Taneli Heikka

Dialogic Journalism

How Can Journalists Participate in the Networks of Social Innovation?

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Taneli Heikka

Dialogic Journalism

How Can Journalists Participate in the Networks of Social Innovation?

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2017

Dialogic Journalism

How Can Journalists Participate in
the Networks of Social Innovation?

Taneli Heikka

Dialogic Journalism

How Can Journalists Participate in the Networks of Social Innovation?

ABSTRACT

This thesis asks the question "What is the role of journalism in social innovation?" It explores how journalism is redefined when it engages in the creation of "the new" in society. The study analyzes four cases of journalism-related social innovation in two countries – the USA and Finland: a contentious national media event; crowdsourcing for legislation; a series of dialogic innovation workshops in Finland; an environment of data-based civic innovation in the USA. Social innovation is defined as innovations that work in meeting social goals.

In literature and the contemporary discussion on the crisis of journalism, innovation is required to restore journalisms' legitimacy and financial sustainability. Simultaneously, innovations that affect and challenge journalistic work increasingly emerge from outside the newsrooms. Despite the potential for mutually beneficial co-operation, professional journalism is either absent, or a passive observer, in these environments. Journalism risks losing relevance and trust in the grassroots of society, as was exemplified during the presidential election in the USA and the Brexit referendum in the UK in 2016.

This thesis argues that journalism is increasingly required to operate in flexible roles in networks of social innovation. The thesis suggests various emerging practices available for journalists to collaborate in these environments. It also introduces the type of dialogic journalism to understand how journalism can participate in networks of social innovation. The thesis characterizes dialogic journalism by co-creating solutions for social problems across organizational borders.

Strong innovative dialogue appears to emerge in environments of physical proximity among people from diverse organizational backgrounds. The argument is that holding spaces are the social structures in which open-ended and non-judgmental dialogue among journalists and the former audience can take place. In these spaces, the making of meaning is not only rational but also social, emotive and corporeal. Journalists are invited to temporarily abandon their position as disinterested observers of events.

Research on innovation in journalism has focused on technology-driven, newsroom led innovation. Consequently, the role of journalism in social innovation has been largely reactive. This thesis introduces a way of thinking about innovation as a dialogue over organizational and professional boundaries.

The relevance of the findings to journalism theory is analyzed through the research theme of participatory journalism. The thesis argues that Bohm's (1996) dialogue, although challenging and seldom accomplished in its pure form, is compatible with the ideals of journalism, for which the participatory journalism movement calls. Traditionally, participatory journalism is viewed as citizens' participation to journalistic projects initiated by newsrooms. This study suggests an inverted model: that professional journalists could also seek to contribute to journalism-related innovations in collaboration with the civil society.

The findings are critically reflected against professional journalism's ideology of objectivity. The findings question the relevance of the journalists' role as an "objective" outsider, in an era when journalistic work requires openness to professional and personal change. Suspension of professional roles and judgment may be a requirement for learning. Furthermore, through dialogue, journalists can also learn new practices of innovation and overcome resistance to change in newsrooms.

Keywords: dialogue, journalism, social innovation, participatory journalism, holding space

Author's address Taneli Heikka
Department of Language and Communication Studies
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Supervisors University Researcher Turo Uskali
Department of Language and Communication Studies
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Professor Epp Lauk
Department of Language and Communication Studies
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Professor Elias G. Carayannis
Department of Information Systems & Technology
Management
George Washington University, Washington DC

Reviewers Professor Indrek Ibrus
Baltic Film, Media, Arts and Communication School
Tallinn University

Professor Harald Hornmoen
Department of Journalism and Media Studies, Faculty of
Social Sciences
Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

Opponent Professor Indrek Ibrus
Baltic Film, Media, Arts and Communication School
Tallinn University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to numerous people, whom a lack of space excludes me from mentioning either their names or their particular help. These include friends, colleagues in academia and the journalistic profession, as well as clients and business partners all of whom have in their own way contributed to the formulating of the research questions, the arguments and the analyses of the findings that form this work.

Finally, my wife Riina has been the staunchest supporter of my doctoral pursuit. It is a rare privilege to have a life companion who not once over the years complained about the pressure and demands academic research inevitably places on a family. Thank you. Our children Elsa and Arvo have provided unconditional love and unending inspiration in discovery and curiosity.

Espoo, Aug 13, 2017

Taneli Heikka

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

NGO   Non-governmental organization
ANT   Actor Network Theory
CI-Act   Civic Initiative Act
HDI   Helsinki Deaconess Institute
MoJ   Ministry of Justice
A1, A2,
A3, A4   Articles 1, Article 2, etc. (the original published articles in this thesis)

TABLES

LIST OF ORIGINAL ARTICLES

I   Heikka, T. (2015) "The Rise of the Mediating Citizen: Time, Space and Citizenship in the Crowdsourcing of Finnish Legislation". Policy & Internet. Volume 7, Issue 3, pages 268–291, September.

II Heikka, T., Valaskivi, K. and Uskali, T. (2016) "Crashing a National Media Event: The Circulation of Social Imaginaries in the Gatecrashers Riots in Finland" in Mitu, B., and Poulakidos, S.: Media events: A critical contemporary approach. Palgrave Macmillan. UK.

III Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E. (2016) The role of journalism in dialogic innovation processes – The case of The Helsinki Deaconess Institute multi-stakeholder workshops. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. Springer. Online first 20 December, 2016.

IV Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E. (2017). Three stages of innovation in participatory journalism – co-initiating, co-sensing and co-creating news in the Chicago school cuts case. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy,* 1-28.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO ORIGINAL ARTICLES

I   Sole author

II Lead author. Designed the research as a result of discussions with the co-authors. Responsible of data collection. Led the analysis of the findings and conceptualizing of the theoretical framework together with co-authors. Led the writing process, produced most of the text, and was responsible of bringing together into the final version the elements produced by co-authors. Contact and main executor in the review and revisions process.

III Lead author. Designed the research plan. Collected the data. Led the analysis of the findings and conceptualizing of the theoretical framework together with co-author. Responsible for the review and revision process. Wrote the final version of the article as a result of discussions with the co-author.

IV Lead author. Designed the research plan. Collected the data. Led the analysis of the findings and conceptualizing of the theoretical framework together with co-author. Responsible for the review and revision process. Wrote the final version of the article as a result of discussions with the co-author.

CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

Professional journalism struggles for financial survival and societal legitimacy. Newspapers in the Western world are in a downward spiral, increasingly failing to make positive financial results. Furthermore, trust in the news media is low. One of the core functions of journalism – that of enabling democracy – may be in peril (Downie & Schudson 2009; Starr 2009; McChesney & Pickard 2011; Lewis 2012a, 2012b; MacGregor 2014; Newman et al 2016.)

As examples, in 2016 the presidential election in the USA and the Brexit referendum in the UK revealed the depth of this crisis. These events raised questions about the ability of the journalistic media to understand emerging sentiments in the "grassroots" of society and provide channels for constructive public discussion. The elections were marred by fake news, a polarized and partisan environment pervading both the legacy media and social media, and a distrust towards journalistic work (Jackson et al. 2016; Lilleker et al. 2016). The need for innovation of new practices, tools and journalistic content is pressing. However, research has suggested that journalists are unwilling to change and to develop, for example, new ways for citizens' participation in the production of journalism.

The main objective of the study is to explore the new roles journalism assumes in creation of "the new" in society. The thesis asks the overarching research question:

> *"What is the role of journalism in social innovation?"*

The study explores how journalism's role evolves when it engages processes of social innovation that emerge from outside the newsroom walls. How does this redefine journalistic practices and ideals?

Four articles comprise the study, each article investigates a case of journalism-related social innovation. The first two articles focus on innovating civic agency through communication technology in the political arena (Heikka 2015; Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). The findings of these articles suggest opportunities, but also challenges in the technology-centered way of thinking

about the interrelation of journalism and social change. The latter two articles combine analysis of technological "hardware" to analysis of "social technologies" that create space for social innovation (Heikka & Carayannis 2016, 2017). The analytical focus in this synthesizing thesis is in the spaces and practices that enable co-creation. The study suggests emerging best practices for collaborative innovation between journalists and other stakeholders in society.

Theoretically, the study draws on the research themes of *participatory journalism* and *innovation*. Participatory journalism is a reform movement that pursues citizen-engaging and citizen-driven answers to the crisis of journalism. Through participatory and citizen-engaging practices, journalism attempts to reinforce or recreate the link between professional journalists, civic processes, and the audience and, in the long run, "save" journalism and its function as an enabler of democracy (Habermas 1962/1989; Lewis 2012a, 2012b).

The concept and theory of *innovation* is applied to assess, how the creation of "the new" – new ideas, practices and technologies – is introduced in and used by journalism. This thesis analyses emerging ways this "new" is innovated through communicative means that complement, bypass and redefine journalism.

The challenges in the interrelation of journalism and society are interlinked to an even wider and more profound change in the global community. The life-style based on industrialized economies and growth is threatened by ecological, social and financial boundaries. Consequentially, identities are engaged in a painful process of change.

Solving these issues requires wide-ranging systemic efforts that are also profound challenges for journalism. Sustainable solutions are unlikely to emerge as top-down recommendations or orders from the professional journalists, the media owners, or government institutions alone. A collaborative effort of creating shared meanings and solutions that engage the marginalized elements in society is required. New ways are needed to not only channel public opinion towards the attention of power-holders, but increasingly to channel citizens' capabilities to serve a community.[1] The research presented here pursues a deeper theoretical understanding as well as practical knowledge on how journalism can engage with these systems of societal change.

---

[1] Empowering citizens to solve social problems is adopted as an objective at the national and international level in many countries and organizations. For the USA, see the White House Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation. For Finland, see the program of the Government of Finland (2015).

2   POSITIONING THE STUDY IN THE LITERATURE

This study is positioned in the literature through two literature reviews: an explorative and a systematic review. The aim of the explorative review is to identify how journalism-related new phenomena have been researched in the context of social, civic and political processes of innovation. By journalism-related new phenomena I mean practices, tools and ideas that emerge from fields of both professional journalism and citizen journalism, and contribute to the public discourse of social, civic and political matters.

2.1 Explorative literature review

This study is informed and inspired by the optimism regarding the social and civic potential of digital technology that was characteristic of the early years of the internet (Rheingold 1993, 2000; Negroponte 1995; Barlow 1996; Dyson 1997; Le vy 1997; Ito 2003.) [2]. Furthermore, this study is guided by accounts suggesting a limited ability of technology to supporting a deliberative community (Lehtonen 2008; Freeman & Quirke 2013).

The emergence of the internet as a revolutionary form of interactive communication sparked a wave of optimistic, even utopian visioning of the future of civic communication (Barlow 1996). The internet was celebrated as providing the individual tools for self-expression and community-building free of geographical or legal constraints. While utopian, vague and politically charged, these ideas have been influential. The call for a new community coincided and resonated with the voices yearning for restored social cohesion and critiques of the propagandistic nature of the press, making the internet's promise of solving both problems plausible (Putnam 1995; Geiger 2009).

These web-utopian ideas, sometimes called cyber-libertarianism, have been criticized for technological determinism, of representing democratic

---

[2]   In some cases, these visions preceded the internet: de Sola Pool 1984; Engelbart 1962/2001.

governments as enemies of individual freedom, and diminishing the individual's humanity and "real" social relationships (Barbrook & Cameron 1996, Dahlberg 2010, Morrison 2009; Geiger 2009; Morozov 2013; Gladwell 2010; Lanier 2010). On the other hand, some researchers have continued to maintain that the internet empowers social movements and can "liberate humanity and nature from (…) tyrannical and oppressive forces" (Kahn & Kellner 2009, p. 721; Diamond 2010).

A technologically driven approach has continued to define much of the debate about the impact of digital technology to the public sphere, as can be observed in the current research on citizen journalism (Jarvis 2014). Digital networks are seen as complementing the deficiencies of the political process and the journalistic press, functioning as the "fifth estate" of democracies (Dutton 2007). Technology is hailed as a catalyst for enhanced civic collaboration that makes democracies stronger and more effective through co-creation of products and services, journalism included (Shirky 2010; Bruns 2007; Benkler 2006; Benkler et al. 2015).

This optimistic framing is characteristic of much of research on major political and civic events in the first decade of the 2000's. The potential of the internet to challenge power and re-frame or set the agenda in the public sphere was a predominant question through which, for example, the Arab Spring, the American presidential election of 2008, and the Occupy and Indignados movements for social justice were researched (Penney & Dadas 2013; Etling 2013; Hamdy & Gomaa 2012; Smith & Rainie 2008). New media helped break geographic, political and stylistic borders and bypass censorship. "Affective news streams" consisting of news, opinion and emotion circulated the web, challenging power holders and reframing public discourse (Tufekci & Wilson 2012; Papacharissi & de Fatima Oliveira 2012; Hermida 2010; Khamis & Vaughn 2011, Hermida et al. 2014).

However, these events failed to bring about the results many hoped for. In hindsight, the "social media revolutions" of the Arab Spring failed in the construction of democracy, stability and social progress, not to speak of a more utopian deliberative community envisioned by the early web-optimists. The Occupy movement did not bring about a more egalitarian society, and the citizen's contributions in the political arena were analyzed as reflecting the professional journalists' agenda instead creating a citizens' agenda (Johnson 2011).

The 2010's saw new forms of internet-assisted civil disobedience, such as leaking and distributed denial-of-service attacks emerged, as well as issue-specific campaigns (for example the SOPA-PIPA-campaign, which forced the government in the USA to shelve planned anti-piracy laws due to concerns over freedom of speech) (Etling 2013). When the messages of these campaigns were echoed by traditional media and sometimes co-opted by political parties, they changed political discourse and in some cases affected media coverage, laws, and policy (Benkler et al. 2015; Heikka 2015; Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

The emergence of a "civic technology" field in many metropolitan areas in Europe and in the USA raised again hopes of a technologically enhanced civic community. Services developed in these environments include neighborhood news and community building sites, crowdsourcing platforms, and data visualizations. Journalists, citizen journalist, civic activists, civic hacktivists, academics, entrepreneurs and civil servants work together in these networks to solve social problems (Goldstein & Dyson 2013; Lathrop & Ruma 2010; Patel et al. 2013; McCann 2015; Heikka 2015; Lewis & Usher 2014; Gray, Chambers & Bounegru 2012). Scholarly assessments of these environments range from cautiously optimistic (Heikka 2015; Aitamurto 2012; Aitamurto & Landemore 2013) to more skeptical (Murray 2013; Pautz 2010).

The framework of *cultural science* explores dynamic change in societies by combining the theoretical framework of complex systems (Kauffman 1995) to the environment of the creative economy (Hartley & Potts 2014a, 2014b).

The name cultural science suggests a break in the established tradition of *cultural studies* (cf. Hall 1981). Whereas cultural studies focused on the *power structures* that are re-created and enforced, in part, by the media (Hall 1981), cultural science focuses on the role of the media in the *generation of new* ideas, practices, products and services – that is, of innovations. In that sense, cultural science continues the program suggested by the literature on innovation journalism, but opens deeper and wider theoretical perspectives.

The explorative literature review led to the following observations that guided further research:

1. New practices, tools and ideas related to the communication of civic, social and political affairs are emerging largely outside professional news organizations.
2. Research on these developments is focused on new technology, whereas in-real-life communication is largely ignored. Even when there is an interest in *culture* as a whole, this interest is inspired by the affordances of new technology to facilitate interaction across institutional borders.
3. New technology functions as an intermediary between the grassroots and the professional media, occasionally succeeding in reframing public debate, or in organizing mass protest.
4. Looking back with the perspective of a few years' time, it appears that the achievements of digital movements for social and political change has been, at best, incremental or temporary.

2.2 Systematic literature review

Introduction

A systematic literature review was conducted to test the perceptions that emerged from the explorative reading and the emerging analysis of the articles, and to further identify gaps in research. This literature review was conducted simultaneously with writing Articles 3 and 4 and its intention is to form a strong basis for analyzing all four articles. In the section 3.3. Structure of research and 3.4. Research process, and scope, I detail the reasons for additional theoretical reading at this point of the research process.

This literature review focuses on analyzing how innovation in journalism is framed, understood and theorized in academic research in 2006-2016. The starting point for the review was that understanding the creation of "the new" in journalism may benefit of the theoretical lens of innovation, and of social innovation in particular. In searching for articles, the general term "innovation" was used over the more specific "social innovation", to achieve broad enough an understanding of innovation in journalism.

The following research questions for the literature review are designed to provide a base for exploring the overarching research question of this thesis, "What is the role of journalism in social innovation?"

The following literature review research questions (LRRQ) were asked.

LRRQ1   What is understood as innovation in journalism?
LRRQ2   Who are the stakeholders of innovation in journalism?
LRRQ3   How is innovation in journalism theorized?

Drawing on Baumeister and Leary (1997), three main objectives were set for the review. First, to map the knowledge of the topic, and secondly, identify potential problems in the existing research. Finally, attention was paid on the theories used to explore needs and directions for theory development and new openings. The Web of Science online database was used to search for peer-reviewed articles within the domains of Social sciences and Arts and humanities, with Communication as the research area. The time span of 2006–2016 was chosen for the search, because the public penetration of the Web2.0 technologies rose to significant levels in these years.

After experimenting with several search terms, a sample of articles from the database was drawn, using the combination of the topic terms "journalism" and "innovation". I added one article that came up with more specific search terms of "participatory journalism" and "citizen journalism" combined with "innovation". A more specific definition of innovation, such as "social innovation" or "civic innovation" provided too limited a sample. Special fields, such as sports journalism, journalism education and visual journalism were omitted. The search yielded 53 articles in the English language.

After reading all the abstracts, 37 articles were chosen for close reading. These articles were read at least twice and a content analysis was conducted. The content analysis combined elements of theme analysis and frame analysis. By themes I mean, following the distinction by Altheide and Schneider (2013, p. 53), "recurring typical theses that run through a lot of the reports". Frames, on the other hand, are "super themes" that form the boundaries within which a theme is discussed (Altheide & Schneider 2013, p. 53). Themes are analyzed to analyze how innovation is understood. Themes, therefore, provide material for answering LRRQ1. Frames, on the other hand, with their emphasis on borders, are helpful in seeking answers for LRRQ2 and LRRQ3, since the questions of stakeholders and theories of innovation deal with exclusion and inclusion of people and ideas.

In coding the articles, the focus was first on how the term "innovation" was used, but in further coding attention was paid equally to "the new" – e.g. an emerging technology, idea, practice, etc. – independent of it being specifically defined as an innovation. Innovation could therefore stand for, for example, a learning and adaptation challenge emerging as a new technology. Furthermore, attention was paid to the stakeholders of innovation: who were expected to take part in creation of the new, and who were potentially valuable partners in innovation? Finally, analysis focused on which theories were chosen (and which were not chosen) for investigating innovation and how these choices might affect the results.

Findings of the literature review

The findings of the systematic literature review can be presented as four emerging themes: A) newsroom centered innovation, B) technology centered innovation, C) innovation by "back-to-basics", and D) community centered innovation. These themes can overlap. In other words, one or more themes can be present in an article. The findings are presented in Table 1, "Themes in research on journalism and innovation".

An overwhelming majority of the articles – 34 out of the 37 articles analyzed– focused on professional journalists in traditional media newsrooms. This frame is here called newsroom centered innovation. Innovation is weighed against the value it has for the status and practices of professional journalism.

Out of 37 articles, 26 focused on innovation as technology. In this theme of technology centered innovation, journalists perceive technology as an innovation that can either enforce or threaten their professional standing. On one hand, journalists resist adoption of new technology that may threaten their status as gatekeepers of the public sphere. On the other, digital technologies are viewed as having the potential to help in engaging with the public and in re-interpreting what journalism is.

Seven articles focused on journalistic practices as a source for innovation. This was called the theme of innovation by "back-to-basics". In this frame, the skills and ethics of good reporting and writing are virtues in the turmoil of the changing media environment, declining readerships and withering trust.

Innovation can be discovering "good old" journalistic practices, such as fact-checking, narrative journalism, investigative journalism, and feature journalism, remediated in the online world (Neveu 2014; Steensen 2009). Other approaches include explorations of reflective practices (Ramaker et al. 2015) and artistic breeches of journalistic practice (Lahav & Reich 2011).

A more inclusive approach to innovation, community centered innovation, emerged in seven articles. Journalists and citizen journalists co-operate in creating models of news making. Innovation in this frame requires immersion into the life of other people and engaging them as rational, emotional and social wholes. Community centered innovation contains an attitude of curiosity and innovation is practiced for its own sake. However, it is notable that media audiences are not always an active part of this process. Rather, audiences are expected incrementally develop products envisioned by others (Lewis & Usher 2013).

