Critical discussion on dialogic engagement and various researcher positions in research concerning co-creation and co-production

Ann Starbæk Bager

PhD, Associate Professor in Organizational and Leadership Studies at the Department of Design and Communication, University of Southern Denmark. She is currently heading a research project in close collaboration with diverse organizations and co-coordinating an international research community centring on translating communicative constitutive and discourse perspectives into practice.

Lone Hersted

PhD, Associate Professor, and head of the research group POLO (Processes and Learning in Organizations) at the Department of Culture and Learning, Aalborg University. Her research is concerned with sustainable leadership, relational leading, leadership development, organizational learning, action research, co-creation, and dialogical and innovative processes for learning and change.

Ottar Ness

PhD, Professor of Counselling at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. His research interests include wellbeing and social sustainability. Particularly, Dr Ness focuses on relational welfare, citizenship, mattering and social justice, recovery in mental health, and leadership and innovation in the public sector related to new public governance.

Abstract

In this article, we introduce volume two of our themed issue on co-creation and co-production and discuss various basic assumptions related to collaborative research. In collaborative studies in general, dialogue is often highlighted as an important process element with important implications for empowerment for those involved. However, the underlying understandings and implications of dialogic practice are seldom examined in depth. We raise a critical reflexive

discussion on different approaches to dialogic engagement and present four high-level discourses guiding organizational scholarship to discuss crucial differences and similarities. Moreover, we outline seven researcher ideal types that reflect diverse degrees of dialogic engagement. Our aspiration is to provide useful insights, models, and questions that can guide participatory scholars in fostering critical awareness of their own position and the sometimes taken-for-granted assumptions guiding their studies.

Keywords: co-production, co-creation, collaborative research, dialogue, critical reflexivity

Introduction

Collaborative research approaches involving participatory aspects such as co-creation and co-production have increased in popularity both in academia and within a wide variety of professional contexts. This trend entails activating participatory ideals and methods throughout most public and private sectors as well as within our civil societies, especially in a Nordic context (Bager, Hersted, and Ness 2021). These participatory and collaborative ideals often promise to strengthen a wide variety of tasks and problem solving in various contexts, such as the development of new welfare solutions, services, products, and production forms. They may even promise to enhance the dominant sustainability and 'green solutions' agenda and contribute to innovate ways of organizing our society and forms of production and consumption (Bradbury et al. 2019). They are often highlighted as contributing to the development of solutions to 'wicked problems' (Ansell and Torfing 2021; Andersen et al. 2017) on a larger, global scale that call for complex, interdisciplinary, and polyvocal efforts. The collaborative ideals also tend to promise that various people are involved and given a voice through co-creative processes. Hence, such research promises to heighten polyvocality and democratic engagement, thereby transforming power dynamics and relations among those involved. Therefore, participation and collaboration through dialogic engagement has become a hegemonic discourse in most social arenas in contemporary society (Bager 2013; Bager, Jørgensen, and Raudaskoski 2016).

When we planned this issue on co-creation and co-production, we sought to gain insight into the interdisciplinary diversity and width characterizing collaborative studies. We also wished to address complexities and the immanent paradoxes and ethical concerns attached to collaborative research practices. As the call prompted many high-quality contributions that address such diversities and complexities in many ways, we ended up with two volumes. On this note, we thank all the authors for their inspiring and intriguing contributions and the blind peer reviewers for contributing their critical and knowledgeable feedback.

In volume one, we emphasize theoretical and conceptual discussions, and the articles display discussions on the often contradictory political and scientific conditions attached to various collaborative studies. Furthermore, several contributions spotlight how situated contextual conditions are based in contradictory management paradigms and reified institutionalized practices, thereby complicating participatory aspirations in several ways.

In this second volume, we focus on empirically based initiatives and projects involving co-production and co-creation. Here, the articles showcase empirical examples of how such participatory efforts tap into many different normative positions. They further illuminate how there is no common definition or consensus regarding what co-production and co-creation mean and signify in practice.

In the wake of the relevant and critical discussions raised in both volumes, we raise a critical reflexive discussion regarding varied collaborative researcher positions and the dialogic ideals and normative hopes guiding them. Such ideals and hopes are difficult to oppose, as they tend to promise a range of positive effects such as more symmetrical dialogic encounters and mutual supportive collaborations across different stakeholder groups. They further promise empowerment of voices that are often overlooked or silenced and to shift power imbalances (Phillips 2011; Bager and Mølholm 2020; Beresford 2021). However, the articles in both volumes illustrate how attempts to reach these ideals and outcomes are not as streamlined as they may seem. In practice, these processes are often messy and filled with tensions, paradoxes, and power struggles. We argue it is important that participatory scholars consider such messiness and complexity, and we hope to inspire critical reflexivity re-

garding the assumptions guiding their specific studies as well as the attached implications for practice and for the people involved.

