. How then does a team, formed to design and develop a technology-rich educational or systems environment, manage and control issues of intellectual capital and intellectual property such that all of those who contribute throughout the life of a project are acknowledged and rewarded fairly and appropriately for that contribution, even after they have left the project?

## **Team Formation and Relationships**

Additional complexity leads to specialization (Jacobson, Booch & Rumbaugh, 1998). New ways of working bring with them a shift in power, where the academic expert will often lack the technical skills, time or resources to turn ideas into reality. Instead, they must rely on a team of experts from other disciplines to interpret their ideas, evolve them, and deliver the finished product. As complexity increases, communication between team members becomes paramount; specialist educational designers are required to translate pedagogy into functional specifications that can be understood by software developers and graphic designers. Modern software teams are project-based, where resources come and go as required.

Software development communities of practice exist within a larger organizational context. Roles and responsibilities will vary and are negotiated depending on the toolset and architecture used, the size of the project, and the culture of the organization (Phillips, 1997; Williamson et al., 2003). Project team members can be full- or part-time employees (academic or non-academic) or contractors retained specifically for the project. As such, these roles exhibit complex relationships and interfaces between each other and the project. In Figure 1, a range of typical roles and relationships found in a tertiary education software development project are shown.

During the various stages of the development process, various players move into prominent roles. One way to illustrate this shifting set of work responsibilities is to list the main players at each stage of the process. We will do this using the classic instructional systems design (ISD) model (Dick & Carey, 1990) as it is so well known. (There are many other models, many of which are discussed in Bannan-Ritland, 2003.) The key players at each stage of the ISD model are listed

11 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/managing-intellectual-capital-intellectual-property/25345](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/managing-intellectual-capital-intellectual-property/25345)

## Related Content

---

### Siemens: Expanding the Knowledge Management System ShareNet to Research & Development

Hauke Heier, Hans P. Borgman and Andreas Manuth (2008). *Knowledge Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 2142-2158).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/siemens-expanding-knowledge-management-system/25248](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/siemens-expanding-knowledge-management-system/25248)

### Co-Evolving Relationships and Innovation Dynamics

Charles Ehin (2010). *Intellectual Capital and Technological Innovation: Knowledge-Based Theory and Practice* (pp. 234-248).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/evolving-relationships-innovation-dynamics/44325](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/evolving-relationships-innovation-dynamics/44325)

### Ontology Merging and Reasoning Using Paraconsistent Logics

Cristian Cocos, Fahim Imam and Wendy MacCaull (2012). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 35-51).

[www.irma-international.org/article/ontology-merging-reasoning-using-paraconsistent/72339](http://www.irma-international.org/article/ontology-merging-reasoning-using-paraconsistent/72339)

### Discontinuity in Organizations: Developing a Knowledge-Based Organizational Performance Model for Discontinuous Membership

Rahinah Ibrahim and Mark Nissen (2007). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 10-28).

[www.irma-international.org/article/discontinuity-organizations-developing-knowledge-based/2694](http://www.irma-international.org/article/discontinuity-organizations-developing-knowledge-based/2694)

### Improving Supply Chain Performance through the Implementation of Process Related Knowledge Transfer Mechanisms

Stephen McLaughlin (2009). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 64-86).

[www.irma-international.org/article/improving-supply-chain-performance-through/2752](http://www.irma-international.org/article/improving-supply-chain-performance-through/2752)