The strategic challenge of continuous change in multi-platform media organizations – a strategy-as-practice perspective[*]

Rita Järventie-Thesleff and **Johanna Moisander**
Aalto University School of Business, Department of Management Studies
Mikko Villi, University of Helsinki, Department of Social Research

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the complexities of managing multi-platform strategies in the complex and highly dynamic environments of contemporary media markets. Based on a comparative case study of two Nordic media organizations, the paper identifies and articulates two sets of practices through which strategy is managed in the continuously changing print and online environments. While the practices that guide strategy development of print publishing tends to be content driven, brand constrained, commercially steered, and top-down monitored, strategizing for online platforms tends to be more technology driven, brand inspired, interactive, and entrepreneurial. For multi-platform media organizations this type of situation is challenging because the incremental and radical innovations that they pursue are platform specific, instead of aiming at exploitation and exploration on both platforms. To succeed in the market, the paper thus argues, multi-platform media organizations need to develop strategies and organizational practices that allow them to be truly ambidextrous—to pursue both incremental and radical change—on all platforms.

Keywords: multi-platform media organizations, change management, ambidexterity, strategy-as-practice, media convergence

INTRODUCTION

As a result of media convergence (Deuze, 2011; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Hartmann, 2009; Jenkins, 2004), the operating environment of contemporary media companies is in a state of continuous change and turmoil: industry boundaries are unclear, business models are evolving, consumer preferences are not well known, and competition can come from hitherto unknown players (Achtenhagen & Raviola, 2009; Küng, 2008; Mierzejewska, 2011; Sylvie & Weiss, 2012). The multi-platform environment—the emergence of new online platforms, new devices (mobile phones, tablet computers) and new channels (television, video)—leads to the opening of new [market] opportunities for media companies that have traditionally been relying primarily on print. In this dynamic business environment, management of continuous change becomes a key challenge for strategy development.

In this study, we set out to contribute to a better understanding of this strategic challenge in the context of media organizations that have opted to pursue multi-platform strategies. While the ongoing economic, technological, and cultural transformation of the media landscape has attracted considerable scholarly attention in the field of media management (see e.g. Küng, 2007), empirical research on the managerial responses to this change continues to be scarce. In particular, we know very little about how media organizations try to develop new strategies and manage change in multi-platform environments and what the key challenges are. In this paper, we set out to fill this gap.

Drawing on the literature on strategy-as-practice (Jarzabkowski, Balogun, & Seidl, 2007; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007; Whittington, 2007) and based on an empirical study of two Nordic multi-platform media organizations, we identify and articulate two sets of practices through which new strategies are developed for different platforms in the continuously changing market environments of the media industry. The two companies are multi-platform media organizations in the sense that they produce content for both print and online platforms (online content being increasingly consumed by using mobile devices).

In the particular cases that we analyze, the practices through which strategies for the print media platforms are developed tend to be geared at supporting incremental innovations, whereas the practices enacted for the online media platforms seem to be oriented toward pursuing more radical innovations. More specifically, while the practices of strategy development in print publishing tend to be content driven, brand constrained, commercially steered and top-down monitored, for online platforms the practices are more technology driven, brand inspired, interactive, and entrepreneurial. For multi-platform media organizations this type of situation is challenging, we argue, because the incremental and radical innovations that they pursue are platform specific, instead of aiming at exploitation and exploration on both platforms.

Our study contributes to the literature on media management by elaborating on a theoretical, strategy-as-practice perspective on the challenges of strategy development in the dynamic, continuously changing market environments of contemporary multi-platform media organizations. Based on an empirical analysis that draws on this perspective, we illustrate the complexities involved and suggest that success and survival in the market calls for strategic practices that allow multi-platform media organizations to both explore and

exploit market opportunities. They need to be able to both adapt their existing capabilities and to create new capabilities in response to the threats and opportunities that the changing market environment brings about. In other words, multi-platform media organizations need to be *ambidextrous:* simultaneously both aligned with and efficient in delivering on present market demands and adaptive to changes in the emerging business environment (Duncan, 1976; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996).