Dialogic engagement is often highlighted as one of the most important elements in participatory processes; thus, we begin by reflecting on critical perspectives on dialogic engagement, followed by an examination of four dominant dialogic positions and discourses guiding organizational studies and their diverse implications for practice. Second, we take a meta-view and outline seven researcher ideal types involving various degrees of participant involvement. Third, we discuss the importance of relational and dialogic capabilities as the overall, and maybe most critical, element for scholars engaging in collaborative research and point toward future research avenues. Finally, we briefly present the fourteen intriguing contributions comprising this volume.

Critical discussion regarding dialogic engagement

In literature concerning collaborative research, dialogical engagement is often highlighted as a promising ideal as well as an important processual marker characterizing successful participatory processes, e.g., action research (Bradbury 2015; Hersted, Ness, and Frimann 2019), dialogic governance studies (Bartels 2015), dialogic organizational development studies (Bushe and Marshak 2015), and many more. However, researchers tend to draw on a variety of dialogic conceptualizations with different implications for practice. Therefore, we encourage researchers to critically reflect on and discuss the specific notion of dialogue they draw on in their research as this will inevitably have practical implications for their research and the practices and participants involved.

Over time, scholars from diverse research fields have critically discussed the implications of various dialogic approaches. For instance, some action researchers have de-romanticized the promise of dialogue, highlighting that many participatory researchers enact dialogic practices without critical reflexivity and with a lack of thorough theorization (Phillips 2011; Bager 2013; Phillips et al. 2018). Some scholars argue that facilitating dialogic processes can be an enactment of power; here, the dialogic engagement can vary from minimum to maximum degrees of participation and have diverse implications for the people involved (Kristiansen and Bloch-Poulsen 2011, 2013). These scholars critically discuss what the prefix 'co'

signifies in the manifold participatory research agendas associated with a series of different yet related terms to cover a 'jungle of co-dimensions' (Phillips and Napan 2016; Heimburg, Ness, and Storch 2021). They further invite critical reflexivity and examination of the enactment of concrete dialogic practices to reflect such consequences. On the same note, scholars in critical management and/or organizational discourse studies (e.g., Bager 2013; Bager and Mølholm 2020) point to the need for dialogic scholars to be critically reflexive and transparent regarding the discourses that guide their specific studies and their inbuilt ideological assumptions and aspirations. The aim is to avoid the pitfall of the 'emancipatory paradox' (Clegg, Courpasson, and Phillips 2006; Bager and Mølhom 2020), referring to how some dialogic organizational scholars uncritically replace one regime of truth with another. Another similar aim is to avoid the 'participatory paradox' (Kristiansen and Bloch-Poulsen 2013), which describes how some participatory scholars impose their own understandings and ideals on the participants. However, it is important to consider that a collaborative and dialogic discourse also represents one regime of truth among others that place some participants in certain power relations at the expense of others (Bager and Mølholm 2020). All in all, such perspectives invite participatory scholars to engage in critical reflexivity and foster transparency regarding their own ideals with the aspiration to avoid enacting participatory conformity.

Diverse dialogic positions and discourses

At least four main positions on dialogue can be detected in the 21st century: *functionalist*, *liberal humanistic*, *critical hermeneutic*, and *postmodern*.

The functionalist perspective is seen in the work of physicist Bohm (1996), who perceives dialogue as a *particular* communication type or mode acquired for solving problems in specially designed dialogic spaces following pre-set principles that are disconnected from everyday organizational practices. Here, dialogue is painted as a unique communicational activity and as a certain skill/tool that can be acquired and activated when change is desired. Bohmian dialogue has commonly been used to cultivate second-order learning, as can be seen in Senge's writings (Barge and Little 2002; Bager 2013).

The liberal humanistic position often builds on thoughts of Maslow (1972) and Rogers (1980) (Deetz and Simpson 2004; Bager and Mølhom 2020). Scholars within this position often rely on the presumptions of internally located meanings recovered through enacting concepts such as *empathy* and *active listening* and through principles of how to perform the most appropriate helper–client relations to uncover hidden resources in the client. Such processes are often described through the metaphor of a *gold-digger* (Kristiansen and Bloch-Poulsen 2000) and/or a *midwife* who nurtures the client to give birth to insights derived from the client's essence or womb (e.g., Alrø 1996). The term 'liberal' refers to the trust in the individuals' capabilities to actualize their own hidden inner resources through client-centred therapy.

