



Relevance of five generic business ideation approaches vis-a-vis contexts embedded within construction markets

Citation

Huovinen, P. (2016). Relevance of five generic business ideation approaches vis-a-vis contexts embedded within construction markets. In N. Achour (Ed.), *Proceedings of the CIB World Building Congress 2016, May 30 - June 3, 2016, Tampere, Finland: Advancing products and services* (Vol. V, pp. 1129-1140). Tampere: Tampere University of Technology. Department of Civil Engineering.

Year

2016

Version

Publisher's PDF (version of record)

Link to publication

[TUTCRIS Portal \(http://www.tut.fi/tutcris\)](http://www.tut.fi/tutcris)

Published in

Proceedings of the CIB World Building Congress 2016, May 30 - June 3, 2016, Tampere, Finland

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact cris.tau@tuni.fi, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Relevance of Five Generic Business Ideation Approaches vis-à-vis Contexts Embedded within Construction Markets

Pekka Huovinen,
Construction Management and Economics, Tampere University of Technology
(email: pekka.huovinen@tut.fi)

Abstract

In general, ideation encompasses the formation of ideas or mental images of things not present to the senses or simply the creation of new ideas. Business ideation is herein perceived to be the core area within future-oriented business management (BM). The main aim of the paper is to assess and advance the relevance of the five generic approaches to business ideation vis-à-vis firms targeting contexts embedded within construction markets. A typology differentiates between the fitting, value-creating, profit generating, systemizing, and commercializing approaches. It is argued that each approach is, at minimum, highly relevant in the case of business unit (BU) management targeting preferred client investment and procurement behavior within construction markets. Approach 1 involves BUs aiming at fit between clients and their needs as well as units' offerings and operations, respectively. Professional clients couple needs with preferred procurement methods whereas competing BUs are trying to achieve best fit between solutions and client behaviors. This approach calls for research on how to sustain such fit between a BU and clients when changes occur. Approach 2 enables BUs to create value by specifying high-value propositions, producing value to clients, and capturing their fair shares of produced values. Farsighted clients look for more or novel values for construction investments and, thus, units are collaborating and co-producing values to clients. This approach calls for research on a BU's value co-production with such clients, value capture, and offerings integration. Approach 3 accommodates BUs that are focusing on generating profits, achieving high-profit levels, and sustaining them. Pioneering clients pursue complex investment aims that can be met only by radical solutions. This approach calls for research on a BU's profit-generating mechanisms related to clients with complex investment needs and radical solutions. Approach 4 facilitates BUs to systemize businesses around core ideas. Sectoral clients have large or complex needs and, in turn, units are satisfying them by engineering systems as wholes and delivering them as parts. This approach calls for research on BUs with systems and clients, multi-dimensional investments, and system engineering as wholes and parts. Approach 5 facilitates BUs to couple ideas with commercializing dimensions such as entrepreneurship, innovation, business development, venturing, or spin-offing. Risk-taking clients prefer to enter high-innovation contracts and, thus, units are offering novel solutions and emerging business cases. This approach calls for research on a BU's entrepreneurial competencies and risk-taking clients, wicked investment needs, and high-innovation contracts. In the same vein, the suggestions are put forth to CIB-related scholars for directing research on along the BM and ideation dimensions and adopting most relevant approaches. Likewise, management in firms and BUs competing in construction markets are encouraged to assess the business case-sensitive relevance of each of Approaches 1-5 and try out those with initial high relevance.

Keywords: Business ideation, business management, construction markets, literature review, management concepts

1. Introduction

Managing a single business (un)successfully is herein seen the most fundamental area of strategic management. In the same vein, *business management (BM) research* is perceived as the most important and evolving sub-field within strategic management research. Within the BM scope, the focus is on managing business issues. In general, ideation encompasses the formation of ideas or mental images of things not present to the senses or simply the creation of new ideas (OED 2012). Business ideation is herein perceived to be the core area within future-oriented BM. The *focal contexts* are embedded within *construction markets*, i.e., the contracting, design, construction, servicing, project-based, and life-cycle aspects of capital and construction investments in natural resources usage, energy supply, telecommunications, transportation, infrastructure, manufacturing, general building, and other real estate concerns.

