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Abstract
In this thesis I study the relevance and impact of a normative ethical theory, capabilities approach, in a service design case project. My work includes a service design case for the public sector, and an autoethnographic study of the design case from the perspective of capabilities approach. In this thesis I use fishing as an analogy to understand capabilities approach and summarize my learnings of the approach in the context of my service design case.

I present that service design is increasingly used in designing public services. I argue that ethics are mostly implicit but relevant in the context of service design in the public sector. I introduce capabilities approach and discuss its’ connections to design and relevance and implications for my case. In my autoethnographic study I introduce capabilities approach as a framework to reflect upon during the case design process to understand if and how it can inform the design process.

The practical goal in the case is to produce user initiated ideas into Helsinki city’s public work and daytime activity services for disabled people, with service design. The design research finds that service users could not truly participate in the idea creation for the services though law required it. The design case outcome, the Our Favourite Ideas (Meidän Suosikki-ideat) design game addresses how disabled service users in the public services can participate in the creation of new service content ideas, make choices, and voice opinions.

The main result of the autoethnographic study of the case is that capabilities approach could inform most of the explicit documented decisions in the case design process. It impacted the case process by making communication more meaningful and more explicit on ethics, questioning the way the designer approached users through the identification of needs and contributing to the assessment of a just design process in the services. Capabilities approach impacted the design outcome by informing the choice of design game as a method, the aims of the game and the way I presented the game.

This thesis finds capabilities approach informative and relevant in the design of the work and daytime activity services, when used together with Finnish legislation in reflective design practice. My results imply that designers should acknowledge and make explicit our ethical standings, be reflective and aware of the legislation governing work in the design of public services. Follow-up research can include similar more extensive studies with stricter planning, studying group settings and the political aspects of design for public services.

Keywords capability approach, service design, ethics, public services, autoethnography
Tiivistelmä

Opinnäytetyössäni tutkin normatiivisen etiikan teorian, toimintamahdollisuusteorian, soveltamisesta ja vaikutuksista palvelumuotoiluprojektissa. Työni sisältää näitä palvelumuotoiluprojektin julkisella sektorilla, että autoetnografisen tutkimuksen samasta projektista toimintamahdollisuus teorian näkökulmasta. Tässä työssä käytän kalastusta analogiana teorian ymmärtämiseen ja sen vaikutusten kuvaamiseen projektissa.

Palvelumuotoilua hyödynnetään yhä enemmän julkisten palveluiden suunnittelussa. Aiempaan tutkimukseen nojaten argumentoin, että etiikka on aiheellista mutta usein näkymätöntä julkisen sektorin palvelumuotoilussa. Esittelen toimintamahdollisuusteorian etiikan teoriana ja käsittelemän sen yhteyksiä muotoiluun sekä merkitystä ja asiankuuluvuutta palvelumuotoiluprojektin näkökulmasta. Autoetnografisessa tutkimuksessani otan toimintamahdollisuusteorian mukaan reflektioitavaksi palvelumuotoiluprojektin aikana saadakseen selville, pystyykö se informoimaan suunnitteluprosessia ja millä tavalla.

Konkreettinen tavoite palvelumuotoiluprojektissa oli tuottaa asiakaslähtöisiä ideita Helsingin kaupungin vammaisten työ- ja päivätoimintapalveluihin palvelumuotoilun avulla. Tutkiessani palveluita havaitisin, että asiakkaat eivät todella voida osallistaa palveluiden sisällön kehittämiseen, vaikka laki tuki sitä. Muotoilullisena tuotoksen tästä projektista on Meidän Suosikki-ideat ideointi ja suunnittelupeli, joka auttaa ja tukee palveluiden asiakkaiden osallistumista uusien ideoiden kehittämisessä, mielipiteen ilmaisussa, ja valintojen tekemisessä.

Tuloksena autoetnografisesta tutkimuksesta on, että toimintamahdollisuusteoria pystyi informoimaan useimpia tietoisesti tehtyjä päättöksiä palvelumuotoiluprosessissa. Teoria vaikutti projektissa viestimiseen tehden siitä merkityksellisempää ja etiikasta näkyvämpää. Teoria kyseenalaisti palvelumuotoilun tarvelähtöisen suunnitteluprosessin, sekä vaikutti asiakkaiden osallistumisen oikeudenmukaisuuden ja tarpeellisuuden arviointiin. Toimintamahdollisuusteoria vaikutti projektin lopputulokseen informoimalla muotoilumetodin valintaa, suunnittelupelin päämääröi, sekä pelin esittelytapaan.

Tässä työssä toimintamahdollisuusteoria nähdään informatiivisena ja aiheellisena työ- ja päivätoimintapalveluiden suunnittelussa, kun sitä käytetään yhdistettynä palveluiden lainsäädäntöön ja muotoilijan reflektiiviseen työtapaan. Työn tuloksista voidaan päätellä, että muotoilijoiden pitäisi tiedostaa ja tehdä näkyväksi omat eettiset suuntautumisensa, reflektoida ja tiedostaa lainsäädäntö julkisten palveluiden suunnittelussa. Jatkotutkimusta tarvitaan saman tyypillisistä, mutta vielä tarkemmin suunnittelujärjestelmistä, teorian mahdollisuuksista ryhmäyössä sekä palvelumuotoilun poliittisista ulottuvuuksista julkisten palveluiden suunnittelussa.

Avainsanat toimintamahdollisuusteoria, palvelumuotoilu, etiikka, julkkiset palvelut, autoetnografia
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INTRODUCTION

This master’s thesis from the field of design is divided into two parts: The design contribution and the theoretical contribution. The design contribution is a case that deals with using service design to provide new user-initiated ideas to the public work and daytime activity services for disabled people in Helsinki. The theoretical contribution is an autoethnographic study of the aforementioned case. In the autoethnographic study, I study the case design process when reflecting on a normative ethical theory: capabilities approach.

In this introductory chapter, I introduce all the main elements of this thesis. I explain the relevant terms, the background developments and my personal motivation, the aims, research questions and scope, my research methods and finally the contributions of my work and the structure of this book.
Key concepts

Service design has been described as “design-based approaches for service innovation” (Wetter-Edman et al. 2014:106,109), further elaboration can be found in the theoretical framework chapter (pp. 10).

Ethics can also be called practical philosophy or moral philosophy. It is a philosophic discipline, whose different approaches answer questions of what is morally right or wrong. Ethics matter to all who wish to reflect upon what is right or wrong in their decisions. (Haase, 2015).

Capabilities approach is a normative ethical theory and a partial theory of social justice (Nussbaum, 2011).

Public work and daytime activity service’s goal is to promote the participation of disabled people in the society and in working life (Helsingin kaupunki, 2017). According to my studies, the work activity services are for more able people, and possibility to participate in working life. They include work related activities, like maintenance of public parks, making craft items for sale, kitchen tasks, and cleaning. The daytime activity services are more related to supporting independent life and providing stimuli for people who are less able. They are more focused on social skills, play, and sensory experiences. Both types of services are often daily activities for people, just like school or work, and they contribute largely to their lives, as they spend many hours of their weekdays in these services. Further elaboration of the services can be found in the case chapter (pp. 32).

Users in my case were diverse people, their ages between 18 and 60 years, they had different cognitive and physical disabilities. Though I understand that the staff providing the services also are users of the design solution, and others in the case of public services could be proposed as well (Lehtonen and Tuominen, 2011:228), I refer only to the service customers as users.

A design process is a process where design is created, there are different models for understanding and framing design processes. In this thesis, I represent my design process with the double diamond model (Design council, 2007) (pp. 29-30).

Autoethnography is an ethnographic method or collection of methods, where the focus of the study is most often the researcher, auto meaning self. The researcher is the one being researched, or the researcher is part of the community being researched. (Chang, 2008:46).
Background

I briefly describe those developments, that lead me to work with this topic from the perspective I have chosen. I see these developments as bigger trends that support my choice of topic. Firstly, this thesis relies on the development in the field of design, where design is acknowledged as an activity with political and moral implications and designers having moral agency and responsibility. This is all based on the idea that technologies, services, designs are not value or morally neutral, starting from Lewis Mumford (1964). More recently, participatory design has also been framed as a practice that deals with ethics (Steen, 2011).

Secondly, my thesis is part of a big global trend of a rather new field of service design used more and more in the public sphere of society. The public sector is now the biggest client of service design agencies (Service Design Network, 2017:12). And inside the public sector, the fields of healthcare and social services are the biggest users of service design (Service Design Network, 2017:13). This is why my case in public social services represents a trend in the service design industry and can address a larger audience.

Thirdly, public services, the services that should be serving us all equally, the services that are the basis for our welfare state in Finland, are facing turmoil, economic and quality pressures (Kurronen, 2015:29). The legislation governing social and healthcare service legislation is also being reformed (Valtioneuvosto, n.d). As service design has been connected to making public services better and more cost-efficient (Mattelmäki, 2015:38), service design is now involved with developing Finnish public services as well, and the demand for it in the public services is growing (Mattelmäki, 2015:16-17).

The starting point for this thesis is that designers are increasingly involved in designing Finnish public services and their actions have moral implications. This development, in my opinion, can be a foundation and pose a good time for reflecting on the ethics or what is right and just in service design in the public sector. My own professional history illustrates the shift from working in the private sector product design to working for the public sector services. Thus the developments, that I described are also very personal to me: I see my own career as an epitome of the changing role of designers in society. As I am quite critical of that developing role, I also want to study my case process, and to connect it to the bigger discussion of justice and ethics to support my understanding of the ways we can approach design. In order to not just discuss from my own point of view of what is ethical, or right or just in this specific case, or from the perspective of design literature, I introduce a normative ethical theory in the design process explicitly to reflect upon different choices during the case design process.
Objectives

The design contribution of this thesis has a rather practical objective compared to the thesis as a whole: The most important goal of the case was to create user-initiated ideas in the work and daytime activity services for the disabled. The objectives and background of the case are further elaborated in the case chapter (pp. 32). With the whole thesis, I want to connect design for public social services to the bigger discussion of justice and ethics by practically introducing a theory of normative ethics in my case design process. I want to understand and describe how the theory can benefit my design process for public services. I aim at producing understanding for myself and creating resonance within the design community. The autoethnographic research can produce significant cultural insights on the way I as a designer work and could work. My goal is that in my thesis designers and to be designers can find an example, that helps them consider the ethical implications of their work and encourages them to reflect upon those implications in their design processes in public services.

Scope & research questions

This thesis as a whole aims to contribute to the discussion of justice and ethics in the field of service design in the public sector with the special connection to capabilities approach and the context of services for disabled people. Due to the bipartite nature of the thesis, I discuss research questions for the design and the theoretical contribution separately.

In my design contribution, I study the work and daytime activity services and their users. A service designer could intervene in different points of a public organization service system, and there would probably be different considerations and decisions that deal with ethics and justice made on different layers of the public organization, whether design deals directly with policymaking or the implications of policy in the public services for example. My case deals with the service layer directly, in the everyday of the public work and daytime activity services for disabled people. In the case (pp. 32-52), I explore the following question with my design process and my design outcome:

*How can work and daytime activity service users participate in the creation of new ideas for the services’ content?*

In the theoretical contribution, I am interested in the interaction between capabilities approach and my ethical considerations and decisions being made in the service design process of the case. In my autoethnographic study I aim at answering this specific research question:
Can capabilities approach inform decision-making in the design process for public work and daytime activity services for disabled people, and if it can, in which ways?

This question asks how capabilities approach can inform and perhaps change the way I understand and make choices in the design process. I am also interested in the conflicts or times, where my professional ethics or my design practice conflicts with capabilities approach. This thesis is not a study of decision-making in the design process in general, though I study my design process through the decisions I made in the process. The focus is on the impact of the theory on the process.

My context for the study is very specific, but I don’t use all of the elements for the study in framing my work: In this thesis I don’t argue for any ethical differences between designing for the public sector compared to the private sector, those have been explored by Narová (2017:66), I have only designed for the public sector and thus cannot make a comparison. It is also not within the scope of this thesis to study whether product design and service design differ in terms of ethical questions or their approach to what is right and just. Though I hesitate to separate the disabled citizen from others, the services I was designing for, were in this case specifically for people with disability. In this thesis, I discuss literature from the perspective of disability at times, if the literature has something specific to contribute.

Application of methods

I have approached my topic from a perspective of a practicing designer, originally coming from the field of product design. In the process of making this thesis, I have however moved between the scholarly position of looking at design practice and actually practicing, and back to studying the practice. This means that the thesis also includes three types of research from the perspective of design research: Two types in the case process, and one in the theoretical contribution. In the case, I studied the public work and daytime activity services for disabled people in order to create a design outcome, and while creating the design outcome, I had to study it as well. These types of research could according to the established framework by Frayling be considered research for design and research through design (Frayling 1993: 4-5). Their results are embodied in the design outcome and contribution to the client. I describe the methods of the case in the Case chapter (pp. 32-52).

In the theoretical contribution of my thesis, I researched my case design process with the help of autoethnographic semi-structured occurrence writing. The application of my method was the following: I recorded as many important decisions from the design process as I could, and while doing that, reflected them
on a specific normative ethical theory, capabilities approach. What I mean by this is that I was using Martha Nussbaum’s capabilities approach as a pair of glasses to look at the different decisions I made during the process and reflect if I wanted to change them according to what I understood the approach would offer. My theoretical contribution could be considered research into design according to Frayling (Frayling 1993: 4-5), and the results are included in this written body of the thesis. I positioned myself in the focus of the autoethnographic study. As my research method is autoethnographic, I also need to contextualize my findings in my working and educational history. To structure my understanding of the design process, and my results, I use the double diamond model of the design process (Design Council, 2007).

Contributions

My work has different kinds of contributions to different audiences: I discuss the contributions to the client organization and to other audiences separately due to the bipartite nature of the thesis. The materials produced in this thesis will be used by the client organization and the academic audience.

The design contribution, the outcome of the case process of this thesis, is Meidän Suosikki-ideat design game. The design game helps users of the work and daytime activity services participate in the design process of the services that they use daily by providing them an accessible process and tool for idea generation and ranking. The game supports public services in developing more user-initiated service content and helps to abide to current and upcoming legislation because user participation in the service design process is required by law. Because the method is Creative Commons licensed and materials, like videos and guides, are available freely online, it can be used by other similar services.

The theoretical or academic contributions of the thesis can be used by the academic community: The results of my autoethnographic study contribute to understanding capabilities approach as an ethical theory in the context of service design in the public sector by providing an example where capabilities approach was reflected upon and tried as an explicit ethical theory during a service design process. My results, both successes and failings of understanding and using the theory can also be used in developing design tools and methods that take root in capabilities approach. I hope that the thesis will also contribute to design students struggling to find their place and define their design ethics, by providing an example when an explicit theory was used as a reflective element in a design process.
Structure

I've structured the chapters of this thesis in the chronological order of my own process to give you a good sense of my process and to clarify, that the design case is not a case analysis done after the process, but the theory was actively used in the case design process. In short, the process of making this thesis was the following: I first familiarized myself with capabilities approach as an ethical theory, then defined my autoethnographic method (Chang, 2008:89-95), then conducted the case design process reflecting my decisions on capabilities approach and documented the process with the method. Finally, I used the data from the case, to study the effect of the theory on my the design process. In the accompanying figure 1, I have linearly arranged my process phases with the thesis chapter structure, chapters presented by different colours.

In this thesis, you are first acquainted with the foundation of my approach, the theoretical framework for the thesis: design for services, capabilities approach and capabilities approach in design (pp. 10-22). I use the analogy of fishing to describe capabilities approach and my understanding of it (fishing, pp. 19). Then I discuss my autoethnographic method for collecting data from the case design process (pp. 24-28). You then read about my case during which I have reflected upon the theory, but the Case chapter (pp. 32-52) does not discuss the theory, rather the design contributions and process. I discuss the analysis of the case from the perspective of the theory’s contribution in the Analysis and results chapter (pp. 54-68). I finally reflect and discuss my results in the Discussion chapter (pp. 70-80) and summarize my understanding of capabilities approach in this case with the help of the fishing analogy (fishing pp. 80).
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter elaborates on the theoretical basis for my thesis. There are different domains of knowledge that I combine here: design, moral philosophy, and philosophy of technology and design. I first discuss an explanatory background for my design process and my approach: Service design, in the context of public services and ethics. I then present basics of capabilities approach and the way it has already been discussed in design and in service design, as it is the theory I use to reflect upon in the case design process, and as I also hope to contribute to this discussion with my study.