The critical hermeneutic position is found in works of Gadamer (1983) and Habermas (1987); rather than focusing on psychological individuals as the locus of meaning production and negotiation, they shift emphasis away from private internal meanings toward interaction between people. This perspective adds a decision-making component to dialogue. However, this position has been criticized for its over-reliance on a rational model of civic engagement and deliberation (Deetz and Simpson 2004).

The postmodern position on dialogue has emerged from poststructuralist perspectives in works such as Foucault (1970), Derrida (1973), Bakhtin (1981), and Levinas (1987). These poststructuralist approaches turn away from digging out internally located meanings and the quest for neat, unitary, and streamlined identities and cultures, as found in the liberal humanistic approaches. Instead, they point toward an understanding of cultures and identities as being intrinsically in flux and characterized by ambiguity, dissent, conflict, and tensions (Deetz 2001; Deetz and Simpson 2004; Bager 2013).

We could have discussed several other central perspectives on dialogue such as Socratic humanistic-based dialogue (Gose 2009), Buberian dialogue (Buber 1970) that represents an existentialist intersubjective contemplative approach, or Paolo Freire's (1970) emancipatory approach to dialogue. However, in this article we have chosen to highlight four positions on dialogue adequate for discussing some overall tendencies in contemporary society.

For instance, the liberal humanistic position tends to be dominant throughout our educational system as well as within business

theory and practice (Deetz and Simpson 2004). Consequently, these mainstream dialogues promote a tendency to fixate on the goal of achieving common ground (Bager 2013; Deetz and Simpson, 2004; Phillips 2011). Moreover, such perspectives tend to place the responsibility for dysfunctions on the individual and not on the source or emergence of the problem – that is, the collective social interactions embedded in conflictual, competitive, and power-laden organizational settings (Bager 2013).

One crucial difference between the functionalist, humanistic, critical hermeneutic, and postmodern positions are that the former two are consensus-oriented and the latter two are dissensus-oriented. To qualify this discussion and provide more precision regarding differences between diverse positions on dialogue and the basic assumptions guiding them, we draw on Deetz's (2001) four discourses of organizational communication scholarship: *normative*, *interpretative*, *critical*, and *dialogic*. We argue these four discourses guide both organizational and participatory scholars in their positioning activities and foster critical reflexivity regarding own research position and its differences and similarities against other positions (Bager and McClellan, in press). To fit the aim of this discussion, Table 1 below is condensed and modified from the original and more detailed table provided by Bager and McClellan (in press). This version highlights the differences between the four discourses (top row) according to the following aspects: orientation to established orders, notion of communication, leadership motives and goals, understanding of the employees / participants, perception of dialogue, change, and frequently used models (left column).

Common to the interpretative and normative studies is their belief in organizational consensus and harmony together with their quest to obtain shared meanings and unified cultures. Here, conflicts and differing meanings and values are often treated as organizational errors to be fixed or overcome to reinstate organizational states of consensus and common ground (Deetz 2001; Bager and McClellan, in press). Such consensus-oriented perspectives are foregrounded to be hegemonic in mainstream organizational theory and practice; they have specific and complexity-reducing consequences (Vasquez and Kuhn 2019; Bager and McClellan, in press). However, these approaches to organizational dialogic practice are highlighted as inadequate to acknowledge and handle organi-

academic
quarter
AAU
akademisk **kvarter**
research from the humanities

Critical discussion on dialogic engagement and various researcher ...
Ann Starbæk Bager
Lone Hersted
Ottar Ness