This paper is part of the pioneering reviewing of construction-related BM research (e.g., Huovinen 2003a, 2006a-b, 2015a-c). The *nature* of this paper is that of reporting on the conduct and findings of a *focused review* of relevant published, conceptual knowledge about business ideation as part of BM. The rationale is that advancements can be designed based on the revelation of the current states of business ideation affairs via a review of the 71 construction-related BM concepts that have been published via the formal channels between 1990 and 2013. The *main aim of the paper* is to evaluate and advance the relevance of the five generic approaches, i.e., the fitting, value-creating, profit-generating, systemizing, and commercializing business ideation vis-à-vis firms and their business units targeting contexts embedded within construction markets. Accordingly, the *three sub-aims* are as follows:

- How is the reviewing being conducted? What are the degrees to which the authors have designed their 34 (out of 71) construction-related BM concepts along the business ideation dimension? The focused review is reported upon in Section 2.
- What are the generic Approaches 1-5 to business ideation? How relevant is each of them in the case of business unit (BU) management vis-a-vis business ideation with contexts embedded within targeted construction markets? Approaches 1-5 and 13 high-degree concepts are briefed as well as the approach-specific relevance is assessed in Section 3.
- How to advance the relevance of Approaches 1-5 vis-à-vis managing business ideation related to contexts within construction? The suggestions are put forth in Section 4.

2. Reviewing of Construction-Related BM Research

2.1 Four reviewing rounds between 1999 and 2014

The four reviewing rounds have been carried out in 1999-2003, 2006, 2010-2012, and 2014. Cooper's (1998) approach and the same limitations have been re-adopted to protect the validity. *The coherence* has been maintained by focusing on research on firms based in the OECD countries. Exceptionally, references originating from Singapore and Hong Kong have been included due to the authors' British Commonwealth heritage and research on international construction. Hart's (1998) guidelines have been relied upon. The design of the *method for the reviewing of conceptual research*, i.e., the replicable handbook-based and invented-here ways

have been documented, used, and reported upon in Huovinen (2003a, 2006a-b, 2013 and 2015a-c). The search for eligible concepts has been conducted comprehensively within the volumes of 21 journals in construction and those of 47 journals in business administration. Concerning the other channels, the degrees of the comprehensiveness vary. The reviewer submits the lists of all the channels on request. So far, the reviewing has resulted in the identification of 71 construction-related BM concepts that have been published between 1990 and 2013.

2.2 Focused review of business ideation as a dimension for designing 71 construction-related BM concepts

For the assessment, the *four degrees of the design of a particular construction-related BM concept along the business ideation dimension* were pre-defined as follows:

- *High degree*: A concept's primary parts include all the three core elements of business ideation, i.e., needs and clients, offerings, and operations and/or resources.
- *Medium degree*: A concept includes only one or two core elements.
- *Low degree*: A reference containing a concept only addresses issues in business ideation.
- *No degree*: A reference does not contain any explicit aspects of business ideation.

The assessment revealed that 48 % or 34 (out of 71) construction-related BM concepts include also the elements for managing business ideation. There are 13 (18%) high-degree, 6 (8%) medium-degree, and 15 (21%) low-degree BM concepts (Table 1).

Table 1: Four-degree assessment of the design of 71 construction-related BM concepts (published between 1990 and 2013) along the business ideation dimension.

<i>High-degree business ideation</i> No. (%)	<i>Medium-degree business ideation</i> No. (%)	<i>Low-degree business ideation</i> No. (%)	<i>No business ideation at all</i> No. (%)	<i>All construction-related BM concepts</i> No. (%)
13 (18)	6 (8)	15 (21)	37 (52%)	71 (100)

The assessment validity has been protected against the five biases as follows. *Concept Inclusion Bias 1* involves this reviewer perceiving that an author has designed a concept along the business ideation dimension even if this author has not done so. This bias has been minimized by assessing each reference in the same way and quoting only the necessary parts that contain 34 (48%) construction-related BM concepts designed along the business ideation dimension. Future reviewers can test the inter-concept consistency of inclusion by repeating the assessments, i.e., reading and confirming the same quotations or rejecting them. *Concept Exclusion Bias 2* involves this reviewer perceiving that an author has not designed a concept along the business ideation dimension even if this author has done so. 37 (52%) “no degree” assessments indicate that this reviewer did not identify business ideation. Future reviewers can test the inter-concept consistency of exclusion by repeating the assessments, i.e., reading and confirming the exclusions or identifying business ideation elements in them. After the inclusion, *Degree Assessment Bias 3* is related to this reviewer’s reliance on a pre-specified scale of the

