Chapter 1

Introduction: Why is innovation needed in organizational media managing?

Stewart Clegg, Aina Landsverk Hagen & Arne L. Bygdås

Introducing OMEN

The action research project OMEN (Organizing for Media Innovation, 2015-2019), responsible for much of the research results presented in this anthology, indicate that the challenge print media organizations face is not only associated with the ability to come up with new (digital) technological solutions in the face of the challenges presented by some of the most successful companies worldwide today (such as Google, Facebook, Amazon and Apple) that emerged in the digital era. A main challenge for a majority of industries established pre-digital continues to be how to make a successful *transition* into the new digital reality (Anderson, Bell & Shirky, 2012). Technology seems to be foremost in considerations. , The development and implementation of a technology fix seems almost to be a fetish. We suggest that there is much more to successful strategies for transition and change than merely technology alone.

Our insights suggest that the extent to which these new technologies are integrated into the translation, transgression and transformation of everyday work practices in synch with the new digital landscapes is critical. How technology changes practices is socially constructed rather than given by the nature of the material artefacts in use. To a large extent, organizations end up *doing* digital – focusing on the newest technological fad – rather than *being* digital, focusing on, for example, integration of the socially constructed affordances of digital technology and their uses for audience engagement.

The OMEN projects' empirical approach builds upon longitudinal field-studies engaging field participants in joint collaboration inspired by appreciative inquiry (Ludema et al., 2006) as a

positive mode of action research (Reason & Bradbury, 2006) designed to liberate the creative and constructive potential of organizations and human communities (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Ludema et al., 2001). Appreciative inquiry recognizes that inquiry and change are not truly separate moments but are simultaneous; that is, inquiry *is* intervention (Pålshaugen, 2001, see also chapter 12). The empirical material collected covers a timespan of five years, 2013 to 2018, and consisted of interviews, documentary studies, participant observation and facilitation of workshops (see Table 1 for overview of the empirical material).[1]

Overview of empirical material	Number	Participants	
		Editors	Employees
Interviews	30 semistructured interviews of 1 hour (MA)	4	26
	70 semistructured interviews of 1 hour (N)	12*	58*
	32 semistructured interviews of 1 hour (SMP)	4	28
Workshops and meetings with editors	8 workshops and meetings of 2 hours (MA)	3	
	22 workshops and meetings of 1-2 hours (N)	5	
	15 meetings of 1-2 hours (SMP)	1	
Workshops with development group (editors or editors and union representatives)	5 workshops of 2-3 hours (MA)	3	4
	16 workshops of 2 hours (N)	3	19
	3 workshops (SMP)	3	
Workshops with newsroom	5 full day workshops (MA)	3	15-20
	10 half days and 1 full day (N)	6	21
	22 workshops of 2-3 hours (SMP)	2-3	10-15
Participant observations and sit-alongs	5 days (MA)	3	15-20
	10 months full time (N)		
	2 days (SMP)	2	5-10
Corporate meetings	2 meetings of 1 hour (MA)	2	
	2 meetings of 1 hour (N)	4	
	2 meetings of 1 hour (SMP)	6	
Workshops with editors (other newspapers in same corporation)	2 workshops of 3 hours (MA)	38	
Informal talks and observations	> 30 hours (MA)	3	15-20
	> 80 hours (N)	10	>50
	> 30 hours (SMP)	4	>15
Internal documents (reports and analyses)	> 150 pages (MA)		
	> 100 pages (N)		
	> 200 pages (SMP)		

*Table 1 Overview of empirical material in the OMEN project in each media organization; Moss Avis (MA), Nationen (N) and Sunnmørsposten (SMP). *Some persons are interviewed more than once*

OMEN: Organizing for Media Innovation, supported by the Norwegian Research Council[2] was a four-year action research project (2015-2019) led by the Work Research Institute at Oslo

---

[1] Our work with *Nationen* and *Sunnmøsposten* started two years before OMEN was kicked off in 2015.
[2] OMEN is funded 80% by Grant 247580 provided by the Norwegian Research and the remaining 20% by the participating media organizations.

Metropolitan University and accomplished in cooperation with Department of Journalism and Media Studies (OsloMet), University of Technology Sydney, Volda University College and University of Gothenburg. The project had three media organizations as partners in which the research has been conducted: *Sunnmørsposten, Nationen* and *Moss Avis*. All three of them publish six paper editions a week in addition to publishing regularly on their websites and social media accounts and are among the 40 largest out of a total of 226 newspapers in Norway.[3]

Sunnmørsposten is part of Polaris Media, the owner of 30 small and medium sized newspapers in Norway. *Sunnmørsposten* is the largest among them with 38 editorial employees and in 2017 had a net circulation of 24419 and by second quarter 2018 a total of 79,000 daily readers combined for all platforms.[4] *Nationen* is a national niche newspaper for the agricultural and rural districts in Norway. It is part of Tun Media, which also owns three other publications targeting the same market segment. *Nationen* employs 27 editorial staffers and in 2017 had a circulation of 13,370 and by second quarter 2018, 58,000 daily readers in total. Norway's largest publisher of local media titles, Amedia, owns *Moss Avis*. Amedia controls 72 local and regional newspapers. *Moss Avis* employs 30 staffers and had in 2017 a circulation of 12,238 and by second quarter 2018 59,000 daily readers.