Two frameworks stand out as the preferred choices for theorizing innovation in journalism: Actor Network Theory (henceforth ANT) (Latour 2005), and field theory (Bourdieu 2005). ANT was used in five articles and different aspects of Bourdieu's field theory (and related theories of sociology of professions) in six articles. Furthermore, three articles use the broad concept of convergence as a framework for theorizing innovation. Articles in the community oriented innovation theme use the theoretical framework of citizen journalism. Three articles rely on Rogers' (1962/2003) classical theory of diffusion of innovations, one article uses Chesbrough's (2003) concept of open innovation, and one that builds on Nordfors' (2004b) concept of innovation journalism (Gynnild 2013). With these exceptions, innovation was seldom defined in any detail.

Conclusion

Innovation in journalism is still a relatively little explored researched topic. Weiss and Domingo (2010) observe that innovation was, in the research of journalism sociology, a "blind spot of its inquiries" from the 1970's to the 1990's. Decades later, innovation in journalism is still studied with a relatively limited thematic and theoretical scope. The articles seldom discuss innovation in journalism in relation to even the closest related elements in society, such as the citizen journalists, public officials, funders, advertisers, or investors. Journalism appears to exist in isolation of most of the society. Professional journalists seldom seek outsiders (technologists occasionally admitted) to take part in journalistic innovation. Gynnild (2014, p. 720) points out that it has been suggested that "most of the exciting innovation in journalism is happening outside news organizations" (see also Bocskowski 2004; Bradshaw 2010, cited in Arthur 2010). However, few studies emerged where these innovative events outside the newsroom are researched.

TABLE 1   Themes in research on journalism and innovation

	What is understood as innovation?	The main stakeholders of innovation in journalism	Number of articles	Examples of themes investigated	Examples of articles
Newsroom centered innovation.	Technologies, ethics, practices and professional culture that challenge journalists' societal status and their relationship to the audience	Journalists	34	How journalists perceive changes to their profession caused by innovations Outsiders are threats to the status and core values of journalism	Fortunati et al. 2009 Hanusch 2015 Spyridou et al. 2013 O' Sullivan & Heinonen 2008 Ekdale et al. 2015
Technology-centered innovation	Innovation is a technological disruption emerging from outside the newsroom	Journalists and technologists	26	The Open source movement The Hacks and Hackers movement Technology helps in redefining journalism as more open and interactive. Professional routines and ideology of control	Lewis 2012a Williams et al. 2011 Reich 2013 Conboy & Eldridge II, 2014 Aitamurto & Lewis 2013 Lewis & Usher 2013
Innovation by back to basics	Time-tested journalistic practices are innovations Reflective practices and artistic 'breeches' of journalistic norms.	Journalists	7	Fact-checking, investigative journalism, slow journalism, narrative journalism Reflective practices	Graves et al. 2016 Steensen 2009 Neveu 2014 Ramaker et al. 2015 Lahav & Reich 2011
Community centered innovation	Innovations are relationships and the outcomes of those relationships	Journalists together with the civil society: e.g. social movements, activists, technologists, academics, businesses and intellectuals	7	@IndigenousX Twitter account "Community Builders" bring members of communities to news teams Knight News Challenge Funding has shifted from legacy journalism towards developing participatory tools	Kern & Nam 2009 Russell 2013 Ostertag & Tuchman 2012 Lewis 2010, 2012

Participation is, in this sample of 37 articles, not considered a source of innovation. Research focuses overwhelmingly on technological innovation as a potential remedy for journalism's woes (Boczkowski 2004; Deuze 2004, 2005; Domingo & Heinonen 2008; Lowrey 2006; Lowrey & Burleson Mackay 2008; Singer 2003; Picard 2006, 2013).

It is noteworthy that, in the literature sample, there were only passing references to theories that focus on innovative interaction over organizational boundaries, and on the "emergence" of new ideas as an outcome of these interactions. An explanation to this finding is that the chosen search terms "journalism" and "innovation" yielded articles from journals that concentrate specifically on journalism studies. In these journals, professional news production is a go-to environment in data collection. Therefore, not only does the sample represent, to a fair extent, the thematic and theoretical choices in the strand of journalism studies focusing on professional journalism but also, that it does not rule out the possibility that innovation theory is used in related ways elsewhere in communication studies. Despite the limitations of the sample, the findings do reflect the mainstream of journalism studies that considers professional newsrooms as the center of innovative activities. Furthermore, the findings underline how deeply entrenched within journalism's professional boundaries does innovation in journalistic work lie.

The literature reviews suggest, that two decades of research on digitally enabled participatory journalism has not lead to any significant amount of literature that would consider the audiences partners or initiators in co-creating journalistic innovations. There is an abundance of literature claiming that a qualitatively new relationship between the news professional and audiences is possible, but much of this literature has remained on a declarative or theoretical level. From that perspective, it can be argued that research on innovation in professional journalism lags behind developments in other fields, where the users of products and services are considered as co-innovators.

3 RESEARCH APPROACH

3.1 Methods and data

This study is a qualitative content analysis of four case studies (Elo et. al. 2014). The common theme of all these papers is the changing role of journalism within a society that pursues social change through communicative means. The qualitative approach was considered appropriate when exploring an emerging phenomena and testing applicability of concepts borrowed from other fields. Qualitative content analysis is a method of extracting meaning from a wide range of qualitative data (Given 2008). In practice, it means close reading of texts and analyzing and organizing data in clusters and themes with the help of theory and the analytical concepts.

The method for reasoning in this thesis is abductive. By abduction, I mean a process of data-based logical reasoning that searches for the best explanation for a new phenomenon (Given 2008). In this study, explanations are sought for emerging new roles and relationships of collaboration between journalists and other actors of social innovation.

This summarizing chapter of this thesis is positioned in the theoretically guided end of the spectrum of abduction. The theories that are applied in this chapter emerged as possible explanatory frameworks in the research process, particularly in Articles 3–4. Therefore, the theories and analytical concepts applied have a somewhat stronger role in the analysis that in some other forms of abduction that attempt to form a more orthodox grounded theory, and use theory only towards the end of the research process.

3.2 Research questions

Each article has its own research questions that explore different aspects of the overall theme. This summarizing chapter of the thesis has its own research question that brings together themes developed in the individual articles.

RQ: What is the role of journalism in social innovation?

3.3 Structure of research

The structure of the research is outlined in Table 2. It summarizes the themes, cases, theories and findings of the four articles and the summarizing chapter at hand.

TABLE 2   Research structure

Article	Theme	Case	Theory	Concept introduced (findings)
Article 1: *The rise of the mediating citizen*	Crowdsourcing tools and practices for democratic engagement	Crowdsourcing for Equal Marriage Law in Finland	Castells' theory of time and space in the networks society (2010, 2013). Bennett's typology of citizenship (2008)	Mediating citizen
Article 2: *Crashing a national media event*	Interrelations of social media and mass media in a national media event	The Gatecrashers riots in Finland	Media events (Dayan & Katz 1992). Circulation (Aronczyk & Craig 2012; Lee & LiPuma 2002)	Dialogic media event
Article 3: *The role of journalism in dialogic innovation processes*	Role of journalism in dialogic innovation processes	Innovation workshops of the Helsinki Deaconess Institute	Innovation theory (Carayannis & Campbell 2012); Dialogic organizational development (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013; Bohm 1991, 1996)	Participatory solutions journalism
Article 4: *Three stages of innovation in participatory journalism*	Co-initiating, co-sensing and co-creating the news in participatory journalism	Civic responses to the Chicago school cuts case	Participatory journalism (Singer, Domingo Heinonen et al. 2011) Collaborative innovation (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013)	Dialogic journalism

TABLE 2 (cont.)

Summary chapter: *Dialogic journalism*	Challenges and opportunities for journalism in holding spaces for dialogic innovation	Analysis of Articles 1–4 from the perspective of dialogue, holding space and journalistic objectivity	Participatory journalism (Glasser 1984; Jarvis 2014; Carpentier 2016) Dialogic innovation and holding space (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013)	Dialogic journalism

3.4   Research process, and scope

This research is a process in which findings guided the steps I took. I constantly re-evaluated the theories I used and the questions I asked, and made changes when necessary. In line with the abductive type of reasoning of the articles, the negotiation between theory and data continued even when I revisited the articles for this synthesizing chapter.

In Articles 1 and 2, the research focuses on civic and democratic change through technology. These articles search for new ways to understand the environment and structural basis of contemporary social innovation, and the role of journalism in this environment. The focus of inquiry is on how power is pursued. These studies use established social and media theories (Castells 1996/2000, 2009; Bennett 2008; Dayan & Katz 1992; Urry 2007; Aronczyk & Craig 2012).

Articles 3 and 4 open new perspectives by focusing on innovation spaces and dialogue (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013; Bohm et al. 1991, Bohm 1996). The reason for introducing new concepts and theories at this point was that the theories used in the first two articles did not adequately explain some of the interesting emerging phenomena I observed in the data. The theme of the investigation moved from investigating the pursuit of power to focusing on co-creative innovation (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013; Bohm 1996; Hartley & Potts 2014a, 2014b; Hartley, Potts, Flew et al. 2012). I hypothesized that the theories of innovation and participatory journalism combined did provide a novel combination for understanding the deeply personal, collective, emotional and generative dialogues that I observed in the networks of social innovation.

As the study moves from Articles 1 and 2 to Articles 3 and 4, the predominantly technological and institution-centered focus of communication gives way to and a more multi-faceted approach that combines mediated communications and face-to-face dialogue in innovation spaces. At this point, the systematic review was conducted to test ideas that emerged from the data and the explorative review, further define gaps in research, and help formulate the research question through which all articles are analyzed.

Due to the nature of this study as a process of discovery, reflection and re-evaluation, I have decided, in this synthesizing chapter, to give more weight to the ideas that emerged in Articles 3 and 4 as an interpretative framework. By

doing so, I hope to provide an additional layer of findings, critical reflection and synthesizing interpretation to the thesis as a whole.

The evolving, multidisciplinary nature of the research process is reflected in the publishing strategy of the articles. Articles 1 and 2 use established communications-related theory (media studies and social sciences). Accordingly, Article 1 was published in Policy & Internet (Wiley); and Article 2 was published in the edited volume Media events: A critical contemporary approach (Palgrave Macmillan) (Mitu & Poulakidakos 2016). Articles 3–4, that introduce innovation and organizational theory in this study, are published in the Journal of The Knowledge Economy (Springer) that favors a multidisciplinary and multi-sector approach to innovation.

4   CONCEPTS AND TERMS

4.1   Holding space

Holding spaces are either or both physical and social spaces that facilitate the capacity of suspending judgment (Bohm 1996; Isaacs 1999/2008; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). Holding spaces can be both physical and social. In terms of physical places, a new environment may for example encourage the type of beyond-the-box thinking that is beneficial for innovation. In terms of a social place, a holding space offers the relative safety to set aside professional roles for sharing experiences and learning. The concept of "holding space" can be used both as a verb and a noun. Space can be held by someone for others to facilitate innovation.

4.2   Dialogue

According to Bohm (1996), the word *dialogue* is derived from the Greek *dia*, meaning through, and *logos*, meaning word. Isaacs (1999/2008) interprets this as the "flow of meaning", a civic practice that is at the center of self-governing. Dialogue can therefore be imaged as a river of meaning that a group of people may be able to find together (Bohm 1996).

In this thesis, dialogue means searching for shared understanding and reflecting together (Isaacs 1999/2008). This definition therefore differs from the use of dialogue as a synonym for interactivity or conversation that is opened by digital technology (Spyridou et al. 2013). Dialogue is a communicative practice that helps in collective development of emerging ideas to prototypes. In dialogue, the focus of the work is in the quality of interaction.

Dialogue is here analyzed through four defining characteristics.

1. **Collective**. Dialogue aims at "thinking together". By this, the term means that dialogue pursues an understanding that reaches beyond the individual knowledge and capacities of the participants. Dialogue is at the onset open-ended.
2. **Experimental**. Dialogue aims at producing concrete results. These are thought of as prototypes that provide feedback to the dialogue. The experimental nature of dialogue makes it a suitable method for social innovation.
3. **Suspension of judgment.** Participants are expected to suspend their previous knowledge, views, values and professional roles. All participants and views are equally valuable.
4. **Self-engaging**. Dialogue engages the person as a whole. This means that rational thinking as well as emotions and sensations are part of a dialogic process.

Dialogue is a challenging practice and its form as proposed by Bohm (1996) is seldom accomplished. In order to analyze the extent, to which dialogue emerges in the data, three categories of dialogue were identified: weak, emerging, and strong. Dialogue begins from the collective stage of convening around a common challenge (weak). The dialogue then develops towards a dialogue where innovations are experimented with and developed through the feedback from the prototypes (emerging). Finally, dialogue deepens to the more challenging and potentially productive mode of dialogue where non-judgmentality and engaging the self in the process are founding principles (strong). The latter stage is in line with the models described by Bohm (1996), Senge (1990), Isaacs (1999/2008), and Scharmer and Kaufer (2013).

This categorization is not intended to be strict. Dialogue can contain the four aforementioned characteristics in any order, for example, starting from the more demanding principle of suspension of judgement, but still lacking experimentalism. Furthermore, borders between the characteristics and intensity are porous. However, the order in which they are presented in this thesis generally corresponds to a dialogue that proceeds from the more common and easily accessible form of interaction to a more challenging and intense one.

4.3 Innovation

The term innovation derives from the Latin innovare and translates as "to change". In the field of organizational studies and economics, innovation was originally defined as the (re)combination of distinct parts to form something new (Schumpeter 1934/1997). In this thesis, innovation is understood as introducing a concept that is new or perceived to be new (Nordfors 2006; Rogers 1962/2003). Innovation can be, for example, ideas, working practices, services or products.

Innovations are often considered as novelties. However, the definition of innovation used in the present study follows Zaltman et al. (1973) in requiring only that the unit of adoption perceives something to be new. This is important because innovations are a process of ideation, iteration and adoption over time; in other words, the perception of the novelty of an innovation may change. For the same reason, commercial success or adoption is not required for something to qualify as an innovation; these, too, may change over time.

This thesis focuses on a special field of innovation: social innovation. Social innovation is defined as innovations that work in meeting social goals (Mulgan et al. 2007; Unger 2015). Social innovations are also often defined by their predominantly non-profit aims, however, social innovation can be commercialized.

4.4 Objectivity

Objectivity is here understood, following Deuze (2005), as a central element of the *occupational ideology of journalism*. Objectivity describes the journalists' distance and coolness to the objects and issues they report on. Close concepts include detachment, neutrality and professional distance. Objectivity is part of an ideology that justifies journalism's privileged role in society and its status as a profession by adhering to the dogma that journalism can, or at least aspires to, report the facts and separate them from values (Schudson 2001). In claiming to be objective, professional journalism communicates authority and control. Simultaneous, it detaches itself from the story (Hornmoen & Steensen 2014).

The definition of objectivity used here is not an epistemological one. The study does not attempt to assess whether "objective facts" can or should be reported. Objectivity is here seen as a ritualistic role and self-description of journalism as a profession.

It should be noted, that recent research on journalistic objectivity has proposed the concept of pragmatic objectivity (Ward 2017). Pragmatic objectivity attempts to reconcile the difference between objectivity and engagement by accepting the journalists' and their sources' interpretive tendencies and capabilities. Pragmatic objectivity proposes that objectivity can be practiced simultaneously with engagement with the issues by "testing beliefs by the methods and criteria of good inquiry" (Ward 2017, section Objectivity as Testing, para 5.). Section 8 of this cover text, Discussion, reflects on the findings of this thesis against these theoretical developments.

4.5 Participatory and citizen journalism

Several terms are used to notate journalistic reform movements that attempt to make professionally produced news more relevant to the public, and on the other hand, help the public engage in producing the news. I follow Sweet et al. (2013) and Borger (2013, p. 120) in assessing that participatory journalism can be used interchangeably with citizen journalism (Allan & Thorsen 2009), and sometimes with its closely related terms grassroots journalism (Gillmor 2006) collaborative journalism, networked journalism (Beckett & Mansell, 2008), and interactive journalism.

Lindner, Connell, and Meyer (2015) make the distinction that participatory journalism is created *with* news organizations while citizen journalism is created *independently of* news organizations. Following this distinction, I prefer to use participatory journalism, when the emphasis is on the interaction between professionals and the audiences in production of news. Furthermore, the term participatory journalism is preferable because of the problems relating to the connotation of citizenship in citizen journalism. At times, however, it is justifiable (for the lack of a better noun) to use the term citizen journalist when emphasizing the distinction between professional production of news and other forms of production (e.g. amateur, pro-am).

4.6 The role of journalism

By a role I mean, following Schudson (2001), a distinct pattern of behavior. The role of journalism means the ways in which journalism positions itself in relationship with sources, audiences and the society at large; and how these relationships are practiced, communicated and justified.

5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study rests on Manuel Castells' (1996/2000) idea of the network society that argues that solid social structures are being replaced with fluctuating social and technological networks. In this space of flows, meanings are constructed through mass self-communication in digital networks. Empowered by digital networks, individuals can trigger, amplify and coordinate social movements, and bypass elite sources of information and power (Castells 1996/2000; 2009; 2015).

To complement this power-centric approach, and to facilitate an investigation that focuses on new phenomena, this study draws on innovation theory that focuses on the emergence of "the new" from the complex and networked systems as a result of many distributed interactions (Kauffman 1995; Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014; Hartley, Potts, Flew et al. 2012, p. 38-42). These theoretical choices and their relevance to the study at hand are explained below.

In exploring how journalism repositions itself in a complex, networked society, this study applies two distinct research themes: *participatory journalism* and *innovation theory*. At first sight, these research traditions may seem far from each other: participatory journalism focuses on engagement with the public in the production of news, and innovation theory investigates the creation of new products, ideas and practices. However, in this thesis they are used as mutually enriching approaches to the role of journalism in social innovation.

5.1 Participatory journalism

The general idea of *participatory journalism* is that the relationship between the public and journalists should be conversational and co-creative (Carey 1987, p 14). In this framework, citizens are elevated from passive spectators to partners in creating the media (Dvorkin 2001; Lasica 2003; Rosen 1999, 2006). This empowerment of the citizen is considered as a normative good in a society

where power is legitimized through public debate and the electoral process. Citizen journalists, either independently or in collaboration with the professional journalists, produce new journalistic content either by themselves or in collaboration with professional journalists.

Participatory journalism can be seen growing from the public journalism movement that emerged in the USA in the 1990's. Public journalism attempted to make the press more sensitive and reflective of the real issues of the audiences, promote democratic deliberation, and help them solve these issues (Merritt 1995, 1998; Glasser 1999; Lewis 2012b; Nip 2006).

Participation, in a *political approach* (Carpentier 2016) to engagement, is a vehicle for leveling the playing field between powerful and non-powerful actors in decision-making. On the other hand, the *critical approach* to participation also contains normative assessments of how desirable the power-balancing outcomes are (Carpentier & Dahlgren 2013). This thesis adds to these approaches an *innovation approach*. The process of participation is analyzed as journalism-related social innovations. The innovation approach to participation, as suggested here, has similarities to the model of innovation proposed by the cultural science literature (Hartley & Potts 2014a, 2014b), but also has two clear differences.

First, the innovation approach presents participation as not only as a political struggle for power, but also as dialogues that can produce new and beneficial openings for several stakeholders. In other words, the innovation approach is a win-win proposition in what is often seen as a zero-sum game. Second, the *innovation approach* contains normative assessments akin to the *critical approach* by emphasizing that social sustainability and inclusiveness of innovation is pursued through dialogue with stakeholders. The sustainability aspect in the innovation approach also has the potential to extend into the natural world and the ecological environment (for example through the systemic and holistic thinking behind the Theory U [Scharmer & Kaufer 213]). However, ecological sustainability is not a central theme in this research.

Looking from a more concrete point of view, this thesis builds on five distinctions of participation (Ahva 2016): participating *through*, *in*, *with*, *around* and *for* journalism. These distinctions attempt to describe the multitude of orientations that professional and non-professional actors have in participation.

Much of the recent research on participatory journalism has been inspired by the interactive qualities of the internet and its ability to level the playing field between the haves and have-nots. The gatekeeping power of professional journalists has been weakened in the digital information society, where the user and the producer have little in difference. Bruns (2007) sees the actors and stakeholders of the established democratic society – the producers (politicians), distributors (media) and consumers (the public) – as emulating an ebbing industrial production model. This model transforms into produsage, the melding of production and usage. The post-industrial era of produsage is characterized by fluid roles, unfinished artifacts, individual merit and community based action (Bruns 2007).