This thesis has quite many defining elements: service design, public services, services for disabled users, ethics, and capabilities approach. Only a few pieces of the literature share all of those elements, however, I aim to build different perspectives that support the understanding of my case process, my design outcome and analysis of my results. Because capabilities approach deals with what is right, fair and justice, and in my autoethnographic study I coincidentally study my design practice and ethics, I discuss studies on service designer’s ethics, though I acknowledge that studying ethics generally is not the same as having an ethical theory to reflect upon in the design case process.
Designing for services

In this section, I largely rely on books: “Designing Services with Innovative Methods” by Satu Miettinen and Mikko Koivisto (2009) presents a comprehensive understanding of service design in its plurality from perspectives different international writers, and it is used as a course book in our school for understanding service design. For a more recent academic understanding of service design and designing for services, I use Sangiorgi and Prendiville’s book “Designing for Service: Key Issues and New Directions” (2017). To specify service design in the public sector especially in Finnish context I refer to the Aalto University report by Mattelmäki and Jyrämä (2015), and to connect service design to a wider concept of innovation in public services, I refer to Jon Sundbo’s and Marja Toivonen’s “User-based Innovation in Services” (2011).

Service design is a rather new addition to the field of design, its’ academic roots date back to the 1990’s, it is a continuation to the product and interface design tradition (Mager, 2009:32,34). First service design agencies opened in London in the early 2000’s (Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:1). There is no one precise definition for service design (Mattelmäki, 2015:27) but service design has been described as “design based approaches for service innovation” (Wetter-Edman et al. 2014:106,109). It is focused on the idea of user and human-centeredness (Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:1-2) (Mager, 2009:38). Service design looks at the user’s experience: “Service-design addresses the functionality and form of services from the perspective of the user” (Mager, 2011:34). Mattelmäki also emphasizes the user- and human-centeredness as a starting point for the design (2015:27). Creativity, iterative nature (Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:2) and co-creation (Mager, 2009:38) (Mattelmäki, 2015: 27) are emphasized as well. For a more comprehensive review of understandings of service design, see for example Meriläinen (2016:26). Starting service design is often discussed through the identification and understanding of, sometimes hidden, user needs (Mager, 2009:35)(Miettinen, 2011:31)(Manzini, 2009:54) and design in the public services has recently for instance been framed around needs by UK design foundation Nesta, IDEO and the Design for Europe initiative in their Designing for public services guide (2017:4-5,7).

The understanding of both services and design have been changing: Services are no longer understood as being completely different from products, and design is also developing into many boundary areas, such as policy-making (Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:4-5,9). What this means to me is that service design is both elusive and expanding, which makes it more timely to study. One of the trends of service design research currently is looking at its impact and contributions, for example, accountability and participation (Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:7). I can also see my work linking to this category and I am not the only one interested.
in ethics in service design; Junginger and Sangiorgi have also described that questions are being raised about the ethics and responsibilities of service designers (2015:165).

Service design has also experienced a few criticisms as a term and been proposed alternatives. I discuss two proposed alternatives because they describe my approach to the case quite well. Sangiorgi and Meroni have discussed the term “Design for Services” instead of service design to acknowledge diverse disciplinary backgrounds of people involved in the field, multidimensional nature of the practice and the inability of designers to completely regulate and plan services (2011:33-34). Prendiville and Sangiorgi have added that “Designing for services” acknowledges that design is something that is already happening in an organization, and designers only intervene (2017:254). In this thesis, I also use the term service design, because it is a more generally used disciplinary term, but my thoughts and actions in the case and my understanding of service design, that are based on my previous project experience, correlate with Sangiorgi, Meroni, and Prendiville.

Since its development, the field of service design has been adapting and harnessing tools and concepts from many disciplines, both from design (like product design and interaction design) and from management and service marketing (Sangiorgi and Junginger, 2015 cited by Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:2). I think that this complexity, the combination of design and business-oriented approaches in service design make service design more difficult to pin down and more important to study, because the tools can incorporate some values of their own. Because of the way services are produced in a co-operative manner, service design practice has also developed collaborative design approaches that are based on participatory design (Shuler and Namioka 1993, Greenbaum and Kyng 1991, cited by Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:2) Due to this reason ethics and justice in service design, as in participatory design, are according to my understanding also often in literature discussed through participation and co-creation in the design process: Most recently Collins, Cook, and Choukeir discuss justice and injustice in service design from the perspective of participation and representation (2017:105-116). They argue that participation can sometimes cause more harm than good due to for example practical constraints (2017:113). What in my opinion is still lacking in research is connecting not just the participatory process of service design but also the outcomes of design to moral philosophical and normative ethical frameworks and theories.

Service design in the public sector has often been discussed from the viewpoint of transforming public services, for example (Thurston, 2009) (Sangiorgi, 2011). Lately, demand for service design in the Finnish public sector has been growing (Mattelmäki, 2015:27), as elsewhere in the world (Service design network, 2016:12). I think this development should be critically examined because service
design can also be seen as part of innovation in the public sector. This has been questioned for its seemingly a-political nature and language: Making the citizen into the user, could be seen as a way of challenging the understanding of citizenship and the public sector as a whole (Langergaard, 2011:222). “If public sector services are increasingly conceptualized as commodities designed to meet individual needs and desires, this de-politicizes the common good, in the form of publicly provided social services to the citizens and society. Public good becomes perceived as commodities, rather than objects of political deliberation about which goods should be collectively provided and enjoyed by all citizens.” (Langergaard, 2011:223) As service design is often looking at needs, as discussed earlier, and I also discuss my case by calling citizens users, I believe this is something we should consider when dealing with ethics in service design in the public sector. The moral philosophical aspects of designing for public services can also be entangled with political aspects, due to the very nature of the public sector and its relationship to public good.

In the remainder of this section, I further discuss and present the connection between service design and ethics through studies as this is also a discussion where I hope to be contributing. Carlsson argued in 2012, that ethical research into service design was lacking completely. The relationship between service design and ethics is still rather limited in literature, though service design and responsibility and sustainability themes, and design and ethics are more generally discussed.

Steen has studied participatory design from the perspective of ethics (2015). As service design, as stated before, is often collaborative, relying on participatory design, most of Steen arguments can also be applied to service design. Steen argues that participatory design as a practice is inherently ethical, and many different strains of ethics can be used to understand it (2015:389). This means that participatory service design can also have ethical qualities. As Carlsson studied ethically loaded situations in service design in his master’s thesis (2011) in the field of ICT, he found that nearly all situations studied could be interpreted as having some ethical implications, which could mean, that service design is a field of design that highly deals with ethics (2011:65). In this context, I argue that using a theory of ethics can be very relevant for service design. Carlsson also discovered that service designers often dealt with these ethical situations in service design consequentialist ways (2011:71). What this means is that they were mostly considering the outcomes of situations when considering what is right and just in service design, not so much what is the just process of design, as one would in participatory design. Both Steen (2015:389) and Carlsson (2011:66-67) have, however, found that designers often talk about ethical issues in implicit ways, not making them explicit, which in my opinion suggests that there is value in making ethics explicit in a service design process where participatory elements are present.
Nararová has recently studied ethical aspects of service design in the context of government (2017) and since it is part of the public sector, I consider her results relevant to my study as well. Nararová’s results show that there are many ethical aspects in service design in this context, especially the situations where needs of the users were compromised, were considered to be ethically charged by designers (2017:70). This relates to service design often starting with user needs (pp. 11), and I think it could be easier to identify those situations if it is already where the service designers are focusing. Communication was according to Narová a key in addressing ethical issues with user needs and managing resources and though most service designers showed interest in the topic of ethics, most of them also stated that the topic was not talked about enough (2017:70). This in my opinion correlates with the previously discussed implicit nature of ethics in participatory and service design. Narová’s results suggest that it could be beneficial to explicitly communicate ethics in service design in the public sector. Nararová concludes that participatory design is not a universal solution to the ethical questions in service design, but rather participatory practices bring along their own set of issues (2017:17), as was also supported by Collins, Cook, and Choukeir (2017:105-116) and Steen (2015). This suggests that there is still a lot of work to be done in the area of service design in the public sector with relation to ethics.

There is also criticism to increase designers’ moral responsibility: Jonas, Morelli, and Münch argue against the development of making designers morally responsible since it is not their domain of expertise (2009:7). I think that if there is something we can do to make our designs more just or ethically acceptable in public services, we should do it, even if it is not our main domain of expertise. As discussed, ethics has been found to be relevant yet implicit in the context of service design in the public sector, service design is expanding in the public sector, and the ethical aspects of service design can be entangled with the political aspects.

It is interesting to consider whether in practice there are some ethical perspectives that service designers in the public sector are perhaps missing when they mostly identify ethical considerations with user needs (Narová, 2017), if they deal mainly with ethical situations from a consequentialist perspective (Carlsson, 2011) and that ethics are largely implicit (Steen, 2015)(Carlsson, 2011)(Narová, 2017). We should try to identify and examine the relevant ethical questions in different public service design processes, while also communicating our findings and ethics in the design process explicitly. To partly address these issues I introduce an explicit ethical framework, capabilities approach, into a service design process to reflect upon. Understandably, as service design is still quite young, there are according to my knowledge no studies that would deal with using a specific ethical theory as a basis for a real service design process in the public sector or in the case of services for the disabled. However, there are different ways capabilities approach, the theory I am reflecting upon, has been discussed in the context of design, I will discuss those in the Design & Capabilities -section.
Capabilities approach

Capabilities approach is an ethical framework and a theory of social justice, introduced by the economist Amartya Sen and developed into the direction of a theory of social justice by philosopher Martha Nussbaum (Nussbaum, 2011:19). Here I draw upon Nussbaum’s work because she has tried to develop capabilities approach in the direction of a theory of social justice, and she discusses capabilities from the point of view of disability clearly. I attempt to draw some connections between Nussbaum’s capabilities approach, service design and my case. My understanding of Nussbaum’s interpretation is based on the book “Creating Capabilities” (2011), where she describes and argues for the basics of her approach. It is also the book that I used as a description of the theory to reflect upon in the case design process. In this thesis, I use the term capabilities approach, compared to the more general term capability approach, because to Nussbaum there are many capabilities (2011:17).

To give a short introduction to the basics of capabilities approach, I can describe it, how it was described to me, and how I refer to it in the thesis title. Matti Häyry has playfully explained, referring to ancient wisdom, that the approach states that we shouldn’t give people fish [resources] if they are hungry, we should teach them how to fish or give them rods [capabilities](Häyry, 2017). At the end of this section, after I have discussed capabilities approach, I make a summary of my interpretation of the theory in light of the same analogy (pp. 19). It is worth noting, that since my background is in design, and this is a master’s thesis, the way I interpret Nussbaum can be different from more experienced scholars in design or philosophers for that matter.

As a philosophical theory, many philosophical views focusing on self-realization and human flourishing have had an impact on the capabilities approach: from Rabindranath Tagore in India to John Stuart Mill and all the way to Aristotle (Nussbaum, 2011:23). As a theory of development economics as introduced by Amartya Sen the history of the capabilities approach is closely related to the United Nations’ development policy: The approach started as part of the critique for measuring a country’s development and wellbeing with only their Gross domestic product GDP (Nussbaum, 2011:ix-x). Because of its history, capabilities approach is often still considered to be more suitable for work in poorer countries. However, Nussbaum reminds us that all states have struggles for human dignity, justice, and equality (2011:16). As there are many aspects of disabled people’s services that deal with questions and struggles of dignity, equality, and discrimination, I think the approach is from this point of view relevant in the design case.

According to Nussbaum, the approach starts with simple questions: “What are people actually able to do and to be? What real opportunities are available to
them?” (2011:x). The approach as understood by Nussbaum, treats each person as an end, not through a total or average well being, as in the case of GDP, but the actual number or variety of opportunities available to him or her (2011:18). This to me means that we should not look at groups but rather individuals, and their opportunities. In service design projects we are however rarely able to really listen to everyone, as I understand would be required in the case of public services.

Nussbaum argues that achievement happens when there are opportunities open to people (Nussbaum, 2011:14), so the main goal of public services if framed through the approach could be to provide opportunities to people. Nussbaum is in favour of looking close to the ground, life stories and meanings of policy changes to real people (Nussbaum, 2011:14). Interestingly, as also discussed before, this is often also the approach used in service design, user-centeredness and user experience being very important (Mager, 2009:34)(Mattelmäki, 2015:27). Nussbaum describes that the approach is very pluralistic when it comes to value: capability achievements should not be reduced to a single numerical scale because they can vary in quality besides quantity, it is fundamental to understand the specific nature of each when when producing them (2011:19). In my opinion, this could mean that there should not be a one size fits all solution to providing capabilities and that one resource can be different in the hands of different people.

Capabilities according to Nussbaum are “a set of usually interrelated opportunities to choose and to act” (2011:20). She clarifies “they are not just abilities residing inside a person, but also the freedoms or opportunities created by a combination of personal abilities and the political, social, and economic environment” (Nussbaum, 2011:20). Pirhonen has used the Finnish word “toimintamahdollisuusteoria” for capabilities approach (2012), and it literally translates as a theory of opportunities to act. These suggest to me that when assessing a situation, we should look at not just if users are able to use a solution, but if it is allowed and supported to take on this opportunity.

With the opportunities comes making choices, freedom to choose is thus naturally an integral part of capabilities approach as well: Nussbaum believes that societies should provide options and opportunities to people, and then people choose whether to take them up or not (2011:18). According to Nussbaum: “Options are freedoms, and freedom has intrinsic value” (2011:25). In her view, the purpose of government and public policy is to improve the quality of life for all, while the quality of life here should be defined by their capabilities (Nussbaum, 2011:19). I understand that to Nussbaum equality means especially equality of opportunity to choose, to truly choose, meaning that you are able to turn those opportunities into actions, if you want, but only if you want to.

Nussbaum refers to the person’s abilities and the opportunities provided to them as combined capabilities (2011:21). She makes difference between characteristics
of a person (personality, emotions, movement, perception) which are a part of combined capabilities, and the internal capabilities, which are trained or developed traits and abilities, in most cases in interaction with the familial, social, economic, and political context (Nussbaum, 2011:21). But internal capabilities don’t guarantee that a person could use those (beyond internally) if the context is not supportive and does not provide or allow opportunities (Nussbaum, 2011:21). And Nussbaum argues that a society cannot produce combined capabilities if it doesn’t produce internal capabilities first (2011:21) Why I think this is particularly relevant for my case, is that Nussbaum’s approach takes into consideration both the abilities or disabilities of the individuals, and the way those translate to opportunities to act in the context they are being used, which in my case is in the work and daytime activity services. I believe this means that I need to understand what the users are able to do, and could be able to do, provided the right circumstances.

From Nussbaum’s perspective, the political goal for all humans in a nation should be the same: all should get over a defined threshold level of combined capability, not by coercion but by opportunities to choose and act (Nussbaum, 2011:24). And what this leads to as an aim is that those, who need more help in getting over the threshold level, actually do get more help (Nussbaum, 2011:24). Nussbaum also directly discusses what this means for people with cognitive disabilities: They should have the same capabilities as everyone else, though some opportunities might need a surrogate or a representative to act in their behalf (2011:24). What this could mean in relation to my public services is that if users are not able to make the choices about their services, a representative should be included.

According to Nussbaum, the notion of basic capability and threshold are appropriate in education, they justify special interventions when a child has an innate cognitive disability (2011:24). This is especially important in my case since the services in question deal with developing abilities, education, and employment for people with disability. According to Nussbaum then, the intervention to support people with cognitive disability is justified. Though as a designer I would consider this to a given, Nussbaum clarifies that many theories of justice do not have any standing on cognitive disability, and she especially critiques John Rawls’ theory of justice for not being able to consider people who are not rational, as persons (2011:24). In my opinion, as Nussbaum’s theory also still relies on active striving (2011:48), making choices and puts a heavy emphasis on agency and practical reason (2011:39), which could make it difficult in the context of disabled people with limited reasoning skills, though those can be also supported.