Collaborating with these three media organizations in their efforts to adjust to the current digital media landscape, OMEN's input has mainly been related to the development of new and innovative practices and models of organizing, which are reported in nine out of the twelve chapters (2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 13). These innovations, in particular, are related to the exploration of new possibilities and practices in the intersection between how news content is produced and presented and how this work is organized and structured within the media

---

[3] https://www.mediebedriftene.no/tall-og-fakta/opplagstall/
[4] https://kantar.no/globalassets/medier/avis/avis_18_2/kombinasjon-aller-produkter.pdf

organization. In close interaction with the newspapers' employees and management themselves, OMEN researchers have probed into and challenged existing structures and practices, engaging and encouraging ways of rethinking and reimagining various taken-for-granted aspects of their everyday work situations.

In this anthology, we relate these issues to the need for organizations and industries to embrace and perform the digital *from within* rather than acting in regard to the digital as if it were an external unpredictable force driven by necessity and fear of being left behind. Of course, there are many in the technology-consulting sector that, in the past, have been prepared to stress the magic of technology, promoting its awe-inspiring or wondrous qualities, the shock of which can transform organizational livelihoods. Having overcome the initial stage of the 'shock of the new' in terms of digital technologies, it is time for media organizations to understand "media evolution as a process whereby past technologies that had been presumed obsolete or 'dead' are reintegrated into new media practices and tool" (Taffel, 2016, p. 335) as interactions and combinations where previously anticipated ideas are brought to life. Doing digital changes organizations and the livelihoods they sustain but not in any pre-defined or given way.

Most media research, especially on innovation practices, focuses on big national media. For instance, in US 97% of all newspapers have less than 50,000 circulation figures (Radcliffe & Ali, 2017). The OMEN researchers' innovative contribution is to bring new perspectives based on findings from small and medium sized media businesses that, after all, constitute the majority of the industry. Doing so, and working closely in ethnographical, anthropologically inclined action research, OMEN have developed and implemented tools and practices for innovation and creativity in the participating news organizations as well as charting the challenges and obstacles faced in efforts to make innovation an integrated part of everyday work practices in these organizations.

The need for innovation in organizations is promoted everyday, nearly everywhere. We are now fully immersed in ongoing, rapid digital transitions, experienced by many as an *age of uncertainty* and *speed* (Wajcman & Dodd, 2017). Traditional media organizations are particularly pressed to explore, develop and adapt to this new reality, as people consume news in different ways. The screen is replacing the newspaper for many readers and offering a very different experience. Consumer culture has shifted irrevocably. As Gillian Tett (2018) noted, customisation is now the dominant trend in consumption. The individualism associated with the rise of neoliberalism, combined with digital technology, means that each individual can customise what he or she consumes according to individual tastes and this goes for news as well. We no longer buy newspapers with preselected news but create personalised news hubs, stream our own choice of media, whenever we want to and can download any podcasts we find interesting.

Politically, this has wide repercussions. Powerful political actors can deride what they do not wish to hear as so called "fake news"; they can manage their press conferences and media appearances so as to only appear before those outlets deemed friendly. Followers can likewise stream media only from those Facebook feeds that reflect what they 'like'. They can slim down the variety of sources that they consult so their news is contained in a 'bubble' (Merleau-Ponty, 2013). Inside various bubbles distinct and alternate realities are constructed as interpretive universes (Bauman, 2013). Newspapers whose editors might once have legislated on what was newsworthy and how it should be interpreted in their print-based bastions of opinion could function as a Fourth Estate. There are significant implications for re-establishing media as the Fourth Estate, re-positioning it so that can make a difference by being a different kind of interpreter rather than one that seeks to assert domain authority. Media organizations' old role of being authorities, proclaiming from a privileged position, is no longer viable but this opens opportunities for more democratic and egalitarian forms of engagement between publics and

news frames. First, there is the role of the media as a dialogical partner in the processes of political, cultural, intellectual and current affairs. In the old print-based economy, even in the most rabidly partisan newspaper, there was a semblance of balance achieved by the spread of opinion, editorial, news, features and correspondence. Customised news loses that.