The paper is structured as follows. First, we introduce the practice-theoretical approach to the management of strategic change that we draw on in our study. Then, after briefly discussing the methods and materials of our study, we present the results of our empirical analysis by juxtaposing practices of strategy development in print and online publishing, elaborating on the internal tensions, conflicts and possible paradoxes that they entail. To conclude, we discuss the contribution and implications of our study, focusing on the strategic challenges that the need for organizational ambidexterity brings about for media management in multi-platform media organizations.

STRATEGY-AS-PRACTICE APPROACH TO MANAGAGING STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE

In the context of the rapidly evolving media environment, strategy development and the management of strategy in general, necessarily entail the challenge of successfully managing continuous change. In the literature on management studies, change is an intriguing question that has been extensively studied and theorized from a number of different perspectives (Van de Ven & Poole, 2005). In this paper, we draw from the literature on strategy-as-practice (Jarzabkowski, Balogun, & Seidl, 2007; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007; Whittington, 2007) and practice theory (Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, Knorr Cetina, and von Savigny, 2001) and conceptualize the management of change as a *strategy practice* though which media companies seek to succeed and survive in the market.

Strategy-as-practice is a fairly new theoretical approach to the study of strategic management that draws on the practice turn in social theory and strategy research. We argue that strategy-as-practice offers a useful analytical lens for exploring the practical complexities and strategic challenges that the management of change involves in contemporary multi-platform media organizations, because it shifts attention to the day-to-day micro-level activities and practices through which strategies are managed in organizations. It emphasizes that strategy is not only a plan or something that an organization *has* but also – and more importantly– something that its members as "strategy practitioners" *do* in the day-to-day of organizational activity (Johnson et al., 2007; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Whittington, 2006). Strategy and strategic management is thus viewed and analyzed as an ongoing process that unfolds over time through the diverse activities of *strategizing* that practitioners engage in. These strategy practitioners include not only senior executives and strategy consultants of the organization but also middle managers and other internal and external actors who participate in and accomplish the work of strategizing. Strategy-as-practice thus opens up a perspective on strategy making as a complex, emergent, and bottom-up process of strategy work and organization-wide praxis (Paroutis, Loizos, and Angwin, 2013).

Moreover, in analyzing this "doing" and strategizing, scholars who draw

on strategy-as-practice usually focus on the *practices* through which strategies are managed in organizations. Here the term *practice* is understood as a coherent pattern of purposive activity that is guided by particular collective, institutionalized and organization-specific structures of knowing, reasoning, and understanding, which transcend individual members of the organization (Reckwitz, 2002: 249-250). These collective codes of knowledge constitute a background understanding of what constitutes a normal, intelligible, appropriate, and desirable course of action in specific situations. Strategy practices have an inherent logic that orients strategy practitioners as carriers of these practices in specific ways. In the praxis of strategy work, organizational members are thus understood to be guided and constrained by the logic of strategy practices in which they engage.

From this perspective, the focus of analysis lies on the activities and practices through which strategic change is managed in organizations. To further elaborate on this perspective, however, we need to distinguish between planned and processual change. The point of departure in *planned change* is that stability is the norm and that change is the exception. According to this view, stability will be interrupted by short periods of change, which are forced upon an organization either by technological advances or by new organizational processes. Hence, the extra-organizational environment is viewed as the source of strategic change, and the organization has to adapt as quickly as possible to changes in this environment to achieve equilibrium. The model developed by Kurt Lewin (1951) captures the idea of planned change. It consists of three steps: unfreeze, move and refreeze. In other words, companies first unfreeze the current state of affairs, and then move things where they want them to be, and after they have succeeded, they refreeze again. (Clegg, Kornberger, & Pitsis, 2005). In the contemporary media industry, however, change is often *processual* and can better be described as a continuous process and an ongoing normal condition of organizational life (Weick & Quinn, 1999; Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). Change thus unfolds and needs to be continuously managed, through the day-to-day activities of strategizing.