Nussbaum and Sen both use the concept of functionings to illustrate the realization of capabilities. As capabilities are freedoms or opportunities to act and function, functionings are the actual acts, beings, and functions that are achieved (Nussbaum, 2011:25). Functioning is, therefore, the end-point of a capability. I
believe that the distinction is put well by Nussbaum in the following quote: “To promote capabilities is to promote areas of freedom, and this is not the same as making people function in a certain way” (2011:25). Nussbaum’s approach could then be understood as a very liberal, and non-paternalistic way of building public services and systems, where nothing is obligatory, but there are rather a lot of options, but you need to make the choice yourself, as the system will not make you function, or choose in a certain way.

When deciding, what is just in a certain question, Nussbaum urges at a public debate about what is liberty and dignity in the discussed matters, what are the valuable capabilities and capacities that human beings might develop and should be nurtured by society (2011:32, 28). This means that we should publicly decide what we consider to be important opportunities and abilities for people to achieve, and then I as a designer could help users achieve those. Though capabilities approach from Nussbaum’s perspective doesn’t state what we should value, it should be left to the public discussion and political process, she has suggested a list of ten central capabilities, which is open for discussion, adaptation, and use (2011:33-34). Her list includes: Life, Bodily health, Bodily integrity, Senses, imagination, and thought, Emotions, Practical reason, Affiliation, Other species, Play and Control over one’s environment A) Political, B) Material (own simplified description, further elaboration in appendix 1).

Another important aspect of the capabilities approach is the notion of human dignity (Nussbaum, 2011:29). Capabilities approach is about protecting the areas of freedom so important, that if removed, life would not be worthy of human dignity (Nussbaum, 2011:31). Nussbaum argues that when we focus on dignity, it makes a big difference compared to satisfaction (2011:30). She especially discusses education for people with severe cognitive disabilities, and how it could be argued that satisfaction could be reached for many without educational development, but it is not dignified (Nussbaum, 2011:30). Nussbaum argues that in many areas, focus on dignity creates policy choices to protect and support agency, and doesn’t infantilize people by treating them as passive recipients of benefits. (2011:30) This is relevant to the discussion of needs and wants satisfaction of users as a starting point for service design (pp. 11) and I discuss it further in the next section.

Nussbaum argues capabilities approach from her perspective discusses disabilities thoroughly. However, Pirhonen has presented how Pogge has criticized the way capabilities approach makes is mandatory for people to recognize their disabilities as a thing that defines them (Pogge 2010, 44-48 as referenced by Pirhonen, 2011:30). In the context of disability as well, Riddle criticizes the capabilities approach and argues that it would increase the stigmatization of disabled people and that the approach in practice is incapable of diagnosing those who are in need and the level of assistance they require (2014). I consider these critiques as I evaluate my results (pp. 78).
I have presented the basics of capabilities approach from Martha Nussbaum’s perspective. To summarize and refer back to Häyry’s analogy about fishing, my interpretation of the capabilities approach after studying it would be along the lines of: If people are hungry, we should give people the opportunity to choose to learn fishing or other ways of getting fish and given that they are in their right mind to make a rational choice, they would prefer that over just having the fish. This would also provide them with the means to satisfy their own needs in the future, or if they choose to fast, that is their decision as well. The approach, in my opinion argues, that it is not enough to say that everyone gets an average of one fishing rod or lesson, every individual should have the opportunity to choose and to truly utilize the opportunity: it is not just to hand out rods if a person cannot hold a fishing rod due to disability, they should thus be supported to have the opportunity to fulfil their needs in some way. This is my understanding of the theory in general, in the next section I connect it with design, and in the Discussion chapter, I synthesize my understanding with my learnings from the case (pp. 80).

Design & Capabilities

In this section I describe and discuss how capabilities approach has been discussed and applied in design, technology and services and compare that with Nussbaum’s capabilities approach and my understanding of it. As the approach is often discussed from the points of view of both Nussbaum and Sen, I discuss design literature discussing both. Capabilities approach in the context of design has been most broadly discussed in the book “The Capability Approach, Technology and Design” (Oosterlaken & Hoven, 2012), which focuses on technologies and mostly on physical objects instead of services. However, as the design outcome of my case is also a design game, which could be considered both a product and a process, I argue that these are relevant to the thesis.

As a theory of justice, capabilities approach is mainly a consequentialist approach, meaning that it focuses on the outcome when assessing what is just (Nussbaum, 2011:99). Nussbaum talks about the proceduralist view and the outcome view of capabilities and is more in favour of the outcome in the case of capabilities approach (2011:95). I think Nussbaum means that capabilities approach does not concern itself so much with what is a fair or just procedure, but rather with what is a fair and just outcome. When the goal is opportunities to choose, this means according to my understanding that it is not of vital importance to Nussbaum how the opportunities, choosing from fishing lessons or rods come to exist, but that they exist and can be turned into functionings by users. How this relates to design and my case is that ethics in design can be seen from at least two perspectives: What is a just or fair design process, and what is a just or fair design outcome. Capabilities approach in Nussbaum’s perspective would suggest that the outcome
view is more important in design, how the design turns out. There are different views of this in design, what is just or what is responsible, one of the more process-oriented views is, for example, participatory design, that emphasizes stakeholder participation in order for a more democratic design process (Keinonen, 2017: 44). With design meeting capabilities approach, both process and outcome view have been discussed.

Nichols and Dong argue that Nussbaum’s list of central capabilities on many occasions points to the activity of design as a central capability when using a broader definition of design as more than just aesthetics (2012:194). What this means is that deprivation of design or planning capability is to them thus unjust, and participation in design processes is crucial when it comes to ethics and justice. By doing this they are able to argue for participation within Nussbaum’s framework that according to my interpretation would not be so concerned with the process dimension of justice (Nussbaum, 2011:99). Nichols and Dong argue for a capability set for design, which is beyond design capacity or skill, though stressing that providing this set requires the political environment to support this process (Nichols and Dong, 2012:196). Their capability set is then according to my understanding a combined capability (Nussbaum, 2011:21), both consisting of the inner ability to do design and the surrounding political environment. In my mind Nichols and Dong imply that capability to design should be included in the political system, in legislation and public service procedure. Nussbaum is more in favour of all states or communities using political deliberation and debate to discuss what they consider important in each case (Nussbaum, 2011:33-34), even if her list suggests this as discussed earlier, it might be that states choose differently. In my case, I need to discuss how these Finnish services see the issue.

When it comes to the outcome view of capabilities approach in participatory design, Frediani and Boano argue that capabilities approach is relevant in analysing both the products and processes of design (2012:200). They separate normative evaluations of the process of design, what they call process freedom from the evaluations of the product of design, which they call product freedom (2012:212). This suggests that in design and in my case, there could be both dimensions of capabilities approach present. Frediani and Boano criticize Nichols and Dong for not acknowledging power asymmetries in participatory design processes (2012:209-210), similar to arguments of Choukeir, Collins, and Cook (2017:105-116) in service design. Frediani and Boano summarize that a just, or democratic process does not entail a just or non-exploitative product or solution (2008:204, 219), as was already discussed in relation to participatory design as a solution to the ethical issues in service design. I think that this means that I also need to consider the outcomes of the participatory processes in my case, and what is my role and responsibility if the participatory process produces exploitative or discriminating solutions for example.
Oosterlaken has discussed capabilities approach in the context of design of technology and development thoroughly. She has proposed a concept of capability sensitive design (compare value sensitive design), that takes into account the diversity of human existence (2009). Oosterlaken argues that capabilities approach is relevant for design and can offer a revival to the ideals of participatory design (2009:100). She calls for the philosophical reflection to be translated into tools and methods in design practice (2009:101), thus linking capabilities approach to the process dimension of justice in design. Her view can be interpreted to include both the process view and the outcome view of capabilities approach in design. Oosterlaken also discusses design of technology as a way to extend capabilities, with the example of a bicycle in the context of disability (2009:94) and argues capabilities approach might assist designers in finding a sounder understanding of the aims of design and connecting designers work with larger normative debates about development and justice (2012:224). As connecting to the bigger normative debates is one of the aims of my thesis as well, I believe my approach from her perspective could be justified.

There has not been a lot of discussion about capabilities approach in the context of service design specifically. Keinonen has discussed capabilities approach from the context of wellbeing, and mental health services as a case (2017:161-188). Keinonen writes that capabilities approach should be made more applicable for design, easier to digest (2017:162-163) and he proposes a set of constructive questions about the design and the process (2017:186). Unlike Nussbaum, Keinonen does not see needs, or as I understand Nussbaum refers to it, satisfaction (2011:30), as fundamentally incompatible with capabilities approach: “A fundamental human need is a condition in which an individual doesn’t have sufficient levels of essential capabilities. An essential capability is something that an individual needs for sufficient wellbeing and agency.” (Keinonen, 2017:170). So as I understand Keinonen to him this is more of a difference of perspective of looking at the issue, the need, or looking at the solution, which is a capability. He frames lack of agency as a need, and designers can take this need as an opportunity to start to design, though capabilities are what designers should provide people with (Keinonen, 2017:170).

Manzini has discussed capabilities approach in the context of service design, (2009:54-55). He argues that the common approach to users in service design is looking at users as an individual, with needs, desires and knowledge to be listened (2009:54). Manzini thinks that capabilities approach, however, makes us look at individuals and communities differently, through the opportunities they offer, not their problems, and capabilities instead of their needs (2009:54). This means understanding the user as an active participant bringing ability and skills in the services, that can address their own problems and also create what he calls collaborative services (2009:54). Ultimately then in my interpretation, Manzini differs from Keinonen in terms of the perspective on what approaching users
with needs can mean, as Manzini sees that capabilities approach fundamentally changes how we approach and understand users, even if lack of essential capabilities can be viewed as needs (Keinonen, 2017:170). In my case, this impacts how I approach and view users.

The closest to using Nussbaum’s capabilities approach in practice in design of public services for disabled people comes Pirhonen in his master’s thesis from the field of sociology and philosophy (2012). Though his background is not in design, I think he has a very designerly (Cross, 2001) approach to ethnographically studying elderly care, because he proposes directions for development. Pirhonen states that when it comes to disability, the Finnish social and healthcare system is following the concept of justice laid down by capabilities approach in principle, as it compensates and supports people, who have disabilities by birth (2012:30). This suggests that capabilities approach can be interpreted as a relevant and compatible ethical framework for my case as the services in the case are social services and part of the same system. Pirhonen found capabilities approach as very compatible with the questions of the justice in Finnish elderly care (2012:116), and he argued it has a lot to give to the services, especially to the service content (2012:42,116). This further suggests that the approach could have something to contribute to the services, and the service content for the disabled as well.

I have argued for the relevance of capabilities approach for my case and presented its connections to participatory design and service design, and drawn some conclusions to elaborate on in my discussion chapter. To summarize and conclude, the literature describes that capabilities approach is a relevant ethical theory for design. Manzini even views capabilities approach as a basis for an updated theory of service design (2009:55), and it can contribute to design for Finnish public social services and their content (Pirhonen, 2012). Capabilities approach has been used in assessing the ethics in design, both the processes and the outcomes of design (Frediani & Boano, 2012). The literature suggests I should also inspect the way capability to design is included in the services in my case (Nichols & Dong, 2008) and how I approach users with relation to their needs (Manzini, 2009)(Keinonen, 2017). Finally, I should also consider the outcome of participatory processes in the case and if the outcome has the possibility to be exploitative (Frediani and Boano, 2008:204, 219). The approach can and should be used to produce tools and methods (Keinonen, 2017) (Oosterlaken 2009) to further proceed using it in the context of design. In the next chapter, I explain how I inserted capabilities approach in the case design process.
METHOD

In this chapter I discuss the autoethnographic method of my study, ground my approach and explain why I have approached this topic from this specific angle: reflexive, practical, personal and with capabilities approach as a pair of glasses while looking at decisions in the design process. As expressed previously, in the thesis process I moved between the scholarly position of looking at design practice, and actually practicing, in this chapter, I explain why. I also present the double diamond model for design process for structuring my thesis and my results.
Reflexivity in practice

Reflection is an approach or practice in ethically sensitive design processes what many can agree on, as there are many who urge designers to be more reflective: Carlsson recommends (2011:67-68), that personal moral reflexivity should also be included alongside value sensitive design when dealing with ethical situations in service design. Sangiorgi also urges at personal reflexivity in the design process for transforming public projects (Sangiorgi 2011:29,37). Steen proposes reflexivity in practice of participatory design to be able to cope with the ethics in the situations more mindfully (2011:389). When it comes to service design practice, reflexivity has been most recently advocated by Collins, Cook, and Choukeir (2017:113). As I estimated that my case would be ethically challenging due to the vulnerability of the users, I chose personal reflexivity as a starting point for my study.

In my study, I used capabilities approach as a specific ethical theory to reflect upon. I have argued for the applicability of this theory in the context of my case. But why to study it in practice? At this stage, a philosopher would have probably continued on a more conceptual level. As I am a practicing designer, I see value in practice and applicability. In the context of capabilities approach in design, Oosterlaken has also emphasized using design project case studies hand-in-hand with more theoretical reflection (2009:101). As there were already theoretical notions and case analysis, conceptions of capabilities approach in design (pp. 19), my understanding was that there would be value in actually putting the theory in practice, studying it in the field, actively using it during a design process and seeing how that would turn out. Pirhonen has argued, that to understand social justice, one must go to the place things are actually happening (2012:52). In my case, this can be interpreted to both mean studying the services in question by actually being there and taking part, as I have in the design case, but also to study my design process with relation to the theory in practice.

As discussed earlier, Keinonen has argued that capabilities approach should be made easier to digest in design and that it would be difficult to apply directly in practice (2017:162-163). Oosterlaken has asked for tools and methods (2009:101). My point of view was why not try to apply capabilities approach in practice, even if it may turn out to be difficult without tools and methods, and what better way than practice to discover needs for tools and methods. I was already interested in philosophy specifically, I had had a few lessons of business ethics where we tried to think about what different philosophical theories would argue about different problems, and that had been both interesting and very hard at the same time. As I also had a client design case, that I wanted to include in my thesis, a case that I knew would be ethically challenging, I saw no harm in the theory questioning or contributing to my design practice, as long as I still had my client and my own moral compass to also reflectively rely upon.
The mere reflexivity in my study wouldn’t do for me: I wanted to connect to a broader understanding because I felt it is futile that I as a designer ponder about ethics and justice in design when there is a long history of philosophy that could be useful for my case. I could not promise that I would provide anything new, but at least I would be able to contribute to the discussion and also say that I have tried to use the theory in practice, and see how my results would relate to the academic discussion of capabilities approach in design, and to service design, justice and ethics. Design projects like my case, in reality, are often messy and busy, and though I knew in many ways I would also fail in using and reflecting on the theory, I thought that those would be important findings as well. I could say that I took a rather experimental approach to the process with the theory in my autoethnographic study.

Autoethnography

Chang describes that autoethnography is a form of qualitative research, that often poses the researcher, or self, in the centre of the study (2008:46). Here I rely on Chang’s book “Autoethnography as method” (2008), where she presents a complete process of creating autoethnographies. I decided to study my own process because I assumed that I would be more able to get much deeper with much more data and understanding than I ever would if I was studying someone else’s process. As my approach was also experimental in its nature, I felt it only fair to first try it on myself and my own process. The reason to study self-narratives or write and study self-narratives is that they can produce valuable learnings of self and others, in a cultural sense (Chang, 2008:41). I knew that though I wanted to study the theory’s impact on my process, I was without a doubt studying my own design ethics and practice coincidentally. I saw autoethnography as a good way to do this and to be able to produce cultural insights of the way designers work and can work.