Second, the practices of the newsroom change dramatically as old routines embedded in a pre-digital world continue to haunt emerging ways of coping with changes that are uncertain, for which much sensemaking is deficient, throwing up new states of uncertainty. In many ways the best thing that happened to the diversity of news production, consumption and distribution has been digitization albeit, that paradoxically, it has been fatal for many news organizations.

Third, advertising revenue which in the pre-digital era was earned from classifieds and other advertising for which newspapers and magazines were the main channels of communication, has been redistributed as advertising has moved into the digital age of Google, Facebook and Amazon as major channels. The shifts in revenue have been the major drivers of the emergence of new business models such as pay-walls, digital subscriptions, organizing events that can be marketed both as events and as stories about the events that are staged, and content marketing where stories are 'sponsored'. The shift in business models to digital subscription and digital advertising revenues has been successful for many news organizations. However, taking a snapshot of the significant decline in advertising revenues for print products in Norway, from 6 per cent (local and niche newspapers) to 20 per cent (tabloids and national newspapers) per annum, it is evident that the viability of many newspapers, particularly regional ones (numbers from 2016, in Norwegian Media Authority 2017), is precarious. Norway is not atypical. The same trends are replicated in other advanced societies elsewhere. For democratic societies a free, independent and robust press is an essential ingredient, as the many critiques of the concentration of print and other media ownership have argued (Doyle, 2002; George, 2007;

Noam, 2009; Baker, 2006; Kavoura, 2018). In Scandinavia, in particular, this concentration is diminishing the relevance of local news organization, as Sjøvaag, Stavelin, Karlsson and Kammer (2018) determine.

Fourth, the digital world is a world of open strategy, the ramifications of which are only now emerging as factors shaping, framing and potentially empowering how news is produced, consumed and distributed. The future is open and uncertain and we cannot know what it will bring but we do know what has been lost. In the pre-digital ecology newspapers and daily newscasts set the frame for the day's hierarchy of news in a single decision event, albeit that it might be updated in subsequent print editions or newscasts later in the day. Events defined by newsrooms no longer constitute the news in an open ecology.

An open ecology involves harnessing collective creativity in routine processes (Chesbrough & Appleyard, 2007), that allows enhanced participation beyond organizational boundaries in which You, dear reader, frame the news values by the clicks that you make; the hierarchy is no longer decided in a single event by a news editor but is a process in which hierarchies are fluid, liquid, changing. Previously excluded actors – the readers now online – frame news hierarchies in a process of open strategy and audience engagement (Appleyard & Chesbrough, 2016; Dobusch, Seidl, & Werle, 2015; Kennedy, Whiteman, & van den Ende, 2016)

In a time when the digital no longer comes across as a novelty, *Media Management and Digital Transformation* provides empirically rich insight into the tensions, change and innovations of news making and managing today. We began our enquiries with a series of questions. What does it take to manage and organize for continuous change and innovation, in an era where *everyone* can be a media maker? What does it take to enable today's media not only to survive digitization but also be able to thrive in a new, uncertain and rapidly changing context? In answering these questions with empirical insights and theoretical acumen, combined with a

commitment to help make media organizations more sustainable and able to cope with these rapidly shifting innovations reshaping newsrooms we developed new analytical perspectives to establish and advance media management as a practice-oriented discipline relevant for students, researchers and practitioners from within and outside of the media industry.

The research that produced this book involved international collaborating partners in the OMEN project drawn from Norway, Sweden, UK, US and Australia, who have worked with media partners in action-oriented research that explores how to foster ingenious innovations and resilient organizations in unsettling times. In chapters that draw on theoretical and methodological resources generated from qualitative case studies of contemporary practices, we investigate long-term processes and ongoing challenges related to managing contemporary media organizations on local, regional, national and global scales.

Media Management and Digital Transformation presents groundbreaking research that contributes not only to managing creativity and innovation better in media organizations but also advances the field of media management by providing insights that are applicable beyond the realm of the media industry. For the interested reader a resource website, OMEN Academy, containing a collection of applicable models, methods and tools is available at http://omenacademy.oslomet.no.

The significance of this research for the future of the Fourth Estate cannot be underestimated in an era when democracy is under threat from the machinations of data analytics companies such as Cambridge Analytica in framing and automating news feeds in decisive events such as referenda and elections (Clegg, Schweitzer and van Rijmen, 2019). Big data derived from open systems can be gamed for political advantage, since knowledge gained from big data analytics creates a competitive advantage (Gobble, 2013; Kiron & Shockley, 2011; McAfee et al., 2012; Prescott, 2014; Sharma, Mithas, & Kankanhalli, 2014). Big data analytic companies such as

Cambridge Analytica create a 'central node' in alternative news and information networks using open sourced data to do so. Against the strategies of big data analytics, whose propensity to produce systematic communicative distortion should not be under estimated, a viable national, regional and local press is the first line of defence, both by reporting covert practices and providing opportunities for windows on the world rather than a narrow aperture (in this respect, the investigative journalism of Carole Cadwalladr (2017a; 2017b; Cadwalladr and Graham-Harrison, 2018) in *The Guardian*, has been exemplary). To do this, newsrooms have to change from a print-based frame to one that is digital. How they might do so is the substance of this book, the contributions to which we turn next.