The weakening of journalisms' gatekeeping power and the empowerment of citizens are approached as a democratically significant and potentially positive developments. The practices of citizen journalism are believed to empower the ordinary people and challenge journalism's elitist position. Journalistic outputs are part of a conversational process that touches and approximates the truth through trial and error. Gillmor (2006, p.18) describes this shift: "In the conversational mode of journalism (--) the first article may be only the beginning of the conversation in which we all enlighten each other. We can correct our mistakes. We can add new facts and context."

The position of journalism as the predominant node in public deliberation is questioned, and to survive, journalism needs to interact with other players in the network. Gillmor (2006, p. 34) suggests that "(p)rofessional news people will need to be plugged into tomorrow's smart mobs, just as they must be plugged into today's informal organizations". Jarvis (2014) suggests that journalists and media organizations could work as incubators and social organizers. Grönlund et al. (2016) observe that such a change is ongoing in the Nordic press, as it seeks for new ways to be an active player in local communities by, for example, organizing events.

These views have the potential to alter the concept of journalism. For example, Jarvis (2014, Introduction, para. 10) defines journalism as "helping a community better organize its knowledge so it can better organize itself". Usher (2011, section Citizen Journalism as Civic Responsibility, para. 3) goes even further by suggesting that "[c]itizen journalism is anything and everything that people believe could count as journalism."

By making the above suggestions, participatory journalism distances itself from the idea of *objectivity*. Objectivity is a key element in scholarly attempts to define professional journalism (Reese 1990; Ognianova & Endersby 1996; Mindich 1998; Schudson 2001). This thesis views objectivity, following Deuze (2005), as a central tenet in the professional *ideology of journalism*. Journalists believe they are objective in the sense of being balanced, fair, disinterested, impartial and detached from the news they report. They merely report the "retrievable facts" (Glasser 1984, p. 13).

The claim of objectivity gives journalism legitimacy in the society as a profession. Observing from another perspective, objectivity also creates a chasm between the journalists and the public (Schudson 2001). The emphasis on facts is related to a reliance on bureaucrats as primary sources in fact-finding. Citizens, on the other hand, remain spectators in this sport of "he said, she said" journalism among professional journalist and the power holders.

Detachment can present a problem in journalisms' attempt to innovate together with the public. Few newsrooms are willing to make significant changes in the practices of their reporting and underlying evaluations of journalism's role in society. Even in the rare cases where mainstream media institutions create extensive projects of collaboration, these initiatives suffer of the lecturing model of mainstream journalism (Hermida 2010). In the next section, theoretical perspectives from innovation theory are presented and

connection to journalism theory are drawn. The attempt is to identify theoretical ideas that could help in opening the gridlock of a clear need for innovation with the public and an incapability to move beyond the newsroom in that pursuit.

5.2 Innovation and journalism

An underlying structure in the innovation theory is Schumpeter's (1942) concept of creative destruction that is advanced and accelerated in a globalized knowledge economy. The role of public communication is traditionally seen as contributing to the diffusion and adoption of innovations (Rogers 1962/2003). As the systematic literature review presented above indicates, innovation in journalism is still studied with a relatively limited thematic and theoretical scope.

The research theme of *innovation journalism* emerged in the early 2000's. Innovation journalism understood journalists as brokers of innovation through the idea of diffusion developed by Rogers (1962/2003; see also Nordfors, 2004a, 2004b). From these beginnings, the concept of innovation journalism developed towards the idea of innovating the society as a whole, by means of participatory communication (Kauhanen & Noppari 2007; Bethge 2012; Bruns 2014). Even if these themes have not been developed further, it can be said that the academic interrelation of journalism and innovation has evolved towards an approach where journalism acts in knowledge creation among multiple stakeholders in society. Nordfors (2009, p. 5) suggests that "[i]n an innovation ecosystem, journalism can be seen as a fourth strand of the 'triple helix' of industry, universities and government, just as it has been considered 'the fourth estate' in democracies." Innovation is driven not only within each element of the system, but increasingly in interaction between the elements.

However, a lack of cases and a limited variety of theoretical lenses can be observed in this literature. Even as the roles of users and producers of journalism are seen as melding into produsage (Bruns 2007), participatory journalism is not explored as a vehicle for participatory innovation.

To introduce new perspectives, this investigation draws on the idea that engaging people across a wide variety of social spheres, over organizational boundaries, is beneficial for innovation (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff 1995; Etzkowitz & Ranga 2011). In this literature, the networked interaction between academia, the public sector, industries and the media-based civil society is seen to be typical of successful innovation ecosystems (Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014). The suggestion relevant to this thesis is that the role of media is a more involved and engaged than acting as mere brokerage of innovations. Innovation takes place, in part, through co-creation and circulation of knowledge and unlearning of previous knowledge. The media are part of this process. This perspective emphasizes the constant flow, evaluation and co-creation of knowledge and knowhow as crucial for innovation (von Hippel 1986, 2005;

Lundvall 1992; Saxenian 1994, 1996; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff 1995; Thomke & von Hippel 2002; Chesbrough 2003; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004). Furthermore, innovation should attempt to engage the disenfranchised populations of society and pursue solving social problems (George et al. 2012; Radjou et al. 2012).

Innovation in, and through, the media has also been explored in the distinct literature set of *cultural science*, that builds on, but also radically departs from the tradition of *cultural studies* (Hall 1981*)*. Leading theorists of cultural science Hartley and Potts (2014a, 2014b) draw, among other disciplines, on complexity theory, evolutionary economics and the creative industries. Innovation is understood as emerging from a continuous flux of meanings in the networked social markets. Culture is understood as "a mechanism for the production of newness and the growth of knowledge" (Hartley & Potts 2014a, p. 189). In this sphere, creative destruction and innovation takes place.

More concretely, cultural science argues that creative urban culture is an ideal environment for innovations to emerge. "The new" emerges from the exchange and competition of ideas between non-kin groups (called demes). In order for these groups to produce innovations, the elements in the "melting pot" of innovation environments should be diverse and dense (Hartley & Potts 2014a, 2014b; Florida 2002). Since innovation is an outcome of communication between elements in this complex system, the role of the media is crucial. The media, both the mainstream journalistic press and social media are considered as important players in the process of creating knowledge. However, the emphasis is in grassroots-projects and the digital media.

More broadly, the innovation theories referred to above build on the idea of complex systems. Complex systems differ from linear systems through the latter's lack of a clear cause and effect relation (Hartley, Potts, Flew et al. 2012). Furthermore, complex systems are characterized by *adaptation* and *emergence*. Adaptation means that the system reacts locally and in a distributed manner to inputs. Emergence is a consequence of adaptation. Reactions to an input into a complex system cannot be predicted from the properties of the elements of the system. Hartley, Potts, Flew et al. (2012, p. 39) present a relevant example:

> The 2011 'Arab Spring' is a good example of emergence due to social network media interacting in very specific local circumstances, leading to unplanned revolutionary change.

To understand in more depth and detail what occurs in the process of emergence, this thesis draws on the theory of innovation by Scharmer and Kaufer (2013), who see innovation as a process of simultaneous change of the society and the self. Furthermore, this thesis answers the call by Scharmer and Kaufer (2013) to envision media innovations that engage audiences in co-creation of sustainable societies. Civil society and the media can – and should – become partners in creation of financially, socially and ecologically sustainable ideas, products and services (Hautamäki 2010; Carayannis & Campbell, 2012, 2014; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013; Murphy 2016). Such innovation is a state of

"permanent beta" – a cycle of trial, error and iteration – where values, organizational structures are in change and in potential discordance (Neff & Stark 2003).

Importantly, innovation is not only a rational process, but includes sometimes conflicting views and emotions (Bohm 1996; Scharmer 2009). Due to this transgressive nature, innovative interaction seems to emerge in hybrid spaces between institutional boundaries. Organizational boundaries and established ways of thinking may prove to be obstacles for innovation. It is therefore crucial to pay attention to the space where innovations emerge and where otherwise marginalized voices can be expressed without judgement (Etzkowitz & Ranga 2011; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). To cope with, and benefit from, fluidity rlated to contemporary innovation environments in a productive way, special spaces and social technologies may be required (Nonaka & Konno 1998).

Here I will use the concept of *holding space* to describe this special space. The concept has been developed over the last twenty years by William Isaacs, Otto Scharmer and Peter Senge at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In a holding space, new relationships can be formed and judgement can be suspended for boundary-transgressing communication to emerge. Holding spaces foster the capacity of individuals to innovate ideas together and prototype them as solutions for social problems, including the possibility to express emotions (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). The aim in a holding space is to create meanings together – think together – by transcending one's own perspective. Isaacs (1999/2008, p. 242) uses the metaphors of *container* and *vessel* to describe this place, where "intensities of human activities can safely emerge". Bohm uses the term *empty space* to convey the idea of what is (and what is not) expected to take place in an ideal space of innovation:

> We must have an empty space where we are not obliged to do anything, nor to come to any conclusions, nor to say anything or not say anything. (Bohm 1996, p. 16)

To explore the practices and conditions for innovation that emerge in holding spaces, this study uses the concept of *dialogue* in creation of new ideas. The idea of dialogue, while conceived by the ancient Greeks, is here used in its modern version developed by Bohm (1996), Senge (1990) and Scharmer and Kaufer (2013). The general idea of this modern version of dialogue is that innovation is possible through special kinds of conversations where complex issues are explored openly and emerging solutions to problems are developed together. Dialogue is distinct from discussion, where individual views are shared and negotiated.

Bohm (1996, p. 7) describes discussion as an often competitive exchange of ideas, somewhat like a ping-pong game, where a winner is sought. Dialogue, on the other hand, is the creation of new ideas for the benefit of all participants. "The principle of dialogue is to go beyond any one individual's understanding" (Senge 1990, p. 244).

Why is dialogue important in innovation? The answer lies in the complexity of issues and the potential of formerly marginalized stakeholders. Dialogue consists of collectively observing the formation of thought. This creates freedom for new ideas to emerge.

> People are no longer primarily in opposition, nor can they said to be interacting, rather they are participating in this pool of common meaning, which is capable of constant development and change. (Bohm 1987, p. 175.)

By dialogue, the capability of the group is potentially extended beyond what individuals would be able to achieve alone. In a network society, the quantity of stakeholders involved in a problem may be infinite, or impossible to determine in advance. Furthermore, without inclusivity the solutions reached to a social problem would be only temporary – seeds for new conflicts. If these spaces are used to co-create meanings at a societal level, public forums such as the journalistic media are needed to make the process transparent, inclusive and legitimate.

In summary, the choice of theory is based on three literature-based observations and two data-based observations.

1. The theory of the four innovation helices (Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014), the literature on cultural science (Hartley & Potts 2014a), and the Theory U (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) emphasize the creative and innovative nature of cross-institutional interaction in complex systems. These theories were chosen because they consider the media as a central element in an innovation system.
2. However, there is a lack of empirical data and analytical tools for understanding the ways in which journalists and citizen journalists operate in the systems.
3. In the cultural science literature, innovative interaction is explained through competition, conflict and creative destruction. The conflictual and power-focused approach to the emergence of innovations (Hartley & Potts 2014a; Castells 2010) is, in this thesis, complemented by the more co-operative, self-reflective and explorative form of dialogue proposed by Bohm (1996) and Scharmer and Kaufer (2013) to explain better the emerging themes of non-competitive co-operation among innovation stakeholders observed in the data.
4. Bohm's (1996) concept of dialogue and the stages of innovation proposed by Scharmer and Kaufer (2013) are here considered useful because they offer analytical concepts that can be used in the analysis of micro-level activities observed in the data.

6   FINDINGS

6.1   Article 1 findings: The rise of the mediating citizen

The first article analyzes the social innovation of civic crowdsourcing for law. The article focuses on the Civic Initiative Act (henceforth CI-Act) passed in Finland in 2012, and the use of accompanied digital crowdsourcing tools by the campaigners for the Equal Marriage Law in 2013.

The case investigated is historically significant. The CI-Act gave the people a channel "to legislate". If a law initiative reached 50 000 supportive signatures, it obligated parliament to process the initiative as if it was made by a parliamentarian or a group of parliamentarians. Furthermore, the law allowed non-governmental developers to create platforms for collecting the signatures, and importantly, for co-creating drafts of legislation. The new tools helped activists to develop a law, and forced the Parliament to pass a law, which the Government had twice promised but failed to deliver.

In developing the digital tools for the crowdsourcing of law, the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) gave a group of crowdsourcing activists unprecedented access for planning a digital tool. This co-operation was inspired by the idea of sharing and collaborative innovation. A holding space was created where people with varying values, objectives and desires were able to create a common understanding of a problem and experiment with solutions (Heikka 2015). A sense of mutual appreciation and trust was expressed by both the activists and MoJ civil servants (Heikka 2015, 280-281). While the co-operation was not without friction, the activists acknowledged the role of the civil servants as guardians of equal access to the democratic process; and the civil servants appreciated the skills and enthusiasm the activists brought to the process.

Drawing on Manuel Castells' (2009, 2013) perceptions of power in the network society, the article argues that the practice of crowdsourcing offers a way to pursue civic agency in a society that is constituted by flows of time and space. In the network society, the power of stable institutions such as the journalistic media and the parliament are challenged. While this can be a cause

for concern, the situation can also be beneficial for innovation. To make full use of the opportunities that emerge inside, outside or between institutions, holding spaces for safe transgression of entrenched roles and thinking are required (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

The civic activists who developed the tools for crowdsourcing for law also created another holding space by inviting volunteers to co-create legislation (Heikka 2015). These were people from various backgrounds and with little connections to the established political process. Initially, a small core group convened in physical spaces and collaborated on digital platforms such as the Open Ministry site and Google Documents. Volunteers from a variety of professions – lawyers, graphic designers, journalists and social movement activists – joined in with their individual skills. In the campaign phase, large numbers of people used Facebook and Twitter to spread the call for signatures for the legislative draft. This was very effective, and the threshold of 50 000 signatures was reached literally overnight.

With the legislative framework of the CI-Act and the accompanying digital tools, idea generation and legislative drafting became possible for "everyone". To some extent, a holding space was digitally extended through digital media to include very large numbers of volunteers who contributed with their own skills and varied levels of intensity (Heikka 2015).

This complemented and challenged not only the politicians' but also political journalists' role in social change. Traditionally, journalists play an important role in setting the agenda for public debate and highlighting the needs for changes in legislation. In the case studied, it is notable that the professional media was not active in the holding space where the co-opetition between the civic activists and developers emerged (Heikka 2015). This was the space and place of flows where new ideas and practices were negotiated and forged. Activists, developers and the government together bypassed or complemented what professional journalists have been expected to do (Heikka 2015; Heikka & Carayannis 2017). The stakeholders developed communicative tools and practices that overlap with the functions of journalism, setting the agenda for public debate, disseminating information and offering opportunities for civic action (McCombs & Shaw 1972; Høyer & Lauk 2003; Heikka 2015).

In the case investigated, professional journalism was involved in reporting on the legislative changes that were passed years before the law drafting and campaigning started (the CI-Act) as well as in reporting on the initiatives, such as the Equal Marriage Law, that were brought to public debate through the citizens' initiative mechanism.

Article 1 introduces the concept of the *mediating citizen* to explain the position the digital activists pursued and, in this case obtained: that of negotiating with the power-holders (Heikka 2015). The mediating citizen is a new type that is developed from Bennett's (2008) typology of citizenship, the *dutiful citizen* and *the actualizing citizen*. Bennett (2008) argues the former trusts the mass media in making informed decisions as a voter, while the latter is mistrustful of both the voting process and the mass media.

The *mediating citizen,* however, sees voting as one important channel of democratic power-making, but also as both inefficient and technically outdated. This view is supported by the technical ability to create fast-paced advocacy campaigns that use digital media to set agendas for public debate and change legislation (Heikka 2015). The mediating citizen develops new kinds of civic practices to mediate between the civil society and existing political institutions.

These innovations can be seen as attempts to build holding spaces for co-creation. The more ambitious crowdsourcing elements – such as collaborating on law drafts – in Article 1 may not have been possible without a holding space where previously competitive actors and institutions could meet and find common ground (Heikka 2015; Heikka & Carayannis 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2017).

6.2   Article 2 findings: Crashing a national media event

What happens when safe spaces for mediating contentious social issues are *not* discovered? What prevents journalists and activists holding space for social innovation, and what are the consequences of failing to do so?

Article 2, *Crashing a National Media Event Circulation of Social imaginaries in the Gatecrashers Riots in Finland*, investigates the unforeseen riots against the presidential festivities of the Independence Day in Tampere, Finland, on the 6th of December 2013 (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). The riots triggered a medley of news coverage, analysis and social media reactions that form the data of the article. The rioters called themselves "Kiakkovieraat", a pun allowing the double meaning of Hockey guests or Gate crashers. They wore facemasks of famous Finnish hockey players and used hockey sticks to smash windows and hit policemen and police horses. Their intent was to protest the power of the "bourgeois elite" and increasing social divides, and declared a "class war".

Theoretically, Article 2 utilizes the idea of circulation (Straw 2010) and builds on the established theory of the media event (Dayan & Katz 1992), and proposes the type of the *dialogic media event* [3] (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). The theory of the media event was originally conceived in the era of static broadcast media, whereas contemporary societies are defined by the constant circulation of items, goods, artefacts, ideas and beliefs in the digitally mediated world (Castells 1996/2000; Sumiala 2008; Valaskivi & Sumiala 2014). The article suggests that the concept of the *dialogic media event* captures the nature of real-time circulation of meanings before, during and after a national media event (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

New digital tools opened channels for real time communication between journalists, activists and authorities during a national media event. These

---

[3]   Article 2 uses the form 'dialogical' instead of 'dialogic'. They are here considered synonymous adjective forms of the word dialogue. In Articles 1, 3 and 4 the form 'dialogic' is preferred, and that decision is followed in this synthesizing thesis.

communications also resulted in real-time changes in the narrative of the event in the journalistic media. The analysis of the data indicates how the rioters skillfully utilized the communication power of blogs, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube in real time to influence the journalistic decisions of mainstream media reporting (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). The professional media initially focused on reporting only on the official event of the Independence Day festivities; but had to change the focus of reporting as tweets from rioters and other journalists appeared on the TV screens. Furthermore, the study notes that violence by activists towards the police formed a tipping point, after which their message was ignored even if it was peaceful and well-articulated (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

As the article analyzes the places and spaces where meanings were circulated, it becomes clear that the safety of a holding space was absent (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2017). The dialogue that emerged did not develop into a non-judgmental search for common ground. Consequentially, the social innovations that emerged from the process were one-sided declarations rather than mutually beneficial discoveries.

The riots were planned and executed to create a conflict between the police and the rioters, and furthermore, to utilize the media presence of the Independence Day reception to hijack the media event. Instead of establishing a framework for co-operation, the events before the riots were designed to create a sense of distrust and mystery. The would-be rioters remained anonymous and disseminated messages of carnivalesque violence.

The interaction between the activists, professional journalists, and the public is in the article described as dialogic (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). Through this dialogue, the rioters succeeded in instilling their message – in the forms of memes, tweets, and other social media content – to the live broadcasting of the media event. "Technology created a space where real-time interaction of all parties was possible but also defined the particular forms that the interaction took" (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016, p.105). In this sense, it can be argued that dialogue took place. Through social media, the protesters, the audiences and journalists were able to create, comment, and circulate messages, often as memes. The event was a more complex exchange of meanings than a hijacked media event, and it did contain elements of dialogue (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

However, the dialogue was weak. It is difficult to find a moment of pausing, listening and appreciation of the "other side" of the debate. Perhaps consequentially, the protesters were able to challenge the ritualistic media event only momentarily (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). Despite their skills and perseverance in preparing the media environment for a disruptive event, and their success in changing the mediated course of events in real time, the activists did little to change the narrative of the media in the days that followed. To a large extent, the message of the protesters was rejected.

By extending the idea of the holding space to the media event theory, it is possible to suggest a model that has the potential to support stronger dialogue. In a media event with stronger dialogue, the search for shared meaning ideally starts before the event. This search can take the form of, for example, journalists inviting stakeholders to a shared space. Invitees could include journalists, citizen journalists, bloggers, police, politicians, activists, academics – all the elements that were present in the actual mediated Gatecrashers event in Tampere, on 6th of December 2013, but lacked mutual understanding and trust to make sustaining use of the energy and visions that were aired (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2016). For example, thoughtful reflections as well as references to now well-known names, such as Yannis Varoufakis, academic and later Greek finance minister, were present, but the legacy media editorials ignored them. The call for social justice and protests towards the elites were sidelined or ridiculed (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

Table 3 is a developed version of the tabulation published in Article 2 (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). Drawing on Bohm (1996) and Scharmer and Kaufer (2013) it develops further the column "Dialogic media event" on the right by using the ideas of holding space and dialogue.