The autoethnography, that Chang promotes, includes cultural analysis and interpretation with narrative details, it is interpretive and analytical, and that separates it from other self-narratives such as autobiography (2008:46). So I do not simply tell how my process went, but I analyse it and try to connect it to the bigger context. In this thesis, the Case chapter, and the Analysis and Results really present and analyse my case from different perspectives, the Case is more involved with design, and Results and analysis more with the theory. The cultural understanding that I aimed at producing was about how the theory would inform the design process but in a cultural context of a practicing designer moving from private product to public service design. This required for me to understand and document and reflect upon the decisions made in the design process and situate them in my own working history and education.
The way I am using autoethnography in this thesis is related to analytic autoethnography, (Chang, 2008:45-46) since I have a theory to reflect upon and I try to limit the subjectivity of results, however, I also base my findings on the cultural understanding of my working process as a designer. My method is an adaptation of Chang’s process: To study the choices I made in the design process in the case, I used autoethnographic semi-structured or hybrid self-observation as my method. What this practically means is that I was self-observing and reflecting on my decisions with the help of structured questions. As Chang suggests, I used a structured recording format for my decision-making process to support data analysis later on (2008:99). To create my recording format, I used my research question: Can capabilities approach inform decision-making in the design process for public work and daytime activity services for disabled people, and if it can, in which ways?” I formulated sub-questions, that I used to self-observe and reflect upon and left an open point for insights from the process if I had any extra thoughts regarding the topic at hand:

1. What were the decisions that you made today in the design (case) process?
2. On what grounds did you make them?
3. What would capability approach say about them/ Reflect?
4. Would that make you change the way you work? Why / Why not?
5. INSIGHTS: (open)

Table 1 Autoethnographic self-reflection questions

This is what Chang calls hybrid format for self-observation (2008:93) because it has structure but the answers are narrative, qualitative, not quantitative, though it can also produce some quantitative data. I planned to avoid the pitfalls of autoethnography, that Chang describes (2008:54) by the following: I aimed at connecting my findings with the practice of design and other professionals and seeing their impact on my process, I didn’t rely much on my own memory, but rather tried to record thoughts as they appeared, I tried to anonymize others in my narrative, and understand autoethnography as a method thoroughly and make my adaptation of it. I was trying to avoid post-rationalizing my decisions, and recording and making notes of them while they are being made and can still be open. This is exceptional in that way, that the data collection was also supposed to change the way I thought and behaved. I forced myself to reflect upon the theory, whenever I realized I was trying to decide something or had just decided something. This is related to what Chang calls occurrence recording. It normally produces data on the frequency of the thoughts and behaviours over a certain period of time (2008:92). In my results I wanted I to connect the timeframe of my notes to the design process phases (pp. 29-30).
You might be asking yourself, why study ethics and the theory through decisions? Devon and van de Poel have studied the decision-making in a design process from a social ethics perspective (2004:461-469) and they view design as an inherently ethical process with technical and social decisions involved. I agree with Narova that decisions can thus be considered to be one of the ethical aspects of designing (Nararová, 2017:5). I also acknowledged that there was only a certain amount of decisions I would be able to record, because in a design process decisions are always made both explicitly and implicitly, and and the implicit decisions are not seen as choices at all, but can lead to ethically compromising situations (Van de Poel and Devon, 2004:466). I thought that studying decisions together with the reflecting would help me question some of my explicit decisions and maybe also unearth some implicit decisions in my design process. I believed that due to the implicit nature of ethics in many service design processes as discussed earlier (pp. 13-14), it would also be valuable to try to make ethics explicit, both by verbalizing it in the process and in writing it in the reflections and letting it impact my decision-making.

According to my understanding at the time of starting the case design process, there were several key decisions in the design process that I wanted to study. My understanding of the key decisions was informed by my own design ethics and here my design education also played a big role. These were the decision topics I wanted to at least see in my data: Who to involve (participation), how to involve them (process), which design method to choose, what is the design outcome and how to present the outcome. I also wanted to see who and what impacted my decisions, what were the grounds I made my decisions on, hence question 2. The decisions in the design process were both about the design outcome, as well the design process and these could be seen framed around the outcome and the process view of capabilities approach in design (Frediani & Boano, 2012:212). I also wanted to see if there was a dimension that capabilities approach could better contribute.

Before I started my structured data collection phase, I studied capabilities approach by reading Martha Nussbaum’s book Creating capabilities (2011), to be informed about the theory and be able to reflect my decisions upon it. I was also referring back to the book during the process. I was a little familiar with the general idea of capabilities approach before the case, due to my studies in business ethics and development, but not the details of the approach. It is also worthwhile to mention, that I did not read a lot of different conceptions of capabilities approach in design before I started the case, I was most familiar with some of Oosterlaken’s work, but not, for example, Manzini’s (2009). I and the client agreed to take the capabilities approach as a theory to reflect upon. We did not choose any specific capabilities from Nussbaum’s list of central capabilities (pp. 18). I took the theory like a pair of glasses and tried to see my decisions as well as the whole process through the lenses.
Double diamond design process model

The double diamond design process model was introduced by the United Kingdom Design Council after they studied the design processes of various international companies (Design Council, 2007). The Design Council describes the double diamond as a general framework for understanding design processes as processes where both divergent and convergent thinking are included (Design Council 2018). In this thesis, I do not aim to study the double diamond design process model itself, its applicability in the public context or the specific context of the case. I only use the model as a framing element in my case description and as a visual framework for situating my results from the autoethnographic study.

There are four stages in the double diamond framework for a design process: Discover, define, develop and deliver according to the Design Council (2007:10), the phases are represented in figure 2. The stages of the model are never this linear in practice, as design processes are often cyclical and iterative (Design council 2007:10-11). Table 2 elaborates on how the Design council describes the four phases.

| Discover – The first quarter of the Double Diamond model covers the start of the project. Designers try to look at the world in a fresh way, notice new things and gather insights. |
| Define – The second quarter represents the definition stage, in which designers try to make sense of all the possibilities identified in the Discover phase. Which matters most? Which should we act on first? What is feasible? The goal here is to develop a clear creative brief that frames the fundamental design challenge. |
| Develop – The third quarter marks a period of development where solutions or concepts are created, prototyped, tested and iterated. This process of trial and error helps designers to improve and refine their ideas. |
| Deliver – The final quarter of the double diamond model is the delivery stage, where the resulting project (a product, service or environment, for example) is finalised, produced and launched. |

Table 2 The four phases of the double diamond model (Design Council, 2015)
The double diamond is definitely not the only design process model: In service design, for example, van Oosterom has proposed a five-phase process (2009:168). According to my understanding, compared to other models, the double diamond puts more emphasis on choosing the right problem to solve, and not just solving any problem; It visualizes the “fuzzy front end” of design processes (Design council 2007:10). The first (left) diamond is there (figure 2) to figure out what is the right problem (Design council 2007:10). The framework implies that we must understand the design problem and frame it ourselves, not just accept a ready brief as such, thus making choice over the problem to solve one of the important decisions in a design process.

Though the double diamond model is used as a basis for design process models by for example UK design foundation Nesta, design firm IDEO and Design for Europe initiative in their guide for designing public services (2017:19), or extending the LEAN methodology (Bicheno and Holweg 2000:2-3), or for example as a model for understanding the design process in my education, it is not a very academically grounded model. It cannot be found in many published books. What it is, however, is a generalized description, that has had apparent practical value. The capabilities approach also did not present any kind of process model for design or development, thus I was free to choose. The reason I am using the double diamond framework here is that it is the most familiar to me and I have found it useful in describing my previous design processes, especially because it focuses on solving the right problem. It is also one that has been commonly used in my education in Aalto University, and thus it is inscribed in my understanding of design processes in the public context.
In this chapter, I present the service design case, the design contribution of my thesis. As this is the case I am studying with the autoethnographic method, you should keep in my theoretical framework, though I do not discuss my design process from the perspective of capabilities approach in this chapter, but rather in the following chapters (pp. 54-82). This chapter explores the participation of the users in the design of the work and daytime activity services, starting from goals, going through the design process, outcome and the evaluation. I describe my design research and design process phases and findings. I have divided the process according to the double diamond model phases (Design Council, 2007).
Background & goals

The case was procured by the Helsinki Department of Social Services and Healthcare. The most important goal, given by the client of the case, was to produce user-initiated ideas into the public work and daytime activity services with the help of service design. The bigger contextual goal was to facilitate a small change in the way the service organization operates: The organization wanted to become more user-centered. They had also started profiling the service units into different directions or themes, and they requested that my process took that into account. The client of this case also wanted to hear the observations from the research phase to better understand the organization and find places for improvement.

After discussions with the client and reading the legislation governing the purpose of these services (Finland, 2006)(Finland, 2002), we agreed that I could generalize that the main purpose of these services was to develop and maintain the users ability to function and their abilities to live as independent a life as possible. We agreed, that I could use Martha Nussbaum’s capabilities approach as a theory to reflect upon and support my work, as the purpose of the services was related to creating capabilities and abilities. This way I was able to use the theory to reflect upon in the decisions I made in the service design process.

As I began researching the services, I became aware that there was legislation governing the design of the services. I realized that my solution and process had to be in line with current legislation, and should also anticipate upcoming changes in the legislation governing the services for disabled people (Verneri. 2016). In the following, I summarize the parts of the legislation and the developments that I considered as starting points for the design process. I especially looked at the position of the user and what was said about the design of the services. Work and daytime activity services are considered social services and they are provided according to the law on social services, and special legislation for disability (Verneri, 2016). The current law on the position and rights of the customer (user) in social services describes the customer (user) participation in the design or planning process in the following way:

“The customer must be provided an opportunity to participate in the planning/design and the execution of their services” (Finland, 2000)(own translation, original text in appendix 2)

In my opinion, the user’s opportunities to influence the services were clearly even more emphasized in the Sosiaalihuollon Työelämäosallisuutta tukeva työryhmä (TEOS) final report (2011), that estimated the needs for the legislative change and change in the services. The report refers to work and daytime activity services as follows:
“The social rehabilitation that promotes working life abilities and participation should be organized so that the person could participate in the design of the service or service system, defining the content and the self-evaluation of the service and service system. Social services should then develop more participatory methods, where customers could truly influence the design, execution, and evaluation of their own services. The starting point would be the customers’ own wishes and their opinion on what they consider meaningful and bringing substance in their lives.” (Sosiaali ja Terveysministeriö, 2011:45) (own translation, the original quote in appendix 2)

Even though the legislation is not finished, in this case, I considered customer participation in the design process of these services an integral starting point.

Design process

Discovering

The discovery phase of this case process included research with many methods, as I familiarized myself with the services. It was all research for design (Frayling 1993: 4-5), meaning that I researched the services with the aim of understanding what to address with my design. I aimed at as rich understanding as possible of the services so that I would be able to define a relevant issue for development. I collected knowledge by observing, experiencing, reading texts such as legislation, familiarizing myself with materials associated with the services, interviewing users, interviewing stakeholders, interviewing staff and by making a query. To begin understanding the services and the general developments in the way disabled citizen’s position in the society has been changing with relation to these services, I first interviewed a doctor, a social worker and a researcher of these services with a semi-structured interview format.

I gathered my most important data and insights from visiting all ten different public work and daytime activity service units. My visits were an average of four hours, during which I observed the activities, participated in the activities (figure 3), interviewed users, instructors and normally also the manager. I interviewed the staff with a semistructured interview format: I was trying to understand how the services work and what the staff considers to be the purpose of the services, why they are provided like they are, as well as how users are participating in the design of the services. From the users, I normally asked whether they are happy to use the services, what they have done there, what do they like and don’t like there, do they have experience of other services, and if they do, which do they prefer and why. Usually, my ability to discuss meaningfully with the users was limited and I really had to be careful not to lead their answers.
When I had an understanding of the users’ position in the services and issues that the services had with the families of the service users, I wanted to get some supplementary information from the families and people close to the users. I delivered a query that focused on the discovered issues, through the client to the users’ parents, as well as through online groups. In the end, I was able to reach ten people, who were relevantly commenting these specific services of Helsinki city.

Defining

The defining phase of the case design process included putting all the data together, analysing it and defining a clear issue to develop. I used the affinity diagram method (Kronqvist, 2017) to analyse my interview materials, observations and other data. I used this method because it was familiar to me from previous processes in design for public services. The affinity diagram is a visual analysis method, that can be used in design processes to combine and deal with different kinds of data points and insights (Kronqvist, 2017). I used a combination of digital and physical notes in different phases in the analysis process. The method produced a great number of findings and places for improvement.

In order to create a design solution, I needed to understand the services, the users, the user participation in the services and then choose a specific issue to develop from my findings. In the following, I describe the part of my findings, understanding and the implications that had the biggest impact on the process.

There are eight “common” public service units in Helsinki with daily work and daytime activity services, and there are different levels of activities in each. These
have the kind of activities I described (pp. 3): work related, kitchen work, crafts, social activities, visits etc. There are also two exceptional services: Haavikko is an adult training centre, that is especially focused on independent living skills, and it takes two to three years to complete, while the other common services have no time limit or long-term curricula. The other exception is the unit for supported employment, that does not offer daily activities, unlike the other services. It helps users find and keep actual jobs with pay, and only acts as a supporting agent between employees (users) and their employers. Supported employment and Haavikko were the ones that could most clearly express their goals: Employment and independent life. In the answers of the other service units describing “something meaningful to do” was vocalized in my opinion too much, if one compares to the TEOS report that talks about social rehabilitation (Sosiaali ja terveysministeriö, 2011), or the legislation about developing and maintaining functioning (Finland, 2002)(Finland, 2006). Due to these findings, I figured that it would be most impactful to focus most of my efforts on the eight “common” work and daytime activity services, not on the exceptions, that already seemed to be doing quite well in terms of service concepts, aims and user participation.

According to my analysis and observations, the position of the users and users abilities to express themselves in the services were tricky. It was clear to me that the users were in a vulnerable position, as there were many colliding interests: Users, frontline staff with limited resources, management, economic interests and pressure, legislation, parents and other people close to the users. When I discussed with users I found that was often difficult for them to express opinions about the services. It seemed nearly impossible for most users to give negative feedback of the services, and some who were more able to do so expressed concern about disappointing staff if they did:

“Will they be disappointed?”

A user when asked privately whether the user is rather in the public service or the private service

However, all talking users could always tell me their favourite, if they had experience from a couple different services. And the favourite wasn’t always the one, where we were at the time. These findings implied that there should be more flexibility, opportunities to choose and try in the service system and that expressing opinions, also negative, should be supported.

There was a deep social meaning in the services that was not obvious from the current legislation: Being social and the creation and support of social bonds, especially forming friendships and relationships were considered to play a big role in the meaningfulness of the services according to both staff and users. The services were often seen as a community to belong to, but the social behaviour was not easy for many users. A couple of the services had tried discussion groups and the staff explained that they were surprised, when the users learnt
conversational skills and could actually discuss together. This suggested that the users could and should learn communication and that you don’t necessarily know it if you always only talk to the staff.

“How does one make friends?”

User’s question to me during an interview

As I was looking at user participation and user-initiated ideas, I discovered that the organization had no specific way to come up with new ideas for the services, user-generated or other. The way new ideas were created was random and organic and often relied on the staff working on their own having some specific knowledge in some domain like a certain type of crafts. Ideation and participation of the users in the design of the services were according to my research mostly not perceived as a processes dealing with justice in the services or with a power structure between staff and users. This was also a practical issue: It was faster for the staff to make most of the decisions. Sometimes participation was about choosing next week’s activities from a list of previous activities.

The services had only recently started to come up with ways for the users to participate, due to the pressure to become more user-centered. Different services had come up with various ways the users could participate in decision-making for the services, such as user panels. They had produced ideas and requests such as getting olive oil for salad dressing, but none of the participatory methods they used introduced support in creating service content ideas that the users would prefer. The service content was not clear-cut as one would assume, but rather cultural: Different countries and even different areas in Finland have very different approaches to activities that are recommended for disabled people, and for example in the UK and USA, there are voluntary organizations just for promoting fishing for people with disabilities (BDAA, n.d) (FHNH, n.d). The lack in user participation and differing cultural influences in most of the “common” service units lead to the situation where the service content was neither based on research about what would best improve people’s abilities for independent life or employment nor was it based on the users’ ideas and preferences.

The actual content of the services like doing crafts in Finland, were the biggest, most time consuming and ability building part of the services, and according to my desktop research there was no general consensus on what should be included in the services. I considered it peculiar that in most services the users weren’t impacting and expressing their opinions about the content. But often users themselves couldn’t come up with ideas that they could express, as they had difficulties expressing opinions and negative feelings about current services. Many of them didn’t realize that literally deciding what to do could even be an option. The staff also explained that it was difficult for the users to imagine something other than what had been done before, even if they were asked to. In the one
service unit where the users could impact the content, the users experienced an issue of not being able to come up with new ideas for content. This suggested to me that creating new ideas and imagination of options should be supported.

