

## **Chapter 13**

### **Challenges of Media Innovation at Mediapolis cluster in Finland**

Sari Virta, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Jönköping International Business School, Media, Management and Transformation Center, Jönköping University, sarivirta@live.com

**Abstract.** This chapter discusses the development of a media cluster called *Mediapolis* in Tampere, Finland, during its initial years. Mediapolis is a brownstone, real-estate-based creative cluster project that combines public and private organisations in cross-sector collaboration. Mediapolis is situated in the premises formerly owned by the Finnish Broadcasting Company, Yle. The Mediapolis cluster aims to create value through collaborative media innovation and new content creation. Mediapolis development is strongly supported by Tampere city and regional authorities.

The qualitative case study connects to the collaboration and partnership notions in the book. It reflects on opportunities and challenges of clusters as tools for creating shared value and innovation. The case study illustrates challenges and complications in developing media clusters from spatial arrangements (as the traditional understanding of clusters) to arrangements of creating collaborative value between the participating organisations in the cluster.

The Mediapolis case study is based on extensive empirical material including interviews, documentation, participant observation and discussions that the author has available since the Mediapolis development started in 2011. The empirical analysis utilises the 7P framework of media clusters and the corresponding media cluster types. Additionally, the analysis builds on dualities and respective organisational tensions of collaboration. The case study revealed organisational tensions of collaboration that emerge and require attention in media cluster development. The case study results imply the importance of anticipating, identifying and managing various organisational tensions in media cluster development. The dynamic, coex-

isting and interrelated tensions require both-and approaches in cluster management.

**Keywords.** Cross-sector Collaboration, Dualities, Innovation, Mediapolis Cluster, Tensions

*Acknowledgement.* [will be added later]

## Introduction

Creative industries are increasingly expected to provide a stimulating environment for innovation, business growth and urban renewal in knowledge-intensive economies (cf. Jones, Svejnova, Pedersen & Townley, 2016). Accordingly, media cluster development is fostered by governments, local and regional authorities (Achtenhagen & Picard, 2014; Karlsson & Picard, 2011; Komorowski, 2016). Media clusters are expected to stimulate media innovation and creative development because of their presumed potential for increased new knowledge and inspiration for companies in the cluster (Karlsson & Picard, 2011; Picard, 2008). The media industry is also highly clustered because media production is fundamentally collaborative in nature (Achtenhagen & Picard, 2014; Davis, Creutzberg & Arthurs, 2009). Collaboration is inevitable, because not even the largest companies are able to maintain the necessary resources and knowledge in-house in the rapidly changing operational contexts.

However, media clusters as mere spatial agglomerations of organisations and institutions are no straightforward guarantee for achieving innovation in media content and production (Virta & Lowe, 2017). The media industry is increasingly reliant on networked collaboration in value-creating and value-adding webs of organisations (Baumann, 2013; Bilton, 2011). Success depends on the quality and amount of collaboration across organisational boundaries (Lowe & Yamamoto, 2016). Alongside this development, the focus of value creation shifts from traditional value chains to collaborative advantage enabled by collaboration (see Kanter, 1994).

Cross-sector collaboration across public and private organisations is considered as a potentially useful tool for achieving innovation. However, collaboration features inherent complexities and tensions, which make the process uncertain and complicated (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015). This is a relevant aspect for media cluster research, because collaboration in clusters is a key prerequisite for success (Virta & Lowe, 2017). However, collaboration in media clusters has rarely been the focus of interest in extant media cluster research. To contribute to the research gap, this chapter discusses the development of a new media cluster and elaborates on characteristic complexities and tensions of collaboration in this regard.

Continuous innovation in content and production is crucial for creative industry organisations, because their success is dependent on originality and novelty of media products (Jones et al., 2016). Tight focus on creative content production distinguishes media clusters from more general industry clusters (Achtenhagen & Picard, 2014; Picard, 2008). Media clusters feature stronger dependence on political support than other industrial clus-

ters and the objectives of media clusters are more complex than traditional cluster aims - all of which makes media cluster management an especially complex endeavour (Hitters & Richards, 2002; Karlsson & Picard, 2011).

Taking the specific features of media clusters into consideration makes them an interesting research context. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on a case study of a media cluster called Mediapolis in Tampere, Finland. The focus is on the early development phase of Mediapolis in light of the 7P framework for media cluster analysis (Komorowski, 2016). Characteristic complications of media cluster development are illustrated by answering the research question: What tensions of collaboration emerge in a newly formed media cluster, and why?

The chapter is structured as follows: first, an introduction to literature on media clusters and a summary on the 7P analysis framework is provided, followed by illustration of the Mediapolis case. Next, methods of the study and research findings are presented. Then, the findings of the case study are discussed. Finally, a conclusion that summarises the study and offers ideas for future research wraps up the chapter.