three conceptual degrees instead of a quantitative scale. This reviewer could assign one of the three pre-defined degrees to each of 34 concepts without hesitation. Future reviewers can test the inter-concept consistency of degree assignments by reading and confirming the same degrees or assessing changes in them. Or, they could re-specify a scale of degrees. *Concept-Approach Correspondence Bias 4* is related to the mapping of each of 13 high-degree concepts onto one or more business ideation approaches (Table 2). This reviewer could map each concept onto one generic business ideation approach based on the identification of the theoretical roots and elements. Future reviewers may deepen this analysis, e.g., by itemizing each (sub-)element within the references and quoting them in a set of more detailed tables to allow cross-approach comparisons and correspondence identification. *Concept Author-Reviewer Bias 5* is related to a fact that this reviewer has designed 14% or 10 (out of 71) concepts. 7 (out of 10) concepts have been designed along the business ideation dimension. Thereof, this reviewer assessed that he has designed 3 high-degree, 1 medium-degree, and 3 low-degree concepts. Future reviewers can test the inter-concept consistency of the assessment outcomes versus each of the four other biases in the case of 10 concepts designed by this reviewer.

3. Five Generic Business Ideation Approaches

In general, OED (2012) defines that “*to idea* is to give a particular form or character to...”. In turn, *ideation* encompasses “the formation of ideas or mental images of things not present to the senses” or simply “*the creation of new ideas*”. Aligning with Normann’s (2001) root principle of fit, a *business idea* is herein defined to consist of the three core elements, i.e., a focal firm is (i) targeting an environment with potential clients and their needs, (ii) developing and leveraging its offerings that best satisfy targeted needs, and (iii) organizing a BU and, thus, performing operations, enabled by its resources.

How is business ideation being approached within strategic management literature? Previously, this author has identified and differentiated between the *five generic approaches* to business ideation, i.e., fitting, value-creating, profit-generating, systemizing, and commercializing approaches, based on the respective dimensions, preferences, and rationales (Huovinen 2013). The rationales are overviewed, the 13 high-degree, construction-related BM concepts are briefed, and the relevance is only qualitatively assessed approach by approach as follows.

3.1 Fitting business ideation and its relevance

Firms are crafting business ideas and accommodating *causal fit* concerning their offerings and operations versus targeted clients and needs. Applying Normann’s (2001) abstract definition, a *business idea* is a unique, historically evolved set of factors related to each other, i.e., an environment with needs and values as well as a BU’s offerings and other internal factors. The overall principle is one of consonance or fit. Adopting Drucker’s (1994) recognized theory of business, the three sets of assumptions can be defined about (a) an environment, i.e. society, market, clients, and technologies, defining what a BU is paid for, (b) a specific mission, defining what meaningful results are and envisioning how a unit makes a difference in a targeted economy (society), and (c) core competencies, defining where a unit must excel to

maintain leadership and accomplish its part of a firm's mission. Such a theory can be validated with the *four specifications*, i.e., the assumptions must fit reality, one another, be known and understood throughout a unit, and be tested constantly. There are the *two measures* for preventing the current theory from becoming obsolete, i.e., to abandon it and study non-customers. Readily, many fitting business ideation concepts have been designed as part of corporate planning concepts.

Among the 13 high-degree, construction-related BM concepts, the four concepts have been designed along the *fitting* business ideation dimension. Winch and Schneider's (1993) *four high-degree strategies* for UK architectural practices, based on the project complexity and the client's quality preference, capture many core *fitting* elements, i.e., (1) the strong, CAD-based delivery of designs with repeat elements for simple buildings at low fees and overheads, (2) strong experience and value engineering, coupled with many disciplines or specialization, to meet requirements related to complex buildings, charging a premium due to high value, (3) strong ideas and identifiable style with the articulation of a competence related to prestige buildings, coupled with charging a premium due to reputation for original, exciting ideas and a figurehead, and (4) strong ambition of young practices with few clients, and charging low fees.

Jennings and Betts' (1996) *high-degree four strategies* for quantity surveying practices in the UK capture many core *fitting* elements, i.e., (1) differentiation-based execution for small and medium-sized practices with a varied client base and simple, tailored, quality services to ensure repeat business, charging average fees, (2) differentiation-based expertise for larger practices with clients in niche markets and predominantly new areas, and complex, technically differentiated services, charging above average fees due to image of quality, adaptability, and professionalism, (3) cost focus-based efficiency for fairly new practices with simple, fixed projects, specific competences, optimized staff/salary levels, and rock-bottom prices, and (4) differentiation focus-based experience for larger, older practices with experience in complex projects and/or hand-holding services, and interpersonally bonded clients, charging a premium. Each strategy also identifies an IT-use level and a staff structure.