When I was discussing user’s decision-making in the services, I was told on a couple of occasions that users need to be encouraged and supported to make choices, and that they are often not used to making decisions for themselves. The staff starts with small things like the user deciding between milk or juice with lunch (figure 4), to get the users accustomed to making decisions for themselves. What did help in was using as many senses as possible, looking at images while deciding, for example. I reasoned that users’ ability to make choices and create ideas for the services could be supported and practiced by many ways, which are also used in decision-making in everyday life: Using images, curating the options, voting, making decision-making continuous and less frightening as a situation.

Figure 4 Observing lunch preparations in a daytime activity service

After my analysis I had to define a specific challenge to further develop. The goal of the case was producing user-initiated ideas in the services, the legislation clearly stated that the users should be participating, not just in the design but also deciding of the content in the future (Sosiaali ja terveysministeriö, 2011:45). According to my findings that truly wasn’t an opportunity for many of the users due to various reasons described earlier. I concluded that the way ideas were created in the services was a good direction for the case. I wanted to support the creation of user-initiated ideas with my designer abilities as the specific challenge. In order to help the development of other matters in the organization, I also decided to gather all my other suggestions and findings for the client in the form of a vision for the future. In the vision text, I turned the negative observations from the services into positive goals for the future. The vision I included in the report, and it can be found in Finnish in appendix 3 of this thesis.
Developing

The developing phase of my design process included research through design (Frayling 1993:4-5): I chose my design method, defined criteria for my design game, ideated different game concepts, combined them, tested and iterated a game method with users and staff of the services.

The next step was choosing a design method that I would use to produce user-initiated ideas in the services. I understood the legislation and capabilities approach suggested that the user participation in the design for these public services should be continuous, and an opportunity for all users. I thought my case should produce something more long-lasting, a method for them to utilize in the future as well. I wanted to try to partly change the first step of their service design process: the creation of ideas for service content, as this was something that was not really impacted by many users. It was also important that the ideas generated could be put to use quite soon, and would be practical. I formulated questions in table 3, for evaluating design methods based on the case goals and my findings.

| 1. How well does the method produce ideas? |
| 2. How well can the method improve user’s capability to participate? |
| 3. How accessible is the method for disabled users? |
| 4. How will the method fit the operation of the organization? |
| 5. Can the method work as a continuous process in the client organization? |
| 6. Is trying the ideas a natural next step for the method? |

Table 3 Evaluating questions for the design method

With these questions, I evaluated familiar and less familiar service design methods from the book “Designing services with innovative methods” (Miettinen and Koivisto, 2009), as well as Vaajakallio’s doctoral dissertation (2012). My options ranged from bodystorming, scenarios to context mapping and probes. After all, I chose design games, because it had the best overall result, was not weak in any front, and I also had discussed it with my advisor. Criticism can be placed here, because I had not used all of the methods I evaluated, and my evaluations were based on my limited understanding of the methods. Design methods can also be seen as an externalization of a designer’s biases and simplified descriptions of methods criticized (Lee, 2014:5.8-5.9).

Design games as a method have been studied and described by Vaajakallio (2012). She has framed them as a mindset for the player, a tool for the service designer, and a structure for the design game designer (Vaajakallio, 2012:219). In my case, I was the design game designer and I needed to design a structure or a process for the game. I started developing the game by producing myself a list of criteria for designing the design game method. Based on all that I understood
from the services, the goals of the case, design games, capabilities approach, and the users and the issue, I wrote the criteria or brief for the game (table 4).

- **Used by both staff and service users, though users play**
- **Should work with a framing element (outdoor activities, or crafts etc.) or without**
- **Very visual, meaning that uses only a little text**
- **Can be used by people with different levels of ability or their assistants/surrogates**
- **Facilitates discussion between players**
- **Can be played without a coach or a guiding person after practising**
- **Includes a good guide on how to play, preferably in visual form (maybe even video)**
- **Introduces elements from quality criteria for these services (Verneri, 2018)**
- **Is open source and can be further developed by the users and staff**
- **Does not involve a lot of dealing with abstract concepts**
- **Involves random elements outside of the game to spark ideas**
  - internet, books, magazines, someone’s phone etc.
- **Incorporates unbiased language that encourages free ideation**
- **Involves game elements or mechanics of gameplay**
  - turns, rewards, movement, competing together, a goal to reach
- **Involves physical objects, materials as well as images**
- **Involves familiar elements from service centres**
  - button for communication, communication images
- **Relates to some easily understandable game reference (Kimble, memory)**
- **Generates a creative easily understandable amount of ideas to choose from by**
  - visualizing elements of the service
  - mixing different options in unlikely manners
- **Helps ease decision-making by**
  - making decision-making continuous
  - providing a process for narrowing down options
  - leaving out the least favourite options first
  - making secret votes
- **Facilitates going to uncharted waters, things that employees don’t know how to teach:**
  - whatever it is, fishing, fixing bicycles, music, skiing, sushi
  - something that the users know, but the staff doesn’t know how to do (switching roles in who teaches whom)

| Table 4 Design game criteria |

I needed to define, who I would develop the game with since in this case, I could never catch everyone or even all the different types of services. After discussing with my advisor and the client, I decided to focus on the daytime activity services in one service centre though the solution would be for all, because the more able users in the work activity services would be probably able to use a game that
would work with the users from the daytime activity services, and the services had a lot of similarities in their operations, which made me think they could use a similar solution. I have already discussed focusing more on the “common” services (pp. 36) and I further elaborate on this decision in the evaluation section (pp. 51).

My process of developing a working design game started with ideating different game concepts, ideas, and processes from all the knowledge that I had. I was using the criteria for the game, (table 2), as support and inspiration, and I also looked at what others had done. In the earliest ideas, I utilized using users’ own dreams, lottery, role-playing the services and visualizing the service experience (figure 5). I went through different processes and tried to combine them to produce a process that would mostly fulfill the criteria. Once I had different options and concepts, I discussed them with my advisor. She has experience in designing games and she could give me an idea of which game methods I shouldn’t try and which might work: a game method based on word combinations.

Figure 5 First game concepts and combining their processes

I started developing the game method based on word combinations, I looked into the different ways to choose words in the game: lottery, picking from cards. As I wanted to keep the game as simple as possible, yet have visual materials, cards seemed to be the easiest solution for this. First I developed the phases of the game: Picking words, combining words, discussing ideas, and deciding favourites, relying on the game criteria to support decision-making (pp. 40). The first game tests with my friends told me, that I had to limit the number of combinations, to make the game easier and shorter. It was also clear that any words wouldn’t
do, but I would have to try to aim for somehow understandable combinations. To answer this I developed a rough categorization for words: The content cards included the thing that was to be learnt or understood, and the process would be the way the content was dealt with. This was not a very clear separation, but it worked in the game tests.

I played different versions of the game three times with the users from daytime activity services. After each game session, I asked for feedback: How did it feel to play, which time was better and why. I also talked with the staff who were participating or observing about whether they thought they could play the game themselves, how the users seemed to be managing to express their opinions and which were the working solutions etc. After each game session, I took all the feedback under consideration and changed the game for the next version. During the first game with users, I was prepared to radically ease the game, if it was required, but the users did really well in the game, thus we played the difficult version of the game, which included voting for favourite ideas. The first test convinced me, that I should continue developing this form of the game method because it worked well for the users.

One of the things I realized I hadn’t included in my game criteria was that the game should be fun as well. The advisor told me that the revelation of votes should probably be the most obvious choice for the exciting phase, that was needed to make the game more fun. This lead me to change the way the votes were revealed: In the first games the votes were revealed one by one, in the next game I wanted them to be revealed all at once by users, not by the instructor of the game. The new voting system was a success, it made the game shorter and the ending more dramatic. The users especially liked the voting pieces I had made, confirming my understanding of the importance of materiality in the game. During second game test session, we also tried a different version of the game that included a game board, but it didn’t make the game easier or more fun if anything it slowed it down. I concluded that it was best to keep the game simple and only have cards in it. For the last game test, I decided to hand over the responsibility of leading the game to the staff, and I filmed the process. This helped me to realistically evaluate if the staff could use the game, and understand what kind of helping materials the staff instructor would need to be able to lead the game themselves.

I tested the game with three other groups: The user panel group of supported employment services and the staff from the whole organization, of work and daytime activity services. From the user panel, I especially wanted to know if the game felt somehow too easy, or boring since they were probably the users with the highest degree of ability in the services. My worries were in vain, they had a great time playing the game, and could include their own interests in the game as cards. I also tried to give them the opportunity to as a group through discussion reduce some ideas from the cards, without voting, but that was really
difficult. This confirmed the importance of private votes in the game. Playing the game with the staff during the development days of the organization had four purposes: Familiarizing the staff with the game, testing an ad hoc version of the game (figure 6), getting feedback of the initial version of the game method and gathering words that they used for the game.

Figure 6 Testing the game with staff

**Delivering**

In the delivery phase of the design process, I finalized the game concept according to the last game session feedback, produced the game materials and delivered the design game to the client. In this phase of the case, I was mainly making decisions about the design outcome and how to present it. I discuss the outcomes of the case process more in detail in the next section, and evaluate my choices more in the Evaluation -section (pp. 49-52).

I developed the visual materials for the game with usability and accessibility in mind. I decided to create illustrated backs for the cards so that they would be easy to print double-sided and ready for use straight out of the printer or could be laminated, because it was a process that was in use in many of the service units, and could help in making the cards easier to pick up from the table. I wanted the visuals of the game to be clear and simple and work together with the communication images, that came readily from the Papunet image database (Papunet, 2018). In all of the illustration, I chose strong contrasts and quite thick lines to allow people with reduced eyesight to make out the shapes
For the finalisation of the game, I also chose words that I would recommend for using in the beginning, because it was not completely straightforward coming up with the words that would create working combinations, and it would be helpful if you could start with ready materials. As I hadn’t narrowed my solution down to either, I made separate lists for work and daytime activity services based on game tests and the quality criteria (Verneri, 2018). I especially looked at what were the content related suggestions in the quality criteria for the services. Then I looked up the communication images for the words from Papunet (2018) and combined them with the card backs and lists of references.

To explain, how the game can be combined within the everyday practices of services, such as using colour coded calendars and discussion aids, I decided to make a visual description of the whole process around playing the game. I considered carefully, which phases of the process should be left to the users which to staff because I was giving a direct recommendation of who decides what is done in the services. In this phase, it was important not to suggest that the gameplay is mandatory for users, but an opportunity that they have, and they, not the staff decides about because otherwise, it would not have fit capabilities approach or the legislation. I considered it important that users would still also give feedback on all the activities, even if they are able to contribute to the design of the content. Because it was requested in the development days of the services, I also created a visual and written stage by stage instruction, that can be used during the game.

I chose to make videos to present the game and its process because I had used a video to communicate the game process during one of the staff tests of the game, and the video of me showing the game had worked better in explaining the game than me just talking about it. As the users also better understood visual communication combined with words, making videos made sense. I thought that the videos could be a user interface to playing the game, they would guide you to the right materials and you could always watch them, anywhere. I used the feedback I received and issues that surfaced during the development process to form the content of the videos. In the videos, I combined the illustrations, visual materials from the game and the last filmed game test with users. Once all the materials for the game were finished I presented my results to the client through a presentation and a report.
Design outcome

The final design outcome of the case is an ideation design game called Meidän Suosikki-ideat, or Our Favourite Ideas in English. It is named simply after its objective: To create user-initiated content ideas in the work and daytime activity services for disabled people, and rank the ideas according to what users like most. The game is a way for the users be part of the ideation and design process of the services in a supported way: It supports the users in expressing their opinions, creating ideas, and making choices. The users express their opinions by choosing preferred topics from visual game cards, the game helps in sparking ideas by combining those cards in unexpected ways and finally it helps making decisions by supporting users to take a secret vote by using tangible materials (figure 7).

The game method is meant to change how some ideas for the service content originate, as this was discovered as an issue (pp. 38). I’ve specifically designed a method for idea generation because if I had gathered ideas from only some users, the services would have ended up depicting the preferences of some, and that would be not in the way I understand the law and capabilities approach view it (pp. 33-34, 16). Describing a new ideation method is important because it makes it possible for all the services to have their own, more user-centered service design processes, where all capable users or their representatives can participate.
Meidän Suosikki-ideat is a multiplayer game that is based on word combinations made from tangible visual materials. The game can be played with 3-4 person group of users with an instructor and it takes half an hour. In the game, there are different supporting physical elements: Two types of cards (hearts and bulbs), idea sheets, voting pins and voting chest or ballot. During the game, users create ideas by combining content or topic word cards, marked with hearts, with action describing word cards, the bulb cards. The gameplay can be visually understood through the symbols: combining the heart cards to the bulb cards to create the favourite ideas, depicted by the heart-shaped light bulb in the communication image (figure 8). The purpose of the communication image (figure 8) is to help communicate with the users about playing the game and also to make it possible to request playing the game.

The game has been tested multiple times with users and staff, both in daytime activity services and with the user panel of the supported employment unit and it has been developed according to the user and staff feedback. The staff has also been able to lead the game with instructions. To give you a sense of what kind of favourite ideas have been created for example in the daytime activity services: Learning about traffic through a story, acting out a play in a library and group work in the botanical garden. Some of them have already been realized, such as baking a salmon pie (figure 10), which was created with the cards depicting fishing and baking. The game has been liked by staff and users.

"Fun to play. When do we play again?"
A service user after the last design game test
The simple gameplay has four phases: Selection, turning & discussion, voting, and revelation. First, the heart cards are placed on the table, and the users choose one by one some topic that they find interesting, or create one. Next, all the chosen heart cards are mixed together and a similar amount of action cards (bulb cards) are drawn or selected from the deck and placed facing down on the table next to the heart cards. In the next phase, each player on their own turn turns one heart and one bulb card, creating a word combination. This combination is discussed together: What could this mean for us? These ideas are written on a paper and the cards and paper attached together. This process is continued until all the cards have been put aside. In the next phase, the users vote on the ideas for their favourites by placing a coloured tag representing the idea in the voting chest. Lastly, the users open the chest and the result is revealed. The winning ideas with the most votes are transferred to the activities calendar in the services.

I have created different materials to support understanding and playing the game: The communication image (figure 8), the starter game card packages, the game instruction sheet, and the game videos. All of the materials are freely available online and can be accessed through the videos and their descriptions. The game method I have created is open source: I have agreed with the client that the game concept is opened with Creative Commons CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 license (Creative Commons, n.d). The concept can be used for non-commercial purposes when naming the original source. As it was also not possible in this case to make a best fitting game version for all the service units, I’ve left the game open for modification and reuse both from the perspective of the licence and the game materials.

The most important materials of the game, the starter word cards packages, are based on the game tests with staff and users, the quality criteria for the services and my own judgement. As the council of disability (Vernerri, 2018), has contributed to creating the quality criteria for the work and daytime activity services, I thought it would provide a good basis for understanding what types of content should be included in the words to start choosing from in the services. The starter packages also include empty cards to be filled with users own preferences directly, or if a user’s preferences are known, but they cannot participate, their preferences can be added to the card deck. Each service unit will be responsible for developing their own set of cards, but the starter package gives an opportunity to start playing immediately. The cards also act as a visual representation of the passing of time in the game: As the game proceeds all the cards are removed from the table, which makes following the game progress easier, similar to memory games, that are used in these services.

I have also visualized how I think the game can be fitted in the everyday of the services by creating a service path description (figure 9). The service path visualizes the whole experience of the participatory design game, both for users and staff starting from making materials and ending with feedback and making
changes. The activities that are visible to the users are on top and the activities of the staff are below. If one wants to use the game in the service, one can simply follow the path stage by stage. It can also be used to visualize the process of how the ideas are put into action. This can be a way to motivate the users to play the game when they have a better understanding of where the ideas are being used.

Our Favourite ideas game has different ways and levels of difficulty to be played, and these are listed in the game instruction (Berg, 2017a) and in the videos (Berg, 2017b). There is an easy paper version for introducing the game or then a more established version that takes more time to manufacture. Users can play an introductory game with few ideas created or a more difficult game to include everyone’s abilities to improve the service content for example. The game can be started easily and made more grounded later, these ways were created to make the adoption of the game method as easy and fast as possible, yet keep the game interesting for the future for more difficulty, once the game is familiar.