## **1. Literature background and the Mediapolis case**

Earlier definitions of media clusters emphasise the spatial element of clusters as agglomerations of activities and institutions, where co-location facilitates innovation-supporting interaction between entities (e.g. organisations, people) in the cluster (Komorowski, 2016; Picard, 2008, Karlsson & Picard, 2011). Spatial agglomeration as such is expected to create opportunities for mutual advantages between cluster partners, as illustrated in Porter's seminal understanding of industry clusters (Porter, 2000). However, media industries rely significantly on talent, and media products, i.e. content and services, are largely intangible, which requires widening the traditional understanding of clusters (Achtenhagen & Picard, 2014; Davis et al., 2009). Also, media clusters feature more complex objectives than clusters in most industries due to their combined cultural, political and economic aims, and this makes media clusters highly contextualised (Karlsson & Picard, 2011).

Komorowski (2016) proposes that media clusters feature various characteristics beyond agglomeration, and groups the characteristics in seven parameters (7Ps). Interrelations between the parameters determine media cluster dynamics and thus the cluster output, which emphasises the importance of dynamic relationships in media clusters. The resulting 7P framework can be used in analysing media clusters to create new under-

standing on their nature and dynamics. The seven parameters and their descriptions are shortly presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 1** The 7P framework (adjusted from Komorowski 2016 and 2017)

Parameter	Description
Place	the space, geographical scale and local conditions (e.g. economic, social, cultural) influencing the media cluster
Proximity	the topographical (i.e. spatial or geographical) and topological (i.e. linkages, interconnections or relatedness between cluster entities) nearness influencing the media cluster
Population	the scale of the cluster in quantity of entities and concentration/relevance for the place linked to the development phase of the cluster
Profile	the type/profile of entities (e.g. size, activities, organisation, place along the value chain, skills) and their functions within a cluster
Path-dependency	the historic ligature, the origins and historically developed patterns influencing the cluster
Policy	the media policy tools (e.g. regulations and governing incentives) from all levels (local, regional, national, supranational) influencing the media cluster (including self-governing structures)
Performance	the endogenous and exogenous externalities (e.g. in relation to added value, knowledge, collaboration, transactions, innovation) that media clusters produce

The 7P framework widens the understanding on media clusters from the co-location focus to differentiated dynamics of interrelated and intertwined internal (Proximity, Population, Profile) and external (Place, Policy, Path-Dependency, Performance) parameters (Komorowski, 2016). In relation to the seven parameters, each media cluster is unique and features different combinations of the attributes (Komorowski, 2016). Based on various combinations of the 7P parameters, Komorowski (2017) suggests a novel typology of media clusters for analytical purposes. She names the resulting six media cluster types as The Creative Region, The Giant Anchor, the Specialized Area, the Attracting Enabler, the Real Estate and the Pooling Initiative.

The case study in this chapter utilises the 7P framework (Komorowski, 2016) summarised above. The Mediapolis case is also discussed in relation to the cluster typology. For the case study in this chapter, the most relevant types are The Giant Anchor (which is defined by one/several media institutions that attract agglomeration, strong concentration, and high influence by politics and path-dependencies), The Attracting Enabler (which is determined by the location of sharable media facilities or resources and strong proximity) and The Real Estate (which is purpose-built and deter-

mined by place and media-targeted office space creating obvious proximity, high policy influence and path-dependency) (Komorowski, 2017).

In addition to highlighting the 7P characteristics and the type(s) of the Mediapolis cluster, interest is placed in the actual functioning of Mediapolis as a collaborative arrangement. This is decisive for the performance and success of the cluster, and thus a crucial angle for developing understanding in relation to the potential of media clusters for producing innovative results and value. Here, the viewpoint of organisational tensions of collaboration is utilised to illustrate the Mediapolis development and operations.

Collaboration is expected to provide potential for value creation and innovation in the context of media clusters (Karlsson & Picard, 2011; Virta & Lowe, 2017). However, collaboration in clusters features complex inter-organisational dynamics and is inherently characterised by various tensions, because clusters must combine cultural, economic and political objectives (Karlsson & Picard, 2011). Despite the assumed usefulness of collaboration for innovation, dynamic tensions lead to complexities that challenge the potential usefulness of collaborative arrangements (Bryson et al., 2015). Tensions between competing dual demands or forces - like art and commerce or current profits and future investment - are an intrinsic feature of content innovation in the creative industries (Jones et al., 2016). Also more generally, creative work in media organisations is inherently featured by tensions (Achtenhagen & Raviola, 2009). Thus, tensions can be perceived as an innate characteristic of media clusters that build on collaboration between creative media organisations for achieving content innovation and collaborative value.