TABLE 3   Three types of media events: Classical, hijacked, and dialogic

	Classical media event	Hijacked media event	Dialogic media event
Places and spaces involved in circulation	Homes, official venues and live broadcasts are the central stages of event.	The locus of the disruptive hijacking attempt emerges as central place in the event in addition to homes, official venues and original event broadcasts.	Holding space before, during and after an event help the construction of shared meanings. Protests on the street, broadcasts and social media create a space of interaction. Social media content gives events a global reach and context.
Predominant actors and their roles	The elites are actors. Journalists are gatekeepers. Audiences are spectators.	Hijackers emerge alongside the elites.	Audiences make meanings together with other stakeholders

6.3 Article 3 findings: The role of journalism in dialogic innovation processes

In this article, the focus of the investigation is in establishing a holding space for social innovation (Heikka & Carayannis 2016). The Helsinki Deaconess Institute (HDI), a large social and health care enterprise organized in 2013 and 2014 a series of innovation workshops. The HDI invited journalists, amongst other stakeholders, to discuss and – if they so decided – to use ideas emerging from the workshops in their journalistic work.

This article suggests, that participatory journalism can increasingly be participation in social innovation emerging outside the newsroom. In other words, it suggests an inverted and complementary model for the traditional idea of participatory journalism, where audiences participate in newsroom-led journalistic work. The article calls this *participatory solutions journalism* (Heikka & Carayannis 2016).

In the multi-stakeholder innovation workshop series, HDI brought its strategy of radical diakonia – caring for the marginalized and most vulnerable people in society in innovative ways – to interaction with stakeholders. The purpose of the workshops was threefold: test the new strategy among key stakeholders; innovate new products and services based on the strategy; and communicate the strategy and potential innovations among stakeholders and the wider public in the social media and mainstream media. However, the agenda was flexible, the participants were invited to take part in conceiving the objectives and methods of the sessions (Heikka & Carayannis 2016).

Results of these workshops include several journalism-related innovations. For example, the workshops ended up in establishing a stakeholder relations tour, The Class Trip to the City Margins. This was a journey, hosted by the HDI for decision makers, experts and opinion leaders, to learn and experience the reality of the underprivileged communities in the Helsinki capital region: for example, drug addicts, alcoholics and troubled youth. The trip was a chartered mini-bus tour to the service locations, where participants had the opportunity to learn first-hand how HDI services work and how they are experienced by users. The tour also fed stories to the media. Among the attendees were journalists, as well as activists, citizen journalists and decision makers who blogged about the tour and commented on it on social media. One of the tours, attended by eight politicians running for parliament, was covered on national television. The article suggests, that the holding space that was created for innovation was related to changes in media content (Heikka & Carayannis 2016, 2017).

Article 3 differs from the previous two in one important way: a conscious attempt to build a holding space for journalist-engaging dialogue can clearly be observed. The article analyses a setting where journalists were invited to join a shared space for innovation. In this physical and social space, journalists took part in exploring how social and health care services were to be reformed to

serve the needs of the whole society. In a facilitated meeting, journalists engaged in a non-judgmental dialogic relationship with other participants. In practice, this means that they joined the dialogue without immediate pressure of news production deadlines, and professional roles that serve that news production agenda. They shared with other participants a certain ignorance and insecurity that may allow learning with others (Heikka & Carayannis 2016).

Representing a rather unconventional approach to journalistic work, a journalist attending one of the workshops said: "I don't know why I am here". The article presents this type of suspension of previous knowledge and roles as a virtue for innovation, including journalistic innovation. Of the articles analyzed in this thesis, this is where the ambitious definition of dialogue provided by Bohm (1996) comes closest to being achieved.

Article 3 also argues that engaging with dialogic processes of social innovations may be a learning experience that encourages innovation in the newsroom (Heikka & Carayannis 2016; see Carpentier 2016, p.79 on *trans-field participation*). Journalists learn about new ways of collective learning and are better equipped to innovate inside the newsroom. They may be able to include the audiences and other stakeholders in innovation.

Article 3 analyses a personal, emotional, inclusive and systemic nature of collective learning. The workshops attempted to form relationships with the margins of the society, not only the power-holders or those already "in" the debate (Heikka & Carayannis 2016). Marginalized individuals and communities are seen as co-innovators of solutions to social problems; this is where "the new" in societies appears first. This approach is contrary to practices observed in mainstream innovation spaces, where the margins of society are absent.

The dialogue between the participants in the innovation workshops covered personal, sensitive and emotional experiences normally ruled out from professional environments. To create solutions to the social problems facing societies in the future, the organizers assessed that they require a learning process that engages people as rational, physical and emotional wholes (Heikka & Carayannis 2016).

The significance of these ideas to journalism is analyzed with the help of the theory of solutions journalism (Benesch 1998; Sillesen 2014). In the case of the HDI workshops, the idea of solutions journalism is extended to not only reporting on solutions, but also to professionals momentarily immersing themselves in creating these solutions. This new role is referred to as *participatory solutions journalism* (Heikka & Carayannis 2016).

6.4 Article 4 findings: Three stages of innovation in participatory journalism

Article 4 builds on the previous articles and develops in more detail the idea of co-creation in journalism (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). The article is a case

study of mediated responses to the large-scale public school closures in Chicago in 2012–2013. Civic activists developed a data-based tool, Schoolcuts.org, to visualize and contextualize the rationale for and consequences of the school closures. Activists and public school parents argued that the closures targeted schools with students from racial and ethnic minorities. The data helped in forming a counter-narrative for the local government's rationale for the closures. This counter-narrative and the data itself was used in mainstream media stories (Heikka & Carayannis 2017).

The civic innovation environment is an umbrella term that refers to a range of activists and activities around the idea of improving lives through technology in Chicago. An epicenter of the activity is a weekly event, the Open Gov Hack Night, that gathers civic activists across institutional borders, hybrid organizations such as the foundation-funded Smart Chicago Collaborative, NGO's and more informal advocacy groups. The environment has produced dozens of digital services that attempt to address social problems in the Chicago area. For such border-transgressing collaboration to emerge, a special place was required. The article makes the argument that the Hack Night functions as a holding space for the activists, developers, data scientists, journalists, city officials, and business people (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). They collaborate in the relative freedom of organizational boundaries and find common ground to experiment with data-based solutions.

Cross-sectoral co-operation in the case investigated took the forms of sharing skills, voluntary help, financial support, and access to other resources such as increased media exposure through existing civic organizations. Many people worked for more than one project or organization. A network emerged with people searching for partners and being introduced to new partners. The article claims that from this space emerged journalism-related civic projects that made an impact in the public debate. The civic activists used terms like "journalistic in nature" and "journalistic angle" when describing their work, while also explicitly saying they were not journalists (Heikka & Carayannis 2017, p.13).

The civil society was, for example, able to insert their interpretation of the events and data into the public debate, including the journalistic media. The tools built by the activists momentarily became go-to sources for understanding what was going on for both journalists and the public. Journalists referred to them and recommended them as a credible source. The article argues that a dialogue emerged. There were moments when both sides of the argument acknowledged mistakes or misinterpretation in their analysis of the school data released by the local government. A more fact-based process of public deliberation emerged (Heikka & Carayannis 2017).

The article introduces the additional phases of co-initiating and co-sensing and defines them as follows:

- Co-initiating – The act of finding common ground among stakeholders in a fragmented system

- Co-sensing – The process of learning what the community needs and what its capabilities are
- Co-creating – Takes place when the initiatives are jointly developed into prototypes

The analysis points out that networks for joint problem-solving were formed across organizational boundaries (co-initiating). Existing digital tools were used for exploring and communicating the needs and realities of the schools (co-sensing), and digital platforms for increased information sharing and engagement were developed (co-creating).

Article 4 presents participatory journalism as a two-way street. In other words, the argument is made that participation in journalism should include not only citizens' contributions to journalist-led initiatives, but also vice versa; journalists should participate in initiatives emerging from the civil society (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). While this would be logical, following the idea of collaboration, the systematic literature review indicates that it is surprisingly absent in literature. The article calls this *dialogic journalism* (Heikka & Carayannis 2017).

The analysis suggests that producing news is an interactive process between journalists, citizen journalists and other civic actors (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). This is what happened when journalists linked to, referred to, and recommended the Schoolcuts.org cite as a useful source. A journalistic discovery was made and communicated through self-made data visualization tools. Even as the developers denied being journalists or following journalistic ethics, these activities would probably have been considered journalism had they been conducted by a journalistic outlet.

The article argues that journalism can be produced "by individuals and organizations whose mission and identity may not be that of journalism" (Heikka & Carayannis 2017, p. 27). The implication to the financially distressed journalism industry is that it is challenged by, but also invited to co-operate with, a breed of citizen journalists that are in some areas better skilled and equipped to produce news than the journalists themselves.

The article argues that a limited idea of what co-creation is may hinder efforts to create journalism together between professional journalists and audience (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). The data suggests, in line with Lewis (2010) that journalism cannot be understood only as a profession but also a set of ethical principles and practices that can be applied by different organizations and by individuals without journalistic training or professional background.

The civic activists represented an iterative approach to public debate. They felt that public dialogue consisted of a series of events where stakeholders added elements to the information. This was different to the journalists, who saw the journalistic end-product as the objective of their work and did not pursue for more pre-publishing dialogue. A civic activist described:

> We use data to get into a dialogue with stakeholders so that the data that we have gets updated and improved. We're not just taking what's given to us, it's this

constant iteration, this constant dialogue with stakeholders, so we're getting the best view, the best perspective of what is happening in the system. (CA4) (Heikka & Carayannis 2017, p.18).

The dialogic journalism that emerged was empowering for citizens. Parents used the data to question the school board members in meetings and on social media. A participatory process in the production of journalism appeared to create a more engaged participation in the civic sphere (Heikka & Carayannis 2017).

7 FINDINGS SUMMARY

The articles of this thesis were analyzed through the concepts of dialogue and holding space. Attempts to construct and hold space for innovation emerged largely outside of mainstream journalism. Holding space appears to be a practice that fits uneasily with how broadcast media operates.

Table 4 describes each article using the analytical concepts of holding space and dialogue. The role of journalism is summarized in terms of the level of engagement in the dialogic space.

TABLE 4   Findings summary

	Holding space	Dialogue	Role of journalism
Article 1 Crowdsourcing for law	The co-opetitive planning group between activist and MoJ The Open Ministry platform	Emerging Developing the platform Co-creating legislative drafts	Reactive
Article 2 Gatecrashers riots	Social media	Weak Challenging the narrative of broadcast media by opening dialogue on social media	Reactive
Article 3 HDL Innovation workshops	Innovation workshops	Strong In-depth dialogue in workshops Televised stakeholder tour as a mediated result of workshops	Engaged
Article 4 Chicago school cuts and civic innovation	The Chicago Open Gov Hack Night	Emerging Platform development Reciprocal fact checking between activists, government and journalists Linking	Adaptive

Attempts to hold space and establish dialogue can be observed in Articles 1, 3 and 4 (Heikka 2015; Heikka & Carayannis 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2017); and to a lesser extent, in Article 2 (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). In other words, the cases of crowdsourcing for law, the HDI innovation workshops, and the civic responses to the Chicago school cuts contain elements of a shared, non-judgmental space for innovation.

These cases of "*emerging dialogue*" and "*strong dialogue*" are marked with light gray and darker gray background color, respectively. The strongest case for holding space can be made with the HDI innovation workshops (Heikka & Carayannis 2016). In these sessions, organizers and participants expressed compassion, enthusiasm, personal commitment, and openness to new ideas. Insights reached in these workshops fed into media products and led into creating stakeholder tools for making the lives of marginalized populations visible for decision makers and audiences. In this space, journalists were present and worked as part of the group in a personally engaged manner. The role of journalism is therefore described as *engaged*.

Cases of *emerging and strong dialogue* appear to be associated with *physical holding spaces* (Heikka 2015; Heikka & Carayannis 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2017). These physical spaces allowed connections and innovations over organizational, professional and ideological boundaries to be made. Attempts to construct spaces for these transgressions were conscious. This is true of the space held for collaboration between civic crowdsourcing activists and the MoJ (Article 1, Heikka 2015), the HDI workshops (Article 3, Heikka & Carayannis 2016) and the Open Gov Hack Night and related "unofficial" social groups (Article 4, Heikka & Carayannis 2017). These cases produced tools and practices – the crowdsourcing tools for law, and the Schoolcut.org service – that contributed to the quality of the public debate. Strong dialogue is related to successful *trans-field participation* (Carpentier 2016, p.79), i.e. that participation in one field may encourage participation in another field. For example, the participation of journalists in social innovation could lead to improvements in the innovations in either or both journalistic coverage and journalistic working practices (Heikka & Carayannis 2016, 2017).

There are differences, however, between these cases, regarding the level and intensity of engagement from the journalists' part. In the case of crowdsourcing for law, journalists were absent from the holding spaces where innovations were made (Heikka 2015). The setting of the agenda for public debate was a result of innovation and co-operation within and between the government and the civil society. Journalism remained an outsider reporter of these events. That is not an insignificant role; the Equal Marriage law was a topic of heated public debate and it was covered comprehensively in the journalistic media. However, the data suggests that journalism's role in the innovation process that preceded these news events was limited. Journalists were not linked into the spaces where innovations were emerging. The role of journalism in the case of crowdsourcing for law in Finland is therefore described as *reactive*.

In the Chicago school cuts case, journalists were initially outsiders in developing and using the data based tools that emerged from the civic developer community (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). However, when the tools gained traction, journalists were quick to link to them, use them in their own work, fact-check the data, and develop their own data based analysis. Therefore, the role of journalism in Article 4 is described as *adaptive*.

On the other hand, weaker dialogue can be observed when these spaces are lacking, particularly in the case of Gatecrashers when the only corporeal connection between the parties was aggressive or violent (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). The dialogue that emerged during the event was only momentary. The interactions that can be observed between the journalists and the rioters remain at the level of debate. In other words, both sides were challenging each other on blogs, social media, news and editorials. A lack of space where these arguments could be held in front of all, for analytical and non-judgmental observation, is clear. A lecture model of both journalism and citizen journalism defined the discourse even if interactive digital technology was used to change the narrative of the media event in real-time.

7.1 Repositioning journalism through dialogue

The findings of this study suggest that good journalism may require journalists to work as *space holders* (Heikka & Carayannis 2016). The argument is that journalism could foster networks of co-initiating and co-sensing innovations in the margins of the society (Heikka 2015). From here, the movement towards the power centers begins, which is why the participation of journalism in social innovation is important (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). If understanding of the origins of these movements is missing, what may be left for journalism is to report on a groundswell of frustration and anger when these sentiments are channeled to the mainstream by, for example, populist movements. This may have happened in the Gatecrashers riots where violence was a consequence of failure in creating holding spaces for dialogue (Article 2, Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016). The violence and aggression were perhaps a desperate, last ditch effort to establish a corporeal relationship with the other side of society (Urry 2002). Even in the era of mobilities and flows, this need has not disappeared, but the media and the protesters were unable to create spaces for such interaction.

If sustainable innovation is a process in which prior knowledge must be abandoned to create new ideas, products and services for social good, journalists may at least temporarily need to suspend the ideology of objectivity (Heikka & Carayannis 2016). However, the challenge to the ideology of objectivity by participatory processes should not be interpreted as a clear-cut choice between two models but of flexible co-operation. For example, in Article 4, the civic developers that performed journalism-like functions in the public debate about the Chicago school closures, valued the skills and ethics of the

professional journalists (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). The citizen journalists also pursued hearing all sides of the issue simultaneously, but they also deemed participation of the citizens to news production and to the public discussion to be so important values that objectivity could be suspended while participatory truth-seeking was still ongoing.

This thesis suggests that instead merely reporting on issues, journalism could venture deeper into the world where meanings and worldviews are constructed. The dialogic approach to journalism-related social innovation suggests that at the point where contentious public discussion is ongoing, it may already be too late for journalists to understand where the issues and their underlying passions emerge from. Holding space for dialogue emerges as an idea and practice for re-engaging with the communities that journalism has lost touch with. Instead of using technology alone, a chance of success in social innovation may lie in holding space for innovation with people in their physical environment; and using technology as a tool in organizing and communicating social change (Heikka & Carayannis 2016, 2017).

These findings suggest, that research has suffered of the lack of concepts to analyze human and corporeal interaction as part of participatory media practices. The concepts of holding space and dialogue add potentially significant missing pieces to journalism-related communicative social change: social relationships and their quality as a resource in innovation. They also offer a complementing approach to participation, in addition to the political and critical view that analyze participation as a power struggle (Carpentier 2016). In this study, innovation emerges as a new approach that does not disregard power, but adds to it the nature of innovation as a potentially win-win process.

7.2   Three models of journalism

The findings can be contextualized in the history of journalism research with the following typology of the *Three models of journalism* (Table 5). I use literature and findings of this study to first present the models of *broadcast journalism* and *participatory journalism* to create a background for the findings of this study, conceptualized as the model of *dialogic journalism*. While a historical continuum can be observed – starting from the broadcast model and developing towards the models of participatory and dialogic journalism – it can be argued that these models have co-existed already in the early 20th century (Lippman 1922; Dewey 1927).

The broadcast journalism model that has dominated the media environment in the 20th century is related to the idea of debate as the form of public discourse. In this model, the role of journalism is to report on experts' and power-holders' views and actions on issues of common interest. The search for a direction for society takes place through a rational assessment and competition of ideas in the public sphere. Journalists function as gate-keepers of the public sphere; the role of the public is to make informed decisions of the

issues in their civic lives, and choose decision makers through the representative political system. The ideal of objective journalism, defined as detachment and disinterest towards the issues reported on, describes how professional journalism functions as the fourth estate; journalism is the reporter of the "retrievable facts" (Glasser 1984, p. 13). Broadcast media are the main space for activity. This means that the reporting of a debate takes the form of a lecture; there is no desire from nor technology for the journalists to receive significant amounts of journalistic input from the public.

On the other hand, the model of **participatory journalism** (with its predecessor public journalism and its subsequent (internet-inspired) versions of citizen journalism, networked journalism etc.) explore the idea of deliberation as the preferred form of public discourse. The idea is that citizens can provide valuable and meaningful inputs to the deliberation process and complement the views and knowledge provided by the decision makers and experts. Journalists seek for ideas, insights, priorities and expertise not only from authoritative sources, but also among the public. Context and interpretation become important elements of the news. Inspired by a civic duty to serve democracies by better representing the needs of the public, the participatory journalism movement was inspired by the emergence of the internet as a space for this deliberation. In addition to the internet, deliberation can take place in designated spaces such as consensus forums which can feed ideas into journalism.

Finally, in the **dialogic journalism** model suggested here, journalists and the public seek each other in shared spaces to create something new – products, services and journalistic content (Heikka & Carayannis 2017). These spaces, that the thesis calls holding spaces, can emerge in the media, in the civil society, or practically anywhere where groups of people wish to hold space for innovation (Heikka 2015; Heikka & Carayannis 2016). The ideal of objectivity is complemented by the ethos that knowledge can be co-created in a participatory process with the public and multiple stakeholders. Innovation is a dialogue where personal emotions and sensations are part of the process as well as rational discourse (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016; Heikka & Carayannis 2016). That is what is meant by saying that the quality of interaction is emphasized. Furthermore, participants consider the event as an opportunity for learning and personal development. Objectivity as detachment is challenged by a participatory ethics, defined here as a view that emphasizes taking part in co-creating solutions to social problems.

TABLE 5   Three models of journalism: Broadcast, participatory and dialogic

Model of journalism	Mode of discourse	Space for innovation	Core value	Focus in interaction	Level of engagement
Broadcast	Debate	Broadcast media	Authority through objectivity	Access to information	Reactive
Participatory	Deliberation	Social media	Relevance through participation	Access to participation	Adaptive
Dialogic	Dialogue	Holding space	Innovation through immersion and experiments	Quality of interaction	Co-creative

8 DISCUSSION

The digital utopians of the 1990's imagined the internet would open doors for free and constructive civic deliberation. These accounts explored and hailed technology as a vehicle for change (Rheingold 1993, 2000; Negroponte 1995; Barlow 1996; Dyson 1997; Le   vy 1997; Ito 2003). On one hand, as the systematic literature review suggested, a large portion of contemporary research of innovation in journalism has followed this technologically inspired path. On the other hand, in the emerging literature of cultural science, the media are seen as actors in the complex and cross-institutional networks of knowledge production, creating innovations as a result of competition and creative destruction.