I present the game through three videos. The experience from the development process told me that the staff would understand the game faster through video. I thought that the videos would be an easier way to facilitate the transfer of abilities from me to the organization and could provide a visual hands-on way for the organization to quickly share and adopt the method, though at their own pace. The first video explains the basic idea of the game and the other two are more instructional: making the materials and playing the game. The instructional videos can be used with users while playing the game and making the materials as well. The videos can be found by searching with “Meidän Suosikki-ideat” in Youtube or with the link in the references (Berg, 2017b).
Evaluation

The most important goal for this service design case was to produce user-initiated ideas into the work and daytime activities for disabled people. The goal was achieved in a way well since some ideas have already been put to action, but the goal still requires work from the organization for the game method to really be put to large scale use and to produce a lot of user-initiated ideas. In this case, I have created a way for the goal to be reached. The personal yet also important goal of the solution being in line with the legislation has also been reached because the solution follows current legislation and anticipates upcoming changes by giving users an opportunity to participate in the planning of service content, which was especially discovered as an upcoming change (pp. 34).

Meidän Suosikki-ideat design game, the workshops, and presentations that I have given, as well as the game videos and materials I have made, provide the organization the abilities and the possibility to change their design process to become truly more user-centered, as was the bigger contextual goal for the case. As a game test showed, it is possible for the organization to use their service profiling themes in the game, as they want to prepare for more intense competition with private services which can result from the upcoming service reform (Valtionneuvosto, n.d). The required development suggestions were handed over in the form of the design game materials and the report including the vision (Appendix 3). Though the case was delivered on schedule, it exceeded the hours reserved for it in the thesis originally. This was due to my determination to create a concrete method and present it with video, as well as my own enthusiasm for the topic.

The game criteria (pp. 40) were met well, though not everything could be put to use because the game does not include external materials to provoke ideas in the process, and the game could still facilitate discussion better. I never expected all the criteria to be met and I am surprised that I could accomplish almost all. Most importantly the game has managed to combine things in unexpected ways, and through that give new ideas as options, and the users have been able to play and choose. Coming up with ideas from a combination of words is sometimes easier and sometimes harder, it is also clear from the game tests that the process requires patience, faith, and creativity from the instructor as well.

According to the feedback and game results, the game has been successful: It has been liked by users and staff and it appears to be a good and concrete way to bring more users in the planning of the content of the services. According to the comments of the staff the produced ideas have been reasonably easy to put into action. The game tests have shredded both mine and the test staff’s prejudices about which kind of ideas the users would vote for, proving once more that the
professionals might not know what the users actually prefer. Once they are given a true opportunity to choose and supported in their decision-making, the results can surprise. Though the game improves the users’ ability to participate in the service planning or design process, I also want to point out, that the users will not necessarily choose the things that would the most develop their abilities or things that they cannot imagine or haven’t tried. They can do the opposite, but that is their right according to the legislation (Finland, 2000) (Sosiaali ja terveysministeriö, 2011). In this case, the goal was to produce user-initiated ideas, not necessarily the newest, most educative or most innovative service ideas.

From a justice perspective, it should also be questioned, who has the right to contribute words to the game, because the words dictate what kind of combinations can be made. This is something that I have reflected upon, and as a designer, I have had to curate the starter pack. I think that the cards I left empty, the possibility to add cards according to preference, and the fact that I relied on the service quality criteria (Verneri, 2018) and the know-how of the staff to create the starter pack of cards, make my solution as ethically acceptable as I could imagine in this specific case. Ultimately the game gives the users the right to choose from ideas and themes, and their imagination is the only limit when coming up with ideas from the word combinations.

The suitability of the game method for both work and daytime activity services is still a bit questionable since I have not tested the game in the work services, besides the supported employment. As I have visited all the services, understand the nature of the services, have used the feedback from the staff of the work services in developing the game, tailored a starter pack of words for them, and left the game concept open for further development I believe there will be no major issues. Developing the game in the daytime activity services was a conscious decision, due to the rationale that if the less able users could use the game, the more able users would definitely be able to play the game. The only issue was then whether the game would prove to be too boring for people with higher abilities. This was disproved by trying the game with supported employment user panel and staff, and the game turned out to be quite fun for them. The relevance of the ideas produced with the game can be questioned for the supported employment service, because the method is specifically for content design, and their service does not provide this kind of content activities. In this case, I have designed for the majority of the services to benefit as many users as possible, and my results of the two exceptional services already having a clearer service offering and concept also made me focus more on the rest. But the game can also work for coming up with more recreational activities for services or then tools for the work, as happened when the staff of the supported employment service tried the game.
In terms of design and service design literature, it can also be questioned, how radical or novel the results are, since Mager (2009:38-39) advocates for service design radically reimagining services. In this case, I have not tried to completely reimagine the services from my perspective, because it would have required a different case outline and goals. There have been some projects where these services have been completely reimagined, such as In With Forward’s Kudoz model (n.d) that more resembles Manzini’s idea of collaborative services (2009:54).

Figure 10  The user produced idea of baking a salmon pie
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My approach in the case was more that of designing for services, (Sangiorgi and Prendiville, 2017:254), as I was focused on what design could contribute to the services, acknowledging that design was already happening in the organization, though rather organically, and I was intervening this process with my design.

In this case, the users were many and with varying degrees of ability and due to the strict resources available, I found it more efficient to be largely in control of the design process. This means that the users did not come up with the game concept through co-design, as I understand Vaajakallio has suggested could be possible (2012:189). The users and staff participated in the development phase of design process especially and I made changes to the game according to their feedback. I tried to understand them as much as I could by being part of the services for quite many days in the discovery phase. In this sense I see my design process connecting to the idea of empathic design (Miettinen, 2011:30-31), rather than participatory design, though the process of designing the services will be more participatory with the existence of the method, and there was participation in my process as well. The staff and users have been involved in the process, to give their valuable contribution to the design. It is important that they feel ownership of the game as the future utilization of the game will be their responsibility.

In the future the applicability and the effects of the game should be studied for a longer time period, to evaluate the usefulness of the approach and the usefulness of the results. The important questions to study would be following: Do the users’ abilities to participate in the process really improve? What kind of ideas are being produced? How does the method influence the content of the services? With reasonable effort, the game could also be made into an online format. I believe the game would also be easier to put into practice if it was digital, though the materiality in the game is also very important when it comes to meaningfulness and flow. The online version could also include different supporting tools to help ideate: For example, the opportunity to search the web with different word combinations, though it is to be acknowledged that search engines might not agree that Fishing + Baking = Salmon pie (Figure 10).
This chapter unveils the analysis process of the design case decision-making and the results of my autoethnographic study. In this chapter, I first describe my data from the case, explain my analysis method and then tell my results from the autoethnographic study of the design process. I then answer my research question in writing and through a visual representation of the results, evaluate the validity of the results and finally, judge my research ethics.
Data

I had different types of data: Unstructured notes from before the official beginning of the design process, which were more reflective and structured notes from during the design process, which answer the specific questions mentioned in the Method chapter (pp. 27), and then other data available like my calendar. To support remembering and understanding the process, I used my calendar, my notes, and my emails, but the most important data were the structured notes. All in all, I had a lot of data that made me able to analyse my process thoroughly. My key data-set, the structured notes, were 27 all together and from each decision were on average 230 words. Following example, (table 5) is 216 words, and it answers the questions 1. What were the decisions that you made today in the design (case) process? 2. On what grounds did you make them? 3. What would capabilities approach say about them/ Reflect? 4. Would that make you change the way you work? Why / Why not? 5. INSIGHTS: (open)

1. I decided upon the final design method: design game
2. I made a quantitative comparison of methods from “Designing services with innovative methods” with specific criteria: How well it suits brief, capabilities building, customer profiles and continuity in the organization. I think I could have considered more how I choose the criteria for selecting the method. Like what are actually the capabilities that the method is supposed to promote. Now those came from the research findings: decision-making as well as opinion voicing for users and for organization: Flexibility and innovation capabilities.
3. I think capabilities approach would only be talking about the outcome mostly, depending on the case though. Whether this is a case of procedural justice according to Nussbaum, I am not sure. However, I am confident that abilities self-expression and decision-making are ranked very high on her list.
4. It could make me rethink how we rank ideas and methods, because it carries a lot of weight. Let’s suppose that capability promotion would always be a criterion in every design agencies decision-making situation, it would make a difference, I believe.
5. I think that capabilities actually here somehow weirdly overlaps with organizational change theory if we think about procedural justice in the design process. I think capabilities have a lot to do with facilitating change.

Table 5 Example quote from journal data, 12.7.2017
Analysis

In my analysis phase, I used a combination of inductive and deductive analysis techniques, because I had framing elements: the capabilities approach and the double diamond design process model, but my research question was about how the theory could inform the process, meaning what would happen if I used the theory to reflect upon in the design case. And a description of what would happen, what were the effects, was the result I expected to have.

I relied heavily on the “Autoethnography as a method” book by Chang (2008), as well as my previous experience of decoding and analysing written data. First I used deductive analysis in the structuring the data in the double diamond framework (Design Council, 2007). I started by colour coding different phases of the design process approximately in the data and organizing notes according to their dates and other supporting data like my calendar. After reading through the unstructured data once, I decided to leave out most of the non-structured notes, that were not about the design process at all. As Chang suggests, I then labelled all the occurrences (2008:116), the specific structured writings according to different data that I had collected: When they were made, where, which part of the design process it was, did I make a decision or was it a reflection, what was the topic of the decision, who was involved, and did the capabilities approach change my opinion of the decision. The following is an example of the label given to the previous example text about deciding the design method:


I created a summary table of the labels, like suggested by Chang (2008:118-119) to be able to subtract some quantitative data from the dataset as well, and to make summarized observations of for example who had the biggest influence on my decisions in the process, or in which phase of the design process most notes were made or most decisions affected by the theory.

While I was labelling the data, I was reading all the data through for the first time properly, adding comments, finding recurring themes, making observations. After this, I started writing my notes down in a separate file. After the labelling, I went into inductive analysis by letting themes emerge from the data, by reading it through multiple times and following Chang’s instructions on looking for recurring topics, patterns, cultural themes, exceptional occurrences of when I felt the theory informed the process, inclusion/omission, connecting present with past, relationships between self and others, contextualizing broadly and trying to compare to social science constructs and ideas (2008:132-137).
After the first read, I had a lot of notes and already some emerging themes because there seemed to be recurring topics. In the second round of reading and writing notes, I tried writing the first attempts in the form of answering the research question as well. I made as many observations as possible and wrote down all, also the ones I deemed irrelevant for the research question. In the analysis process, I also used some of my earliest more reflective diary type notes to analyse my positioning and language at the beginning of the process compared to the latter stages.

I sorted the emerged categories or themes roughly around which were specifically about the theory, and which were more about my process, and didn’t have so much to do with the theory itself, such as my relationships with others in the decision-making process. Then I wrote out the findings as a more coherent text, explaining the findings and added captions from the data. I kept going back to the data for more findings, but once the same topics kept on popping up over and over again, I decided I was done with dealing directly with the data.

Lastly, a month later after being reacquainted with the capabilities approach, I again framed my themed findings with the elements of the framing theory: Which were the parts of the theory that could be seen in the results, which came up as themes and were found most meaningful for the process. The reason I did it in this order is that I had to be again acquainted with the theory for writing the thesis, and I didn’t want to over-interpret the emergence of the theoretical notions in my results. The results from this last round of analysis are situated in the Answering research question section (pp. 65).

Results

Unlike some autoethnographic writings, my autoethnographic writing of the results is compressed into this results section in the more formal style of the thesis though also containing quotes from the data, that hopefully elaborate on my own thought processes. I expose my own professional identity in the process as well, because my findings are from a professional working culture of a designer that has moved from product design to service design. In order for this to be a proper autoethnography, the reader should understand my process and me as a learning designer. During the analysis process, I’ve begun to understand myself and my design process as a product of the university and as an extension of my professional history in general. I’ve realized that I need to explain my work and educational history to give some context to my findings and to my process, and I do that next. I understand that my professional background does not answer my research question, I just think it is relevant to understanding the process, where the results were created.
The context

In the data and in the decisions I made, one thing that came up constantly is my professional and educational background, thus I believe it is relevant to clarify it. My background is in product design, more specifically in the field of ceramics and glass design, and I had actually worked on a case of designing for visually impaired people in my bachelor of art studies as well as one case in service design. In my earlier studies, I was heavily leaning on entrepreneurship and pedagogical studies, though I also studied industrial design for a year. However, after my studies, I started working in product development and design for a multinational consumer goods company that industrially produced ceramics and glassware. Because of my four-year history in the company, being an employee representative and trustee, I also was educated in legislation regarding work, and how to use the legislative databases, quite thoroughly. After being frustrated with the way design and sustainability were treated there and having so little chances of impacting that, feeling like I had tried everything I could, I decided to apply to a university to study further. In the university, I have studied in a program that emphasizes systematic understanding of problems: systems thinking, co-design, multidisciplinarity and sustainability. To further elaborate, I have not specifically studied in a service design programme, the tools, methods and processes have been introduced to me in various courses, where service design, among others, has been applied.

The mix of theory, legislation, and my background studies lead me to think about designing a design method as the final outcome of the process. In my process, I use tools and practices from various fields: Service design, participatory design, and empathic design. My professional and educational history could be seen in many ways in the data: There are even a few occasions where I actually literally go back to my school materials.

“This dates back to my designing for services class. I read the materials again and also went through my goals for the work again. “ (quote from journal data,15.6.2017)

In this context of my professional process, besides being the frame for the whole case, there were several ways that having capabilities approach to reflect upon impacted my process. I produced findings of the theory’s impact on my process, as well as more general findings of my design process and the decisions and omissions thereof. In the following results themes, I have gathered the most obvious impacts that the theory had on my process, and some themes, that came with the interpretation process. All of them don’t necessarily answer the research question but elaborate on my process. First I summarize what can be seen from the quantitative data.
The quantitative data, that I gathered from the labelling, told the following: in 17 out of 27 notes the theory had according to my own estimation an impact on an important decision in the design process, or at least on the way I thought about the decision. At times I would record that the theory had laid down the foundation for my thoughts already before making the note or that the theory had made me ponder or question certain aspects of my process. The notes were roughly distributed in the way table 6 presents, in the double diamond design process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Amounts of notes made in different phases of the double diamond process

These phases are somewhat fluid since, in design processes, there are phases that take some steps back, even though the process is already ahead. I also looked at how many choices there were about the design process, and which were more about the design outcome. They were roughly even, according to my analysis, the approach had a similar degree of influence on both dimensions of justice in my case design process. In the following, I describe my qualitative findings.

## Communication

The fact that I had studied the theory and was studying it in the process lead me to explicitly use it in the communication during the design process: Capabilities approach informed the discussions and interviews in the discovery phase of the process. Because of the theory, I was also more articulate about the purpose of the services, I was able to discuss it with people and make it one starting point for my design and research process. The theory helped me in being more articulate about the ethical dilemmas in these services and make communication more meaningful.

“... capabilities approach actually helped me in being able to articulate certain issues that might have been left undiscovered: what is the aim of the services and the ethical dilemma of having people do something to promote their capabilities even if they don’t like it.” (quote from journal data, 2.6.2017)

Being aware of the theory and understanding the ethical or moral aspects of the services lead me to present the services and development suggestions differently
on different occasions during the design process. I would specifically talk about the choices that the staff has to make and how they can be discussed through capabilities.

“What I did decide upon however was my angle upon approaching the presentation I was having there... I made my decision and presentations based on the capabilities approach, partly and partly on the current legislation and upcoming legislation.” (quotes from journal data, 4.9.2017)

Communication was also an important crux for the services in terms of capabilities approach: If there is to be informed choice, there should be information to make an informed choice about the services. This is why I ended up recommending more visual materials so that the users would have more understanding when choosing the services.