In this study, tensions are perceived as dynamic interrelationships between the elements or 'poles' of the corresponding dualities (see e.g. Papachroni, Heracleous & Paroutis, 2015). Dualities are conceptualised as two seemingly opposing, but interdependent and intertwined elements or demands along a continuum of dynamics (Achtenhagen & Melin, 2003; Farjoun, 2010). In other words, dualities are 'opposing forces that need to be balanced - properties that seem contradictory or paradoxical, but which are in fact complementary' (Evans & Doz, 1999: 83). Dualities reflect 'jointly desirable but competing objectives' (Zimmermann, Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2015, p. 1119), evident for example in the fundamental duality between creative and commercial aspects of media organisations and production (Caves, 2000; Jones et al., 2016). The existence of dualities manifests in tensions that emerge through everyday practice in organisations (Papachroni et al., 2015), making tensions 'the source and substance' of dualities (Putnam, Fairhurst & Banghart, 2016: 132). Thus, tensions constitute the empirical research focus in concrete terms.

This study follows the understanding of Achtenhagen and Raviola (2009) that tensions may severely inhibit creative performance and innovation, if not properly understood and managed. Because tensions are inherent not only to creative work but also to collaboration, this aspect can be considered relevant for analysing media clusters. Innovative and value-creating outcomes depend on how well the poles of dualities are recognised and the tensions between them handled.

The viewpoint of dualities and tensions opens new avenues for understanding media cluster development. Media clusters are expected to offer potential for growth and innovation, as mentioned earlier. However, tensions create discomfort and frustration, and increase complexity in organisations (Lewis, 2000). Thus, identifying tensions and understanding the respective dualities holds promise for finding ways to deal with them as enablers instead of inhibitors of innovation.

The case study in this chapter focuses on a media cluster called Mediapolis in Finland. On its website, Mediapolis is characterised as “a centre of storytelling and digital industries” (Mediapolis, 2019). The cluster is located in Tampere, which is the third largest city of Finland. The premises are situated in a district called ‘Tohloppi’, which is situated around seven kilometres to the west from Tampere city centre. During the case study, Mediapolis was in the planning and early operational stage.

Mediapolis development started in concrete terms in 2011, but is explained by earlier events and features intersecting interests. Mediapolis was initiated by Yle, the Finnish Broadcasting Company, which is the public broadcaster of Finland. Yle has operated in Tohloppi since 1970s. A few years into the new millennium, Yle considered withdrawing its operations from Tohloppi as one of several future scenarios for cost savings. The plan made the Tampere City and Pirkanmaa region (the area around Tampere) authorities concerned. Their motivation to preserve Yle in Tohloppi correlates with the regional industrial development plan of ‘creative Tampere’ that was operational in 2006-2011. Later, Mediapolis development was even included in the City strategy, indicating strong support for and commitment in the initiative.

In early 2010s, Yle’s renewed strategy focused on ‘openness’. It included increasing public-private collaboration with external partners aiming at innovation in content and services and reducing Yle’s real estate ownership. Tohloppi premises were sold to an international real-estate development company Technopolis in 2012. The ownership change supported the legitimation of Yle’s continuing presence in Tohloppi. Yle vacated a large proportion of its former space in the premises, and they were fully renovated by Technopolis in 2013. Long-term rental contracts with Yle and TAMK (Tampere University of Applied Sciences, media branch) were part

of the original deal, and later a third large tenant, Tredu (Tampere Vocational College, media branch) was included in the package.

The first private production companies moved to Mediapolis ‘campus’ in autumn 2014. To support the start of Mediapolis operations development, Tampere City provided €750,000 of EU funding. An unofficial Board between the main Mediapolis partners (including Yle, Technopolis, TAMK, and Tampere City) was formed to govern the finance and to lead the collaborative development of Mediapolis, including specifying its vision and aims.

In early 2019, around 30 companies and organisations rent space at the premises, and approximately half of them are media-specific. Mediapolis offers up-to-date production facilities (e.g. fully equipped digital studios, filming facilities, production services, editing facilities) for media productions. In 2015, a new multi-purpose production facility owned by Yle was built in Mediapolis. Firms and institutions at Mediapolis share closely located offices and other spaces including a restaurant and a cafeteria. Everything is under one roof. Daily, more than 1000 people work and study at Mediapolis.

Mediapolis combines public and private organisations in cooperation. The aim is innovation in content, formats, programmes, media technology and operational models through collaboration. In January 2016, the main partners founded a legal entity in the form of a co-operative company for Mediapolis management and coordination purposes. The core aim was to find solutions to uncertainties and tensions, which had unearthed in relation to shared operations in Mediapolis development. The co-operative was expected to help clarify the situation and provide tools for supporting collaborative innovation in practice. It was also expected to generate revenue and sustain itself, at least partly, as a business later on. Yle representative was nominated the Chair of the Mediapolis co-operative.