Discourse	Normative	Interpretive	Critical	Dialogic
Orientation to established social orders	Consensus and unification, unified cultures	Consensus and unification, unified cultures	Dissensus and pluralism	Dissensus and pluralism
Notion of communication	Linear, instrumental, universal, communication as transmission	Communication as interpretive processes that show unification in subcultures	Communication as a process that embeds and reproduces dominance/power	Communication as a co-creative process that creates knowledge, identities, and organization
Leadership motives and goal	Strategic control by striving for regular relations between objects, establishment, and maintenance of unified cultures	Strategic control by fostering visibility and internalization of unified cultures	Collaborative joint decisions to reveal dominance and create more open consensus	Collaborative joint decisions to cultivate dissensus and pluralism as a source of creativity
Views on conflict and opposing interests	Conflicts and inconsistencies are seen as system errors that are eliminated so that organizational order can be re-established	Conflicts and disagreements are seen as inconsistent values or goals that should be overcome so that organizational order can be re-established	Conflicts and conflicting interests are premises that must be uncovered with a liberating aim	Conflicts and conflicting interests are premises that can give rise to creativity and new polyphonic practices
Understanding of the employees/participants	Rational objects that can be controlled and determined mechanically	As active interpretive subjects and opinion-makers; interested in the authentic person, who is often reflected as having an inner core that can be redeemed and realized; focus on inner life and essence	Oppressed by norm systems and power structures; need expert help to free themselves	Co-producers of knowledge and organizing; active reflective subjects who should be involved in reflective dialogue about differences of interest and conflicts to create more polyphonic/egalitarian practices
Perceptions of dialogue	Normative dialogic techniques applied to solve problems in rational systems among rational employees/participants to secure and maintain order and unified cultures (e.g., Bohmian dialogue)	Interpretative dialogic conceptualizations often applied to dig out the hidden and internal resources within the employees/participants to help secure and maintain order and unified cultures (e.g., liberal humanistic approaches)	Critical dialogic models applied to uncover and overcome the hidden ideological discourse within organizational communicative acts to free employees/participants from domination when striving for power-free spaces (e.g., Habermasian dialogue)	Plurivocal dialogic models framing dialogue as a way of being in the world forming a fundamental participatory worldview; applied to identify the discourses and construct new plurivocal meanings and cultures through co-creative processes (e.g., Bakhtinian dialogism)
Perceptions of change	Change as episodic that can be managed to create streamlined and unified cultures	Change as continuous and emergent in social interactions; often enacted with some degree of employee/participant involvement to create unified cultures	Change as episodic and as an outcome of power relations; change often viewed as a result of, or controlled by, those 'in power'	Change as continuous and as the basis for organizing; change as happening in dynamics between stability and fluidity. Such tensions should be embraced through a high degree of employee/participant involvement.
Frequently used models and tools	Quantitative measurements and evaluations; linear and static 7- or 10-step models; universal models	Observations over a longer period; interpretive conversations (interviews) with the employees/participants being studied; models/theories adapted to the context	Observes from a critical distance through categories and assumptions about power and dominance	Locally produced approaches and theories; communication is considered, analyzed, and presented to organizational actors. Sometimes, employees/participants are involved in the analysis of own communicative practice in an immanent quest to foster reflexivity and change.

Table 1: Four discourses on organizational communication scholarship and their similarities and differences according to various organizational aspects

zational dissent, messiness, conflicts, and paradoxes that are recognized within the critical and dialogic discourses as integral parts of organizational life and fragmented cultures. Here, conflicts, differences in meaning, paradoxes, and dilemmas are framed as organizational premises that we can study and learn from (e.g., Deetz 2001; Bager and McClellan, in press).

Our main point is that the discourses and their attached dialogic positions and ideals represent various normative hopes prompting different implications for practice and for the participants involved. For instance, there are crucial differences between how the employees/participants are framed and approached (highlighted in Row 6, Table 1). It matters whether the participants are framed as rational objects that can be controlled and determined mechanically (as within normative discourse) or as active reflexive subjects who should be involved in reflexive dialogue about differences of interest and conflicts to create more polyphonic/egalitarian practices (as seen in dialogic discourse). These conceptual differences have important consequences for practice, for how dialogic processes are designed and conducted, and for knowledge production, all of which are crucial to discuss. Following this train of thought, we sketch seven researcher ideal types to further discuss various degrees of participation and researcher–participant relationships.

Seven researcher ideal types

In the literature concerning co-creation and co-production, Arnstein's (1969) ladder of citizen participation is an established typology comprising a conceptual way of differing between various degrees of citizen involvement. However, the literature seldomly address diverse researcher types and their consequences. Table 2 comprises a list of seven preliminary researcher ideal types based on our own experience as participatory researchers and years of teaching and supervising master and PhD students engaging in participatory projects for knowledge-building. The seven types are shown in Table 2 below (top row) and are reflected against the following elements: researcher position, foundation of the knowledge produced, relational interface, and degree of dialogic engagement (left column).

Researcher type	1: Researcher as theoretician / philosopher (e.g., discussing and writing about co-creation / co-production from a theoretical / philosophical position)	2: Researcher as analytical observer from the side-line (e.g., observing and analyzing "the object" from a distance)	3: Researcher as qualitative interviewer	4: Researcher as trainer or supervisor (e.g., supporting competence development among practitioners working with co-creation / co-production in practice)	5: Researcher as co-designer of the co-creative processes	6: Researcher as facilitator of the co-creative process (e.g., through action research, action learning, or related inquiries)	7: Researcher as participant on an equal basis as the co-researchers (e.g., through action research, action learning, or related inquiries)
Researcher positioning relative to participants	Expert	Expert	Expert or non-expert depending on the used qualitative interview approaches	Expert or non-expert	Expert or non-expert	Non-expert	Non-expert
Foundation of the knowledge produced	Mainly theoretical	Both theoretical and based on data-analysis	Based on engagement in practice	Mainly theoretical + eventually based on engagement in practice	Based on engagement in practice combined with relevant theoretical insights	Based on engagement in practice combined with relevant theoretical insights	Based on engagement in practice combined with relevant theoretical insights
Relational interface	Mainly reading other scholars' work	Practitioners and citizens	Practitioners and citizens	Practitioners and citizens	Practitioners and citizens	Practitioners and citizens	Practitioners and citizens
Degree of dialogic engagement	Low	Low	Medium	High	Low / medium / high	Medium / high	High