“Capabilities approach would probably say that we need to provide the citizen the capabilities to make a rational choice. “ (quote from journal data, talking about materials displaying the services to users 19.6.2017)

Approaching users

In the process, I reported on many occasions that the way I, as a designer, approached users through the identification of their needs was in conflict with what I understood of capabilities approach. Needs based design process understanding was clashing with capabilities based design process: Especially in the case context of education and work and disabilities, the needs paradigm did not seem to get me very far. In this context, the capabilities approach was for me a better way to conceptualize, justify and understand things. Capability ethics guided the design process in the direction of considering learning, agency, and abilities as important concepts in this process, instead of needs. The focus on needs with regard to service design tools or methods like personas was also apparent.

“There seems to be a mismatch between design focusing on needs of the people and capabilities approach focusing on capabilities or positive freedoms of the people (albeit by providing freedom to fill the basic needs). The needs as well as capabilities are something that can be relatively universally understood, though capabilities approach has a higher emphasis on a nobler goal “dignity” compared to needs “needs satisfaction” This becomes very apparent with the case of disabled people: if we approach the needs paradigm, education, for example, is not very high on the list. This is probably why the learning right/responsibility has not existed for disabled [sic] before the 1990’s.” (quote from journal data, 5.6.2017)
Just processes?

There seemed to be mismatches between my understanding of Nussbaum’s capabilities approach and the legislation’s perspective on a fair procedure of determining the way the services are designed. Capabilities approach is more concerned with the outcome, how the services are and how they contribute to users capabilities. The way I saw it in the process was that as long as the users of the services had the choice to choose services of their liking, they might not need to participate in the planning. However, the Finnish Position and rights of the customer in the social services act, (2000) says all should be given the possibility to design or plan their services. Capabilities approach could not thus contribute much to my thoughts about “what is enough participation” a question I considered ethically relevant, other than questioning whether participation is necessary, both in the way the services are designed in general and in my design process.

“I think in the decision-making of “who participates” there were many clashing ideas: Capabilities approach does not require user participation in my opinion necessarily [sic]. However, from the perspective of participatory design, it is adamant. And also from the perspective of the legal framework, it is actually required. We were basically hosting illegal development day. As a framework for disability, capabilities approach says that it is not enough that we provide the disabled people resources if we do not support them in having the capabilities to use those resources properly. ” (quote from journal data, 4.9.2017)

But when I considered the legislation to override my understanding of capabilities approach, and framed participation as necessary and defined by society, the approach could help with questioning whether there actually was an opportunity to design or plan, if all users aren’t able to understand and utilize this possibility, and asking what can I do to support that they are able to participate.

Freedom to choose individually

Capabilities approach’s disposition towards positive freedoms to choose for all was guiding me towards letting users choose for themselves in the services. This lead me to think about not producing only one size fits all readymade service solution or using only some user groups to produce some ideas. The theory kept on guiding to consider everyone’s positive freedoms - this meant that it would be difficult to narrow down a group to focus on, which lead me to eventually think about customization of the design outcome for diversity.

“Capabilities approach treats each individual as an end, meaning that in a way all should be considered I guess. It doesn’t treat groups well, we should consider the positive freedoms of all individually greatened, then we are progressing/
developing. (2)Yes, maybe. It makes me think about who to involve and how to actually benefit the positive freedoms of all individuals involved in the process. “(quote from journal data, 2.6.2017)

The freedom to choose and to make an informed choice naturally leads to being informed and understanding what you are deciding about, as was discussed in the communication theme. The theory focusing on the freedom to choose also lead me to think about some tools as representations of hierarchy and power structures, because of the way they can represent who has the right to choose something:

“Customer journey map is a hierarchy and there is a power structure that I am creating here as well.” (quote from journal data, 1.11.2017)

**Design method**

I used the theory to inform the decision about my design method, which also turned out to be the outcome - I made criteria for the selection of the design method inspired by capabilities approach and assessed many methods according to how they could be understood by users, their ability to produce new ideas and their ability to increase users’ ability to function in this system. I chose the method much more meticulously than I otherwise probably would have done, especially since here the method would also be the outcome. Capabilities approach in collaboration with the legislation led me to think about the user’s ability to participate in the design process of the services.

**My role and the outcome**

The theory had an impact on how I saw my own role in the design process of these services, and how I saw the outcome. My process was not as much a matter of “designing something novel” as it was about learning to support. When I was reflecting the outcome of the process I saw capability ethics in contrast with my designer identity: As a designer I’d want to deliver something finished and polished, but capability wise, in order to pass on the skills and their right to choose for themselves, I thought it would be better if they can modify the design, it’s open and they can make it their own.

“And how can I support that they are able to do and be MORE.” (quote from journal data, 18.7.2017)

“It might not be innovation in the purest form, it is a concept and methodology used before. What is valuable here is the fact that I pay attention to this crowd, to these users. Even if the game might not be the most innovative or the
most beautiful, it will work for the people who will use it.” (quote from journal data, 17.8.2017)

I was using capabilities approach to reflect upon what the design outcome of the case should be like and how it should also inspire learning and build capabilities. I was originally inspired to make a video out of the game due to the approach. I also saw the game as a resource and the videos and workshops as a good way to pass on the ability to use that resource. I could also use the theory in thinking about the aims of the game: Using capabilities enhancement as an end goal for the game, through increasing abilities to create ideas, make decisions and participate.

Curation and availability

There were some things in the design process, where capabilities approach did not seem to offer me much help: When it came to making decisions for the users, I was afraid of limiting the pool of options by defining a starting package of word cards. I decided to be the curator partly, and partly leave the cards open to be filled. Curation seemed, in general, to be an important topic in the process, as it is heavily connected to limiting understanding and information (pp. 60), which connects to opportunities to choose and act.

The relationship between self and capabilities approach

There was a timely relationship between me and the theory: I was more articulate about the theory at the beginning of the process, I saw it more through the process, and in the end, I saw it more through the outcome, and I was less articulate of the theory. In the earliest writings I was also very critical of the whole process, but as time passed, I was less critical and less able to reflect. When looking at the data, it is clear that I was not always in full understanding of the theory and have interpreted it in an obscure way, and I was not able to use it in reflections. Since moral philosophy is not my main field of study and capabilities approach was recently unfamiliar to me, it is understandable.

Relationship between self and others

The data shows that there was a strong influence from others in the decisions in the design process. It can be seen from the data that my advisor played a role in at least five of the decisions made in the design process. She, however, was not familiar with capabilities approach, that was my own responsibility. The influence
from the interviewees and others encountered can be seen in the decisions: Some of the meetings with my client and earliest interviews lead me to understand these services as an extension of the fragmented legislation governing them, for example. The staff also had their impact on the design process. I only realized later on, that I had let the staff choose who would participate in the game tests from the users according to their understanding of who would want or could do it. This was something that I did not question immediately, and I realized that I too had fallen victim of their paradigm of the staff making the decisions. This was one of the assumptions that seemed to rule the system of the services. Incidentally, it was one of the things I set out to correct, yet I could not recognize it when it happened to me.

**Patterns and omissions**

There were many observable patterns in my data, that relate more to the nature of the process than the theory. I can observe that there are some things that I have decided upon, but later on changed my mind. I also used rational decision-making tools in the process and tried to make valid choices that would be based on learnings and capability building aspects, probably knowing that my process would be scrutinized. At times I observe myself relying on the legislation, being a moral legalist, or at least relying on the law as “what is just” and “what is right”. Some things popped up surprisingly early on in the writing, and then only later on they would be considered as an option and decided upon.

“But I also started to think about the design method itself and got thinking about whether I could design a way for them to design. Meta-design method is what I mean.” (quote from journal data, 15.6.2017, the choice of the final design method was 12.7.2017)

There were several decisions that I neglected to reflect upon explicitly in writing in the journal. About some of them I wrote somewhere else, like in the report: Choosing the analysis method for the case data (affinity diagram), or choosing to focus on user participation idea generation in the organization, though I had written about what would be a just design process or making the vision. There are also not many notes about the game development process itself, though I must have made many decisions there as well. Some of the decisions flew by so fast that when working alone, I never had to debate them with myself. Other decisions grew a long time to be realized, like presenting the game as a video, and they were difficult to reflect upon with the method. It is neither realistic to assume that I could have rationally evaluated all my decisions in this design process, due to the implicit choices we all make continuously.
Answering research question

My research question was: Can capabilities approach inform decision-making in the design process for public work and daytime activity services for disabled people, and if it can, in which ways?

My results show that capabilities approach could indeed inform the design process. The degree to which it was informative: According to my results, in roughly three out of five of the documented decisions in the process were impacted by the theory upon reflection. This is a big influence, meaning that capabilities approach could often inform the explicit, documented decisions made in the design process. Upon critical reflection, I must disclose that at times it might have been that having an explicit theory, reflecting and discussing, is what made a difference, not having capabilities approach as a theory, but I consider those times still a minority, and that the impact of the theory was significant on the explicit choices. There were also times when I only realized to reflect upon an issue due to the theory, so the theory’s impact on my process was less straightforward than I expected.

It is to be acknowledged that these 27 decisions or reflections pose only a fraction of the choices made in the whole process. I tried to focus on the most important choices, that I defined, thus my understanding of what would be an important decision has impacted my results. In order to answer my research question fully, I need to answer what kind of decisions a designer needs to make in a design process, and I answer according to my results from the case. There were many decisions about participation: Who to involve in the process, how to involve them, decisions on participatory design methods, and other means of participation. In my case, there were also decisions about the outcome and how I present it. Then there were decisions about which tools to use in the design process. One of the single decisions in the process was defining the problem to solve.

The fact that the designer chooses how he/she communicates with the client organization and others turned out to be an important finding, though it was not considered to be a key decision before the process. There were both implicit and explicitly made decisions in the design process, and I have only been able to study the explicit in this case. I would argue that the most implicit, more intuitive decisions were made in the development phase of the process, where least notes (5) were also made and the theory changed them the least. That is also the part of the process that is most familiar to me from my experience in product development and my design education. It can be, that due to familiarity, my decisions in the development phase were more based on intuition and practice. As I was only able to use the theory when making explicit decisions, which I recognized as decisions, there have been a lot of decisions that I fail to acknowledge here.
The research question addresses the content in which the theory was informing the process and phases in the design process. When it comes to the phases in the design process where the theory helped and to which degree and with what, I have synthesized my findings with the double diamond design process model in the accompanying image (figure 11). To answer to the question of content in this design process, capabilities approach could inform my design process by informing how I communicate during the whole process: I communicated more explicitly on ethics in the interviews and discussions in the first half of the process and also the second half in developing and presenting my results. Capabilities approach questioned how I approached users through needs at the beginning of the process and contributed to analysing what would be a just participatory process (conflicts in figure 11). The theory also informed my process by helping me define my role and aim of the outcome more clearly. The theory guided me towards considering the freedom to choose as an integral part of the design solution and leaving the concept rather open for modification. The approach also informed the selection process of the final design method for the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to theory</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Discover</th>
<th>Define</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Deliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes made</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicts</th>
<th>Questions remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaching users through needs</td>
<td>legislation choosing to focus on users capability to design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 Summary of the findings and examples framed in the double diamond design process model
Practical examples of using capabilities approach in my decisions are for example: I did not narrow down my focus group to either work or daytime activity services, but made the game customizable for all units. Both the legislation and the theory guided me towards considering everyone’s individual freedom to choose and to accommodate for diversity (figure 11, discover). Some of the decisions were related to what I thought the service system should be like: I recommended for all the materials about the services to be publicly displayed to make it possible for the users to make more rational or more informed choices about choosing the service where they spend all their days in (figure 11, define). I also included the capability to design in the criteria for choosing my design method (figure 11, develop). Capabilities approach informed my understanding of what would be a good way to present the design game through video, to give the ability to use the game, make it easily learnable (figure 11, develop). Some smaller details were also impacted by the theory: In the visualization of the game process, I included the phase where users are asked if they want to participate in the design of the service content with the game method because they have the freedom to choose (figure 11, deliver).

Out of the outcome view versus the proceduralist view of capabilities approach, in my results at the beginning the theory was more seen from the proceduralist view and in the end from the outcome view (figure 11 top row). In my results there are decisions and considerations about both, the views are actually quite balanced. According to my analysis, the theory had a similar degree of impact on both the process related and the outcome related decisions in my design process. The questions and ethical issues that surfaced in spite of the theory, and could not be helped with the theory in my data were curation and availability of choices, and the degree of participation needed, as the approach in my interpretation, would argue would be none (figure 11, bottom row).

Out of the constructs that the theory is expressed in, which parts were used in the process and which not? For this specific design process, the elements of the capabilities approach that impacted this design process, and could be found in the results after inductive and deductive analysis were multiple. Individual’s freedom to choose can be seen so much in the data that it merits its’ own theme. Nussbaum’s understanding of the proceduralist or outcome view of capabilities approach comes up when discussing what is the just process, and if there is a just process from the perspective of capabilities approach. “What are people able to do and be?” this was a starting question that comes up in the analysis in framing my own role in the process. The central list of capabilities does come up briefly, but not as a clear starting point or a guide of reference. As I now look at it, in this case, I often saw capabilities through internal capabilities of the users and supporting them, rather than just providing options to choose from. Dignity, especially in the context of needs satisfaction versus capabilities for disability, also was used.
There were many integral parts of the theory that could not be seen in the results: The concept of a threshold for capabilities was not visible, though I treat the legislation as stating that. The idea of separating capabilities to internal and combined capabilities, though it was there in the background, it does not come up specifically. The notion of functionings as ends or outgrowths of capabilities could not be verbalized. Nussbaum’s understanding of social deliberation process for determining the capabilities was not used. So there were several missed opportunities of articulating and understanding the theory better in the reflection. And missed opportunities in using it in the design process as well: One could have for example had a design process and the report based on the central capabilities if one wanted.

Though I could not use the theory fully, I experienced that together with the reflection, explicit communication of ethics and legislation it had a beneficial impact on my process as a whole, beyond single explicit decisions. The theory had a bigger impact on the bigger defining questions of the case, and the most notes were made at the beginning of the process (figure 11). It is good to notice, that the research question could have been answered in other ways as well, probably even by speculating from a completely theoretical perspective. However, I believe the results would have been different, and the way I would be able to present them lesser. I do not pretend that I would have been in command of the theory properly in the process. The main emphasis in this study was to figure out if and how the approach can inform decision-making in a real design process, and I believe I have answered this question in this particular case.

Validity & research ethics

One must keep in mind that these results haven’t in any way been triangulated or confirmed, the autoethnography is a description of my process and the theory’s role in it, I have documented it to the best of my abilities. The way these results could have been tested could have for example involved interviewing my advisors and staff, explaining the theory, and seeing if they recognize the phases and ways I used the theory. This was not in the timely scope of this study. The fact that the person being studied, in this case, myself, knows she is being studied, always also impacts the results.

In my opinion, the data did a relatively good job of reflecting the field of study. I was relying on my own judgement and realizations that something that I was thinking about or deciding was worth reflecting on through the theory. I am happy with this decision because this made it possible for me also to change those decisions according to my reflection if I wanted. It provided me with the data of what I considered to be important, and what I recognized as a decision. The omissions
and neglected aspects provide further avenues to study and reflect. From the perspective of a learning designer professional, it was enlightening to observe my omissions and acknowledge my own neglect.

My method worked in acquiring relevant data, though I could have formulated my questions for the decision journal better. I am somewhat conflicted about framing my process around questions and decisions: They did prompt reflection very efficiently, but they lacked in producing some of the results, like how the theory changed the way I communicate. It was not such a clear big decision that I was making, rather a way of acting, but luckily I had the open field in the end. The free open reflections actually turned out to be very important for my analysis. I should have also framed my questions more strictly around what is the outcome after considering the theory. For uncovering implicit decisions, I think one would require another person to question your way of working or stricter planning of the study. I appreciate how autoethnography forced me to acknowledge my background and history and other parts about my process I otherwise would have neglected. However, autoethnography with the theory produced a long list of results, many of which don’t really answer the research question.

The data collection techniques that I have used here could be used in some other studies as well, knowing that the data collection itself will change the way one views one’s process and decisions. This was a very subjective process, I noticed a change for the better: I was more argumentative, rational and less jumping to conclusions because I had a theory to reflect upon. However, one must also notice that for me it was sometimes difficult to separate which was the result of capabilities approach and what was just resulting from being more reflective and structured.