## **2. Methods and findings**

The case study on Mediapolis in this chapter is qualitative. The aim is to explore an empirical, contemporary case within its real-world context (Yin, 2015). The empirical data collection benefits from a longitudinal approach, (e.g. Farjoun, 2010; Papachroni et al., 2015) and covers a period of several years (2011-2019) from Mediapolis initial ideation phase to date. The extensive access to the case builds on the author’s professional network developed by personal history as an Yle employee and manager (1995-2006).



The empirical data consists of 23 semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted in four rounds linked to prominent stages in Mediapolis development between March 2013 and February 2017. The interviewee sample is purposive (Patton, 2015), and covers 15 individuals from 12 organisations (1-3 interviews per respondent), adding up to 24 hours of recordings in total. The interviewees included Mediapolis unofficial Board members, Mediapolis co-operative Board members, Tampere City representatives, contracted external consultants and entrepreneurs at campus. The interviews were transcribed verbatim. Supportive empirical case data included participant observation at Mediapolis since 2013 (e.g. meetings, events, seminars, presentations), documentation (e.g. strategy documents, EU project reports), and 11 discussion meetings (1-3 hours each) with the Chair of the Mediapolis co-operative board between November 2014 and February 2019.

The analysis approach is abductive, which means moving between theory and data in several iterative rounds (e.g. Danermark, Ekström, Jakobsen & Karlsson, 2002). Extant theory was utilised to strengthen the case analysis alongside conducting data-driven and observation-based analysis (cf. Järvensivu & Törnroos, 2010). The qualitative analysis process consisted of data condensation (coding and generating categories), data display (organising categories in patterns) and conclusions (interpretation for results) (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014). Atlas.ti analysis-supporting software was used in the process.

Next, the Mediapolis case study results are discussed in relation to the 7P framework and the cluster types (Komorowski, 2016, 2017). Following this, three core dualities and respective tensions in relation to collaboration development at Mediapolis are illustrated. The level of analysis is organisational.

Mediapolis is located in Tohloppi, Tampere. The Place was determined by Yle's historic presence on site. The location has been important for political reasons, because Yle as the public broadcaster is mandated to serve the whole of Finland in equal terms. Tampere also wanted to secure Yle's continuing presence. However, Tampere is not a major international city, and Mediapolis is not located in the centre of Tampere. Thus, the Place has been a constant issue in Mediapolis development. For example, Mediapolis development is strongly dependent on traffic connections and zoning, which continuously require negotiations with Tampere City and regional authorities.

The Place is not only a central parameter in Mediapolis development regarding Yle. It is also at the core of Technopolis strategy and operations as a real estate operator. Despite that Technopolis representatives acknowledge media industry differing from other industries, their early

engagement for specialised solutions in Mediapolis has weakened and the traditional focus on standardised office rental strengthened.

Place can be considered as the determining factor in classifying Mediapolis to cluster types (cf. Komorowski, 2017). As a brownstone project, the Mediapolis real estate was not purpose-built for the cluster, but it was renovated to become one. As a real-estate development, Mediapolis reached the original goals ahead of schedule, and the cluster is well populated.

The Place connects Mediapolis especially to the Real Estate and the Giant Anchor cluster types. Yle was originally located in the premises, and still is the major commissioner for the independent production companies as the Giant Anchor (cf. Komorowski, 2017). As Giant Anchors typically, and also Real Estate clusters, Mediapolis is highly influenced by politics and path-dependencies (cf. Komorowski, 2017). Yle's plans to leave Tampere raised severe local and regional political concerns, and public support for its development is strong. However, path-dependencies of the large public organisations at Mediapolis have challenged collaboration development of the cluster.

The second parameter, Proximity, is a crucial success factor for creating collaborative value in Mediapolis. Significant effort has been made to enhance Proximity by arranging joint events or working together in the unofficial Board and the Mediapolis co-operative. However, proximity in physical agglomeration terms (topographical/spatial proximity in Komorowski, 2016) cannot substitute for proximity in collaboration terms (topological proximity in Komorowski, 2016). The latter gets emphasised in relation to innovation potential, because density in clusters does not substitute for intensity of relationships (Virta & Lowe, 2017).

In terms of Population, Mediapolis reached its targets ahead of schedule. Most rental premises are occupied, which was the aim for 2020. The original goal of 1,000 people on campus by 2015 was considered ambitious, but the goal was well surpassed. In mid-March 2016, 1,8888 individual Mediapolis access passes were active. However, the relevance of the cluster participants varies. The largest tenants, Yle, TAMK and Tredu, are of the most significant importance to Technopolis as the real estate operator. With these three long-term lease contracts, Technopolis has reached its core business aims regarding Mediapolis. This has hindered the development of the cluster as a whole, because the smaller collaboration partners have been disappointed with the emphasised focus on large organisations.