Lowendahl (2000) has designed the *three high-degree strategies* for US professional services firms with many *fitting* elements. (a) Client relation based strategies emphasize a unique ability to understand and help particular client groups. Performance is measured as client satisfaction, client retention, and follow-on contracts. Strategic assets involve senior professionals with reputation and client relationships. (b) Solution or output based strategies emphasize the exploitation of superior organizational competences. Vulnerability is related to solution obsolescence. When clients accept contracts without naming professionals, this is a sign of the successful development of collective routines and reputation. A challenge involves the motivation of R&D people to create new solutions to a large group of clients. (c) Problem solving or creativity based strategies result in highly complex firms typically delivering services based on innovations. Firms cannot avoid dependence on key individuals. Top managers are likely to be the best professionals who are willing and able to accept managerial responsibilities.

Helander and Möller's (2007) *high-degree, dynamic model for a system supplier's customer strategy* is based on the categorization of a client's strategies, with many core *fitting* elements, i.e., independence of supplier strategy A, shared expertise with supplier strategy B, and reliance on supplier expertise strategy C. A system supplier assumes (i) an equipment/material supplier role to causally couple with an independent customer's strategy A, (ii) a solution provider role to couple with a sharing client's strategy B, and (iii) a performance provider role to couple with a dependent client's strategy C. It seems that a supplier can extend its role only when a customer's strategy is compatible with the aimed role. A supplier's role may be dependent on interrelated activities and coordination mechanisms so that a client can close its knowledge gaps and start to perform activities that a supplier has performed in the past.

Thus, it is herein argued that in construction *Approach 1 is highly relevant*, at minimum, in the case of BU management aiming at causal fit between buyers and their needs, a BU's offerings to satisfy needs, and its operations enabled by key resources. Targeted professional clients couple needs with accommodating procurement methods whereas a particular BU achieves best fit between its solutions and such client investment and procurement behavior.

3.2 Value-creating business ideation and its relevance

Firms are crafting business ideas, specifying high-value propositions, and organizing BUs to actually produce values under contracts with clients and to capture shares of produced values. Applying Slater's (1997) founding client value-based strategy, market segments are selected, *value propositions* are created to establish positions of competitive advantage, necessary capabilities are developed for understanding client needs, and promised value is delivered. Relying on Ramirez' (1999) pioneering value co-production framework, BUs and clients could increasingly co-invent, combine, and reconcile values where interactions (offerings) are units of value creation and clients' roles are new factors of production. Applying Kothari and Lackner's (2006) typical value creation cycle, value is defined (sources and quantification), created, delivered for clients (flow and outside in -based processes), and captured (shares of profit, wallet and market). The value that clients receive from a focal BU's offerings is being determined by product, access, experience, and cost attributes.

Among the 13 high-degree, construction-related BM concepts, the five concepts have been designed along the *value-creating* business ideation dimension. Pinto et al.'s (2000) *high-degree value chain analysis*, based on partnering and a technique of client-based project success includes many core *value-creating* elements. A project supplier can redefine itself as a long-term partner for enhancing a client's competitive advantages and operations as well as eliminating disadvantages. Through value chain analyses, a supplier tailors project bidding, engineering, design, fabrication, and delivery in a manner and for a price that gives a client an advantage over using alternative methods or competitors. Client satisfaction is ensured through contract development, a client's multiple levels, and project-specific phases. In order to achieve an overall project success, a supplier enters cooperation with subcontractors to offer superior service to clients where technology is to a great extent undifferentiated.

Metais and Meschi's (2005) *high-degree, core competence-based strategy for strategic flexibility* via linking the value chain and resources of an (oil and gas) plant contractor involves many *value-creating* elements. A strategic architecture links a contractor's value chain and core competencies. There are four processes, i.e., (i) to understand market and invent new products, by analyzing products and services in cooperation with customers, (ii) to design generic solutions, (iii) to design and produce customer-specific solutions, and (iv) to operate solutions (constructed facilities). The five core competencies are project development, project execution, technologies, processes, and operation. This architecture enables to make choices between forms of a value chain and between types of competitive advantages. In unstable environments, core competencies allow for varying and adjusting a contractor's value chain, as a resource network, according to an industry's stakes.