The findings of this study offer ideas to explain why so few of the promises in the literature has become true. The optimistic visions of collective intelligence lacked methods for turning the visions into policy, social innovation or democratic change. One approach to understand the failure is to argue interaction extended to *debate* and *deliberation* but not to *dialogue*. This emphasis on the *quality of interaction* is an increasingly important element in literature on organizational development and sustainable and inclusive innovation (Senge 1990; Bohm 1991, 1996; Senge et al. 2005; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013), but has been absent in participatory journalism research.

The reform movements of participatory and citizen journalism emphasize the idea of a resourceful citizen that has, when better informed and engaged by the journalistic media, the capacity for enhanced civic life (Gillmor 2006; Rosen 1999, 2006; Bruns 2007; Jarvis 2014). By using the concepts of holding space and dialogue, this thesis argues journalism can move towards exploring a more constructive, and less reactive, role in networks of social innovation.

This exploration builds on ideas raised within the public journalism movement – for example the idea that media form "public places" for citizens to meet and discuss issues (Sirianni & Friedland 2001, p. 194). This thesis introduces new concepts in the field of journalism studies to understand the opportunities and challenges journalism faces in these environment. By holding space for dialogue, journalists may be able to practice a refined version of being

''conductors of the public debate'' and set aside their monopoly as news producers (Bardoel, 1996, p. 299). In this scenario, "news would no longer be an 'objective' story, but a heterogeneous narration made up of multiple voices" (Domingo 2008, p. 687; Bruns 2007). Entering and creating spaces for dialogue can be ambitious and ethical journalism that adheres to the high ideals of (investigative) journalism, updated to contemporary contexts of social innovation.

In an example of how conducting public debate is achieved, Boczkowski (2004) reports how the New Jersey Online created the staff roles of *community producer* and a *director of community relations*. These professionals gave citizen journalists technical assistance in using the newspaper's website builder; they sparred citizen journalists in coming up with ideas what to publish; and they pointed out news leads in the community created content for the professional journalists. In a similar line of thinking, Jarvis argues:

> We should begin to see ourselves as enablers, sometimes educators, even organizers and, yes advocates. We change how we measure our success — on the number, depth, quality, and value of the relationships we build — and how well-informed and well-equipped people are as a result. (Jarvis 2014, Chapt. Content vs. Service, para 13.)

As a result of this type of thinking, the idea of journalism as *gate-opening* – instead of gatekeeping – is formed (Boczkowski 2004). People formerly regarded as recipients of a product are invited to create products and services. Gate-opening has much in common with space-holding – creating a space for increased quality of relationships. However, space-holding takes the participatory process further and deeper than gate-opening. The difference with gate-opening and space-holding is, that gate-opening focuses on the technical moment when obstacles for participation are removed, whereas space-holding pays more attention to the dialogic process of innovation that takes place after the gates have been opened. Drawing on Boczkowski's (2004) suggestions of *community producers* and *directors of community relations*, it can be suggested that in journalism as gate-opening could be practiced by *community space holders.* These could be job descriptions in newsrooms or shared roles with stakeholders.

8.1 Dialogic journalism in the age of Trump and Brexit

The above experiments and suggestions carry new weight after the surprising victories of Donald Trump in the American presidential election 2016, and the Brexit vote in the UK earlier that year. Political journalists were unable to foresee the rising discontent that supported Mr. Trump and Brexit, and understand the reasons behind these phenomena. The rise of *fake news* and disinformation are examples of how affective news streams can form bubbles of worldviews and "truths" that no longer communicate with each other, and no

longer respond to traditional journalistic methods such as fact-checking (Papacharissi & de Fatima Oliveira 2012; Jackson et al. 2016; Lilleker et al. 2016;).

In immediate post-election analyses of the UK Brexit vote and the US presidential election of 2016, these events were analyzed as a sign of how little journalists understood of the anger, fear and realities behind the emerging protest vote (Byers 2016; Sambrook 2016; Franklin & Mullin 2016). Analyses from within the journalistic profession point towards a detachment from large proportion of the electorate. The Poynter Institute, a journalism training organization in Florida, interviewed ten news executives immediately after the Trump victory in 2016 (Franklin & Mullin 2016). "This was a rural roar, and journalists on the coasts had a hard time hearing it," said Brian Stelter, host of CNN's Reliable Sources in a comment that echoes the sentiment of many others.

This thesis suggests, that the journalistic answer for phenomena like the rise of populism and fake news would be not only to resort to role of a detached observer and reporter, but also to join the public as co-creators in constructing knowledge. It is tempting to think, that had journalists immersed themselves in this blogosphere before and by the time of the Gatecrashers events in 2013, and develop mutual trust with the activists in holding spaces for shared making of meaning, journalists would have been better equipped to understand not only that event, but some of the subsequent protest movements against the elites in Western democracies. The Greek debt crisis and its political fallout, the Brexit referendum in 2016, and the American presidential election in 2016, were marked by the incapability of the media to predict, depict and analyze political developments that grew out of profound discontent towards the "elites" of Western democracies and the global economic order.

The ideology of journalism as an objective reporter of the news legitimates the role of journalism as a professional mediator of the established political process. While that position has many merits and is not to be discarded, it may also sideline the citizen as a civic actor and may black-box the process of creating alternative political programs. From this point of view, adhering to the ideology of objectivity serves the power-holders in society. This issue has been analyzed by arguing, that the *ideology of objectivity* (Deuze 2005) is challenged by the *ethics of participation* (Lewis 2010, 2012). By the ethics of participation Lewis (2010, 2012) means that core values of professional journalism are complemented by the duty to participate. This thesis supports these findings, and adds the notion that the duty to participate is not driven solely by technological networks, but perhaps more importantly by societal change that affects organizations, individuals and their interrelations (Heikka 2015, Castells 2009).

Deuze (2005) suggests that the claim of being objective was a useful principle to justify journalisms' professional status in a "binary world"; when there were two competing truths, a disinterested referee was needed to report on "both sides of the story". However, in the era of cultural and technological complexity, issues may no longer be binary. As an example of non-binary phenomena, Deuze (2005) mentions multimedia and multiculture. In these

fields, there are different readings of an issue, and what is required from a journalist is an understanding of all of them, instead of merely reporting on "both sides" of an issue.

The findings of this thesis suggest new ideas for dealing with such complex, non-binary and sometimes contentious issues while pursuing good journalism. In doing so, the suggestions made here come philosophically close to what Ward (2017) outlines as the *pragmatic objectivity* of journalism. In pragmatic objectivity, objectivity is not seen merely as investigating the factual correctness of propositions, but also as investigating the nature of the *beliefs* that lie behind our views and convictions. "Pragmatic objectivity (--) is inclusive, open to the evaluation of many kinds of writing. It denies dualisms, viewing journalism as both factual and interpretive, an engaged chronicling", (Ward 2017, section Old and New Objectivity, para 5.). Furthermore, Ward suggests "standards of evaluation" for journalism. They include, for example, "Standard of attitude", that is defined as follows: "Journalists should adopt the objective stance, step back from their beliefs, display a passion for truth and give reasons that others could accept." The standard of self-consciousness encourages journalists to examine, whether they are "conscious of the conceptual frame" they use to understand the topic. (Ward 2017, section Old and New Objectivity).

Ward's suggestions deal largely with epistemology. This thesis suggests that holding spaces are corporeal environments where pragmatic objectivity can be practiced. Furthermore, this thesis introduces concepts and practices to deal with not only the rational aspects of evaluating and creating journalistic knowledge, but also the personal, communal and emotional elements related to journalistic truth-seeking.

It is worthwhile to note, that "suspension" of judgement – the requirement of dialogue in Bohm's (1996) theory – does not imply abandoning judgement and reason altogether. The word *suspend* means, literally, to hang. In that sense, the terms *objective* and *non-judgmental* are in fact close relatives. Through suspension, we attempt to observe the issues under investigation without prejudice, "as it is". In holding spaces, even our own predispositions are hung in front of us for all to observe. In that sense, holding space and dialogue can be used as methods for updating the principles of quality journalism to the world of networks of social innovation (Castells 1996/2000, 2012).

In dialogue, the "objectivity" of the observer is one of the presuppositions that are called to question. As such, dialogic practices can simply be possibilities for journalists to observe and reflect their own practices and role in society (Heikka & Carayannis 2016; Ward 2017). If holding space is defined in this way, experimenting with the above described innovation methods may not be in contradiction with the objectivity norm of journalism in a way that challenges the autonomy of journalism. After all, journalistic decision making remains in the hands of the journalist and the newsroom.

8.2   Basic income for the dialogic journalists?

Is the idea of holding space and dialogue in journalism a realistic practice? Journalism is a busy profession in which time is almost always a scarcity (Spyridou et al. 2013). Journalists are expected to do more with less resources than before (McChesney & Nichols 2010; Champagne 2005; Barnard 2016). In that vein, Ramaker, Stoep and Deuze (2015) suggest that reflective practices, if introduced in newsrooms, should be closely linked to the reality of news professionals.

Journalism and journalism-like content is increasingly produced by non-professional journalists. Consequentially, many producers of citizen journalism and journalism-like content are not bound by the routines, management, peer pressure and professional ethics that are typical for newsroom work. While citizen journalists may of course be confined by other types of restrictions (such as those related to earning a living), these restrictions do not necessarily negate the potential of their flexible situations. In the network society, organizational structures are in a flux (Castells 1996/2010, Laloux 2015; Shirky 2008). These conditions can make new room for reflective practices in journalism. A dialogic citizen journalist working in the space of flows can therefore be not only a problem for the social and financial sustainability of quality journalism, but also a partial answer to those issues.

Let us imagine, for example, a part-time journalist who practices freelancing as a side-line, or even a hobby. In this role, taking part in time-consuming processes that render deep insights into an issue could be more likely than in most newsroom jobs. Project jobs and flexible roles are predicted to be typical of work life in the decades to come (Thompson 2015; Alderman 2016). As automation evolves and robots take over many logical and manual work routines, researchers have suggested that human time and capacity may be freed to new forms of work and co-operation (Le vy 1997; Shirky 2010). This also means new opportunities for the transfer of knowledge and innovation through organizational boundaries.

If these structural changes apply to journalism, it is easy to imagine journalists taking part in holding spaces, sensing journeys and other reflective and experimental practices where knowledge is co-created. In this environment, the future of journalistic work may be a quest for meaning practiced largely by those who Ahva (2016) calls "in-betweeners" in journalism. To provide relative safety in this new environment in general, many European states are either or both considering and introducing basic incomes. As a result, journalism could be practiced as a part time job or passion as – citizen journalists, prosumers (Toffler 1980), pro-ams (Leadbeater & Miller 2004), or produsers (Bruns 2007).

8.3 Journalists as space holders

It is a long-standing journalistic method of (investigative) news gathering to be well networked with the influencers and news-makers of a "beat" – for example, politicians, civic leaders, law enforcement or the underworld. In these circumstances, the fine line between good networks and corrosively close relationships between power-holders is rightfully discussed. The analysis of this article presents these relationships in a new light: are they, or can they be, networks of innovation? Do they have the potential of being relationships of learning and creating new ideas together?

While this may sound as a radical abandoning of the impartial role of a professional journalist, this method for social innovation may already be relatively widespread. Versions of it can be observed, for example, in civic innovation environments, hubs and labs that journalists take part in, and more formal innovation conferences where journalists are invited to discuss and co-create solutions for social problems (Lathrop & Ruma 2010; Goldstein & Dyson 2013; Patel et al. 2013; Lewis & Usher 2014; McCann 2015). Journalists do not have to be invited to holding spaces of social innovation; the evolution of professional roles and digital technologies means that the ubiquitous (citizen) journalist is present regardless of the invitation (Antony & Thomas 2010; Uskali 2013).

It can also be argued, that the ideal of co-sensing, i.e. learning what the community needs and what its capabilities are, is what good journalism has always been. Drawing on Ramaker et al. (2015), we can think of the journalist entering a holding space for innovation as a reflective practitioner who asks "the relevant questions out of an attitude of curiosity and a critical search for truth" (Ramaker et al. 2015, p. 350). A helpful analogy could be the practice of action research, where the researchers may immerse in the actions of the objects of inquiry, accessing the tacit knowledge embodied in the practitioners (Polanyi 1967; Greenwood & Levin 2007).

Reich (2013) contends that *co-presence* is an age old journalistic ideal that encourages to be present where news happens to fully appreciate the complexities and sensitivities of the event (see also Urry 2002 on copresence). Reich (2013, p. 420, paraphrasing Boden & Molotch 2004) states that "co-presence becomes mandatory if the information is sensitive, complex, uncertain, and susceptible to misunderstanding, requiring intimacy, trust, assessment of commitment, and detection of lies". These words describe well the uncertainties with which contemporary societies struggle, and where holding spaces for dialogue are needed. Problems are complex and a high level of tolerance to uncertainty, and the ability to intimacy, empathy and trust are crucial. The dialogic principle of suspending judgement is a constructive starting point for working in such environments. Engaging with sources in an emotional way does not necessarily mean that the end-product is gonzo journalism or

immersion journalism (Hemley 2012). The method of learning does not dictate the journalist's ethical or stylistic choices.

8.4   Implications on innovation theory and participatory theory

Innovation theory has approached media theory by claiming that the media and the media-based civil society play a role in socially, financially and environmentally sustainable innovation (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013; Bast, Carayannis & Campbell 2015).   Scharmer (2009, Chapter 19, section The evolution…, para. 10) suggests that "[b]y transforming our current media system, we could shape new collective patterns of awareness and conversation". The research themes of creative industries, evolutionary economics and cultural science have stressed the role of mediated communication in the creation and adaption of "the new" in societies. (Hartley & Potts 2014a; Hartley, Potts, Flew et al. 2012).

However, these theories have little to say concerning what this role would be in practice and how it would fit together with the profession of journalism or citizen journalism. Without connections to the realities of media work, transformative ideas risk being yet another utopian vision.

Despite their novel approaches to the role of the media in innovation, many innovation scholars appear to gear towards a broadcast model of journalism: if only professional journalists would better reflect what is happening in environments of innovation, innovations would diffuse and societies at large would be better off (Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). On the other hand, when the networked nature of the media is acknowledged as crucial in the communication of innovations, empirical data that would link corporeal activities to mediated networks is largely missing (Hartley, Potts et al. 2012). What cultural science shares with other "systemic" innovation theories (e.g. Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) is a genuine interest in the role of communication, the media, and journalism, in innovation; but it also shares a lack of empirical depth and detail that would support the claims specifically in relation to journalism. Furthermore, journalism-related innovation is viewed predominantly as a grass-roots phenomenon, ignoring the opportunities of engaging with the mainstream press (Jones 2015). The findings and arguments of this thesis can be interpreted as tentative suggestions for filling these gaps.

The notion of the importance of dialogue and self-reflection in innovation also distinguishes this thesis from some of the arguments made within the recent literature of cultural science (Hartley & Potts 2014a, 2014b). Even as cultural science presents a break in the tradition of seeing culture through the concepts of struggle, power, and hegemony, it nonetheless retains a conflictual attitude to innovation through culture. The cultural science approach is based on the assumption that innovations emerge in a "demic conflict" between non-kin groups and this conflict is a core driver of innovation. Hartley and Potts

(2014, p. 44) argue that "[f]orces that reduce conflict (or promote harmony and oneness) thus also reduce the possibility of demic clash as a source of newness". The position this thesis argues for is that conflict is an important element in innovation – but that equally important is the capacity to mediate between conflicting elements: the capacity for self-reflection, suspension of judgment, and the pursuit for new common ground. Opportunities for such openings are present in some of the research literature, but these are interpreted through the concepts of agonism, conflictual consensus, or "dissensus" (Mouffe 2007), instead of co-creative innovation (Jones 2015).

Practices for moving from the conflict zone to discovering new common ground is required. In other words, this thesis argues, that "harmony and oneness" are elements in innovation just as conflict is. This perspective has been largely absent in communication related literature on innovation both on practical and theoretical levels.

Furthermore, cultural science tends to see communication in quantitative terms; the more the better for innovation. "The best strategy is to send out lots of messages. This is how communication works as semiotic productivity (Lotman 2009); the model is that of successful reproduction in nature, which is achieved by what looks like profligate waste of sperms, eggs, and offspring simply to achieve the reproduction of two individuals" (Hartley & Potts 2014b, p. 47–48). The findings of this study suggest that attention also needs to be paid to the quality of interactions to understand, how "the new" is discovered and disseminated in co-creative processes.

It should also be mentioned that the cultural science approach is explicitly urban; it celebrates the power of cities as a source for demic clashes and innovation (Hartley, Potts & MacDonald 2012, see also Florida 2002, 2005). The innovation theories used in this thesis (Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) are more open to the potential of the natural environment as a crucial element in innovation that is ecologically and socially sustainable.

In holding spaces, a wider variety of voices than before can potentially be heard in the process of innovation. The media is an important "cell" in the innovation system that needs to be engaged with the innovation process early on to make innovations ecologically, socially and financially sustainable (Murphy 2016). Aspects of sustainability in innovation are important, as societies globally struggle with the increasingly complex challenge of slowing growth, shrinking of the middle class, and acute ecological crises (Hautamäki 2010; Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014; George et al. 2012; Radjou et al. 2012; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). To stay relevant, searching spaces for such collaboration is crucial for the future of journalism.

Drawing on the research theme of participatory journalism can help in redefining the role of journalism in these environments. Ahva (2016) suggests that orientations of participations in the field of journalism include *through*, *in*, *with*, *around* and *for* journalism. This thesis suggests that the participation *of* journalism in processes of social innovation has been missing. It is argued that

journalism can seek spaces for open-ended dialogue between the stakeholders outside the newsroom. This follows naturally from the reciprocal nature of participation, and is supported by the idea of innovation as dialogue (Senge 1990; Bohm 1996; Isaacs 1999/2008; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013).

In making the aforementioned claims, this thesis contributes to both media-related aspects of *innovation theory* as well as to the *theory of participatory journalism*. Bruns (2014, p. 16) points out that innovation in the media "often originates from the edges of the mainstream media system, where change is less encumbered by tradition, by an established way of doing things". Furthermore, Bruns (2014 p. 13-14) claims that "(m)edia innovations are inextricably interlinked with societal innovations (--)."

However, in journalism research, these innovations have been expected to emerge without providing tools, concepts and spaces for these interlinkages to develop. Conducting dialogue with these margins is a practice that may have been missing, as journalism and its research has focused predominantly on newsrooms and technology to produce innovations.

8.5 Practical implications, and suggestions for journalistic experimentation

Three types of practical implications of the findings of this research can be suggested.

1. The *funding of innovation systems* would benefit from more emphasis on social innovations that include and use journalism-like initiatives. The focus should be in supporting initiatives that emerge in hybrid spaces between the civil society, the government, businesses and academia. These initiatives are often non-profit or not-for-profit projects, and tend to fall out of the scope of traditional channels of funding innovations.
2. The *role of journalism in innovation strategies* in both public and private sectors could benefit from re-evaluation. What now is a question of diffusion and public acceptance of innovation could be developed towards a more co-creative relationship. For example, engagement with co-innovators in the civil society can be included among the criteria in measuring the success of innovation strategies. This can be seen increasing the financial, social and ecological sustainability of innovations.
3. The *journalistic media* could continue developing new content genres and practices (such as events, holding space for social innovations, and engaging with innovations emerging in the civil society). This would require a conscious effort in newsrooms to reinterpret journalistic

practices and ethics in ways that supports quality reporting and allows for experimenting together with outside stakeholders.

In the following, I will take a few steps further to iterate what the last of the suggestions – relating to the journalistic media – could mean in the realities of newsroom work and citizen journalism.

In order to understand what the findings of this study mean, and to critically reflect on their plausibility the following questions can be raised: Who in the world of busy journalistic practice could, and would, pursue the time-consuming and demanding model of dialogic journalism? Can the news media, for example, construct spaces for dialogue? Could media organizations or groups of freelancers host such events?

In Table 6, I organize practical suggestions for journalism with the help of the three-stage innovation process of co-initiating, co-sensing and co-creating (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). Rows 1–3 in the table are written in the form of action proposals. On Row 1 (*Offer help*), I have written the ideas in the form of questions. The point of this is to emphasize listening to the needs of other stakeholders to learn and create common ground. In formulating the questions, I have used the data, especially practices of creating spaces for dialogue, which I observed in Articles 3 and 4. The form of the questions follows the kind of appreciative inquiry present in literature on dialogue (Bohm 1996; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013). While these questions are not unique, the way their tone and intent differs from what is generally considered the work of a journalist justifies their presence here. Row 2 (*Be a peer*), is based on practices observed particularly in Articles 1, 3 and 4. Row 3 (*Transgress boundaries*), contains observations from all articles, written in the form of practical suggestions.