In this paper, we contend that to better understand the complexities and challenges of strategic management in the context of continuous change, analytical attention needs to be focused on the practices and micro-processes of strategizing through which change unfolds and is managed in media organizations. From this perspective, we set out to empirically explore the activities through which strategic change initiatives are conceived, developed, and executed for the print and online media platforms. Based on a comparative case study of two media organizations, the aim is to identify and articulate the practices that guide strategizing in the continuously changing market environment of the print publishing business.

EMPIRICAL STUDY

Our empirical analysis is based on a case study (Stake, 2003) of strategy development in two Nordic multi-platform media organizations, carried out by using qualitative analysis of interview data (Moisander, Valtonen & Hirsto, 2009) and textual, documentary material (Moisander & Valtonen, 2006). Methodologically, the study draws on the basic principles and procedures of constructionist qualitative research (Alasuutari, 1996; Moisander & Valtonen, 2006). From this perspective, qualitative analysis is based on an "emergent

research design", which is continually worked on and revised as the researcher learns more about the empirical phenomenon under study (Moisander & Valtonen, 2012). For such analysis it is important to obtain a rich set of empirical materials that allows the researchers to gain insight into the particular meanings and practices through which people make sense of the world around them and achieve social order in the particular socio-material context at hand (Moisander et al., 2009). This methodological approach was chosen, because the challenges of managing continuous change in the media industry are currently poorly understood, and a better understanding of the phenomenon calls for interpretive, data-driven analysis (Stake, 2003; Moisander & Valtonen, 2012).

Case Study. The purpose of the case analysis is to gain a better understanding of the activities and practices through which members of the two multi-platform media organizations conceive, develop, and execute strategies in the continuously changing business environment of the media industry. The companies were chosen as case organizations because both companies have a background in highly successful print businesses, but recently they have focused their efforts on developing their business models towards a full-fledged multi-platform model.

The first case company is a *Nordic newspaper* with a history of almost 80 years of print publishing. It is part of a large media corporation, which owns several newspapers, radio stations and television channels, and is now in the process of seriously developing its digital business. Throughout its existence the newspaper has been considered as a discussion generator and a news channel for people from all walks of life. The website of the newspaper is among the most popular media websites in the Nordic countries, and the newspaper is also a forerunner in its country in providing content for the smart phone and tablet computer platforms.

The second case company is a *Nordic women's magazine,* which belongs to a publishing corporation that has a portfolio of both women's and general interest magazines. The magazine is targeted to readers younger than 35 years of age. The magazine is essentially tied to an online service established by the publishing corporation that offers a platform for bloggers. The Internet site is extremely popular within the target audience.

Analyzing these case organizations allows us to explore the differences and similarities of strategy development towards a full-fledged multi-platform model in two somewhat different contexts of traditional print media. The Nordic Women's Magazine that we study may be described as an example of "slow media", which typically produce specialized content tailored to meet the needs of a relatively narrow but highly interested audience. The Nordic Newspaper, in contrast, is an example of contemporary news media producing content for a relatively broad audience, who, for example, need to quickly catch up on sports scores or scan through news items to stay current about what is happening in the world. As regards strategy development and change, there is reason to believe that the strategic environments of magazines and newspapers represent somewhat different change contexts. By comparing these contexts our aim is to gain a more nuanced understanding of the challenges that strategizing for new multi-platform models in the changing media landscape might involve.

Data. The primary data collected on the *Newspaper* consists of 22 personal interviews carried out with journalists and members of the marketing and business development teams. The primary data collected on the *Women's*

magazine consists of two rounds of personal interviews with the entire editorial team of the magazine (18 interviews). The interviews in both case companies lasted between 60 and 90 minutes and they were digitally recorded and transcribed in verbatim (about 400 pages). In both case organizations, the interview data were collectively elaborated in management workshops, organized around the theme of continuous change. To complement the data we also used publicly available documentary material (company reports, website, press releases) in printed and online forms. The documentary data was used primarily for contextualizing the primary, interview data.