In relation to the Profile parameter, the size of the participating organisations affects Mediapolis development. The smaller, agile organisations are important for their ability to react quickly, and the larger organisations typically hinder possibilities for rapid co-creation opportunities. At Me-

diapolis, Yle's role was decisive in initiating the cluster, but its role is also considered too decisive for a balanced development of the cluster. For example, Yle is the main buyer of content from independent production companies, which makes them compete. Yle is also considered unpredictable in its actions towards the independent production sector, for example in relation to short-term and frequently changing commissioning and content acquisitions.

Path-dependency is especially evident in relation to the large, public organisations as Yle and TAMK in Mediapolis. Their established ways of working and making decisions hinder collaborative operations development. Mediapolis as a cluster is in its early years, but its development is fundamentally dependent on the path-dependencies of the participating organisations, because the cluster itself does not have decision-making mandate or power to act independently.

Policy issues are central for Mediapolis development. Policy supported the decision to sell the Mediapolis premises to Technopolis. The aim was to avoid Yle leaving Tohloppi and to direct Yle to increase collaborative content production with independent production companies. Decisions based on Policy also directed financial (EU-funds) and other resources, e.g. consultancy or improved traffic connections towards Mediapolis development. Recently, Business Tampere (Tampere City development company) has launched new incentives for attracting both domestic and international audio-visual productions to Tampere and Mediapolis. First productions have started, but it remains to be seen, if Tampere region as a whole and Mediapolis as a specific location will develop a stronger future attraction as a production locale.

Alongside external policy-based support, the establishment of internal self-regulating structures have complicated Mediapolis development. This is due to an over-emphasis on creating governance structures for Mediapolis operations on a meta-level instead of focusing on actual collaboration structures and opportunities on site. After several development cycles and projects, the Mediapolis co-operative was established. The shared management structure and arrangement was considered necessary for developing joint innovation and collaborative value.

The desired added value of Mediapolis collaboration is innovation in media content, formats and production by working together as partners in the cluster. This can be linked to Performance, the last parameter in the 7P framework. Collaboration has intensified between Yle and the schools, TAMK and Tredu, i.e. the public-sector organisations in the cluster. However, cross-sector collaboration across Mediapolis partners is still underdeveloped. Despite notable progress in getting the cluster running, attracting tenants and forming organisational arrangements for advancing cluster op-

erations, Mediapolis development has not met its targets especially in relation to everyday collaboration and joint innovation.

The centrality of collaboration and innovation in relation to Mediapolis aims suggests connections to the cluster type Attracting Enabler. Networked collaboration at Mediapolis is emphasised and expected to enable shared value creation between the partners. Mediapolis vision expects to provide a major attraction to both media entrepreneurs and educational institutions. Further, the Yle 'openness' strategy contains promise for a wide and uncomplicated access to high quality production facilities for cluster members and network. In the everyday realities of Mediapolis operations, the strategy has been easier to plan than implement, and the cluster has not met the set aims as an Attracting Enabler. This is due to the dominant Real Estate and Giant Anchor characteristics of Mediapolis, but also to organisational complexities and complications in collaboration development. These are discussed next.

The case analysis revealed core dualities and respective tensions, which hindered collaboration development for innovation at Mediapolis. The Mediapolis partners were surprised and frustrated over the slow pace of the cross-sector collaboration development. Central reasons for complications were characteristic tensions that emerged between constituent elements of three dualities, especially. For clarity, they are presented separately below, although they are intertwined in practice and contain overlapping features.

1) Duality between private and public organisational orientations

This duality concerns public and private organisational logics and forms, which Mediapolis needs to combine. Public organisations typically emphasise long-term development and viability, which collides with more immediate profit imperatives of private businesses. The risk-taking ability and willingness is also different between the organisational orientations. A central tension emerged between the path-dependency, as well as rigid and slow decision-making processes of public service organisations and the more ad-hoc and short-term approaches of private sector partners in Mediapolis. Sometimes the rigid orientations derived also from the private business side, which was illustrated in building the necessary new production facility in 2015. Technopolis as the real estate operator was expected to take the lead and responsibility over the project, but its strategic focus was on constructing standard offices. Thus, Yle had to take the responsibility over the new facility against its plans of reducing real estate ownership.

2) Duality between ideal planning and practical actions

Mediapolis development began with shared enthusiasm and vision between partners. The strategic-level aims of collaboration were

agreed on, which was crucial for securing commitment and public funding for the early days. However, operationalizing the ideal-level plans lacked concrete processes and practices. Although significant effort supported by public money and external consultants was made to plan Mediapolis operational principles and management, the investment did not lead to useful results in practice. Partners on the campus were confused and frustrated with the overemphasis on planning over practical collaboration and action. Especially private companies were disappointed by the discrepancies between visionary planning and corresponding action, because they were expecting concrete results sooner. An illustrative example is leasing Yle studios by external partners, which on the ideal level corresponded with the Yle 'openness' strategy. In reality, studio booking was complicated by long planning periods and requirements of using Yle operational personnel, as well by ambiguous price quotes for the studio usage.