Part I Ethnographing the Newsroom

In Chapter 2, "Print and digital: Synchronizing discrepant temporal regimes in the newsroom", Gudrun R. Skjælaaen and Ingrid M. Tolstad examine the efforts of a Norwegian national niche newspaper in organizing, managing and integrating the two distinct and apparently discrepant temporal regimes associated with print and digital news. The authors build upon the notion of "practices of synchronization" introduced by Jordheim (2014). Applying this to the empirical data, they argue that even if a strategy of 'digital first' is imposed in the newsroom, this will imply neither a transition that makes the digital news' temporal regime dominant nor will it necessarily establish a hierarchical relation between them. A specific emphasis is thus placed upon how these temporal regimes are negotiated in order to navigate according to both temporalities simultaneously. The print production frame is governed by deadlines following a daily linear trajectory starting with the morning meeting and ending in the shared relief, satisfaction and joy of having avoided 'death' once again when the paper is sent to print. The authors describe this production regime as being similar to a Groundhog Day because each day in the newspaper repeats itself in a way that is remarkably similar to previous ones and thus

represents a repetitious reproduction of past experiences. In contrast, in digital news production, the regime of the deadline is rendered obsolete and transformed into another temporality representing an ongoing and immediate production and publishing that is near-future oriented and 'rewarded' in terms of metrics generated by consumers' decisions. Each of these coexisting temporal regimes contains multiple, alternative and competing times and the authors find that the dissonance between them also comes into play in framing the relationship between management and employees. They investigate how tensions and conflicts arise as additional and interwoven temporal understandings and experiences inform and influence the practices of (non-)synchronization, influencing managers' efforts to change newsroom practices from prioritizing print production as opposed to online production modes.

In Chapter 3, "From Deadline to flowline: Managing paradoxical demands in news organizations through metaphor", the topic of how metaphors can be used in organizational change processes, is raised by Arne L. Bygdås, Aina Landsverk Hagen, Ingrid M. Tolstad and Gudrun R. Skjælaaen. Their point of departure was a puzzle: why is shifting from a tight and narrow deadline work schedule to a more loosely structured and open-ended work flow so hard to accomplish in practice, even though everyone agrees it is feasible and desirable? They build on the knowledge and discussion of the previous chapter and add empirical data from three Norwegian medium-sized media organizations, with an emphasis on temporal regimes.

The notion of the deadline is an ingrained institutionalized norm for keeping track of time. Meeting the deadline is the drama of the print-based journalists' day, as many movies have explore, most classically the Humphrey Bogart noir classic, *Deadline U.S.A.*, directed by Richard Brooks (2018). The norm is deeply engrained in practice despite its institutionalization in a regime of print-based production. Indeed, it is so deeply embedded that it influences attempts to change the production flow to be more in line with digital publication.

The notion of deadline is a metaphor, and metaphors are commonly thought of as vehicles for thought experimentation and means for transmitting meaning. By viewing metaphors as a process of bringing forth new perspectives (Schön 1988), the authors suggest that metaphors are creative enacted accomplishments linking the organizational realm to the realm of action. The chapter presents and discusses what happened in the three media organizations when the metaphor 'flowline' was introduced. The authors argue that generative metaphors can be a powerful device for facilitating organizational change. Drawing on the analogy of an airport production flow, with its continuous stream of people and flights, they introduce the metaphor of the flowline as a continuous process in contrast to a deadline in which where everyone starts and finishes at the same time. The flowline metaphor situates paradoxical demands and introduces managers in to a chance to think anew with new metaphors for their central workflow task.

The metaphor of flowline was interpreted differently in the three organizations and the authors suggest that the transformative 'what if…?' question opened up new situations in which existing rules and procedures could be imagined as not applying. Journalists and editors had to construct narratives to 'fill in the residuals' to see what they could become when their imagination of what they were doing was changed. Connecting seemingly disparate realms, metaphors turned out to be a vehicle for opening up ingrained practices, enabling new conceptions of time and temporal structuring, disembedding participants from deeply institutionalised norms. The authors conclude that performative metaphors can function as temporal and provisional constructs for lowering thresholds and enabling transformative change. Through metaphorical events a new temporal structuring viewed as a flow of ongoing action is imagined and brings forth a new way understanding how activities can be linked, interconnected and sequenced in media organizations.