Hawk's (2006) *five high-degree, most promising business ideas* for stakeholders in construction are as follows: (i) intelligent systems applications, (ii) lateral thinking capabilities, (iii) environmental concerns, (iv) decentralization needs, and (v) leisure time facilities. The *nine high-degree recommendations for international construction development* include many *value-creating* elements, i.e., (1) embrace consumer ideals, (2) seek new business ideas in cross-border customer relationships, (3) add new value potentials via innovative design and global procurement processes, (4) use of global construction to discover new local visions, (5) accommodate diversity while embracing the contradictory, (6) adapt and adopt cross-border design and production, (7) find and organize new knowledge across the globe, (8) innovatively avoid limits in hierarchies, and (9) integrate the Asian and European models of construction.

Salonen et al.'s (2006) *high-degree supplier centric systems model* for the enhancement of competitive advantages consists of the eight *value-creating* elements, i.e. (i) finding new ways to enhance customer value, (ii) adopting a supplier centric systems model with a shift to a systems integrator's role, (iii) identifying buyers who appreciate maximum value, (iv) insulating a systems integrator from threats via entry barriers, e.g., cost advantages, economies of scale, switching costs, unique and valuable resources, (v) acquiring and possessing required resources, e.g., superior systems know-how, systems oriented sales force, service capabilities, control of physical components, (vi) controlling costs, e.g., through standardization, (vii) integrating value propositions either as lowered total costs or enhanced performance for buyers throughout value chains and the life-cycles of systems, and (viii) communicating value to customers to change the predominant, buyer centric business model to the supplier centric one, e.g., signaling to gain top management's awareness and getting a mandate for containment of customers' line worker opposition as well as maintaining interfaces.

Kujala et al.'s (2010) *high-degree typology of the five empirical business models* of a power plant supplier also captures a *value-creating* scope. A 5-model framework was developed for the analysis of a project supplier's business models based on the six characteristics, i.e. customers, value propositions, competitive strategy, a position in a value network, an internal organization and capabilities as well as logic of revenue generation. The 1st model of basic installed base services involves product-oriented value propositions and transaction-based revenue generation logic. The 2nd model of customer support services involves process-oriented

value propositions and transaction-based revenue generation logic. The 3rd model of operations and maintenance outsourcing involves product-oriented value propositions and relationship-based revenue generation logic. The 4th model of the delivery of life-cycle solutions involves process-oriented value propositions and relationship-based revenue generation logic. The 5th model of the development of life-cycle solutions involves process-oriented value propositions and relationship-based revenue generation logic accepting more risk and upfront costs as well as requiring more extensive business, market, and stakeholder management capabilities (in comparison with the 4th model).

Thus, it is herein argued that in construction *Approach 2 is highly relevant*, at minimum, in the case of BU management creating value by specifying high-value propositions, producing such value to clients, and a BU capturing its fair share of produced values. Farsighted clients look for markedly more or novel values for construction investments and, thus, a BU is collaborating with technology-intensive suppliers, proposing integrated offerings, and co-producing value.

3.3 Profit-generating business ideation and its relevance

Firms are crafting business ideas to achieve high-profit BU performance and also to sustain it. Adopting Slywotzky et al.'s (1999) multi-pattern approach to profitability, the rules of games can be redefined and *new profitable business designs* be recreated in terms of high client relevance, a consistent scope of products and value chain activities, a terrific profit model, a powerful source of differentiation and control across markets as well as a supportive, reinforcing organization. All this is enabled by the early, continuous recognition of evolving profit patterns such as mega, value chain, customer, channel, product, knowledge, and organization. The recognition, identification, and analysis of such patterns are based on paying attention to story-telling, mapping a strategic landscape, measuring degrees of mindshare by business designs as well as deciphering conditions and triggers for next profit-making patterns.

Among the 13 high-degree, construction-related BM concepts, only one concept has been designed along the *profit-generating* business ideation dimension. Leinberger's (1993) *high-degree dichotomy of project-oriented and process-oriented businesses* in US real estate markets captures many *profit-generating* elements, coupled with risk management. *Project-oriented business* exhibits five marketing characteristics (one project at a time, no guarantee of a next project, different projects, higher margins, higher risk), six financial characteristics (unique deal, changing financing markets for both equity and debt, project-by-project financing, huge financing needs, limited access to public equity market, and potential for surprises; restructuring of vehicles), and six organizational characteristics (job shop, barely contained anarchy, exciting and ever-changing, fighter pilots, high turnover, addicted to change). *Process-oriented business* exhibits differences in its five marketing characteristics (business stream, repeat business with satisfied customers, customer similarity, lower margins, and lower risk), six financial characteristics (uniform contract structure, consistent financing, corporate financing, working capital needs, broader access to public equity market, stable financing structure), and six organizational characteristics (assembly line, efficiently organized, consistent, ship's crew, stable workforce, slow adjustment when change occurs).