3) Duality between individual organisations' self-interest and collective interest for collaboration

The establishment of the Mediapolis co-operative company was expected to provide a collective instrument for managing collaboration on campus. However, the formalisation of collaborative relationships did not erase the duality and respective tensions between self-interests and collective interests in Mediapolis. The co-operative lacked its own decision-making power in relation to the individual organisations, and was thus dependent on their interests and processes. Despite the overall commitment to cross-sector collaboration, the individual organisations' manifestations differed in this regard. For example, even the largest organisations questioned the amount of time and effort their representatives used on Mediapolis issues, although the expected benefits of collaborative advantage were high. Despite the shared strategic-level agreements, the corporate aims, strategies and principles often overruled the collaborative interests in practice. This was especially evident in the private sector organisations, both large and small. Additionally, the small organisations could not afford to invest their scarce resources on collaboration without immediate prospects for individual benefit.

### **3. Discussion**

In earlier studies, co-location and agglomeration of media companies and attached institutions is considered as key in media cluster development

(Karlsson & Picard, 2011, Picard, 2008). However, as the Mediapolis case study in this chapter illustrates, achieving expected benefits of cluster participation and collaborative innovation requires a more diverse perspective. The spatial density of companies in a cluster does not substitute for networked interactions and actual collaboration between them (cf. Virta & Lowe, 2017; see also Achtenhagen & Picard, 2011). For media clusters to provide opportunities for innovation in practice, ‘the exchange is what is really important’ (Allee, 2000: 38). Presence needs to become collaborative participation. Creating conditions for collaboration requires a mandate, ability, possibilities and willingness to work together in practice. At Mediapolis, the internal processes were lacking fluidity, flexibility, rapid expeditions and experimentation, as well as boundary crossing and trade-offs between partners.

Extant media cluster research also typically focuses on the positive aspects of clustering and respective success stories. However, opportunities, benefits or best practices identified in individual clusters and cases are difficult to transfer to or duplicate in other media clusters, because each cluster is individual and different (e.g. Komorowski, 2016; Virta & Lowe, 2017). Thus, focusing on complications in media cluster developments opens new avenues for understanding the media cluster phenomenon and the characteristics of media clusters more thoroughly. This chapter has done so on the basis of a recent media cluster development of Mediapolis in Finland. Copying benefits is often redundant, but understanding and analysing potential difficulties in advance and being alert to recognizing specific challenges of each cluster and its operations offers a new angle to scrutinise media cluster development. Further, the potential benefits produced by a cluster are typically outcomes of the development process, but do not directly indicate much in relation to the practical aspects of the dynamic process itself.

Even if, and maybe because, the real estate development goals of Mediapolis were met well beyond expectations and ahead of schedule, the development of collaborative innovation got tangled in practice. Although Population was a success in the real estate sense, it could not substitute for the Profile or Performance of the cluster in the media innovation sense. Despite the shared initial commitment to create a ‘hub’ for innovative production in Mediapolis, the diversion between the main partners’ strategic aims remained. Initially, Yle’s focus was on relinquishing real estate ownership and operationalizing its ‘openness’ strategy, and Technopolis was interested in opportunities to enlarge its real estate portfolio and business in Tampere. Although both organisations were committed to Mediapolis collaboration on the strategic level, their independent operational realities overruled the shared vision (cf. Hitters & Richards, 2002).

Both internal and external factors affect the development of a new cluster, which is evident in Mediapolis. In addition to the internal development challenges, external issues have also hindered progress. For example, the Tohloppi area keeps waiting for the planned new apartment buildings on the shore of the lake, which were supposed to become a key attraction of the developing area. Also, public funding has expired, and Mediapolis partners need to find resources for development among themselves.

The Performance development of Mediapolis operations has been erratic and uneven. Mediapolis partners have been engaged in and enthusiastic for collaboration, but at the same time, frustrated with slow movements and scattered decision-making. Mediapolis development is especially challenged by distinct organisational orientations and business logics, discontinuities between strategic aims and practical results, and contending organisational interests, all of which represent dualities evident in organisational tensions that hamper collaboration development.