The topic treated in Chapter 4, "Local journalism seen through the numbers: Interpreting metrics through quantitative and qualitative methods", by Bente Kalsnes, focuses on the use of performance measurements, often denoted as metrics in news organization. In the era of digital news, measuring and analysing audience footprints has attracted considerable interest among managers in news organizations. In this chapter Kalsnes discusses how and in what ways metrics are used, for what purposes. Her point of departure is a study of the major Norwegian media corporation *Amedia* that conducted a large-scale analysis of stories published by their subsidiaries. The aim of this study was to provide guidelines about what kind of stories should be made and how best to present them to attract readers and persuade them to become subscribers. More than 11,000 stories were analysed and in addition to discussing the main implications of the analysis Kalsnes also investigates how the results were received and utilized by one of the subsidiaries. She finds that metrics are not only used to track how well news stories are performing with audiences but that they are also used to obtain a more general understanding of audiences' preferences, as cues for how to make successful stories in the future. In the local newspaper studied for the staff concerned the comprehensive analysis of the data, in combination with weekly reports and access to real time performance, represented an overwhelming amount of data and a major interpretive effort. Nonetheless, by focusing on some core measures and the overall guidelines from the analysis, the local newspaper improved their performance over time in terms of numbers of readers and the time readers spent reading as well as conversion of unregistered to registered users.

An even more significant improvement took place when the local newspaper initiated a change of the production process, adapting to a flowline production philosophy (see Chapter 3) through a series of workshops that led to an increase of 40 percent in the number of stories produced by journalists and 30 percent increased reading. Nonetheless, Kalsnes concludes that even if the analysis performed by the media corporation was unprecedented in scale, scope and use of

resources in the Nordic media industry and was regarded as a success internally, the usefulness for the subsidiary gradually diminished over time as the potential for improvement was emptied.

Chapter 5, "Projects as containers of future hopes and dreams: Organizing innovation projects in the newspaper field", by Elena Raviola, Maria Norbäck and Rolf Lundin, investigates how innovation of new digital products and services generating new revenue streams are organized in mature newspaper organizations. The empirical basis for the chapter is two in-depth case studies in two Nordic newspapers, one held to be a pioneer in innovating new products and services, while the other is perceived as being more conservative, with a focus on implementing already established technologies in the industry. In both cases innovation initiatives are from the outset organised as separate projects to avoid disturbances from and to the established organisations. The reason for this is to keep them from interfering with everyday news production; hence, they are organised to facilitate only compartmentalized innovation.

The authors examine the unfolding of the projects' character and relations to the organisation changes, using an analytical lens founded on institutional theory. Even though they were supposed to be temporary organizations with specific tasks and measurable goals, over a period of time they went from having their own goals and measures to becoming infused with the values of the permanent organization. Rather than being time limited and connected to well defined tasks, these projects became ongoing and almost permanent containers of future hopes and dreams so that the remainder of the organization might continue with 'business as usual'.

The organisation's key players involved in the new digital initiatives challenged the work practices of the parent through boundary spanning from the projects to the host organization. Raviola et al. introduce two notions to capture and describe the dynamics between projects and the parent organisation: 'permanentization of the temporary' in which projects may become

permanent units through which strategy can be enacted and the future can be handled, and 'temporalization of the future' where issues regarding the future take project form and are handled by a temporal logic in which the people working in the newspapers do not have to worry in the present about the future of the newspaper. The authors conclude that despite the contemporary allure of project work as means of succeeding with innovation, in-depth studies of 'polar types' of innovation projects raise the question of whether projects have become 'garbage cans' for rather loose and vaguely defined development projects with unclear outcomes, as such not living up to their promise as a universal model for organizing innovation initiatives.

Part II. Interventions: Changing practices in the Newsroom

Part II opens with a discussion by Øyvind Pålshaugen and Aina L. Hagen on "Creating the new while producing the news: Managing media innovation in times of uncertainty". Chapter 6 discusses how chronology is an uncertain parameter in the planning of innovation processes in media companies, given that there is no general rule for what should be 'the first step' in exerting an overall strategy for innovation. The 'digital first' strategy that is common in many contemporary newsrooms quickly turns into a buzzword with demobilising effects if the management's attempts to realise it turn out to be 'just talk'. The authors' claim that managers would be more successful if, in collaboration with journalists and outsiders, they focused instead on staging *constellations* of innovation processes, providing room for the staff's creativity while simultaneously directing the intervention processes. Based on empirical data from a local and a regional news organization in Norway, the authors argue that the processual interplay of such interventions and their performative enrichment of each other depends on three aspects in the ongoing processes of innovation: 1) the need for involving all employees; 2) the need for testing the ideas and attempts of innovation in practice and 3), the need for

taking advantages of unforeseen outcomes in the process. The combination of these strategies results in a continuous co-creation of methods, tools and ways to think about change in a local news organization.

