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Introduction

- Knowledge management in the field of futures studies has emerging interest
- Knowledge as 1) a state of mind 2) an object 3) a process 4) a condition of having access to information 5) a capability (Alavi & Leidner 2001)
- Knowledge as a process:
  - Knowledge creation
  - Knowledge transfer
- Futures knowledge
  - Outcome of the foresight process
  - Justified contingent plausibilities (Dufva & Ahlqvist 2015)
- Structure of the workshop has a role in futures knowledge creation
Research questions

- How futures knowledge regarding urbanizing society is created in Participatory Futures Workshop and how such knowledge develops further in the participating organizations?
  - Do the futures knowledge/consciousness of the participants change during the workshop?
  - In which stages of the workshop the futures knowledge is created?
  - Do the results of the workshop provide futures knowledge for the participants?
  - Do participants disseminate or use the results or new ideas after the workshop in their own organizations?

### Taxonomy of knowledge creation measures

*(Mitchell & Boyle 2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge creation component</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process measures</td>
<td>Actor judgment</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>non-participant categorisation of processes associated with knowledge creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>participants’ subjective categorisation of the immediate output of knowledge creation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output measures</td>
<td>Actor judgment</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>non-participant categorisation of the immediate output of knowledge creation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>participants’ subjective categorisation of the immediate output of knowledge creation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome measures</td>
<td>Substantive evidence</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>new product, service, routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>external criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rye-bred model of knowledge creation
(Uotila et al. 2005)

Data and methods

• Case study in project URMI (Urbanization, Mobilities and Immigration) workshops (2)
  • Questionnaire in the beginning of (and after) the workshop
  • Participatory observation during the workshop
  • Interviews of participants after the workshop
  • Content analysis (/CLA) of the workshop results
First results

- One workshop has been organised (Kaupungistunut Suomi 2039), second is coming on next autumn
- Most of the participants did not feel that their futures knowledge has changed during the first workshop
- Participatory observation showed that the discussions in smaller groups were quite superficial, because the topic was broad and time short
- Structure of the workshop and definition of the topic has a role in futures knowledge creation!
- Before the interview participants had not read the result of the first workshop
- Knowledge transfer after the workshop has mostly happened in unformal context and has been quite faint
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