Table 2: Seven researcher ideal types and their different degrees of dialogic engagement

Table 2 is tentative, and there are most likely more types of researcher ideal types to define. In addition, research projects are often complex and messy, and the researcher may oscillate between various positionings throughout the same project. So, these ideal types are not static categories but should be seen as dynamic and changeable. We find that all seven positions require superior analytical and intellectual skills; however, we argue that there are significant differences in the degree of dialogic engagement that are crucial to be considered in order to foster reflexivity and transparency regarding the researcher–participant relationship as well as the basis of the knowledge produced.

In our experience, most researchers are trained to enact the positions described in types 1–3, whereas relatively few are trained in types 4–7. What characterizes the latter is that they usually require a high degree of dialogic and relational engagement – these positions may challenge the more expert-oriented positions (types 1–3). Below, we spotlight how dialogic engagement can be seen as relational capacity-building that is sensitive to everyday ethics.

Collaborative research as capacity-building

Collaborative research can be framed as dialogic processes of relational capacity-building. Capacity-building in this regard is defined as activities that strengthen the relationships, knowledge, capabilities, and resources of œindividual communities and that improve institutional and social structures and processes so that organizations and communities can meet their goals in sustainable ways (Brix, Krogstrup, and Mortensen 2020; Ness and Heimburg 2020). Desai et al. (2019) argue that such participatory studies can bridge the divide between science and community. Community input and participation, including those community members with direct experience of the topic being studied, are highly valued and embraced as an important feature of knowledge co-construction, which can transform the wider society and benefit the community around it (Desai et al. 2019). Thus, participatory research focuses on co-construction *with*, not *about* or *on*, people (Shotter 2008; Bradbury 2015). In such participatory and dialogical research, it is important to consider the ways of conceptualizing ethical issues in terms of an approach that Banks et al. (2013) call 'everyday ethics'. This emphasizes the situated nature of ethics, with a focus on the qualities of character and the responsibilities attached to particular researcher–participant relationships (as opposed to the articulation and implementation of abstract principles and rules). Everyday ethics is the daily practice of negotiating the ethical challenges that arise through the life of collaborative research. Thus, the 'ethical' is present in our ways of relating to each other, in our ways of being and acting as well in our emotions and conduct (Ness and Heimburg 2020). The key qualities of a participatory researcher include ethical sensitivity (the capacity to see the ethically salient features of situations) and a relational virtue such as trustworthiness (reliability and not disappointing others) (Banks et al. 2013; Ness and Heimburg 2020). This

is related to Swim et al's. (2001) 'process ethics' and McNamee and Gergen´s (1999) term 'relational responsibility'.

Concluding remarks and presentation of the fourteen articles

In sum, we have discussed crucial elements concerning participatory studies and provided several perspectives to encourage and potentially guide scholars in fostering critical awareness and transparency regarding the basic assumptions, normative hopes, and ideals guiding their studies. Our main interest is to spotlight the diversity of dialogic engagement and draw attention to how the dialogic conceptualizations and the discourses guiding them have highly different implications for participatory research designs, the knowledge produced, and the practices and the participants involved. Based on these discussions, we find it critical to recognize that diverse dialogic enactments have crucial effects on power-(im)balances and the (dis)empowerment of the people involved and our social worlds. Moreover, dialogic encounters and relational capacity-building can span a wide continuum ranging from minimum degrees of participation to maximum degrees of participation – sometimes, they even occur in rather monologic forms, as seen in the normative discourse (Column 2, Table 1) and researcher ideal types 1–3 (Columns 2–4, Table 2). Here, the participants are invited into dialogic spaces and may be given a voice, but we question whether they have choice and the opportunity to influence the process, outcomes, and specific social arenas affecting employees in an organization or citizens in a community project or other contexts. As Barge and Little (2002) posited, many so-called organizational dialogic spaces are evidence of monologic participation. Here, people are invited to qualify already-had discussions that are often pre-set by management rather than given the possibility of influencing the process conditions or outputs. We welcome more research that examines the relation between specific participatory aspirations and its implications for diverse situated dialogic encounters and contexts, and we hope that we have provided meaningful perspectives that are useful to participatory scholars.