The specificities of Norwegian contributions to the broader field of organizational analysis inform the chapter. Co-creation is the key: working in the traditions of Nordic work life research with its strong emphasis on anthropological methods of research that work *with* the members of the organization, the authors introduce us to process innovations such as the OMEN chart and the reconfiguring of colour coding in a production planner software, as examples of low cost performative enrichments. The strategy of 'all in' for example, gave the local journalists an opportunity to see the potential rationality of incremental innovations in the planning system from within their own work experiences, as well as an opportunity to participate in improving this rationality.

In the media organization *Sunnmørsposten*, an initiative by the digital editor, called The Duet Relay, was highly successful in terms of engaging an audience, yet the attempts to bring the marketing department into the process failed. The all in-strategy thus seems to be challenging especially for such attempts at crossing the threshold between marketing and the newsroom for boosting innovation projects. The authors also argue that the dialogical model of *giving it a try*, in which no actor can claim to know what will be the outcome of intervention processes, implies that managers have to give something away: control, time/space, power – and some more. The tricky and risky business of innovation in media practice literally entails attempts to create the new while making the news.

Overall, the OMEN project found how the absence of systematization and skills for conceiving and planning intense and rapid idea development seems to be a major challenge for both the media organizations as well as in journalism education. Thompson (2003:106) argues that

traditional management practices hinder rather than facilitate creative teamwork. Chapter 7, by Aina Landsverk Hagen and Ingrid M. Tolstad, introduces collaborative creativity as a major challenge and possibility for innovation in newsroom practices. the title of their chapter is "The Idea Propeller: Managing for collective creativity in newsrooms", in which the authors argue that involving all employees in daily creative work will have several positive effects for organizational practices and products. Leaders should manage *for* creativity instead of managing creativity, as Amabile and Khaire (2008) argue.

The chapter, in which the authors investigate how idea development can become a daily practice in news production, through a specific tool called the Idea Propeller, is based on cases from three newsrooms and a variety of student arenas in Norway and the United States. This low-threshold tool is designed to be effective in amplifying ideas for news stories, and numerous testing show how initial ideas always becomes multiple ideas for stories – yet, the newsrooms find it hard to implement such a systematic way of working with ideas in their daily production flow. The chapter concludes that for managers to foster creative literacy of others, a mastery of creativity boosting techniques is required, in order to prioritize this as a fundamental, collective activity in the newsroom. Moreover, the use of the Idea Propeller in education show that journalism students thrive when exposed to ideas and tools of creativity and innovation. They certainly want more of this.

In Chapter 8, "Managing for audience engagement: Taking steps towards a 'glowline' co-production in the newsroom",Ingrid M. Tolstad, Aina Landsverk Hagen and Gudrun R. Skjælaaen discuss the ways media organizations experiment with different forms of audience engagement. The lack of systemic approaches with a predictable learning curve makes the success or failure of such endeavours dependent on the motivation and competencies of the individual manager. How can newsrooms tap into and strengthen people's engagement?

Building on empirical data from newsrooms' interactions as well as face-to-face interviews, the OMEN researchers have developed the systemic approach of 'glowline', a co-creation model integrated into the flowline regime. Three cases of audience engagement initiatives in the media organizations *Moss Avis, Sunnmørsposten* and *Nationen* are presented and discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the benefits and challenges of co-creation and exchange between news workers and audiences. A particular emphasis is placed on the role of management in such collaborative efforts.

Christina Dunbar-Hester in Chapter 9, "Challenging digital utopianism: Electronic imaginaries and the second century of radio", presents a case of turn of the millennium activism promoting FM broadcasting in the United States. These digital radio activists provide a unique site for analysing new media adoption and resistance; as technologically savvy critics of Internet utopianism, they are not dismissible as mere 'Luddites' or nostalgic radio hobbyists. Although features of this case are unique to a national policy context, they offer wider lessons for thinking about electronic communication and the future of civic life. In particular, the radio activists give voice to values often overlooked in electronic communication, including alternatives to 'informational' discourses; an insistence on contextual knowledge with community accountability, de-emphasising commercialism and market values. The values they ascribe to FM radio not only have significance as material consequences of this medium but also even more potential as metaphorical entailments applicable to other media.