Thus, it is herein argued that in construction *Approach 3 is highly relevant*, at minimum, in the case of BU management focusing on generating profits, achieving high-profit performance levels, and sustaining them. Pioneering clients pursue complex investment aims that can be met only by radical solutions and, in turn, a BU is highly competent in innovating and proposing solution-driven values, realizing values, and capturing exceptionally big portions of them.

3.4 Systemizing business ideation and its relevance

Firms are crafting systemic business ideas as well as modeling or designing businesses and organizing businesses as systems. Applying Osterwalder and Pigneur's (2010) generative business model, rationales can be defined, i.e., how BUs create, deliver, and capture value as well as cover the four areas of a business (clients, offers, infrastructure, and viability). The 9-block logic of how to make money includes (i) client segments, (ii) value propositions, (iii) communication, distribution, and sales channels, (iv) client relationships, (v) revenue streams, (vi) resources, (vii) activity performance, (viii) partnerships for outsourcing and resource acquisitions, and (ix) a cost structure. *Business model innovations* result from the objectives, i.e., (a) to satisfy existing but unanswered needs, (b) to bring new technologies or offerings, (c) to improve, disrupt, or transform markets with better business models, or (d) to create markets.

Among the 13 high-degree, construction-related BM concepts, the three concepts have been designed along the *systemizing* business ideation dimension. Huovinen's (2003a) *high-degree, 5-element, knowledge-based system* for managing a firm's business units in global capital investment markets captures the core *systemic elements in knowledge-based ways*. (i) A unit advances front-line strategies and offerings for best solutions, high client satisfaction, and high firm profitability. Value-adding knowledge enables to pre-empt client needs. (ii) A unit integrates global, local, and contract-specific business processes for high dynamic operative effectiveness, ensured by virtual knowledge. (iii) A firm nurtures core technology for creating advantages. Innovative knowledge involves business-opportunity perceptions, a foresight, a technology platform, a core competence architecture, a core offering portfolio, and innovation paths. (iv) A firm governs and optimizes business-specific frames. This knowledge covers ownership, top management, venturing, financing, and firm-market interactions. (v) A firm extends its frame via collaboration with global and/or local parties. This knowledge includes synergistic ways of opportunity exploitation, benefit balance, and risk avoidance.

Huovinen's (2004) *high-degree, 5-element, organization-based system* for managing a firm's business in capital investment markets captures the *core systemic elements in organization-based ways*. The 1st value-adding front line enables a BU to pre-empt client needs, excel among competitors, and meet its goals in the short term. A unit integrates the 2nd business processes for ensuring virtual effectiveness. A firm nurtures the 3rd back-end core technologies, competences, and offerings. Innovative organizing involves a core competence architecture and a matrix of core processes and project types where teams play flexible, integrative roles. A firm governs the 4th BU frames. Framing solutions cover ownership, top management, venturing, financing, resource silos, and firm-market interactions. The 5th extended frame includes collaborative ways of front-lining, process integration, competence fusion, benefit balance, and risk avoidance.

Huovinen's (2011) *high-degree, 5-element, high-sustainability system* for managing a firm's business in construction-related contexts captures the core *systemic* elements, i.e. a BU advances the 1st strategies and offerings also for the highest degrees of sustainability. Offerings with no/low negative impacts enable to pre-empt or over-satisfy client needs and meet high-sustainability goals in the short term. A unit integrates the 2nd business processes also for minimizing carbon footprints. A firm nurtures the 3rd back-end or core technologies also based on high-sustainability foresights. A firm governs the 4th frame of each business also for high sustainability. The 5th extended frame is also based on sustainability.

Thus, it is herein argued that in construction *Approach 4 is highly relevant*, at minimum, in the case of BU management systemizing or modeling its business around a core idea. Sectoral clients have large, multi-dimensional investment needs and, in turn, a BU is satisfying needs by engineering systems as wholes and delivering them as modularized parts.

3.5 Commercializing business ideation and its relevance

Firms are crafting business ideas and coupling them with new legal and organizational business entities, i.e., through entrepreneurship, innovation, business development, venturing, or spin-offing. Applying Looser and Schlöpfer's (2001) traditional, 8-part business plan, business ideas can be identified and rolled out to start up high-growth businesses. Innovating may result in new products/services and/or business systems. Adopting Hamel and Breen's (2007) radical approach, management innovations alter managers' work or modify organizations and, thus, advance the goals of respective BUs. Principles, processes, and practices are being reinvented. A management innovation could have a unique capacity to create a long-term advantage when one or more of three conditions are met, i.e., (a) a novel management principle, (b) systemic with a range of processes and methods, and (c) a rapid-fire innovation. When higher tiers denote higher levels of value creation/defensibility in a hierarchy, the 4th tier of management innovations comes out above the 3rd tier of strategy innovations, the 2nd tier of product/service innovations, and the 1st tier of operational innovations.