On the basis of the Mediapolis case study, this chapter argues for the importance of anticipating, identifying and managing various organisational tensions in media cluster development. Tensions co-exist and are interrelated, and thus need to be considered as a dynamic package. Achieving this requires a both-and rather than an either-or approach to dualities and respective tensions in practice (cf. Putnam et al., 2016). Understanding the importance of interrelations between duality elements and considering them as an integrated package is crucial for success in pursuing innovation (cf. Farjoun, 2010), as well as enhancing the potential for collaborative value creation (cf. Koschmann, Kuhn & Pfarrer, 2012). It is not feasible to dispose of or resolve the tensions, and ignorance does not make them disappear. On the contrary, unattended tensions may result in constraining rather than supporting development and innovation (cf. Sutherland & Smith, 2011). Careful attendance to managing the dynamic interplay between duality elements can support the potential of tensions to serve as means to energise development and as enablers of innovation (cf. Achtenhagen & Raviola, 2009).

In addition to the three core tensions presented in the case study results, Mediapolis faces a tension between its current and intended cluster type. The strategic aims of Mediapolis as a whole and the Mediapolis cooperative as a supportive structure suggest the centrality of the Attracting Enabler type (cf. Komorowski, 2017). However, in real everyday terms Mediapolis relates fundamentally to the Real Estate and Giant Anchor types of the media cluster typology. This suggests the usefulness of carefully considering the aims and realities in media cluster development in relation to cluster characteristics.

Currently, the functions, feasibility and future of the Mediapolis co-operative are being discussed among the partners. One of the founding members of the co-operative has withdrawn, and also moved away from the Mediapolis premises. The real estate operator Technopolis continues to focus more profoundly on its core strategy of leasing office space, thus distancing itself from the original idea of creating a unique cluster environment reflecting the characteristics of media and creative industries as context. Further, Yle discontinued a major production that occupied the newly built production space in Mediapolis. Mediapolis development is at crossroads. As the case study shows, the trajectory of media cluster development is not simple or straightforward, and different phases unearth different challenges and complications.

On the positive side in relation to Mediapolis aims, the coordination of innovative productions and programme pilots has been clarified among the Mediapolis co-operative members and ‘an operator’ for this activity has been agreed on. Yle is also investing significant internal effort in clarifying and strengthening the strategic role of Mediapolis in its portfolio of operations. The continuing developments and changes make Mediapolis a fruitful context also for future research interest.

In addition to the insights for media cluster development discussed above, this study offers viewpoints for policy making. As stated, the expected potential of creative industries and media clusters to revitalise economies and stimulate innovation is high. The traditional means of supporting spatial agglomeration in clusters by, for example, providing financial support for pre-determined development projects may be useful, but they do not suffice in the current environments of rapid disruptive change. More flexible focus on individual characteristics and development phases of each cluster, thorough understanding on the respective complications and challenges, as well as provision of targeted support mechanisms could offer tools for more productive policy-making in regard to media and creative industry clusters.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter featured a qualitative case study on Mediapolis, a newly formed media cluster in Tampere, Finland. It analysed the cluster in relation to the 7P framework (Komorowski, 2016) and the corresponding cluster types (Komorowski, 2017). Further, the case study discussed complex interdependencies between organisations in the cluster, as well as dynamics of their collaboration. The analysis unearthed core dualities and respective tensions that create complications for the necessary collaboration in



media clusters in practice. The chapter suggests that understanding dualities and tensions, as well as various interrelations between the dynamic tensions is crucial for cross-sector collaboration in media clusters.

As the case discussion in this chapter illustrates, both the 7P framework and the cluster types suggested by the typology (Komorowski, 2017) are useful for analysing and understanding media clusters, their development and management. However, differences between the types in the theoretical typology are not clear-cut in reality. An individual cluster often reflects certain elements of several types in the typology. Also, relations between cluster characteristics and corresponding type(s) may change along the cluster evolution and live-cycle.

Future research on media clusters will certainly benefit from using the 7P analysis framework (Komorowski, 2016) that was utilised in the Mediapolis case study in this chapter. It could be fruitfully used in comparative studies between cases or for comparing individual studies in meta-level analyses. Also, complexities and complications of media cluster development merit further research interest. It is common to benchmark successes and best practices in media cluster development, but past success does not predict future accomplishment and best practices may not work when put into use in different organisational contexts and cultures. Instead, there is a lot to learn from complexities and cases, which are not successful to benefit both theory enhancement and cluster development in practice.

## References

Achtenhagen, L., & Melin, L. (2003). Managing the homogeneity-heterogeneity duality. In A. M. Pettigrew, R. Whittington, L. Melin, C. Sánchez-Runde, F. van den Bosch, W. Ruigrok, & T. Numagami (Eds.), *Innovative forms of organizing: international perspectives* (pp. 301-327). London: Sage Publications.