Part III Openings & collaborations: Renewing the Newsroom

Elizabeth Anne Watkins and C.W. Anderson discuss the paradox of stasis and change within journalistic practices in Chapter 10, "Managing journalistic innovation and source security in the age of the weaponized internet". The authors research resistance to and the eventual asymmetrical adaptation of information security tools in media organizations. Building on two

empirical case studies of adoption of novel technologies, they argue that innovation is neither an imposing, inexorable force of nature demanding compliance, nor a sweeping wave of future-oriented jubilance. Their driving question is how innovation spreads through organizations and they focus, in particular, on the crucial role of legitimacy within the newsroom. When it comes to changing practices in a pressurized market for reputation, which the journalistic profession represents, there is a great need for identifying sources of validity in order to establish legitimacy. The case shows how solutions to even the alarmingly apparent necessity for innovation can be suppressed. Managers must manage against custom, habit and routine: they must break customary routines and habitual practices if they are to implement new roles and secure a diverse staff.

In Chapter 11, "Teaming up with technology: socio-material managerial approaches for digital transformation", Gudrun R. Skjælaaen and Arne L. Bygdås explore ways of managing organizational change by introducing new technology. Their point of departure is a longitudinal case study of the niche newspaper *Nationen's* project of developing an integrated production system for seamless publishing of print and online news. By building upon theories of socio-material practices (Orlikowksi, 2007), actor-network theory (Latour, 1987; Callon, 1986; Law, 1987), affordances (Gibson, 1979) and scripts (Akrich, 1992) they identify and describe changes in the organizational practices as new technology are introduced in the newsroom. Skjælaaen and Bygdås do this in terms of what they denote as prescriptive and proscriptive socio-materiality as opposites of a continuum. The former advocates building rules and routines for sustained efficiency while the latter provide opportunities for flexibility and uses technology as an enabler for novel and creative action.

The authors describe several attempts of forcing designed solutions on the newsroom to make it 'digital first' that did not work out as intended. Over time, they observed a gradual shift in

the managerial approach from applying technology in order to impose precepts and routines tom instead using it as support for developing employees' crafts and skills. Skjælaaen and Bygdås argue that the way of organizing and managing technology-driven organizational change effectively relies on the extent to which solutions are located towards the prescriptive or proscriptive side of the socio-material continuum; successful scripting is dependent on an in-depth knowing of the ongoing practices subject to change, while using technology as support require mechanisms for developing individual crafts and skills and enabling collective learning and knowledge sharing in the newsroom.

Ivar John Erdal discusses the process of bringing newsrooms and media students together in co-creation and experimental collaboration of digital journalism and web documentaries in Chapter 12, "Education as innovation: Exploring the synergy of student-journalist collaboration". He takes us through four iterations of such experiential educational practices in the regional news organization *Sunnmørsposten*, showing how this is a continuous learning process for both the students *and* the journalists, by building upon a perspective of "learning by doing" (Deuze 2006). The chapter discusses such new forms of collaboration with external non-newsroom actors, showing how emerging technologies and innovative storytelling are incremental to diminishing the traditional hierarchy between novice and mentor. These new collaborations can inspire and challenge the everyday practices of students, the educational institutions they belong to, as well as the newsrooms engaged. The chapter outlines a model describing steps for conducting collaborative learning projects and provide suggestions for how and what to consider when establishing creative and viable academia-media industry cooperation.

In the closing chapter, "Context and continuities: a plea for media research *in medias res*", Øyvind Pålshaugen and Stewart Clegg discuss lessons learnt from the OMEN project for future

research on managing media innovation. In particular they are concerned to show how social research can create knowledge that has a continuing social impact and hark back to the origin of the Scandinavian tradition of action research tradition in "the industrial democracy project" of contributors such as Emery & Thorsrud, (1976), Elden (1979) and Deutsch (2005) to suggest ways this can be achieved. The OMEN-project is consciously founded on this tradition of action research, forming the basis for diverse research approaches and framing of organizational interventions. What is common to the approach is linking theoretical concepts with practical methods and tools for creating innovative practice in *ongoing practice*. Pålshaugen and Clegg argue that entering into practical cooperation with media companies*, in medias res*, is a precondition for generating research-based knowledge and methods that are *useful* for managing, enabling and performing innovation processes. The authors make the point that knowledge developed in OMEN cannot be found in abstract models or concepts but is lodged in the *critical reasoning* displayed throughout and within the various chapters' analyses. It is from this reasoning that new perspectives and a new understanding of phenomena and issues crucial for new ways of managing and performing innovation emerge.

References

Ali, C. & Radcliffe, D. (2017, November 15). "Small-market newspapers in the digital age". Report, Tow Center for Digital Journalism. https://doi.org/10.7916/D8WS95VQ

Amabile, T. M., Khaire, M. (2008). Creativity and the role of the leader. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(10), 101-109.