The reason for this concrete formulation is two-fold. First, academic research too often falls short of presenting practical and actionable outcomes of a study. This cautiousness is well founded, as one single study rarely dramatically extends the knowledge base of a discipline. That is true for the present study as well. Taking that into account, I am poised to take a deliberate risk. Suggesting data-based explorative steps is in line with the ethos of experimental and non-judgmental dialogue that form the theoretical foundation of this study. Second, journalism is a hands-on profession and its practitioners deserve no less than concrete suggestions on how to improve their craft.

These suggestions are intended as encouragement for further dialogic testing and evaluation both in the academia and the fields of journalism. The ideas can be applied by all elements in the network of journalism-related social innovation, including journalists, citizen journalists, and other stakeholders; however, they are here written predominantly from the perspective of journalism.

TABLE 6   Practical suggestions for developing dialogic journalism

	Co-initiating	Co-sensing	Co-creating
Offer help:	"Who are and who should be involved in your situation?" "How can I help you in bringing these people together and talk about this".	"What can I do to understand your situation".	"What can I do to help you accomplish you goal?" "Can I host spaces for social innovation?" "How can I help in telling your story?"
Be a peer:	Tell stakeholders you want to learn about what they are doing and thinking. Show interest in the issues and their solutions as such, as well as journalistic perspectives. Suspend professional, personal and/or civic roles to advance learning together.	Apply methods of organizational learning to support quality of discussion and reduce the risks experienced. As a co-worker, support ideas developed in these networks.	Commit to innovation processes for example in civic and social hubs, social movements, and informal organizations. Contribute to solutions. Offer ideas both as a professional and a citizen. Co-produce journalism with the participants, with tools and styles emerging from these spaces.
Transgress boundaries:	Search for marginalized communities and emerging contentious issues. Seek for stakeholders of an issue from elements across the civil society, academia, industry, and government. Consider third party facilitators to assist participants in thinking together.	Develop physical spaces where personal relationships are possible. Make newsroom walls permeable: Include citizen journalists in newsroom meetings and daily work. Create and apply dialogic principles in newsroom routines.	Own an innovation if you are the best host for its success. If you're not the best owner, help others own it. Develop job descriptions that extend beyond the routines of newswork – such as community space holders.

8.6   Limitations, and recommendations for further research

This thesis uses theories that have been scarcely applied in journalism research. I hope to have provided evidence to support the use of the theories of innovation (Carayannis & Campbell 2012; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) and dialogue (Bohm 1996) in analyzing the interrelation of journalism and social

innovation. However, the nature and relative novelty of these theories in the context of journalism research, and the analytical concepts I have drawn from them, warrant critical observations.

This thesis used the three stages of co-initiating, co-sensing and co-creation to analyze a dialogic process that may emerge in safe spaces. However, Scharmer and Kaufer (2013) also include the stage of *co-presencing* in the process of innovation. Co-presencing refers to practices of deep collective reflection and intentional silence. In this thesis, I decided to exclude co-presencing from the analytical concepts. I assessed that critically investigating co-presencing would have required dwelling deeper in to the theories of reflective practices with insights from, for example, psychology, sociology, and even the study of religion. This decision may result in some shortcomings in understanding how innovations emergence. In this study, the concept of dialogue (Bohm 1996) was used, partly instead of presencing, to analyze how non-judgmental spaces were (or were not) created.

On a methodological note, this study contains limitations that are typical of naturalistic inquiry. The researcher's presumptions affect the collection and interpretation of the data and may limit the generalizability of the arguments (Patton 2002; Given 2008). Analyzing innovation processes in holding spaces contains elements, for example, of emotional relationships between people, internal and interactional breakthroughs, moment of silence and reflection, rational reasoning, iterative and practical prototyping etc. To argue that something *emerges* from interaction of such complex nature is a matter of inference that remains open for multiple and even contradicting interpretations. This is not exceptional in research, but leaves room for further questions and competing analysis (Given 2008).

In the research process, I attempted to admit, as much as possible, my own biases towards the objects of inquiry. I applied safeguards described by Guba (1981), Miles and Huberman (1994), and Corbin and Strauss (2008) to triangulate (cross-check) findings from several sources within and between the individual articles. I attempted to be rigorous in analyzing the data, asking questions such as: Are these findings truly representative in the data? Is data used in a balanced way to both support and counter the emerging arguments? Would these findings resonate as true among the people involved? Is the theoretical framework applied helping or hindering in constructing a reliable synthesizing account of the cases?

The arguments made in this thesis are not to be understood as representative of wider populations, organizations or industries; they are meant to serve as insights that help in understanding and further researching other similar settings (Given 2008). The result of such an inquiry is, at best, a working hypothesis (Guba 1981).

Further research that investigates these findings with several different analytical, theoretical and methodological tools is therefore welcome. Ethnographic studies and even action research (Greenwood & Levin 2007) may be beneficial to access more micro-level interaction and internal processes in

innovation. Both *qualitative* and *quantitative* studies are needed to further the understanding of emerging practices of dialogic journalism. Lewis (2010, p. 852) calls for research on *where*, *how* and *why* the nascent renegotiation of the borders of journalism is performed. All these questions are relevant. The approach suggested in this thesis – looking outside the newsroom – can be extended to, for example, testing the findings of this study in journalism practiced by a wide variety of NGO's and hybrid civic organizations.

This thesis explores journalism-related social innovation in two different kinds of democratic contexts, Finland and the USA. In the Finnish data, successful innovation appears to emerge in government-sponsored initiatives that are open to ad-hoc co-operation from the civil society (e.g. crowdsourcing for law, Heikka 2015). In the USA, on the other hand, the field of civic technology has attracted hundreds of millions of dollars of private investment, and appears to have more established organizational structures (Patel et al. 2013; Heikka & Carayannis 2017). Comparing these models was not in the focus of this thesis, but emerged as a theme for future research.

The findings of this thesis suggest, that these environments are developing important channels for social innovation as such, and may have a positive impact to the quality of democracy (Campbell 2008; Unger 2015). Literature on public engagement in innovation points out that pursuing socially, ecologically and financially sustainable innovations requires a variety of communicative means for participation and deliberation with the civil society (Rask et al. 2016; Bast, Carayannis, & Campbell 2015). Policy decisions on supporting new forms of innovation and journalism-like civic activity is important, especially in times of political upheaval, and would benefit of further research. Practical questions include funding available for journalism-like initiatives in the civil society; funding and other resources (e.g. spaces and technological infrastructure) for building and maintaining networks for innovative multi-stakeholder initiatives; and the business models and innovation strategies of the mainstream news media in social innovation. Multi-disciplinary studies and academic dialogue that extend over the borders of disciplinary traditions are welcome in the future. The concept of dialogic journalism can be a helpful starting point for further research.

9   SUMMARY

This thesis asked the research question "What is the role of journalism in social innovation?" The study pursued understanding of how journalism is challenged and changed when it engages with journalism-like innovations emerging in the civil society.

The data for the analysis consists of four published articles. The synthesizing and summarizing thesis presented here uses two distinct theoretical frameworks. On one hand, it builds on the theory of participatory journalism and theories of multi-stakeholder innovation (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) and dialogue (Bohm 1996).

The systematic literature review of this thesis suggests that, to a large extent, journalism has remained a passive observer in the environment where innovations emerge. The findings from the empirical data study support these observations. Journalism-like social innovations are challenging the position of journalism as an objective outsider in social change. Engaging with these environments is hindered by an understanding of innovation as technology or technology as a primary means to innovation; and the newsroom as the center for innovation.

However, new models for collaborations are emerging where journalists take part in multi-stakeholder innovation processes and momentarily suspend their position as professionals and outsiders. It is argued, that safe spaces, called here *holding spaces*, may help journalists and other stakeholders in taking part in a step-by-step process of innovating together (Bohm 1996). The study suggests the typology of *dialogic journalism* to describe the processes of news production as co-creation between multiple elements in the environments of social innovation.

The practices of holding space and dialogue (Bohm 1996; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) can be ways for reconnecting with the audience and alleviating journalisms' crisis of legitimacy and financial sustainability. Through dialogue, journalists can also learn new practices of participatory innovation and overcome resistance to change in newsrooms. This thesis argues that entering and creating spaces for dialogue can be ambitious and ethical journalism that

adheres to the ideals of public and participatory journalism as a facilitator of public deliberation, updated to contemporary contexts of the networked social innovation.

YHTEENVETO (FINNISH SUMMARY)

Väitöskirjassa kysytään, mikä on journalismin rooli sosiaalisissa innovaatioissa. Tutkimuksessa pyritään ymmärtämään, kuinka journalismi tulee haastetuksi ja muuttuu, kun se osallistuu kansalaisyhteiskunnasta nouseviin, journalismiin liittyviin sosiaalisiin innovaatioihin. Väitöskirja koostuu neljästä julkaistusta artikkelista ja yhteenvetoluvusta.

Yhteenvetoluvussa käsitellään neljää tapaustutkimusta journalismiin liittyvistä sosiaalisista innovaatioista Suomessa ja Yhdysvalloissa. Suomalaiset tapaustutkimukset käsittelevät lainsäädännön joukkoistamista ja Tahdon2013 kampanjaa tasa-arvoisen avioliittolain puolesta; ns. Kiakkovieraiden mediatapahtumaa; sekä Helsingin Diakonissalaitoksen järjestämiä dialogisia innovaatiotyöpajoja. Yhdysvaltalainen tapaustutkimus analysoi Chicagon kaupungin koulusulkemisia vastaan noussutta digitaalisia kansalaisaktivismia ja siihen liittyviä journalistisia innovaatiota.

Teemoja yhdistelevä ja kokoava luku yhdistää kaksi teoreettista viitekehystä. Yhtäältä tutkimus hyödyntää osallistuvan journalismin (participatory journalism) teoriaa (Carey 1987). Toisaalta tutkimuksessa käytetään monitoimijaisten innovaatioiden teoriaa (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) sekä dialogin teoriaa (Bohm 1996).

Tutkimuskirjallisuudessa ja journalismin kriisiin liittyvässä julkisessa keskustelussa innovaatioita toivotaan tukemaan journalismin taloudellista kestävyyttä ja yhteiskunnallista asemaa. Samanaikaisesti journalismin relevanssia ja taloudellista menestystä haastavat innovaatiot nousevat lisääntyvässä määrin ammattimaisen journalismin ulkopuolelta. Yhteistyön mahdollisuuksista huolimatta ammattijournalismi ei yleensä ole läsnä näissä innovaatioympäristöissä; tai ammattijournalismi on niissä passiivinen tarkkailija. Tämän kehityksen yhtenä seurauksena journalismi on vaarassa menettää merkitystään ja luottamustaan yhteiskunnan ruohonjuuritasolla – kuten havaittiin esimerkiksi Yhdysvaltain presidentinvaaleissa ja Britannian Brexit-kansanäänestyksessä vuonna 2016. Voimakas kritiikki mediaa kohtaan ja syytökset valeuutisista olivat leimallisia näissä tapahtumissa.

Uusia malleja yhteistyöhön perustuville innovaatioille kuitenkin syntyy. Niissä journalistit osallistuvat monitoimijaisiin innovaatioprosesseihin ja väliaikaisesti pidättäytyvät ammatillisesta, ulkopuolisesta roolistaan. Turvalliset tilat, joita tässä kutsutaan kannattelutiloiksi, voivat auttaa toimittajia ja muita sidosryhmiä osallistumaan askel askeleelta eteneviin innovaatioprosesseihin yhdessä muiden kanssa (Bohm 1996). Tutkimuksessa ehdotetaan dialogisen journalismin tyyppiä kuvaamaan uutistyötä useiden sidosryhmien välisenä yhteisluomisena sosiaalisten innovaatioiden ympäristössä.

Neuvotteleva kansalaisuus syntyy

Ensimmäinen artikkeli, *The rise of the mediating citizen* (Heikka 2015), selvittää, kuinka kansalaisaktivistit loivat Suomessa yhdessä hallinnon kanssa uudenlaisen tavan lainsäädännölliseen aloitteentekoon ja lakiluonnosten kirjoittamiseen. Tarkastelun kohteena artikkelissa ovat kansalaisaloitelaki, sitä hyödyntävät digitaaliset työkalut, sekä Tahdon2013-kampanja tasa-arvoisen avioliittolain säätämiseksi.

Demokraattisen prosessin vaihe, jossa toimittajat ovat perinteisesti olleet aktiivisia – lainsäädännöllisistä aloitteista raportointi ja niistä käytävä keskustelu – siirtyivät osittain digitaalisille alustoille. Väitöskirjassa arvioidaan, että uusien käytäntöjen syntyminen oli mahdollista kannattelutiloissa, joita kansalaisaktivistein ja valtionhallinnon edustajien välille syntyi. Toisaalta kansalaisaktivistit rakensivat omia kannattelutiloja, joissa kehitettiin teknologiaa ja kirjoitettiin lakitekstien luonnoksia, ja kampanjoitiin lakiehdotusten puolesta. Artikkelissa ehdotetaan neuvottelevan kansalaisuuden (mediating citizen) käsitettä kuvaamaan, kuinka innovaatioverkoston aktivistit saavuttivat keskustelevan ja tasaveroisen aseman vallankäyttäjien kanssa. Neuvottelevaan kansalaisuuteen liittyy yhtäältä kyky täydentää ja haastaa viranomaisten toimintaa taidoilla, joita viranomaisilla ei välttämättä ole, ja luoda tältä pohjalta uusia tuotteita, palveluita ja toimintatapoja; ja toisaalta kyky sopeutua kompromisseihin yhteisiin demokraattisiin tavoitteisiin pääsemiseksi.

Näin neuvottelevan kansalaisuuden tyyppi täydentää Bennetin (2008) jakoa velvollisuudentuntoiseen ja toteuttavaan kansalaisuuteen (*dutiful citizen* ja *actualizing citizen*). Velvollisuudentuntoista kansalaisuutta luonnehtii äänestäminen demokraattisena vaikuttamisen muotona, toteuttavaa kansalaisuutta luonnehtii ulkoparlamentaarinen aktivismi. Näiden väliin muodostuu uudenlainen kansalaisuustyyppi, joka arvostaa demokraattista prosessia, mutta pyrkii myös kehittämään sitä radikaalisti uudistavia innovaatioita yhdessä verkoston muiden toimijoiden kanssa.

Journalismin kyky toimia neuvottelevan kansalaisuuden maailmassa on puutteellinen, ja journalismin rooli innovaatioiden syntytiloissa on passiivinen. Toisaalta, ammattijournalismi perinteisessä roolissaan ei ole merkityksetön; medialla oli aktiivinen rooli uutisoijana itse kansalaisaloitelain syntymisessä, ja toisaalta tärkeä reaktiivinen rooli julkisessa keskustelussa, joka Tahdon2013-kampanjasta seurasi.

Dialogi, konflikti ja kannattelutilan puute

Toisessa artikkelissa, *Crashing a National Media Event*, tutkitaan Kiakkovieraiden mediatapahtumaa Tampereella itsenäisyyspäivänä 2013 (Heikka, Valaskivi & Uskali 2016).

Aktivistit osoittivat mieltä sosiaalista epätasa-arvoa ja "eliitin" valtaa vastaan Tampereen kaduilla ja sosiaalisessa mediassa itsenäisyyspäivän juhlien aikaan 2013. Analyysissa selvitetään, kuinka aktivistit muuttivat taitavalla sosiaalisen median käytöllä tapahtuman reaaliaikaista journalistista seurantaa ja siitä

muodostuvaa narratiivia. Ammattijournalismin ja mediaa hyödyntävien aktivistien välille syntyi vuoropuhelun väyliä. Tutkimuksessa ehdotetaan *dialogisen mediatapahtuman* käsitettä kuvaamaan, kuinka perinteisen mediatapahtuman käsitteen (*media event*) ja kaapatun mediatapahtuman käsitteen (*hijacked media event*) lisäksi teknologia mahdollistaa uutta luovan vuoropuhelun avaamisen kansalaisyhteiskunnan, viranomaisten ja ammattijournalismin välille (Dayan & Katz 1992).

Toisaalta analyysissa havaittiin, että keskusteluyhteys oli väliaikainen, eikä sen mahdollisuuksia juurikaan hyödynnetty sen paremmin aktivistien kuin ammattijournalismin puolella. Epäonnistumista voidaan selittää kannattelutilan puutteella. Kiakkovieraiden mielenosoituksia valmisteltiin konfliktin hyödyntämisen, ei yhteisluomisen näkökulmasta. Journalismi vahvisti tätä narratiivia. Aktivistien, viranomaisten ja journalistien väliltä ei löytynyt tilaa kunnioittavalle kuuntelulle, joka on dialogin edellytys. Analyysissa todetaan, että kiistanalaisten ja tunteita herättävien aiheiden kannattelutiloja median, viranomaisten ja kansalaisyhteiskunnan välille pitäisi rakentaa hyvissä ajoin ennen mediatapahtumaa.

Dialogiin liittyy ennakkokäsityksistä luopuminen. Sitä ei tapahtunut, ja orastava vuoropuhelu katkesi lopullisesti mielenosoittajien väkivallan käyttöön. Tapahtumaa seuraavina päivinä mielenosoittajien viesti torjuttiin yleisesti mediassa. Journalistisessa mediassa ei enää viitattu aktivistien blogeissa ja muissa digitaalisissa kanavissa esiin tulleisiin asiallisiin ja rauhanomaisiinkaan uusiin ajatuksiin, vaan tapahtumat tulkittiin konfliktin ja väkivallan kautta. Blogeissa viitattiin esimerkiksi kreikkalaiseen ekonomistin Yannis Varoufakisin ajatuksiin. Tämä kuitenkin nousi journalistien mielenkiinnon kohteeksi vasta Kreikan velkakriisin aikaisena valtiovarainministerinä 2015.

Kannattelutilan tietoinen rakentaminen

Kolmas artikkeli, *The role of journalism in dialogic innovation processes* (Heikka & Carayannis 2016), analysoi Helsingin Diakonissalaitoksen (HDL) koolle kutsumia innovaatiotyöpajoja 2013–2014. Näihin työpajoihin kutsuttiin kirjava joukko vallankäyttäjiä, kansalaisvaikuttajia, sosiaali- ja terveysalan ammattilaisia sekä journalisteja keskustelemaan sosiaali- ja terveysjärjestelmän uudistamisesta. Keskustelun keskiössä oli yhteiskunnan heikoimpien näkökulma. Tarkoituksena oli testata Helsingin Diakonissalaitoksen strategiaa, kehittää sen pohjalta uusia palveluita ja tuotteita, sekä kommunikoida työpajojen sisältöä yleisölle median kautta.

Työpajojen tuloksena syntyi mediaan ja journalismiin liittyviä innovaatiota. Osallistujat kehittivät esimerkiksi Luokkaretki laitakaupungille -nimisen sidosryhmäkonseptin. Siinä sosiaali- ja terveysalan vaikuttajat, media mukaan lukien, tekevät minibussiretken HDL:n toimipisteisiin, esimerkiksi asunnottomien, paperittomien maahanmuuttajien ja huumeongelmaisten palvelupisteisiin. Luokkaretket ovat tuottaneet lukuisia journalistisia juttuja, joissa yhteiskunnan heikoimpien näkökulmaa palveluihin on tuotu esiin. Sidosryhmätyökalu on HDL:n säännöllisessä käytössä.

Analyysissa todetaan, että journalismiin liittyvät innovaatiot olivat mahdollisia kannattelutilassa, joka työpajoissa luotiin. Journalistit kutsuttiin luopumaan hetkeksi ammatillisesta roolistaan tapahtumien raportoijana ja tarkkailijana, ja osallistumaan ratkaisujen luontiin yhdessä muiden kanssa. Käytännössä tämä tarkoittaa esimerkiksi sellaista ideoiden ja näkemysten esittämistä, joissa oma tietämättömyys, haavoittuvuus ja halu oppia käyvät ilmi. Uutistyön paineista, konventioista ja aikatauluvaatimuksista pidättäydytään tietoisesti hetkeksi. Järjestäjien näkökulmasta kokonaisvaltainen työskentely oli välttämätöntä, jotta yhdessä oppiminen ja uudet kokeilut olisivat mahdollisia. Työskentely oli paitsi rationaalista keskustelua, myös emotionaalista ja yhteisöllistä yhteisluomista.