As already mentioned, the other fourteen articles comprising this volume in various ways demonstrate practice and empirically based examples from research projects involving co-production and co-

creation. We find that they all provide important thought-provoking and learning encouraging discussions regarding some of the dilemmas, challenges and ethical concerns arising in the various collaborative research practices across multiple contexts. What characterizes all the contributions is, one the one hand, a normative hope and appreciation of collaborative research and, on the other, a critical awareness of the complexities, messiness, and power-struggles that inevitably come with collaborative research processes. We are pleased to shortly present the fourteen intriguing articles that in our opinion provide critical and important perspectives in relation to collaborative and participatory research:

The article 'Du greier det ikke alene – samskaping krever komplementære kompetanser' ('You can't make it alone – co-creation requires complementary competences') written by Bjørnerud and Krane deals with competence development in relation to an action research-based study involving co-creative processes with vulnerable citizens in a Norwegian welfare context.

Kobros's article 'Gjensidig støtte som forberedelse før samskaping med sårbare familier' ('Mutual support as preparation before co-creation with vulnerable families') is based on an action learning project concerning preparations for dialogue between public service receivers and social workers in the context of a public social housing support program in Norway.

'Patientinvolvering og patientaktivisme i medicinsk forskning – om autoritet, kredibilitet og forudsætninger for samskabelse' ('Patient involvement and patient activism in medicinal research – about authority, credibility, and prerequisites for co-creation') by Holen and Strand centres on patient activism in Denmark. The authors discuss how patients can act as activists and experts in their own right, initiate or transform research agendas and research networks, and even take the lead in the knowledge-production process.

Stage's article 'Business as usual? – Inequalities in patient and public involvement in health research' concerns co-creation in Danish healthcare research. It focuses on the risks of reproducing disparities in healthcare through the process of knowledge co-creation.

'At lykkes i fællesskabet – aktionsforskning som ramme for udvikling af samskabende ledelse' ('Succeeding in collaboration – action research as a frame for the development of co-creative leader-

ship') by Frimann, Hersted, and Søbye emphasizes the potential of action research to develop co-creative leadership in organizations.

Gulstad's article 'Det oversete samskabelsesfelt i den digitale branche' ('The overlooked co-creative field in the tech industry') spotlights how research attuning to co-creation or co-production tends to overlook important experiences and learning potentials obtained among workers in the tech industry (e.g., from specialized social media platforms like Dribble and GitHub). It also discusses what organizations can learn from such digital co-creative practices.

In 'Frontmedarbejdere som professionelle samskabere - dilemmaer og udfordringer i praksis' ('Frontline employees as professional co-producers - dilemmas and challenges in practice'), Mortensen uses three case studies to examine the dilemmas and pressures that professional co-producers in municipal settings experience whilst implementing co-production processes.

In the article 'Key factors in facilitating collaborative research with children - a self-determination approach', Olsen, Stenseng, and Kvello conduct a thematic analysis on interviews with adolescent girls who were involved in a participatory research project in Norway focusing on empowerment in educational support services. From the analysis, they pinpoint important process elements when facilitating co-creative processes with adolescents and discuss inbuilt challenges.

From a Goffmanian perspective, in 'Samskabelse mellem frontmedarbejdere og udsatte grupper – er nye roller i socialt arbejde muligt?' ('Co-creation between frontline professionals and marginalized groups - are new roles in social work possible?'), Müller and Stougaard explore how citizens are offered new roles as co-creators and discuss how this can help in overcoming the barriers of how co-creation can reach a transformative value.

In 'Ledelsesudvikling i et samskabende aktionsforskningsprojekt - etiske opmærksomhedspunkter som intern aktionsforsker' ('Leadership development in a co-creating action research project - ethical points of awareness as an internal action researcher'), Munch discusses co-creation inspired by narrative inquiries within the frame of action research with the aim of creating leadership development in a Danish public institution for adults with developmental disabilities.

Johansen's article 'Mellem nærhed og specialisering - en samskabt kritisk refleksiv analyse af dialog og magt i lægers tværsektorielle samarbejder om tidlig diagnostik' ('Between proximity and specialization - a co-created critical reflexive analysis of dialogue and power in physicians' cross-sectoral collaborations on early diagnosis') uses ethnographic co-creation as a method to examine doctors and other practitioners cross-sectoral collaboration on early diagnostics from a clinical everyday life perspective.