None of the 13 high-degree BM concepts has been designed along the *commercializing* business ideation dimension. Nevertheless, it is argued that in construction *Approach 5 is highly relevant*, at minimum, in the case of BU management coupling its business ideas with intensively commercializing dimensions. Risk-taking clients with 'wicked' investment needs desire to enter high-innovation contracts and, thus, a BU is nurturing and using entrepreneurial competencies for the making of novel solutions and the realization of business cases profitably.

4. Conclusions

It seems that the business ideation dimension is being recognized among construction-related researchers, at least by the authors of the 13 high-degree BM concepts published between 1990 and 2013. Indicatively, the number of these high-degree concepts corresponding to one of Approaches 1-5 varies between zero and five (Table 2). Nevertheless, it is herein argued that each generic approach to business ideation is, at minimum, highly relevant in the case of BU

management targeting preferred client investment and procurement behavior within construction markets.

Table 2: Correspondence between five generic approaches and 13 construction-related BM concepts designed to high degrees along the business ideation dimension.

<i>Approach</i>	<i>1 Fitting ideation</i>	<i>2 Value-creating ideation</i>	<i>3 Profit-generating ideation</i>	<i>4 System-izing ideation</i>	<i>5 Commer-cializing ideation</i>	<i>All high-degree BM concepts</i>
	<i>No. (%)</i>	<i>No. (%)</i>	<i>No. (%)</i>	<i>No. (%)</i>	<i>No. (%)</i>	<i>No. (%)</i>
<i>No. of concepts</i>	4 (31)	5 (39)	1 (8)	3 (23)	0 (0)	13 (100)

It is suggested that CIB-related scholars design next construction-related BM concepts along the business ideation dimension and adopt the most relevant approaches, respectively. Approach 1 calls for research on how to sustain fit between a business unit and professional clients when changes occur. Approach 2 calls for research on value co-production with farsighted clients, value capture, and offerings integration. Approach 3 calls for research on profit-generating mechanisms related to pioneering clients with complex investment needs and radical solutions. Approach 4 calls for research on systems related to sectoral clients, multi-dimensional investments, and system engineering. Approach 5 calls for research on entrepreneurial competencies related to risk-taking clients, wicked investment needs, and high-innovation contracts. Management in firms competing in construction markets are encouraged to assess the business case-sensitive relevance of each approach and try out those with initial high relevance.

References

- Cooper H M (1998) *Synthesizing Research - A Guide for Literature Reviews*, Thousands Oaks, SAGE.
- Drucker P F (1994) "The Theory of the Business." *Harvard Business Review* **72**(Sep-Oct): 94-104.
- Hamel G with Breen B (2007) *The Future of Management*, Boston, MA, HBS Press.
- Hart C (1998) *Doing a Literature Review*, London, SAGE Publications.
- Hawk D (2006) "Conditions of Success." *Construction Management and Economics* **24**: 735-742.
- Helander A and Möller K (2007) "System Supplier's Customer Strategy." *Industrial Marketing Management* **36**: 719-730.
- Huovinen P (2003a) Firm competences in managing a firm's dynamic business in particular in construction markets. Unpublished licentiate thesis, Espoo, Helsinki University of Technology.
- Huovinen P (2003b) "Knowledge-Based Management of a Firm's Business in Capital Investment Markets", in Ofori G and Ling F Y Y (eds) *Proc. of CIB W55 et al. Symposium on Knowledge Construction*. Vol. 1 (pp. 367-381), 22-24 Oct, National University of Singapore and CIB, Singapore.
- Huovinen P (2004) "Organization-Based Management of a Project Business in Capital-Investment Markets", *Proc. of NORDNET 2004 Conference on Successful PM – Art, Science, and Culture* (pp. 1-5), 29 Sep-2 Oct, PM Association in Finland, Helsinki, Finland.
- Huovinen P (2006a) "Reviewing Conceptual Research on the Targeted Area of Construction-Related Management", in Pietroforte R, De Angelis E and Polverino F (eds) *Proc. of Symposium of CIB on Construction in XXI Century* (pp. 1-12), 18-20 Oct, CIB et al., Rome, Italy.
- Huovinen P (2006b) "Theoretical 52-Concept Platform for Advancing Construction-Related Business Management", in Pietroforte R, De Angelis E and Polverino F (eds) *Proc. of Symposium of CIB on Construction in XXI Century* (pp. 1-12), 18-20 Oct, CIB et al., Rome, Italy.