Analysoitavista neljästä artikkelista dialogin ehdot täyttyivät tässä tapaustutkimuksessa parhaiten. Toimittajat ja muut osallistujat uskaltautuivat yhdessä etsimään ratkaisuja yhteiskunnallisiin ongelmiin. Tärkeää oli myös, että yhteiskunnan marginalisoitujen näkökulmaa ja kykyä innovaatioiden luomisessa etsittiin tietoisesti. Työpajoissa saavutettu dialogi heijastui myös journalistisissa sisällöissä, joissa yhteiskunnallisesti marginalisoitujen näkökulma ja oma ääni olivat vahvasti esillä.

Artikkelissa esitellään *osallistuvan ratkaisujournalismin* käsite. Osallistuva journalismi ymmärretään kansalaisten osallistumiseksi ammattijournalismin tuotantoon. Ratkaisujournalismissa taas media pyrkii esittelemään rakentavia ratkaisuja yhteiskunnallisiin ongelmiin (Benesch 1998; Sillesen 2014)**.** Osallistuva ratkaisujournalismi yhdistää nämä näkökulmat. Käsite ehdottaa, että toimittajat voivat hetkellisesti sukeltaa ratkaisujen luomiseen yhdessä innovaatioverkoston sidosryhmien kanssa.

Yhteisluomisen kolme vaihetta

Viimeinen artikkeli, Three stages of innovation in participatory journalism (Heikka & Carayannis 2017), analysoi tarkemmin yhteisluomisen vaiheita journalismin tuottamisessa. Tapaustutkimuksen kohteena ovat laajamittaiset koulujen lakkauttamiset Chicagossa 2012–2013 ja näitä toimia vastaan noussut kansalaisaktivismi. Aktivistit kehittivät datapohjaisia digitaalisia työkaluja, joiden avulla he toivat julkiseen keskusteluun uutta tietoa. Visuaalisissa sovelluksissa esimerkiksi perusteltiin lakkauttamisten kohdistuvan etnisiin vähemmistöihin. Avoimeen dataan perustuvat blogit ja sovellukset (esimerkiksi Schoolcuts.org) loivat keskustelun agendaa journalistisessa mediassa.

Artikkelissa analysoidaan näiden työkalujen synty-ympäristöä ja suhdetta journalistiseen mediaan. Työkalut ja uudet toimintatavat luotiin Chicagon kansalaisinnovaatioiden ekosysteemissä (Chicago civic innovation ecosystem) (McCann 2015). Tällä ympäristöllä tarkoitetaan joukkoa organisaatioita ja toimia, joilla pyritään ratkaisemaan suurkaupungin sosiaalisia ongelmia datan ja digitaalisten työkalujen avulla. Tätä ympäristöä analysoidaan kannattelutilan ja sen sisällä tapahtuvan kolmen yhteisluomisen vaiheen avulla: yhteisaloitteen, yhteisoppimisen ja yhteisluomisen kautta (Scharmer & Kaufer 2013).

Tutkimuksessa todetaan, että Chicagon kansalaisinnovaatioiden ekostysteemissä oli kolme ominaisuutta: kyky etsiä yhteistä maaperää eri toimijoiden välillä (yhteisaloite); kyky oppia yhteisön tarpeista ja kyvyistä (yhteisoppiminen); ja kyky kehittää aloitteita konkreettisiksi prototyypeiksi ja kokeiluiksi (yhteisluominen). Tämä mahdollisti organisaatiorajat ylittävät kokeiluja ja mediasisältöjä, joiden seurauksena kansalaiskeskustelun laatu parani.

Journalistit liittyivät yhteisluomisen prosessiin linkittämällä aktivistien rakentamiin työkaluihin, haastattelemalla heitä tietolähteinä, aktivisteina ja asiantuntijoina sekä rakentamalla omia datapohjaisia työkaluja koulujen lakkautuksien vaikutusten analysointiin. Analyysin pohjalta ehdotetaan, että vuorovaikutuksessa syntyi parhaimmillaan *dialogista journalismia*. Dialogisen journalismin syntyyn osallistuivat kansalaisjournalistit, jotka olivat joiltain osin taitavampia tiedon hankkijoita ja jalostajia kuin ammattitoimittajat. Tämä tieto johti parempaan journalismiin mediassa ja vilkkaaseen kansalaiskeskusteluun koululeikkausten syistä ja seurauksista.

Toisaalta ammattitoimittajien oli vaikea suhtautua kansalaisjournalismiin muuna kuin yksipuolisena asianajamisena. Innovaatiot työkaluissa ja toimintatavoissa nousivat ennen kaikkea kansalaisyhteiskunnasta. Tutkimuksessa arvioidaan, että journalistien aktiivisempi mukanaolo kansalaisyhteiskunnan kannattelutiloissa – esimerkiksi data-aktivistien säännöllisissä tapaamisissa – olisi tehnyt dialogista syvempää ja mahdollistanut mediatuotteiden aktiivisemman kehittelyn yhdessä kansalaisyhteiskunnan kanssa.

Journalistien rooli havaitussa dialogissa ei kuitenkaan ollut merkityksetön. Journalistit toimivat "faktantarkastajien tarkastajina"; journalistin ohjeisiin sitoutuen he tasapainottivat ja verifioivat data-aktivistien luomaa kuvaa kokonaisuudesta ja vertailivat heidän väitteitään viranomaislähteisiin.

Dialoginen journalismi

Tutkimus vahvistaa sitä kirjallisuudessa tehtyä havaintoa, että ammattimainen journalismi on pysytellyt valtaosin passiivisena havainnoitsijana innovaatioympäristöissä. Väitöskirjan tapaustutkimuksissa journalismiin liittyvät sosiaaliset innovaatiot haastavat journalismin aseman objektiivisena ja ulkopuolisena tarkkailijana sosiaalisessa muutoksessa. Journalistien osallistumista kansalaisyhteiskunnan toimintaan estää ajatus innovaatioista teknologiana, tai teknologiasta innovaatioiden pääasiallisena keinona; toimituksen ymmärtäminen innovaatioiden keskukseksi; sekä objektiivisuutta ja ulkopuolisuutta korostava toimittajien ammatillinen rooli.

Tutkimustuloksia kokoavassa osiossa ehdotetaan, että journalismia tarvitaan toimimaan joustavissa rooleissa sosiaalisten innovaatioiden verkostoissa. Tutkimuksessa havaittiin uusia käytäntöjä, joita toimittajat voivat hyödyntää yhteistyössä innovaatioverkoston eri toimijoiden kanssa. Tätä kutsutaan tutkimuksessa *dialogiseksi journalismiksi*. Dialogista journalismia luonnehtii organisaatiorajoja ylittävä yhteisluominen sosiaalisten ongelmien ratkaisemiseksi.

Vahva innovatiivinen dialogi vaikuttaa kehittyvän fyysisessä läsnäolossa organisaatiorajojen yli muodostetussa ryhmässä. Tällaisen kohtaamisen mahdollistamiseksi tutkimuksessa ehdotetaan kannattelutilojen hyödyntämistä journalistisissa innovaatioissa. Kannattelutilat ovat sosiaalisia rakenteita, joissa avoin ja ei-tuomitseva dialogi journalistien ja "entisen yleisön" välillä on mahdollista. Näissä tiloissa merkitysten rakentaminen on rationaalinen, mutta myös yhteisöllinen, kokeellinen, tunteellinen ja ruumiillinen prosessi. Journalisteja kutsutaan tilapäisesti luopumaan objektiivisen ja sitoutumattoman tapahtumien tarkkailijan roolistaan, jotta yhdessä oppiminen olisi mahdollista.

Tilan kannattelu ja dialogi (Bohm 1996; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013) voivat olla tapoja, joilla journalismi luo uudelleen yhteyttä yleisöön ja samalla lievittää journalismin legitimiteettiin ja taloudelliseen kestävyyteen liittyviä kriisejä. Dialogin avulla toimittajat voivat myös oppia uudenlaisia osallistuvan innovaation käytäntöjä ja voittaa muutokseen liittyvää vastarintaa toimituksissa. Tutkimuksessa väitetään, että dialogisiin tiloihin astuminen ja niiden luominen voi olla kunnianhimoista ja eettistä journalismia, joka noudattaa kansalaisjournalismin ja osallistuvan journalismin ihanteita julkisen keskustelun mahdollistajana nykyaikaisissa sosiaalisten innovaatioiden verkostoissa.

Perinteisesti osallistuva journalismi on ymmärretty kansalaisten osallistumisena journalistisiin projekteihin. Toimitukset ovat näiden hankkeiden aloitteentekijöitä. Tässä tutkimuksessa ehdotetaan käännettyä mallia: ammattijournalistit voivat pyrkiä osallistumaan ja vaikuttamaan sosiaalisiin innovaatioihin osana kansalaisyhteiskuntaa.

Näitä havaintoja vertaillaan tutkimuksessa journalismin objektiivisuuden ideologiaan ja sen pohjalle rakennettuun ulkopuoliseen rooliin. Tutkimuksen tulokset kyseenalaistavat ulkopuolisen roolin relevanssin aikana, jolloin journalistinen työ edellyttää avoimuutta ammatilliselle ja henkilökohtaiselle muutokselle. Arvostelmista ja käsityksistä pidättäytyminen voi olla oppimisen edellytys. Dialogisen journalismin käsitys journalismin roolista suhteessa tietoon ja ympäröivään yhteiskuntaan tulee lähelle Wardin (2017) kehittämää pragmaattisen objektiivisuuden ajatusta. Siinä objektiivisuus ymmärretään tulkitsevaksi ja tutkivaksi asenteeksi, jossa myös toimittajan omat uskomukset ovat kriittisen tarkastelun kohteena. Tämän väitöskirjan tulokset sisältävät ehdotuksia siitä, mitä tällainen itsereflektiivinen toimittajan työ voi olla käytännössä osana innovaatioverkostoa.

Dialogisen journalismin käsite korostaa yhteisluomisen, vuorovaikutuksen laadun, kokemuksen kokonaisvaltaisuuden ja kokeilujen merkitystä journalistisessa työssä. Kannattelutilat ovat sosiaalisia ja fyysisiä rakenteita, joissa dialogia voidaan turvallisesti kokeilla. Tutkimuksessa ehdotetaan, että näiden käytäntöjen kokeilu ja opiskelu yhdessä yleisön kanssa voi osaltaan parantaa luottamusta journalismiin, toimitusten innovaatiokykyä ja taloudellista asemaa.

Ehdotukset tuovat konkreettista sisältöä innovaatioteorioissa esitetylle ajatukselle, että journalismilla on merkittävä rooli innovaatioiden ekosysteemeissä (Carayannis & Campbell 2012, 2014; Scharmer & Kaufer 2013; Hartley & Potts 2014a, 2014b). Väitöskirjassa esitetään, että osa tästä potentiaalista on jäänyt toteutumatta, koska journalistien vuorovaikutus innovaatiojärjestelmän muiden

toimijoiden kanssa on ulottunut väittelyn (debate) ja deliberaation tasolle, mutta ei vielä syventynyt dialogiksi. Toisaalta osallistuvasta journalismista on puuttunut ajatus journalismin osallistumisesta kansalaisyhteiskunnasta nouseviin aloitteisiin. Väitöskirjan tulokset ja niiden pohjalta luodut kokeiluehdotukset kannustavat rakentamaan innovaatioiden kannattelutiloja, joissa näitä raja-aitoja voidaan turvallisesti ylittää.

REFERENCES

Ahva, L. (2016). How is Participation Practiced by "In-betweeners" of Journalism? Journalism Practice, published online July 26.

Aitamurto, T. (2012). Crowdsourcing for Democracy: a New Era in Policy-making. Parliament of Finland, Publication of the Committee for the Future.

Aitamurto, T. and Landemore, H. (2013). Democratic Participation and Deliberation in Crowdsourced Legislative Processes: The Case of the Law on Off-Road Traffic in Finland. In The 6th Conference on Communities and Technologies (C&T). Workshop: Large-Scale Idea Management and Deliberation Systems.

Aitamurto, T., and Lewis, S. C. (2013). Open innovation in digital journalism: Examining the impact of open APIs at four news organizations. New Media & Society, 15(2), 314-331.

Alderman, L. (May 20, 2016). In Sweden, an Experiment Turns Shorter Workdays Into Bigger Gains. New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/21/business/international/in-sweden-an-experiment-turns-shorter-workdays-into-bigger-gains.html?_r=0 Accessed Jan 4, 2017.

Allan, S., and Thorsen, E. (2009). Citizen journalism: Global perspectives. New York: Peter Lang.

Altheide, D. L., and Schneider, C. J. (2012). Qualitative media analysis (Vol. 38). Sage.

Antony, M. G., and Thomas, R. J. (2010). "This is citizen journalism at its finest": YouTube and the public sphere in the Oscar Grant shooting incident. New Media & Society. 12(8) 1280–1296.

Aronczyk, M. and Craig, A. (2012). Introduction: Cultures of circulation. Poetics, 40(2): 93–100.

Barbrook, R., and Cameron, A. (1996) The Californian ideology Science as Culture, Number 26, Volume 6, part 1, p. 44-72.

Bardoel, J. (1996). Beyond Journalism A Profession between Information Society and Civil Society. European journal of communication, 11(3), 283-302.

Barlow, J.P. (1996). A declaration of the independence of cyberspace. Electronic Frontier Foundation. Viewed Jan 4, 2017. https://www.eff.org/cyberspace-independence

Barnard, S. R. (2016). "Tweet or be sacked": Twitter and the new elements of journalistic practice. Journalism, 17(2), 190-207.

Bast, G., Carayannis, E., and Campbell, D. (eds.) (2015). Arts, Research, Innovation and Society. New York, NY: Springer .

Baumeister, R. F., and Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of general psychology*, *1*(3), 311.

Benesch, S. (1998). The Rise of Solutions Journalism. Columbia Journalism Review. March/April.

Benkler, Y. (2006). The Wealth of Networks. Yale University Press.

Benkler, Y., Roberts, H., Faris, R., Solow-Niederman, A., and Etling, B. (2015). Social mobilization and the networked public sphere: Mapping the SOPA-PIPA debate. *Political Communication*, *32*(4), 594-624.

Bennett, WL. (2008). Changing citizenship in the digital age. In Civic Life Online: Learning how digital media can engage youth. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1–24.

Bethge, F. (2012). Five theses about the future of innovation communication. Unpublished.
https://www.academia.edu/1949861/Five_theses_about_the_future_of_innovation_communication .Accessed Jan 4, 2017.

Boden, D. and Molotch, H. (1994). The compulsion to proximity. In Friedland R., Boden, D. (Eds.) Nowhere. Space, Time and Modernity. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bohm, D., Factor, D., and Garrett, P. (1991). Dialogue - A proposal. http://www.david-bohm.net/dialogue/dialogue_proposal.html Accessed Jan 4, 2017.

Bohm, D. (1996). On dialogue. New York: Routledge.

Bohm, D. (1987). Unfolding Meaning, London: Routledge.

Boczkowski, P. (2004). Digitizing the news: Innovation in online newspapers. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*, *29*, 47.

Bruns, A. (2007). Produsage, Generation C, and Their Effects on the Democratic Process. In Media in Transition 5, 27-29 April 2007, MIT, Boston.

Bruns, A. (2014). Media innovations, user innovations, societal innovations. Journal of Media Innovations, 1(1), 13–27.

Campbell, D. (2008). The Basic Concept for the Democracy Ranking of the Quality of Democracy. Vienna: Democracy Ranking.

Castells, M. (1996, second edition, 2000). The Rise of the network society, The information age: Economy, society and culture Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2007). Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. International journal of communication, 1(1), 29.

Castells, M. (2009). Communication power. Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. John Wiley & Sons.

Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. (2012). Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems. In Mode 3 Knowledge Production in Quadruple Helix Innovation Systems (pp. 1-63). Springer New York.

Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. (2014). Developed democracies versus emerging autocracies: arts, democracy, and innovation in Quadruple Helix innovation systems. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *3*(1), 12.

Carey, J. W. (1987). The press and public discourse. The Center Magazine, 20(2), 4-16.

Carpentier, N. (2016) Beyond the Ladder of Participation: An Analytical Toolkit for the Critical Analysis of Participatory Media Processes, Javnost - The Public, 23:1, 70-88.

Carpentier, Nico, and Peter Dahlgren. 2013. "The Social Relevance of Participatory Theory." Comunicazioni Sociali 3: 301–315.

Champagne, P. (2005). The "double dependency": The journalistic field between politics and markets. In: Benson, R. and Neveu, E. (eds.) Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field. Cambridge: Polity Press, p. 48–63.

Chesbrough, H. (2003). Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Conboy, M., and Eldridge, S. A. II. (2014). Morbid symptoms between a dying and a re-birth (apologies to gramsci). Journalism Studies, 15(5), 566-575.

Dahlberg, L. (2010) Cyber-libertarianism 2.0: A discourse theory/ critical political economy examination. Cultural politics, Volume 6, issue 3, 331–356.

Dayan, D., and Katz, E. (1992). Media events. The live broadcasting of history. Harvard University Press.

De Sola Pool, I. (1984). Technologies of Freedom. On Free Speech in an Electronic Age. Massachusetts and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge.

Deuze, M. (2004). What is multimedia journalism 1?. *Journalism studies*, *5*(2), 139-152. Taylor & Francis.

Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. Journalism, 6(4), 442-464.

Dewey, J. (1927). The Public and its' Problems. An Essay in Political Inquiry. The Pennsylvania State University Press. University Park. Pennsylvania.

Diamond, L. (2010). Liberation technology. Journal of Democracy, 21(3), 69-83.

Domingo, D. (2008). Interactivity in the daily routines of online newsrooms: Dealing with an uncomfortable myth. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13(3), 680-704.

Domingo, D., and Heinonen, A. (2008). Weblogs and journalism. *Nordicom review*, *29*(1), 3-15.

Downie, L., and Schudson, M. (2009). The reconstruction of American journalism. New York, NY: Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism.
http://www.cjr.org/reconstruction/the_reconstruction_of_american.php

Dutton, WH. (2007). Through the Network (of Networks)—The Fifth Estate. Prepared for an Inaugural Lecture, ExaminationQ8 Schools. University of Oxford.

Dvorkin, J. A. (2001) "Can Public Radio Journalism Be Re-Invented?" National Public Radio interview with W. Davis "Buzz" Merritt Jr. (Dec. 30) at http://www.npr.org/yourturn/ombudsman/2001/010705.html   . Accessed Jan 4, 2017

Dyson, E. (1997). Release 2.0: A Design for Living in the Digital Age. New York: Broadway Books.

Ekdale, B., Singer, J. B., Tully, M., and Harmsen, S. (2015). Making change: Diffusion of technological, relational, and cultural innovation in the newsroom. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 92(4), 938-958.

Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utriainen, K., and Kyngäs, H. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. Sage Open, 4(1). Sage.

Engelbart, D. C. (1962/2001). Augmenting human intellect: a conceptual framework (1962). In *Packer, R & Jordan, K. Multimedia. From Wagner to Virtual Reality. New York: WW Norton & Company*, 64-90.

Etling, B. (2013). Citizens as Actors. In Internet Monitor 2013: Reflections on the Digital World. P. 63–68. Berkman Center for Internet & Society. Harvard University.

Etzkowitz, H., and Leydesdorff, L. A. (1995). Universities and the global knowledge economy: a triple helix of university-industry-government relations.

Etzkowitz, H. and M. Ranga (2011), "Spaces": A Triple Helix Governance Strategy for Regional Innovation. In: A. Rickne, S. Laestadius and H. Etzkowitz (eds), Innovation Governance in an Open Economy: Shaping Regional Nodes in a Globalized World, London: Routledge.

Finland, a land of solutions (2015). Strategic Programme of Prime Minister Juha Sipilä's Government. 29 May. Government Publications.

Florida, R. (2002). The Rise of the Creative Class. New York: Basic Books. — (2005), Cities and the Creative Class. New York: Basic Books.

Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the creative class*. Routledge.

Fortunati, L., Sarrica, M., O'Sullivan, J., Balcytiene, A., Harro-Loit, H., Macgregor, P., et al. (2009). The influence of the internet on European journalism. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14(4), 928-963.

Franklin, T. and Mullin, B. (2016) How How the media missed President Trump, and what comes next for journalism. Nov. 10, 2016. Poynter Institute. Retrieved March 17, 2017. http://www.poynter.org/2016/how-the-media-missed-president-trump-and-what-comes-next-for-journalism/438665/

Freeman, J, and S Quirke. (2013). "Understanding E-Democracy." eJournal of E-Democracy and Open Government 5 (2): 141–154.