Data analysis. When analyzing the data, the methods and basic methodological procedures developed in the field of cultural analysis were used (Alasuutari, 1996; Moisander & Valtonen, 2006). In the empirical analysis, we employed theoretically informed but 'data-driven' analytical procedures, building our coding schemes through an abductive process of interpretation (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). The theoretical perspective discussed above, thus, provided a way of drawing attention to particular aspects of the texts, helping us to elaborate on the distinctive ways in which strategizing and strategy development were represented and made sense of in the data.

Generalizability of results. Regarding the generalization of our results, we wish to point out that by means of a qualitative case analysis our aim was to elaborate on the ways in which strategic change may be managed in today's multi-platform media organizations. We identify a number of currently existing practices and explore their nature and implications for strategic development in the dynamic context of the contemporary media industry. Our aim is not to say anything about how typical these practices are within media organizations in general. Rather, in the context of research on media management, we seek to offer some clarifications and raise critical questions about the complexity and strategic challenges of managing continuous change in multi-platform media organizations. We contend that our study will provide practitioners with useful knowledge and new perspectives for critically examining the strategic practices through which new strategies are developed and change managed in their own organizations.

PRACTICES OF STRATEGIZING IN PRINT AND ONLINE PUBLISHING

Despite the fact that magazine and newspaper businesses represent two somewhat different strategic environments, in both of the organizations that we studied strategizing and strategy development seems to draw on similar platform-specific logics and practices. Based on our empirical analysis, we identify two patterns of activities through which strategy is developed and change managed in the multi-platform media organizations that we studied. While the practice of strategizing that is enacted in print publishing can be characterized as *content driven, brand constrained, commercially steered and top-down monitored* activity*,* the practice of strategizing that is enacted in online publishing strategizing seems to be *technology driven, brand inspired, interactive and entrepreneurial.*

Strategizing in print publishing
Printed magazines and newspapers can be characterized as 'continuous creation media products', meaning that they are based on a tightly defined concept, which provides the package for the content. The package exhibits continuity, but the

content is based on an on-going creation (Pickard 2005: 62). Strategizing in this context is usually ***content driven****:* development is typically based on the initiatives taken by the journalists and motivated by transformations in the external environment. For example, in the case of the women's magazine, the emergence of new fashion trends functions as an impulse for change, as the following extract illustrates:

> *The style of the magazine is renewed along the changes in fashion. 2-4 times a year our magazine is partially renewed (…) As a fashion magazine we need to renew ourselves constantly. (Magazine, management)*

The traditional print media companies, which our case organizations represent, have often strong, well-established brands in their own fields. In this context, brand alignment is crucial and strategizing can be described as ***brand constrained.*** Established brands are strategically important as they enhance recall, create a point of differentiation, generate positive attitudes and feelings, and provide a reason to buy (Chan-Olmsted, 2006:71). In addition, managers of media companies usually take it for granted that having a strong brand in the minds of consumers is essential for profitability (Stipp, 2012: 107). Therefore, neither the media managers nor the journalists want to endanger the brand position of the print versions, which leads to rigorous brand alignment – even to the extent of constraining change. It is important to support the brand identity and the uniqueness of the publication by a "carefully defined visual outlook and strictly determined journalistic style and tone of voice" as one of the interviewees put it. The quality of each issue needs to live up to the standards. Content, imagery, journalistic style and visual consistency all need to conform to the brand.

In print publishing, the objectives of brand strategy thus inform and shape all activities in the organization – from marketing to daily journalistic work. Strategy development seems to be initiated primarily to strengthen the brand position both in the eyes of the readers and of the advertisers. The following quotes illustrate this brand-constrained logic of practice that guides strategizing in print publishing:

> *Of course there is a definition of our brand that creates the general context for us. And then the requirement that our content is of good quality and trustworthy. (…) We shape the brand by "doing", and do not just rely on the brand "existing". (Newspaper, sales)*

> *In traditional [daily] newspapers, the brands play an important part, to the extent that they can constrain the actions. (Newspaper, journalist)*

Finally, changes to the print version—be it in the unit price, size of the edition, type and quality of the brand extension, or the way either the publication or advertising space is promoted—tend to be predictable and ***commercially steered.*** The media are subject to financial pressure, as printed magazines and newspapers operate in 'unit cost economics'. Commercial steering is thus built on the cost structure and cost pressure felt by the managers responsible for the print editions (Picard, 2005: 64).