Seeberg and Holmboe's article 'Recovery, kapabilitet og relationel velfærd' ('Recovery, capabilities, and relational welfare') discusses what happens when people with mental health problems are invited to co-construct knowledge, practices, and policies for the sake of the 'the common good'.

Lystbæk addresses some of the tensions inherent in co-creation in terms of what is being created and who is participating in 'Samskabelse på biblioteker - positioner og perspektiver' ('Co-creation in libraries - positionings and perspectives'). The author suggests that facilitating co-creation requires an on-going attention to creating a good balance between what is being created and who is participating.

Ottesen's article 'Dialogisk aktionsforskning med samskabende processer om hvordan sang og musik kan integreres i kulturen og hverdagslivet på plejehjem' ('Dialogical action research with co-creative processes on how songs and music can be integrated into culture and everyday life in nursing homes') draws on action research to address what co-creation can be like, how it can take place and what it can contribute to in nursing homes.

References

Alrø, Helle. 1996. *Organisationsudvikling gennem dialog*. Aalborg. Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35 (4): 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225.

Bager, Ann Starbæk. 2013. "Dialogue on Dialogues: Multi-Voiced Dialogues (Dialogism) as Means for the Co-Production of Knowledge in and on Leadership Communicative Practices."

Academic Quarter 6 (juni): 146–159. https://doi.org/10.5278/ojs.academicquarter.v0i6.2858

Bager, Ann Starbæk, Lone Hersted, and Ottar Ness. 2021. "Co-Production and Co-Creation: Critical Examination of Contemporary Dominant Participatory Discourses." In a themed issue on *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Perspectives, Forms of Practice, and Contexts*, edited by Hersted, Lone, Ann Starbæk Bager, and Ottar Ness. *Academic Quarter* (23): 4–20. https://doi.org/10.5278/academicquarter.vi23.7042

Bager, Ann Starbæk, and John McClellan. In press. "Leadership and Organizational Small Storymaking: Inviting Employee Engagement and Engendering Open and Sustainable Workplaces." Accepted for the *World Scientific Encyclopedia on Business Storytelling and Sustainability*, edited by David Boje and Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen.

Bager, Ann Starbæk, Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen, and Pirkko Raudaskoski. 2016. "Dialogue and Governmentality-in-Action." In *Studies of Discourse and Governmentality: New Perspectives and Methods*, edited by McIlvenny, Paul Bruce, Julia Z. Klausen, and Laura Lindegaard, 209–234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bager, Ann Starbæk, and Martin Mølholm. 2020. "A Methodological Framework for Organizational Discourse Activism: An Ethics of Dispositif and Dialogue." *Philosophy of Management* 19 (1): 99–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40926-019-00124-x

Banks, Sarah, Adrea Armstrong, Kathleen Carter, Helen Graham, Peter Hayward, Alex Henry, Tessa Holland, Claire Holmes, Amelia Lee, Ann McNulty, Niamh Moore, Nigel Nayling, Ann Stokoe and Aileen Strachan. 2013. Everyday Ethics in Community-based Participatory Research. *Contemporary Social Science*, 8 (3): 263–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2013.769618

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogical Imagination*. Edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Barge, Kevin J., and Martin Little. 2002. "Dialogical Wisdom, Communicative Practice, and Organizational Life." *Communication Theory* 12 (4): 375–397. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/12.4.375

Bartels, Koen P.R. 2015. *Communicative Capacity: Public Encounters in Participatory Theory and Practice.* Bristol University Press.

Beresford, Peter. 2021. *Participatory Ideology: From Exclusion to Involvement*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bohm, David. 1996. *On Dialogue*. Edited by Lee Nichol. London: Routledge.

Bradbury, Hilary, ed. 2015. *The Sage Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Bradbury, Hilary, Steve Waddell, Karen O'Brien, Marina Apgar, Ben Teehankee, and Ioan Fazey. 2019. "A call to Action Research for Transformations: The times demand it." *Action Research*, 17 (1), 3-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750319829633

Brix, Jacob, Kathrine Hanne Krogstrup and Nanna Møller Mortensen. 2020. "Evaluating the Outcomes of Co-Production in Local Government." *Local Government Studies* 46 (2): 169–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2019.1702530

Buber, Martin. 1970. *I and Thou*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Charles Schribner's Sons.

Bushe, Gervase R., and Robert J. Marshak, eds. 2015. *Dialogic Organizational Development*. Berrett- Koehler Publisher.

Clegg, Stewart R., David Courpasson, and Nelson Phillips. 2006. *Power and Organizations*. London: Sage.

Deetz, Stanley. 2001. "Conceptual Foundations." In *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication. Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods*, edited by Jablin, Friedric, and Linda Putnam: 3–46. London: Sage.