- Huovinen P (2011) "Managing of Construction-Related Businesses in Environmentally Sustainable Ways - a Focused Review of 62 Concepts", in Wamelink H, Geraedts R and Volker L (eds) *Proc. of MISBE2011 – Int'l Conf. on Management and Innovation for a Sustainable Built Environment* (pp. 1-16), 20-23 June, CIB, Delft University of Technology, AESOP, and ENHR, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Huovinen P (2013) "Advancing International Business Ideation: A Review of 59 Competence-Related IB Management Concepts Published via 23 Journals 1990-2012", in Larimo J (ed) *Proc. of 12th Vaasa Conference on International Business* (pp. 1-31), 21-23 Aug, University of Vaasa, Vaasa, Finland.
- Huovinen P (2015a) "Advancing International Business Ideation Concepts for Contexts Embedded within Capital Investment Markets", in Larimo J et al (eds) *Proc. of 13th Vaasa Conference on International Business* (pp. 1-25), 26-28 Aug, University of Vaasa, Vaasa, Finland.
- Huovinen P (2015b) "Leveraging Concepts for Environmentally Sustainable Business Management in Construction - A Focused Review", in Egbu C (ed) *Proc. of CIB 2015 on Going North for Sustainability: Leveraging Knowledge and Innovation for Sustainable Construction and Development* (pp. 286-296), 23-25 Nov, IBEA, London South Bank University and CIB, London, UK.
- Huovinen P (2015c) "Theoretical 71-Concept Platform for Advancing Construction-Related Business Management", in Kähkönen K, Huovinen P and Keinänen M (eds) *Proc. of the 8th Nordic Conference on Construction Economics and Organisation. Procedia Economics and Finance* **21**: 80-87, 28-29 May, Elsevier. RIL, Tampere University of Technology and CREON, Tampere, Finland.
- Jennings M J and Betts M (1996) "Competitive Strategy for Quantity Surveying Practices." *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management* **3**(3): 163-186.
- Kothari A and Lackner J (2006) "A Value Based Approach to Management." *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* **21**(4): 243-249.
- Kujala S, Artto K, Aaltonen P and Turkulainen V (2010) "Business Models in Project-Based Firms." *International Journal of Project Management* **28**: 96-106
- Leinberger C B (1993) *Strategy for Real Estate Companies*, Washington, ULI and ACRE.
- Looser U and Schläpfer B (2001) *The New Venture Adventure*, London, TEXERE Publishing.
- Lowendahl B (1997/2001) *Strategic Management of Professional Service Firms*. 1st edn/2nd edn, Copenhagen, Copenhagen Business School (Handelshøjskolens Forlag).
- Metais E and Meschi P-X (2005) "Competence-Based Management and Strategic Flexibility: The Case of Air Liquide." *Advances in Applied Business Strategy* **7**: 91-107.
- Normann R (2001) *Reframing Business*, Chichester, John Wiley.
- OED (2012) *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, 1989 with a draft addition January 2002 on ideation, Oxford University Press. Online version November 2010 (available online <http://www.oed.com/search?searchType=dictionary&q=Idea&searchBtn=Search> [accessed on 12/10/2012])
- Osterwalder A and Pigneur Y (2010) *Business Model Generation*, Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley.
- Pinto J K, Rouhiainen P and Trailer J W (2000) "Project Success and Customer Satisfaction", in Lundin R A and Hartman F (eds) *Projects as Business Constituents and Guiding Motives*, Boston, MA, Kluwer.
- Ramirez R (1999) "Value Co-Production: Intellectual Origins and Implications for Practice and Research." *Strategic Management Journal* **20**: 49-64.
- Salonen A, Gabriellson M and Al-Obaidi Z (2006) "Systems Sales as a Competitive Response to the Asian Challenge." *Industrial Marketing Management* **35**: 740-50.
- Slater S F (1997) "Developing a Customer Value-Based Theory of the Firm." *Academy of Marketing Science* **25**(2): 162-166.
- Slywotzky A J, Morrison D J, Moser T, Mundt K A and Quella J A (1999) *Profit patterns*, Times Business.
- Winch G and Schneider E (1993) "The Strategic Management of Architectural Practice." *Construction Management and Economics* **11**: 467-473.