When defining their strategic objectives and action plans in the print context, managers seem to explore alternative options and their outcomes, guided

by careful, rational calculations and information from the past. In doing so, their actions seem to be centered on short term profit-making rather than pursuing for long-term opportunities. Yet, the rapidly changing environment can force the media to make rather sudden reforms, as is illustrated in the following quote.

> *We lost advertisers, we lost readers, we lost everything, and then it was most…almost forced on behalf of the top management that now you reform, or this magazine will not exist anymore. (Magazine, management)*

In this context, strategy work is tightly managed by the senior executives of the organization. Hierarchical practices are considered necessary for the management to have the authority and possibility to 'make things happen'. Hence, as the following quote illustrates, strategizing becomes ***top-down monitored***, leaving little room for actions that comply with emergent strategizing – actions that would be guided by collective structures of knowing (Reckwitz, 2002: 249-250).

> *In magazines, and this is not something I'm making up, the thing is that it is the holy trinity – editor-in-chief, managing editor and art director – make things roll. They have the power and the responsibility. (Magazine, middle- management)*

Strategizing in online publishing
In the online context, by contrast, strategizing tends to be *technology driven, brand inspired, interactive and entrepreneurial*. In the organizations that we analyzed, strategizing is first of all ***technology driven*** in the sense that it is based on the tendency to jump on the bandwagon of the latest development in online and mobile solutions. In making sense of this tendency, the interviewees refer to the threat of losing ground in fierce competition that is currently ongoing (Wikström & Ellonen, 2012: 64), as the following quotes illustrates:

> *We got to be there [online]. Despite the fact that we do not know if anything will ever come out of it. It is not possible that we wait and see if it develops into something viable and only then enter. We need to be present on several fronts, some of them are successes, others are not, and over those we just draw the cross. (Newspaper, sales)*

> *The tablet computers and e-readers are coming, we need to have some kind of a readiness for that.* (Magazine, online business development)

For the organizations that we studied, this seems to mean that the speed with which they are investing in the online and mobile operations can sometimes surpass the speed with which customers are ready to adopt the new solutions. Publishers have the tendency to feel "the need to be present" in all the early stages of online and mobile development – even without knowing which specific online platforms will establish their positions and turn out to be commercially feasible.

This probably results from the fact that the development of online and mobile operations involves a lot of uncertainty. As one of the interviewees put it:

> *If somebody invents how to make money online, just send me a tip. Yet,*

nowadays we need to be both in print and online business. (Magazine, middle-management)

There has been a lot of toing and froing, for example, about the new mobile platforms, mainly regarding the content, delivery channels, and alternative business models.

Second, strategizing in the online contexts tends to be **brand inspired.** By this we mean that the alignment of strategizing with brand strategies is more relaxed in the sense that it allows 'trial and error'. This is in contrast to the print version, which still represents the core of the brand – especially in the field of magazine publishing — as the following quote suggests:

Although both print and online are under the same brand, they should somehow be separated. Online development is so different from print. If we do a mistake, then we do the thing differently the next time. In the print context, we never put anything out unfinished. But online we need to do so, try and see if we get feedback. There [online] we need to tolerate incompleteness, which is a big problem. (Magazine, online development)

Third, our study suggests that in the online context, strategizing is oriented toward pursuing increased **interactivity**: an urge to form a community with the readers and to develop the offering in interaction with them. The new publishing formats of the online environments tend to be interactive, thus blurring the boundaries between production and consumption. In these environments, input is sought and change initiatives come both from the readers and the editorial staff, as the following quote suggests:

We will implement communal features. Communal aspects are stressed in our strategy. We will step up and enable interaction for the readers. We will open our website more for the consumer, so that they have a possibility to be part of the community, and can have more influence and have their voice better heard. (Newspaper, marketing)