Deetz, Stanley, and Jennifer Simpson. 2004. "Critical Organizational Dialogue: Open Formation and the Demand of 'Otherness'." In *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, edited by Anderson, Rob, Leslie A. Baxter, and Kenneth N. Cissna: 141–158. London: Sage.

Derrida, Jacques. 1973. *Speech and Phenomena, and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs.* Northwestern University Press.

Desai, Miraj, Chyrell Bellamy, Kimberly Guy, Mark Costa, Maria J. O'Connell, and Larry Davidson. 2019. "'If You Want to Know About the Book, Ask the Author': Enhancing Community Engagement Through Participatory Research in Clinical Mental Health Settings." *Behavioral Medicine* 45 (2): 177–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/08964289.2019.1587589

Foucault, Michel. 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Translated by A. Sheriden. New York: Pantheon.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1983. *Dialogue and Dialectic: Eight Hermeneutical Studies on Plato*. Yale University Press.

Gergen, Kenneth J.. and Sheila McNamee, eds. 1999. *Relational Responsibility*. London: Sage

Gose, Michael. 2009. "When Socratic Dialogue is Flagging: Questions and Strategies or Engaging Students." *College Teaching* 57 (1): 45–50. https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.57.1.45-50

Habermas, Jürgen. 1987. *The Theory of Communication Action: Vol. 2 Lifeworld and System*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Heimburg, Dina von, Ottar Ness, and Jacob Storch. 2021. "Co-creation of Public Values: Citizenship, Social Justice and Well-being." In *Processual Perspectives on the Co-Production Turn in Public Sector Organizations*, edited by Anja Overgaard Thomassen and Julie Borup Jensen, 20–41. Hershey, Pennsylvania: IGI Global.

Hersted, Lone, Ottar Ness, and Søren Frimann. 2019. *Action Research in a Relational Perspective: Dialogue, Reflexivity, Power and Ethics.* London and New York: Routledge.

Kristiansen, Marianne, and Jørgen Bloch-Poulsen. 2000. *Kærlig rummelighed i dialoger*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Kristiansen, Marianne, and Jørgen Bloch-Poulsen. 2011. "Participation as Enactment of Power in Dialogic Organisational Action Research. Reflections on Conflicting Interests and Actionability." *International Journal of Action Research* 7 (3): 347–380. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-414304

Kristiansen, Marianne, and Jørgen Bloch-Poulsen. 2013. "Participation and Power." *International Journal of Action Research* 9 (1): 5–14. http://aauforlag.dk/Shop/forside-e-boeger/participation-and-power.aspx

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1987. *Time and the Other*. Translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press

Maslow, Abraham. 1970. *Motivation and Personality.* New York: Harper & Row.

Ness, Ottar and Dina von Heimburg. 2020. "Collaborative Action Research: Co-constructing Social Change for the Common Good." In *SAGE Handbook of Social Constructionist Practice,* edited by S. McNamee, M. Gergen, C.C. Borges, & E. Raser, 34-45. London: Sage.

Phillips, Louise Jane. 2011. *The Promise of Dialogue*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Phillips, Louise Jane, and Ksenija Napan. 2016. "What's in the 'Co'? Tending the Tensions in Co-Creative Inquiry in Social Work Education." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 29 (6): 827–844. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1162869

Phillips, Louise Jane, Birgitte Ravn Olesen, Michael Scheffmann-Petersen, and Helle Merete Nordentoft. 2018. "De-Romanticising Dialogue in Collaborative Health Care Research: A Critical, Reflexive Approach to Tensions in an Action Research Project's Initial Phase." *Qualitative Research in Medicine & Health Care* 2 (1): 1-13. https://doi.org/10.4081/qrmh.2018.7178

Rogers, Carl Ransom. 1995. *A Way of Being*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Sanders, Elizabeth B.-N., and Pieter Jan Stappers. 2008. "Co-creation and the new landscapes of design." *Co-design* 4 (1): 5-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710880701875068

Shotter, John. 2006. "Understanding Process from Within: An Argument for 'Withness'-Thinking." *Organization Studies* 27(4): 585–600. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606062105

Shotter, John. 2008. *Conversational Realities*. Chagrin Falls: Taos Institute Publications.

Swim, Susan, Sally A. St. George, and Dan. P. Wulff. 2001. "Process Ethics: A collaborative partnership." *Journal of Systemic Therapies* 20(4): 14–24. https://doi.org/10.1521/jsyt.20.4.14.23087

Vásquez, Consuelo, and Timothy Kuhn, eds. 2019. *Dis/organization as Communication: Exploring the Disordering, Disruptive and Chaotic Properties of Communication*. New York: Routledge.