Anderson, C. W., Bell, E. & Shirky, C. (2012). *Post-Industrial Journalism: Adapting to the Present.* Report (November 2012). New York: Tow Center for Digital Journalism, Columbia Journalism School. https://doi.org/10.7916/D8N01JS7

Appleyard, M. M., & Chesbrough, H. W. (2017). The dynamics of open strategy: from adoption to reversion. *Long Range Planning*, 50(3), 310-321.

Baker, C. E. (2006). *Media concentration and democracy: Why ownership matters*. Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, Z. (2013). *Legislators and interpreters: On modernity, post-modernity and intellectuals*. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Brooks, R. (1952) (motion picture director) *Deadline U.S.A.* New York: Twentieth Century Fox.

Cadwalladr, C. (2017a). The great British Brexit robbery: how our democracy was hijacked, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/may/07/the-great-british-brexit-robbery-hijacked-democracy, accessed 14.06.2018.

Cadwalladr, C. (2017b). Robert Mercer: the big data billionaire waging war on mainstream media, available at https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2017/feb/26/robert-mercer-breitbart-war-on-media-steve-bannon-donald-trump-nigel-farage, accessed 14.06.2018.

Cadwalladr, C., & Graham-Harrison, E. (2018). Revealed: 50 million Facebook profiles harvested for Cambridge Analytica in major data breach. *The Guardian*, available at https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election, accessed 14.06.2018.

Chesbrough, H. W., & Appleyard, M. M. (2007). Open Innovation and Strategy. *California Management Review*, 50(1), 57-76.

Clegg, S. R., Schweitzer, J. and van Rijmen, M. (2019) The Politics of Openness, in Seidl, D. van Krogh, G., and Whittington, R. (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Open Strategy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobusch, Laura, Dobusch, Leonhard, & Müller-Seitz, G. (2017, December 21). Closing for the Benefit of Openness? The case of Wikimedia's open strategy process. *Organization Studies*. 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617736930

Doyle, G. (2002). *Media ownership: The economics and politics of convergence and concentration in the UK and European media*. London: Sage.

George, L. (2007). What's fit to print: The effect of ownership concentration on product variety in daily newspaper markets. *Information Economics and Policy*, 19(3-4), 285-303.

Gobble, M. M. 2013. Resources: Big Data: The Next Big Thing in Innovation. *Research-Technology Management*, 56(1), 64-67.

Kavoura, A. (2018). Socio-Economic Processes, User Generated Content, and Media Pluralism. In Mehdi Khosrow-Pour (ed.) (2018) *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition*, pp. 7270-7280. IGI Global. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-2255-3

Kennedy, S., Whiteman, G., & van den Ende, J. (2016). Radical Innovation for Sustainability: The Power of Strategy and Open Innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 50(6), 712-725.

Kiron, D., & Shockley, R. 2011. Creating Business Value with Analytics. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 53(1), 57-63.

McAfee, A., Brynjolfsson, E., Davenport, T. H., Patil, D., & Barton, D. (2012). Big data: The management revolution. *Harvard Business Review*. 90(10), 61-67.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2013). *Phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge.

Noam, E. (2009). *Media ownership and concentration in America*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Norwegian Media Authority (2017). Økonomien i norske medieverksemder 2012–2016. delrapport 1: Økonomien i avishusa (The economy in Norwegian media organizations. Part report 1: The economy in newspaper organizations). Report (June 2017). Oslo: Norwegian Media Authority.

Prescott, M. (2014). Big data and competitive advantage at Nielsen. *Management Decision*, 52(3), 573-601.

Pålshaugen, Ø. (2001): "The Use of Words: Improving Enterprises by Improving Their Conversations". In: Reason, P. and Bradbury, H.: Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice. London: Sage Publications.

Sharma, R., Mithas, S., & Kankanhalli, A. (2014). Transforming decision-making processes: a research agenda for understanding the impact of business analytics on organisations. *European Journal of Information Systems*. 23(4), 433-441.

Sjøvaag, H., Stavelin, E., Karlsson, M., & Kammer, A. (2018). The Hyperlinked Scandinavian News Ecology: The unequal terms forged by the structural properties of digitalisation. *Digital Journalism*, 1-25. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2018.1454335

Taffel, S. (2016). "Perspectives on the postdigital: Beyond rhetorics of progress and novelty" in *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*. 22(3), 324-338.

Wajcman, J. & Dodd, N. (2017). *The Sociology of Speed: Digital, Organizational, and Social Temporalities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tett, G. (2018) Trump, Oprah and the era of pick 'n' mix politics, *Financial Times*, June 14 2018, accessed at https://www.ft.com/content/b0ecf3de-6e96-11e8-92d3-6c13e5c92914