In the online environment, "strategy practitioners" include a broader range of actors; not only the top and middle management of the organization but also the editorial staff, and even the readers or users of the media content. In this sense, strategizing in the online platform is characterized by, or at least desired to have, an **entrepreneurial** – or *intrapreneurial* spirit. An intrapreneur thinks innovatively like an entrepreneur despite the fact that s/he is an employee. Hence, s/he searches for various possibilities that could be beneficial for the employer, questions old ways of acting and thinking, and stays open to the changes taking place in the operating environment. The middle managers that we interviewed, for example, praise the various "garage entrepreneurs" in the organization, for example, journalists who "do strategy" in their everyday work by innovating new services for the newspaper's online pages without first "establishing a committee" to work on the task.

In the organizations that we studied, many of the new services on the online platforms are indeed based on the spontaneous initiatives and innovations from the editorial staff. They are based on intuitive decision-making instead of lengthy analysis and planning. According to the entrepreneurial**,** or intrapreneurial

spirit, therefore, the role of the editorial staff is to act as stimulators and inspirers that enable the organization to better recognize and meet new market demands (Meckel & Fieseler, 2012), as the following quote illustrates:

> *I consider the nurturing of the entrepreneurial attitude to be most essential. Not only that somebody is enthusiastic about some specific thing, but that all individual activities are seen to have a huge impact on the totality [of the newspaper]. When the this entrepreneurial attitude is part of our DNA, then… (Newspaper, journalist)*

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, our aim has been to advance knowledge of the strategic challenges that arise from the need to manage continuous change in media organizations that have opted to pursue multi-platform strategies. By extending the strategy-as-practice perspective to the domain of media management our aim has been to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the processes and practices of strategizing through which media organizations develop new business models to keep up with the ongoing transformations in the media industry (Johnson et al., 2007; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Sotirios et al., 2013).

Our study suggests that in the multi-platform media environments of today, the need to pursue both incremental and radical change constitutes a major challenge. To succeed, media organizations need to simultaneously avoid inertia and be open for innovations as well as to maintain efficiency in their existing operations and support effectiveness in new business development (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004; Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009). To do so, they need to constantly pursue *incremental innovations,* small changes and improvements in their existing products and operations that let them operate more efficiently and deliver ever-greater value to their customers. Simultaneously, however, they also need to come up with *radical innovations*, i.e. changes that profoundly alter the basis for competition in the industry and thus often render old products or ways of working obsolete (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008).

One of the main insights that we offer is that strategic survival in the changing media markets calls for *ambidexterity*: practices of strategizing that allow the organization to continuously explore new ways of doing business while exploiting existing capabilities (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008). For most organizations, however, this may be prove to be highly challenging, as it entails the balancing of seemingly contradictory activities and objectives (Meyer & Stensaker, 2006; Mom, van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2007; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Hamel & Prahalad, 1993). Exploitation is about efficiency, increasing productivity, control, certainty, and variance reduction. Exploration, by contrast, is about search, discovery, autonomy, innovation and embracing variation. As ambidexterity is about doing them both simultaneously, it requires a particular organizational capacity to deal with the tensions that Hamel and Prahalad (1993) call "leverage and stretch": the need to utilize existing capabilities while searching for new ones.

For media management scholars and practitioners alike, this would seem to be an important insight because successful innovation management, in general,

has arguably become a key to success in strategic media management (Sylvie & Schmitz-Weiss, 2012: 183). As the long-term survival of media organizations appears to be based on a continuous and aggressive innovation activity, publishers have become evermore eager to develop their operations, continuously looking for novel solutions for organizing and managing their business (Johansson, Ellonen & Jantunen, 2012: 98; Wikström & Ellonen, 2012: 63).

This may be challenging, however, as we observed in our empirical study. For the old, well-established media organizations, in particular, it might be difficult to break loose from the old 'paper business' model. While the top-management of the organizations that we studied understood the importance of a successful transition to the new digital world, they did not seem to know how and when to initiate such strategic change process. In neither of the case organizations, moreover, was there a clear structural division between print and online operations. On the contrary, there was a tendency to merge the two.