Achtenhagen, L., & Picard, R. G. (2011). Media clusters: development paths and core issues. In C. Karlsson, & R. G. Picard (Eds.) *Media clusters: spatial agglomeration and content capabilities* (pp. 44-71). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Achtenhagen, L. & Picard, R. G. (2014). Challenges and success factors in media cluster development: a review of contemporary knowledge. In C. Karlsson, B. Johansson, & R. R. Stough (Eds.), *Agglomeration, clusters and entrepreneurship. Studies in regional economic development* (pp. 221-251). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Achtenhagen, L. & Raviola, E. (2009). Balancing tensions during convergence: duality management in a newspaper company. *International Journal on Media Management*, 11(1), 32-41.

Allee, V. (2000). Reconfiguring the value network. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 21(4), 36-39.

Baumann, S. (2013). Adapting to the brave new world. Innovative organisational strategies for media companies. In T. Storsul & A. H. Krumsvik (Eds.), *Media innovations. A multidisciplinary study of change* (pp. 77-92). Göteborg: Nordicom.

Bilton, C. (2011). The management of the creative industries. From content to context. In M. Deuze (Ed.), *Managing media work* (pp. 31-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: needed and challenging. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 647-663.

Caves, R. E. (2000). *Creative industries: contract between art and commerce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Danermark, B., Ekström, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. C. (2002). *Explaining Society. Critical realism in the social sciences*. New York: Routledge.

Davis, C. H., Creutzberg, T., & Arthurs, D. (2009). Applying an innovation cluster framework to a creative industry: the case of a screen-based media in Ontario. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, 11, 201-214.

Evans, P. A. L. & Doz, Y. (1999). Dualities: a paradigm for human resource and organizational development in complex multinationals. In M. Poole (Ed.), *Human resource management. Critical perspectives on business and management: Vol. 3. Emergent HRM issues for the new millennium* (pp. 83-104). London: Routledge.

Farjoun, M. (2010). Beyond dualism: stability and change as a duality. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 202-225.

Hitters, E. & Richards, G. (2002). The creation and management of cultural clusters. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11(4), 234-247.

Järvensivu, T. & Törnroos, J-Å. (2010). Case study research with moderate constructionism: conceptualization and practical illustration. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(1), 100-108.

Jones, C., Svejenova, S., Pedersen, J. S., & Townley, B. (2016). Misfits, mavericks and mainstreams: drivers of innovation in the creative industries. *Organization Studies*, 37(6), 751-768.

Karlsson, C. & Picard, R. G. (2011). Media clusters: what makes them unique? In C. Karlsson, & R. G. Picard (Eds.), *Media clusters: spatial ag-*

*glomeration and content capabilities* (pp. 3-29). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Kanter, R. M. (1994). Collaborative advantage. The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(4), 96-108.

Komorowski, M. (2016). The seven parameters of media clusters: An integrated approach for local cluster analysis. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 12(2), 171-191.

Komorowski, M. (2017). A novel typology of media clusters. *European Planning Studies*, 25(8), 1334-1356.

Koschmann, M. A., Kuhn, T. R., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2012). A communicative framework of value in cross-sector partnerships. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 332-354.

Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 760-776.

Lowe, G. F. & Yamamoto, N. (Eds.) (2016). *Crossing borders and boundaries in public service media, RIPE@2015*. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.

Mediapolis (2019). Mediapolis. <https://mediapolis.fi/en/>, retrieved April 1, 2019.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis. A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Papachroni, A., Heracleous, L., & Paroutis, S. (2015). Organizational ambidexterity through the lens of paradox theory: building a novel research agenda. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 51(1), 71-93.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Picard, R. G. (2008). Media clusters: local agglomeration in an industry developing virtual clusters (Working Paper Series No. 2008-3). Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.

Porter, M. E. (2000). Location, competition, and economic development: Local clusters in a global economy. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14(1), 15-34.

Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G. T., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: a constitutive approach. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 65-171.

Sutherland, F. & Smith, A. C. T. (2011). Duality theory and the management of the change-stability paradox. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 17(4), 534-547.

Virta, S. & Lowe, G. F. (2017). Integrating media clusters and value networks: Insights for management theory and research from a case study

of Mediapolis in Finland. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 23(1), 2-21.

Yin, R. K. (2015). Case Studies. In *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 194-201). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Zimmermann, A., Raisch, R., & Birkinshaw, J. (2015). How is ambidexterity initiated? The emergent charter definition process. *Organization Science*, 26(4), 1119-1139.

## List of Contributors

SARI VIRTA

Jönköping International Business School, Jönköping University, Sweden (sarivirta@live.com)

Sari Virta combined business administration and media studies in her double-degree PhD in the field of media management. Her research interest concerns creative content development and innovation management in media companies and their collaboration. Virta has published in several well-regarded outlets including *Journalism*, *Journal of Management & Organization*, *Journal of Media Business Studies*, and *RIPE@2015* book (Nordicom). Her previous work experience in the industry is extensive, covering managerial positions as well as consultation and development.