Geiger, R. S. (2009). Does Habermas understand the Internet? The algorithmic construction of the blogo/public sphere. Gnovis 10.1, p. 25.

George, G., McGahan, A. M., & Prabhu, J. (2012). Innovation for inclusive growth: Towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. Journal of management studies, 49(4), 661-683.

Gillmor, D. (2006). We the media: Grassroots journalism by the people, for the people. O'Reilly Media.

Given, L. M. (2008). The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Gladwell, M. (2010). Small change. The New Yorker, 4, 42-49.

Glasser, T. L. (1984). Objectivity precludes responsibility. *The Quill*, *72*(2), 13-16.

Glasser, T. L. (Ed.). (1999). The idea of public journalism. New York: Guilford Press.

Goldstein, B, Dyson, L. (2013). Beyond Transparency: Open Data and the Future of Civic Innovation. Code For America Press. San Francisco, California.

Guba, E.G. (1981). "Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries." Educational Communication and Technology 29 (2): 75–91.

Graves, L., Nyhan, B., and Reifler, J. (2016). Understanding innovations in journalistic practice: A field experiment examining motivations for fact-checking. Journal of Communication, 66(1), 102-138.

Gray, J., Chambers, L., and Bounegru, L. (2012). The data journalism handbook. O'Reilly Media.

Grönlund, M., Lehtisaari, K., Lindén, C-G. Villi, M. (2016) Uutismedian uudet liiketoimintamallit Pohjoismaissa - Viestinnän tutkimusraportteja 1/2016 Viestinnän tutkimuskeskus CRC, Sosiaalitieteiden laitos, Helsingin yliopisto. Unigrafia. Helsinki.

Gynnild, A. (2014). Journalism innovation leads to innovation journalism: The impact of computational exploration on changing mindsets. Journalism, 15(6), 713-730.

Habermas, J. (1962/1989) The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hall, S. (1981). Notes on Deconstructing "the Popular". In R. Samuel (ed.) People's History and Socialist Theory. London: RKP.

Hamdy, N., and Gomaa, E. H. (2012). Framing the Egyptian uprising in Arabic language newspapers and social media. Journal of Communication, 62(2), 195-211.

Hanusch, F. (2015). Transformative times: Australian journalists' perceptions of changes in their work. Media International Australia, (155), 38-53.

Hartley, J., Potts, J., Flew, T., Cunningham, S., Keane, M., & Banks, J. (Eds.). (2012). Key concepts in creative industries. Sage.

Hartley, J., & Potts, J., (2014a). Cultural Science: A Natural History of Stories, Demes, Knowledge and Innovation. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hartley, J., & Potts, J. (2014b). What is cultural science? (and what is it not.). Cultural Science, 7(1), 34-57.

Hartley J., Potts, J. & MacDonald, T, with Erkunt, C., & Kufleitner, C. (2012). Creative City Index. Cultural Science, 5:1 (whole issue).

Hautamäki, A. (2010). Sustainable innovation. A New Age of Innovation and Finland's Innovation Policy, Edita, Helsinki, Sitra Reports, 87.

Hemley, R. (2012). A Field Guide for Immersion Writing: Memoir, Journalism, and Travel. University of Georgia Press.

Hermida, A. (2010). E-democracy remixed: Learning from the BBC's Action Network and the shift from a static commons to a participatory multiplex. eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government, 2(2), 119-130.

Hermida, A., Lewis, S. C., and Zamith, R. (2014). Sourcing the arab spring: a case study of Andy Carvin's sources on twitter during the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19(3), 479-499.

Heikka, T. (2015). The Rise of the Mediating Citizen: Time, Space, and Citizenship in the Crowdsourcing of Finnish Legislation Policy & Internet Volume 7, Issue 3, pages 268–291, September.

Heikka, T., Valaskivi, K. and Uskali, T. (2016). Crashing a National Media Event: The Circulation of Social Imaginaries in the Gatecrashers Riots in Finland, in Mitu, B., and Poulakidos, S.: Media events: A critical contemporary approach. Palgrave Macmillan. UK.

Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E.G. (2016). The Role of Journalism in Dialogic Innovation Processes—the Case of the Helsinki Deaconess Institute Multi-stakeholder Workshops Journal of the Knowledge Economy. Published online 20. Dec., p. 1–27.

Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E.G. (2017) Three stages of innovation in participatory journalism – co-initiating, co-sensing and co-creating news in the Chicago school cuts case. In review for the *Journal of the Knowledge Economy.* Springer.

Høyer, S., and Lauk, E. (2003). The paradoxes of the Journalistic Profession. Nordicom Review, 24(2), 3-12.

Hornmoen, H., and Steensen, S. (2014). Dialogue as a Journalistic Ideal. Journalism Studies, 15(5), 543-554.

Isaacs, W. (1999/2008). Dialogue: The art of thinking together. Crown Business.

Ito, J. (2003). Emergent Democracy. https://joi.ito.com/joiwiki/EmergentDemocracyPaper Accessed Sept 2, 2016.

Jackson, D., Thorsen, E., and Wring, D. (2016). EU Referendum Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign. The Centre for the Study of Journalism, Culture and Community Bournemouth University. Poole, England

Jarvis, J. (2014). Geeks Bearing Gifts: Imagining New Futures for News.

Johnson, K. A. (2011). Citizen journalism, agenda-setting and the 2008 presidential election. Web Journal of Mass Communication Research, 28.

Jones, S. (2015). Becoming Homebaked: Employing citizens, culture and networked media in the creation of new local economic models. Cultural Science Journal, 8(1), 72-84.

Kauffman, S. (1995.) At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kauhanen, E., and Noppari, E. (2007). Innovation, Journalism and Future. Final report of the research project Innovation Journalism in Finland. Helsinki: Tekes.

Khamis, S., and Vaughn, K. (2011). Cyberactivism in the Egyptian revolution: How civic engagement and citizen journalism tilted the balance. Arab Media and Society, 14(3), 1-25.

Kahn, R., and Kellner, D. (2009). Oppositional politics and the Internet. In Durham, M. G., and Kellner, D. M. (Eds.). *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kern, T., and Nam, S. (2009). The making of a social movement citizen journalism in South Korea. Current Sociology, 57(5), 637-660.

Lahav, H., and Reich, Z. (2011). Authors and poets write the news A case study of a radical journalistic experiment. Journalism Studies, 12(5), 624-641.

Laloux, F. (2015). Reinventing organizations. Nelson Parker. Belgium.

Lanier, J. (2010). You are not a gadget. Vintage.

Lasica, J. D. (2003, August 7). What is Participatory Journalism? USC Annenberg Online Journalism Review. http://www.ojr.org/ojr/workplace/1060217106.php Accessed Jan 4, 2017.

Lathrop, D., and Ruma, L. (2010). *Open government: Collaboration, transparency, and participation in practice*. O'Reilly Media.

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the Social An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory, Oxford University Press.

Leadbeater, C. and Miller. P. (2004) 'The pro–am revolution: how enthusiasts are changing our economy and society', Demos, [Online] Available at: http://www.demos.co.uk/files/proamrevolutionfinal.pdf?1240939425 (19 December 2011).

Lee, B., and E. LiPuma. (2002). Cultures of Circulation: The Imagination of Modernity. Public Culture 14 (1): 191–214.

Lehtonen, P. (2008). Civic Expression on the Net: Different Faces of Public Engagement. In Häyhtiö T., and Rinne, J. (eds): Net Working/Networking: Citizen Initiated Internet Politics, Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, 163–188.

Lévy, P. (1997). Collective intelligence: Mankind's emerging world in cyberspace. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Lewis, S. C. (2010). Journalism innovation and the ethic of participation: A case study of the Knight Foundation and its News Challenge. Thesis, Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Lewis, S. C. (2012a). From journalism to information: The transformation of the Knight Foundation and news innovation. Mass Communication and Society, 15(3), 309-334.

Lewis, S. C. (2012b). The tension between professional control and open participation: Journalism and its boundaries. Information, Communication & Society, 15(6), 836-866.

Lewis, S. C., and Usher, N. (2013). Open source and journalism: Toward new frameworks for imagining news innovation. Media Culture & Society, 35(5), 602-619.

Lewis, S. C., and Usher, N. (2014). Code, Collaboration, and the Future of Journalism: A Case Study of the Hacks/Hackers Global Network. Digital Journalism, 2(3), 383-393.

Lilleker, D., Jackson, D., Thorsen, E., and Veneti, A. (2016). US Election Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign Early reflections from leading

academics. The Centre for the Study of Journalism, Culture and Community, Bournemouth University. Poole, England.

Lippman, W. (1922). Public opinion. New York: Harcourt & Brace.

Lotman, Y. [J.] (2009). Culture and Explosion. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Lowrey, W. (2006). Mapping the journalism–blogging relationship. *Journalism*, *7*(4), 477-500.

Lowrey, W., and Burleson Mackay, J. (2008). Journalism and blogging: A test of a model of occupational competition. *Journalism Practice*, *2*(1), 64-81.

Lundvall, B. A. (1992). National systems of innovation: An analytical framework. London: Pinter.

MacGregor, P. (2014). Siren songs or path to salvation? Interpreting the visions of web technology at a UK regional newspaper in crisis, 2006-2011. Convergence-the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 20(2), 157-175.

Merritt, D. (1995). Public Journalism – Defining a Democratic Art. Media Studies Journal 9(3): 125–32.

Merritt, D. (1998). Public Journalism and Public Life. Routledge.

McCann, L., (2015). Experimental Modes of Civic Engagement in Civic Tech: Meeting people where they are. Smart Chicago Collaborative. Chicago, IL.

McChesney R.W. and Nichols, J. (2010). The Death and Life of American Journalism: The Media Revolution That Will Begin the World Again. New York: Nation Books.

McChesney, R. and Pickard, V. (Eds.), (2011) Will The Last Reporter Please Turn Out the Lights?: The Collapse of Journalism and What Can Be Done to Fix It. New York, The New Press.

McCombs, M. E., and Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. Public opinion quarterly, 36(2), 176-187.

Miles M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994) Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook, 2nd ed. California: Sage, 1994.

Mindich, D. T. (2000). Just the facts: How "objectivity" came to define American journalism. NYU Press.

Mitu, B., & Poulakidakos, S. (Eds.). (2016). Media events: A critical contemporary approach. Palgrave Macmillan. UK.

Morozov, E. (2013). The real privacy problem. Technology Review, 116(6), 32-43.

Morrison, AH. (2009). An Impossible Future: John Perry Barlow's 'Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace. New Media & Society 11 (1–2): 53–71.

Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Rushanara, A., and Sanders, B. (2007). Social innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated. Oxford, UK: Oxford Said Business School.

Murray, M. (2013). Politics at the Touch of a Button: An Evaluation of the First Ever Oireachtas (Irish Houses of Parliament) E-Consultation. Parliamentary Affairs 66 (3): 597–616.

Neff, G., and Stark, D. (2003). Permanently beta. Society online, 173-188.

Negroponte, N. 1995. Being Digital. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Neveu, E. (2014). Revisiting narrative journalism as one of the futures of journalism. Journalism Studies, 15(5), 533-542.

Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Levy, D. A. L., and Nielsen, R. K. (2016). Reuters Institute digital news report 2016. Retrieved from Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism: http://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Digital-News-Report-2016.pdf

Nip, J. (2006). Exploring the Second Phase of Public Journalism. Journalism Studies, 7(2), 212-236.

Nonaka, I., and Konno, N., (1998). The concept of "ba": Building a foundation for knowledge creation. California Management Review, 40(3), 40-54.

Nordfors, D. (2004a). The Role of Journalism in Innovation Systems. Innovation Journalism, 1

Nordfors, D. (2004b). The Concept of Innovation Journalism and a Programme for Developing It. Innovation Journalism, 1 (1), 1-14.

Nordfors, D. (2009). Innovation Journalism, Attention Work and the Innovation Economy. A Review of the Innovation Journalism Initiative 2003-2009. Innovation Journalism, 6 (1), 1-46.

Ognianova, E., and Endersby, J. W. (1996). Objectivity revisited: A spatial model of political ideology and mass communication. Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs, (159), 0_5.

Ostertag, S. F., and Tuchman, G. (2012). When innovation meets legacy: Citizen journalists, ink reporters and television news. Information, Communication & Society, 15(6), 909-931.

Papacharissi, Z., and de Fatima Oliveira, M. (2012). Affective news and networked publics: The rhythms of news storytelling on# Egypt. Journal of Communication, 62(2), 266-282.

Patel, M., Sotsky, J., Gourley, S., and Houghton, D. (2013). The emergence of civic tech: Investments in a growing field. Knight Foundation.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (2nd ed.)

Pautz, H. 2010. "The Internet, Political Participation and Election Turnout: A Case Study of Germany's www.abgeordnetenwatch.de." German Politics & Society 28 (3): 156–75.

Penney, J., and Dadas, C. (2013). (Re) Tweeting in the service of protest: Digital composition and circulation in the Occupy Wall Street movement. New Media & Society, 16(1), 74-90.

Picard, R. G. (2006). Capital crisis in the profitable newspaper industry. *Nieman Reports*, *60*(4), 10.

Picard, R. G. (2013). Killing journalism? the economics of media convergence. Journalism and Media Convergence, 5, 19-27.

Polanyi, Michael. (1967). The Tacit Dimension. New York: Doubleday.

Prahalad, C. K., and Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. Strategy & leadership, 32(3), 4-9.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. Journal of democracy, 6(1), 65-78.

Radjou, N., Prabhu, J., and Ahuja, S. (2012). Jugaad innovation: Think frugal, be flexible, generate breakthrough growth. John Wiley & Sons.

Ramaker, T., van der Stoep, J., and Deuze, M. (2015). Reflective practices for future journalism: The need, the resistance and the way forward. Javnost-the Public, 22(4), 345-361.

Reese, S. D. (1990). The news paradigm and the ideology of objectivity: A socialist at the Wall Street Journal. Critical Studies in Media Communication, 7(4), 390-409.

Reich Z. (2013). The impact of technology on news reporting: A longitudinal perspective. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 90, 417-434.

Rheingold, H. (1993). The virtual community: Finding connection in a computerized world. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Rheingold, H. (2000). The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier, Revised Edition. MIT Press, Cambridge

Rogers, E. (1962/2003). Diffusion of Innovations. 5th edition. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Singapore: Free Press.

Rosen, J. (1999). *What are journalists for?* Yale University Press.

Rosen, J. (2006, June 27). The People Formerly Known as the Audience. Pressthink.ru http://archive.pressthink.org/2006/06/27/ppl_frmr.html Accessed Jan 4, 2017.

Russell, A. (2013). Innovation in hybrid spaces: 2011 UN climate summit and the expanding journalism landscape. Journalism, 14(7), 904-920.

Sambrook, R. (2016) Why the media got it so wrong on Trump and Brexit. Nov 10th. The Conversartion. Accessed Nov 15, 2016. https://theconversation.com/why-the-media-got-it-so-wrong-on-trump-and-brexit-68542

Saxenian, A. (1994). Regional networks: industrial adaptation in Silicon Valley and route 128.

Saxenian, A. (1996). Regional advantage. Harvard University Press.

Scharmer, O., and Kaufer, K. (2013). Leading from the emerging future: From ego-system to eco-system economies. California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Scharmer, O. (2009). Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Schudson, M. (2001). The objectivity norm in American journalism. Journalism, 2(2), 149-170.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934/1997). The Theory of Economic Development. New Brunswick: Transaction USA.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy (3d ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Senge, Peter M. (1990), The Fifth Discipline, Doubleday/Currency

Senge, P. M., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., and Flowers, B. S. (2005). Presence: An exploration of profound change in people, organizations, and society. Crown Business.

84

Shirky, C. (2008). Here comes everybody: The power of organizing without organizations. Penguin.

Shirky, C. (2010). Cognitive surplus: How technology makes consumers into collaborators. Penguin.

Sillesen, L.B. (2014). Good news is good business, but not a cure-all for journalism. Columbia Journalism Review. Sept, 29.

Singer, J. B. (2003). Who are these guys? The online challenge to the notion of journalistic professionalism. *Journalism*, 4(2), 139-163.

Singer, J. B., Domingo, D., Heinonen, A., Hermida, A., Paulussen, S., Quandt, T., Reich, Z., and Vujnovic, M. (2011). Participatory journalism: guarding open gates at online newspapers. Malden: John Wiley & Sons.

Sirianni, C., and Friedland, L. (2001). Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Smith, A. W., and Rainie, H. (2008). *The Internet and the 2008 election*. Pew Internet & American Life Project.

Spyridou, L., Matsiola, M., Veglis, A., Kalliris, G., and Dimoulas, C. (2013). Journalism in a state of flux: Journalists as agents of technology innovation and emerging news practices. International Communication Gazette, 75(1), 76-98.

Steensen, S. (2009). What's stopping them? Towards a grounded theory of innovation in online journalism. Journalism studies, 10(6), 821-836.

Starr, P. (2009). The End of the Press: democracy loses its best friend. The New Republic, 4, 28-35.

Straw, W. (2010). The Circulatory Turn. In Crow, B., Longford, M. and Sawchuck, K. (eds), The Wireless Spectrum: The Politics, Practices and Poetics of Mobile Media 17–28. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sumiala, J. (2008). Circulation. In Morgan, D. (ed.) Keywords in Religion, Media, and Culture. London: Routledge.

Sweet, M., Pearson, L., and Dudgeon, P. (2013). @Indigenousx: A case study of community-led innovation in digital media. Media International Australia, (149), 104-111.

Thomke, S., and Von Hippel, E. (2002). Innovators. Harvard business review, 80(4), 74-81.

Thompson, D. (2015 June/Jylu). A World Without Work For centuries, experts have predicted that machines would make workers obsolete. That moment may finally be arriving. Could that be a good thing? The Atlantic. http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/07/world-without-work/395294/ .Accessed Jan 4, 2017.

Toffler, A. (1980). The Third Wave. William Morrow and Company. Inc., New York.

Tufekci, Z., and Wilson, C. (2012). Social media and the decision to participate in political protest: Observations from Tahrir Square. Journal of Communication, 62(2), 363-379.

Unger, R. M. (2015). Conclusion: The task of the social innovation movement. In New Frontiers in Social Innovation Research (pp. 233-251). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Uskali, T. (2013). Jokapaikan journalismi. Management Institute of Finland. Jyväskylä.

Usher, N. (2011). Professional journalists, hands off! Citizen journalism as civic responsibility. Will the last reporter please turn out the lights, p. 264-276. The New Press. London.

Urry, J. (2007). Mobilities. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Urry, J. (2002). Mobility and Proximity. Sociology May 2002 vol. 36 no. 2 255-274

Valaskivi, K. and Sumiala, J. (2014). Circulating social imaginaries: Theoretical and methodological reflections. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 17(3): 229–243.

Von Hippel, E. (1986). Lead users: a source of novel product concepts. Management science, 32(7), 791-805.

Von Hippel, E. (2005). Democratizing innovation: The evolving phenomenon of user innovation. Journal für Betriebswirtschaft, 55(1), 63-78.

Ward, S. J. A. (2017). Engagement and Pragmatic Objectivity. Center For Journalism Ethics, School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University Of Wisconsin–Madison. March 27.

Weiss, A. S., and Domingo, D. (2010). Innovation processes in online newsrooms as actor-networks and communities of practice. New Media & Society, 12(7), 1156-1171.

Zaltman, G., Duncan, R., and Holbek, J. (1973). *Innovations and organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

I

THE RISE OF THE MEDIATING CITIZEN: TIME, SPACE AND CITIZENSHIP IN THE CROWDSOURCING OF FINNISH LEGISLATION

by

Heikka, T. (2015)

II

**CRASHING A NATIONAL MEDIA EVENT:
THE CIRCULATION OF SOCIAL IMAGINARIES IN
THE GATECRASHERS RIOTS IN FINLAND**

by

Heikka, T., Valaskivi, K. and Uskali, T. (2016)

In Mitu, B., and Poulakidos, S.: Media events: A critical contemporary approach.
Palgrave Macmillan. UK.

III

**THE ROLE OF JOURNALISM IN DIALOGIC
INNOVATION PROCESSES – THE CASE OF THE HELSINKI
DEACONESS INSTITUTE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER
WORKSHOPS**

by

Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E. (2016)

Journal of the Knowledge Economy. Springer. Online first 20 December, 2016.

IV

THREE STAGES OF INNOVATION IN PARTICIPATORY JOURNALISM – CO-INITIATING, CO-SENSING AND CO-CREATING NEWS IN THE CHICAGO SCHOOL CUTS CASE

by

Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E. (2017)

Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 1-28.