Moreover, when operating in the realm of print publishing, the personnel in both organizations tended to reproduce the concepts of past successes, focusing on incremental changes, rigorous brand alignment, and top down-monitored, commercially steered activities. This is understandable, of course, as in the past many print media organizations have been extremely prosperous without having to be innovative or entrepreneurial (Wikström & Ellonen, 2012: 63). When operating in the realm of online publishing, by contrast, the personnel in both organizations appeared to have a different attitude towards change. They were more open to exploratory ideas, inspired by involving the audience, eager to apply new technological solutions, and in many ways less constrained by branding or fear for mistakes.

Our study contributes primarily to the literature on media management by elaborating on the socio-historically constructed practices that present challenges to managing multi-platform media organizations in the conditions of continuous change. First, the strategy-as-practice perspective has allowed us to shift attention to the important roles that members of the organization—middle managers, web editors, and journalists—play in the processes through which strategies emerge and are developed in the midst of continuous organizational and strategic change. Second, the practice lens has allowed us to illustrate how strategy practitioners act as carriers of particular, organizational practices that limit the scope of their day-to-day strategizing activities.

Third, our study demonstrates that the survival and success in the contemporary media business is not only a matter of creating better strategic plans; it also calls for the development of better practices of strategizing.

To conclude, we therefore argue that multi-platform media organizations would benefit from a better understanding of the socio-historically built, platform-specific change management practices. As a key contribution of our study, we have offered insights into these practices, shedding light on the strategic challenges that they entail for managing exploitation and exploration across all platforms.

REFERENCES

Achtenhagen, L. & Raviola, E. (2009). Balancing Tensions During Convergence: Duality Management in a Newspaper Company. *The International Journal on Media Management*, 11, 32–41.

Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2009). Exploitation-Exploration Tensions and Organizational Ambidexterity: Managing Paradoxes of Innovation. *Organization Science, 20(4),* 696-717.

Birkinshaw, J., & Gibson, C. (2004). Building Ambidexterity Into an Organization, *Sloan Management Review, 45(4),* 47-55.

Carter, C., Clegg, S., & Kornberger, M. (2008). Strategy as practice? *Strategic Organization, 6,* 83-99.

Chan-Olmsted, S. (2006). *Competitive Strategy for Media Firms*: *Strategic and Brand Management in Changing Media Markets*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chia, R., & MacKay B. (2005). Post-processual challenges for the emerging strategy-as-practice perspective: Discovering strategy in the logic of practice. *Human Relations, 60,* 217-242.

Clegg, S., Kornberger, M., & Pitsis, T. (2005). *Managing and Organizations, An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.

Deuze, M. (2011). Managing Media Work. In M. Deuze (Ed.), *Managing Media Work* (pp. 1–10). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dubois, A., & Gadde, L.-E. 2002. Systematic combining: an abductive approach to case research. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(7): 553-560.

Duncan, R. B. (1976). The ambidextrous organization: Designing dual structures for innovation. In R. H. Kilmann, L. R. Pondy, & D. Slevin (Eds.), *The management of organization design: Strategies and implementation* (pp. 167–188). New York: North Holland.

Dupagne, M., & Garrison, B. (2006). The Meaning and Influence of Convergence. *Journalism Studies, 7(2),* 237 -55.

Ellonen, H-K., Kuivalainen, O., & Tarkiainen, A. (2008). *Internet, brändi ja aikakauslehdet.* Technology Business Research Center, Lappeenranta University of Technology.

Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal, 47,* 209–226.

Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1993). Strategy as stretch and leverage. *Harvard Business Review, 71,* 75-84.

Hartmann, M. (2009). The Changing Urban Landscapes of Media Consumption and Production. *European Journal of Communication, 24(4),* 421-36.

Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J., & Seidl, D. (2007). Strategizing: The challenges of a practice perspective. *Human Relations, 60,* 5-27.

Jenkins, H. (2004). The cultural logic of media convergence. *International Journal of Cultural Studies, 7(1),* 33-43.

Johansson, A., Ellonen, H-K. & Jantunen, A. (2012). Magazine publishers embracing new media: Exploring their capabilities and decision making logic. *Journal of Media Business Studies,* 9(2), 97-114.

Johnson, G., Langley, A., Melin, L., & Whittington, R. (2007). *Strategy as practice, Research Directions and Resources.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Küng, L. (2007). Does Media Management Matter? Establishing the Scope, Rationale and Future Research Agenda for the Discipline. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 4(1), 21-39.

Küng, L. (2008). *Strategic Management in the Media: Theory to Practice*. London: Sage.

Laine, P-M. & Vaara, E. (2007), Struggling over subjectivity: A discursive analysis of strategic development in an engineering group, *Human Relations*, *60(1):* 29-58

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers.* London, Taistock.

Meckel, M., & Fieseler, J. C. (2012). Journalistic Skillsets in the Age of Data-Driven Journalism. In 2012 International Communication Association Conference, Phoenix, AZ, 24-28 May 2012.

Meyer, C. B., & Stensaker, I. G. (2006). Developing capacity for change. *Journal of Change Management*, *6(2),* 217-231.

Mierzejewska, B. I. (2011). Media Management in Theory and Practice. In M. Deuze (Ed.), *Managing Media Work* (pp. 13–30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moisander, J. & Stenfors, S. (2009) Exploring the edges of theory-practice gap: epistemic cultures in strategy-tool development and use. *Organization, 16(2):* 227–247.

Moisander, J. & Valtonen, S. (2006). *Qualitative Marketing Research: A Cultural Approach.* London: Sage Publications.

Mom, T. J. M., van den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2007). Investigating managers' exploration and exploitation activities: The influence of top-down, bottom-up, and horizontal knowledge inflows. *Journal of Management Studies*, *44(6),* 910-931.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behaviour, 28*, 185–206.

O'Reilly III, C.A., & Tushman, M.L. (2004). The Ambidextrous Organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 74-81.

Ostertag, S. F., & Tuchman, G. (2012). When Innovation Meets Legacy. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6), 909–931.

Paroutis, S., Heracleous, L. & Angwin, D. (2013). Practicing strategy. Text and cases. London: Sage.

Picard, R. (2005). Unique Characteristics and Business Dynamics of Media Products. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 2(2), 61-69.

Rasche, A. & Chia, R. (2009), Researching Strategy Practices: A Genealogical Social Theory Perspective, *Organization Studies*, 30 (7): 713-734

Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw J. (2008). Organizational Ambidexterity: Antecedents, Outcomes, and Moderators. *Journal of Management, 34*, 375-409.

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a Theory of Social Practices, A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *5(2),* 243-263.

Schatzki, Theodore R., Karin Knorr Cetina, and Elke von Savigny, eds. (2001), *The Practice Turn in Contemporay Theory*, London and New York: Routledge.

Stake, Robert E. (2003). Case Studies. In Norman K. Dentzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 134-164). London: Sage.

Stipp, H. (2012). The Branding of Television Networks: Lessons From Branding Strategies in the U.S. Market. *International Journal on Media Management, 14(2),* 107–119.

Sylvie, G. & Schmitz Weiss, A. (2012). Putting the Management into Innovation & Media Management Studies: A Meta-Analysis. *The International Journal on Media Management*, 14, 183–206.

Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On Organizational Becoming: Rethinking Organizational Change. *Organization Science*, *13(5),* 567-582.

Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *California Management Review, 38(4),* 8–30.Van de Ven, A.H., & Poole, M.S. (1995). Explaining Development and Change in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 20(3),* 510-540.

Weick, K.E., & Quinn, R.E. (1999). Organizational Change and Development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50,* 61-386.

Whittington, R. (2007). Strategy Practice and Strategy Process: Family Differences and the Sociological Eye. *Organization Studies*, *28(10),* 1575–86.

Wikström, P. & Ellonen, H-K. (2012). The impact of social media features on print media firm's online business models. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 9(3), 63-80.