I think it’s also only right to question whether it is justified or fair to use a guiding theory of justice in a case like this. I would argue, that it is better for the theory to be visible in the process than to have all decisions made solely based on intuition or practice without reflection. The client agreed to use the theory as a framework for the thesis, even though I specifically explained that it would impact my process. As long as all the goals were looked after, the client agreed. In this case, I was paid for the deliverance of the design outcome, not researching the case. I was also explicit about having the theory, whenever talking about my thesis and the case, and as I have described, it made my discussions better. My research ethics of the case design research were assessed further in the contract with the client.
In this chapter, I interpret and discuss what my results mean and can mean. I first summarize my findings, then ponder their meaning and implications for different contexts and how the results relate to others’ research. Finally, I summarize my learnings with the fishing analogy, assess how my research aims were achieved and propose further research. I first discuss my findings of the autoethnographic study, and then my design process and outcome with relation to others’ work. As I have discussed both service design and capabilities approach literature, here I reflect on both.
Summary of findings

The main finding from the theoretical contribution, the autoethnographic study was that capabilities approach could inform majority of documented explicit decisions in the case service design process for public work and daytime activity services for disabled people. The contributions of the theory were the following: Making communications between me, the designer and stakeholders more meaningful and more explicit on ethics, questioning how I approached users trough needs, which was very prevalent in my design practice, guiding me towards considering all users’ true opportunities to choose and participate in the design of the services. The theory contributed to my choice of design method, the way I built the Our Favourite Ideas design game, and the way I presented it through video.

The theory was not always informative. The most used aspect of the theory impacting the design process was individual freedom to choose as an aim. Many of the concepts of the theory could not be identified in the data. The questions and ethical issues that surfaced in spite of the theory in my data were curation and availability especially in the case of the disabled citizen being the users of the services and due to the theory’s focus on making choices. In the results the outcome view and process view of capabilities approach were balanced. I came to understand capabilities approach as a relevant and applicable theory for design for public work and daytime activity services for the disabled in Finland when joined together with legislation and reflective design practice.

Meaning & implication

The fact that I was able to fuse together legislation, the theory, and my client’s wishes means that capabilities approach was suitable as an ethical framework for the case, it was informative and it contributed to many phases of the process together with legislation and reflective design practice. I think this can mean that moral philosophy is nothing to be afraid of in the field of service design, though it is to be acknowledged that my case is just one example. I now think that my results mean that service designers in the public sector should be explicit about the ethics or concepts of justice that we have, and voice them because it can make communication more meaningful. I must also disclose that I found the case to be challenging, due to the diversity of the users of the services, and the ethical issues residing in many services for the disabled. It was my professional decision to take on the capabilities approach, and I have not regretted it, though it posed more work and reflections.
In my case, I treated design as an important capability, or a capability set (Nichols and Dong 2008: 194), and I tried to change the environment and way design happens by creating a structured process or a tool for this. The reason I did this, however, was mainly the legislation, not my own opinion about whether design should be treated as a capability, though that must have had an impact as well. So though my research was not focused on it, I could not help but realize how big a role legislation played in my case. As I was dealing with ethics and justice, it shouldn’t have come as a surprise though: There are many public services where legislation has a huge impact and also requires citizen participation, such as city planning. Many this kind of processes need the support of procedure beyond just legislation. I started my thesis with the acknowledgments that designers are increasingly involved in designing Finnish public services and their actions have moral implications. The logical implication of my results is that we need to be aware and literate of the legislation to base our designs on, as well as our own ethical standings, which we can then strengthen and make more transparent with an ethical theory to support us and help us discuss more meaningfully with stakeholders.

I was able to use an ethical theory to contrast my design practice through reflections. Implications from my results for education could actually be explicitly trying different ethical theories as a starting point or a theory to reflect upon for design in school projects as well as commercial projects. I do not mean that we should forget what we have learnt about service design, sustainable design or participatory design, but rather it could help us to inspect the values and ethics that are intertwined in these different practices such as starting with user needs, if bring out other, explicitly ethical, theories to contrast those. I think that designers should also be educated to be more literate and articulate about ethics and legislation in contexts such as mine, where there actually is legislation stating what is a just design process for the services.

According to my results, there are clearly more easily applicable concepts for my design practice in capabilities approach, such as the freedom to choose individually and more difficult concepts like social deliberation to determine important capabilities. Like Keinonen (2017:162-163), I think that the theory could be made more digestible for designers. I believe strongly in the power of reflection, due to my results and my experience with the case. In order for designers, and the public to grasp the theory better, and to be able to discuss and reflect on it further, I think that capabilities approach should actually first be visualized. It is the power of communication that is also represented in the results of this thesis, and the strength of analogies, that I believe could get the theory more understood beyond academia: A visual representation of ethics, even a rather elementary one, would be a conversation and thought starter. A more general understanding and easier digestibility through visuals could also ease turning the philosophical reflection into tools, that Oosterlaken has called for (2009:101).
Reflecting on previous research & theory

I have argued ethics to be relevant in the context of public sector service design and I have used capabilities approach as an explicit ethical framework to reflect upon in my choices. In my work I chose to take a broad understanding of ethics in design and my results can be interpreted that the ultimate aims of design are also choices that deal with ethics and can be informed with capabilities approach, as was suggested by Oosterlaaken (2012:224). I was only able to study some of my explicit decisions and as Carlsson found in his study, that nearly all situations or decisions in service design could have ethical implications (2011:65) it can be questioned how relevant the theory would be to all the decisions. I think it is most helpful for the bigger questions. I treated some of the decisions with more ethical significance, but it can also be questioned whether those were the right decisions. My understanding stemmed from my design education, and my results are also framed in that context. There were also many decisions that I made implicitly and failed to reflect upon, and some had ethical implications that I discovered later as was also suggested by van de Poel and Devon (2004:466). This has been a good learning for me, but it also implies, that we should study the matter further and that this method is definitely not perfect.

According to my results, I was able to make decisions regarding ethics partly explicit and communicate better with the theory in my process, both for myself and for the stakeholders. This is a stark contrast to what Carlsson (2011:66-67) and Steen (2015:389) have found about ethics in service design and participatory design in general when ethics have almost always been implicit in the process. My results of the theory’s impact on the design process align with Nararová regarding the importance of communication. She found that communication is often connected to ethical aspects of service design and solving ethical issues, especially with regard to stakeholders (2017:65). When interpreted together, one could argue that having a theory or at least an understanding of your own ethics and aims and communicating them can help relieve ethical issues in the design process for public services. My conclusion is that we should be more explicit about our ethical undertakings, as suggested by Keinonen (2017:187), and thus also more articulate on ethics in general, not just about the process, but about the outcome as well, and about the ultimate aims of design.

My results can be interpreted to align with ideas of Frediani and Boano, as there was both a process freedom and product freedom dimension (2012:212) in my design case with relation to capabilities approach. The process with the theory and with the legislation’s focus on participation lead me to interpret the
theory first from a proceduralist perspective, and towards the end more from an outcome perspective. My results differ from Carlsson’s (2011:71) in that I was more attentive to the procedural aspects of ethics in service design at least in my explicit decisions. Though Nussbaum is in favour of the outcome view of capabilities (2011:95), I would argue that there is value in both the proceduralist and the outcome view in light of my results and the fact that the design outcome of the case is actually a process.

The legislation emphasized user participation as socially just in the design process of the services, as was suggested by Nichols and Dong (2008:196). At least in the case of public social services, participation in Finland was considered crucial. There was a tension as I understood Nussbaum might not consider participation as essential, as long as the users had the opportunity to choose and change between services. In my case I let the legislation override that aspect of the process, as the legislation could also be interpreted as stating the threshold (Nussbaum, 2011:24) and capabilities approach could still contribute to this “process dimension” in many ways. With his work in the Finnish elderly services seen through Nussbaum’s capabilities approach Pirhonen also refers to “inhabitant democracy” in determining the service content (2011:107), which could be seen as a similar participatory process, as I have suggested in my design solution. In his case, it could be interpreted that Pirhonen also takes a rather proceduralist view when he inserts capabilities approach in the design of these services. He also derives more content out of Nussbaum’s list, which I did not use as a basis for the service provision, but which could be an interesting avenue to study further.

Capabilities approach is a theory that in my understanding ultimately puts a high emphasis on choice, opportunities, and learning, and this has an impact on the designer’s role. If we frame design through capabilities approach and understand design as an important capability, as I have, and thus put a high emphasis on participation and making decisions, we can interpret us designers as both providers and also curators of some of the options, when we deal with public services. Jonas, Morelli, and Münch consider that designer’s role to be merely ‘jesters’(2009:7) without ethical reflection, but I do not agree at least in my context. Even a jester is a curator of jokes, opportunities and has the power to make decisions. I think one of the key issues to discuss is the communicating of those options, how they are understood, and when people make choices, what guides them and distorts their understanding.

My results suggest that capabilities approach lacks in assisting when dealing with realities of cognitive psychology and the new understanding of the way human decision-making is rather flawed and irrational. I argue that the work on cognitive biases like Kahneman’s (2011) would be of use in the real world cases
such as mine, because it could assist designers in helping users make better, more informed and more conscious decisions. Nussbaum’s emphasis on “practical reason” (2011:34, 39) could also be interpreted to argue that we need to support making decisions, as I have in the case, but I believe we still need understanding and tools to actually do that due to biases.

The central tension in this case between capabilities approach to development and my design practice, that aligns with service designs idea of development, revolved around the idea of user needs (pp. 11, 18, 21-22, 60). There are two strains of thought here, which I discuss separately: Arguing for the justification for my approach and how I approach users and where my design started. In my case, when defining my problem to solve, I found it more helpful to argue for user’s right of having an opportunity to design the services by law, not for their need to design the services. In this case the users weren’t able to vocalize this need. Nussbaum has suggested that satisfaction could probably be argued to be guaranteed to users with cognitive disability without special education (2011:30), which I considered these services to be part of. This is why I considered my justification to design to be stronger without needs.

I found it more helpful to look at users through capabilities or at least not to focus solely on needs. I did, of course, consider user needs when I was designing a usable design game and you can interpret the way I express the issues as needs based, but I did not start with discussing needs from the beginning. The reasons for this were that I found it more difficult to justify my approach with needs, as discussed, but I also found the semantics and connotations of the word needs difficult in the case of disability: Needs to me sounded too much like physical needs, needs that were discussed at the activity centres with relation to people’s disabilities and their diagnoses. This might have been because of the connotations I have with the words in Finnish, which are very physical, or the connotations and meanings that the word has in the services. This, of course, depends on our specific definition of what we designers consider to be needs. My understanding that stems from my design education is related to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943) in English, but I still found the term difficult in this context: With the specific case of people with disability as my users, focusing on needs I think could have made me approach the users who I was designing for and with as “those in need” or “people with special needs”. This would have put them in a very different position than focusing on their individual opportunities to act and choose, even if those opportunities to act are in fact to satisfy their needs.

Even though I agree with Keinonen about his understanding of the connection between fundamental human needs and essential capabilities (Keinonen, 2017:170), I approached my process from the view of Manzini (2009:54-55), refusing to approach users only through their needs, but rather their capabilities and what they are or are not able to do and be, and what are their rights according
to legislation. My interpretation of the users was not as active as Manzini suggested, because though I acknowledge users as having abilities and skills that can contribute to the service content, I do not propose for the services to be only collaborative (2009:54). In this case it was a matter of perspective: Capabilities approach in the context of design and especially in this design case made me focus on user agency and supporting their agency and activeness, not focusing on needs, though as argued by Keinonen, lack of agency can be viewed as a need as well (Keinonen, 2017:170). Nussbaum has argued the focus on (needs) satisfaction can make people passive recipients (2011:30), and Manzini also emphasizes user activeness (2009:54). In this sense capabilities approach was helpful in focusing on abilities and opportunities that highlight activeness, rather than needs, even though I defined the issue also largely by lacks of abilities and opportunities (pp. 38).

There were actually two different design processes that I used the capabilities approach to inform, my own shorter process, and the longer rather organic everyday design process of the service activities. In this thesis, I considered their process as part of my outcome, the justice aspects of which I also had to consider. If I articulate my design process, in Nussbaum’s concepts, I could say that in the case of design of the work and daytime activity services, the threshold (Nussbaum, 2011:24) was set by the legislative process about users rights for participation in design and production of these social services (Finland, 2000). The legislation placed the opportunity to design as an important capability (Nichols and Dong, 2008:194), and I considered legislation as a product of social deliberation process that defines what we value in these services (Nussbaum, 2011: 33-34). My process was that of “looking close to the ground” (Nussbaum, 2011:14) looking at the policy implications for actual users and staff in the services. What I found was that regardless of the legislation, the threshold was not reached in these services with these specific users. Because it is just to support users to reach the threshold with interventions (Nussbaum, 2011:24), I tried to do so with my own designer skills.

As my outcome of the design case I chose to design a design method, a design game process that I believed would cater for the users’ capabilities to participate in the design process of the services, make decisions about their own everyday services and reach the threshold provided by law. In order for catering for the ability to choose individually, to provide the freedom of individual choice (Nussbaum, 2011:18), I, however, did not propose to make this process in any way mandatory, but rather voluntary to participate, but modifiable for different kind of users to accommodate for diversity. In order to cater for individuality, better fit and building of design and choice making abilities in the organization, I left the concept open for further development. I delivered the results in forms that I believed would help their adoption and understanding: video and presentations accompanying a report.
Capability to design in the case could be interpreted as a combined capability, consisting of both the ability to create and vocalize new ideas and opinions, which needed to be supported, and the social and the surrounding social and political environment, as suggested by Dong and Nichols (2012:196) and Nussbaum (2011:20). This was intervened with the introduction of the method that both supports the design abilities and formalizes participation as part of the service process. In this specific case, I encountered no issues resulting from capabilities approach perspective on disability, that I have presented earlier (pp. 18). The design solution itself does not force the service users to acknowledge their disability as a defining element any more than they have to normally in the services, as was feared by some critics of capabilities approach (Pogge 2010, 44-48 as referenced by Pirhonen, 2011:30).

To discuss my design case from the point of view of the literature, I evaluate my design according to the constructive questions that Keinonen proposes based on capabilities approach (2017:186): “Does design bridge resources to preferred attainments?” I believe it does, yes. “Does design create agents who flourish?” Yes, since they are able to decide, participate, do the things they like to a certain extent. “Does our design improve the capability to compromise subjective well-being?” No, my design actually does quite the opposite, it helps disabled people not compromise their subjective well-being, which I identified as an issue in the services. The users can now consciously decide not to participate in the design process, which could be interpreted as an opportunity to compromise though. But my solution makes the staff compromise their well-being and ease of working, since users can produce activity ideas that are not familiar or preferable to staff. “Do we create sustaining capabilities and foundations for new ones to emerge?” Yes, the ability to create options, express opinions and make decisions is integral in independent life, which is the ultimate purpose of the services and was one of the things the users clearly could not handle. The game is designed to be a permanent part of the services, and it can foster developing many kinds of abilities. “Does our design trade in human dignity?” No, I think it does not. After reviewing these questions I believe my design is on the right track, though Keinonen’s constructive questions originate in the context of well-being, and my outcome rather in the context of self-development though they are also closely linked.

The power asymmetries in participatory design (Frediani and Boano, 2012:209-210) came up in the design process and I tried to resolve them at least between staff and users with the design of the game method. As discussed before, the participatory nature of the design outcome does not necessarily mean that the designs that the users end up creating would somehow be more ethical or more purposeful. I don’t believe that in the services the participation can do more harm than good (Collins, Cook, and Choukeir, 2017:111-112), because participation is still voluntary. The legislation and capabilities approach focus on the opportunity to participate, and users only define part of the activities. Of course, if the user
created content defines the whole services above all curricula and plans then the services can become rather confusing. It is also a possibility, that the game could produce exploitative or discriminating service content (Frediani and Boano, 2008:204,219). I have contributed to the game through the words, and the rhetorics should not be guiding towards exploitative solutions. Ultimately the staff of the services still has the choice over what gets put to use, and they can also evaluate whether something is unethical.

What must be considered is the seemingly a-political nature of innovation in public services (Langergaard, 2011:222), that can also be recognized in the service design case. However, I believe my work has not at least largely contributed to de-politicizing the common good (Langergaard, 2011:223), as in the case I tried to consider all users of the services and their opportunities increased, not just some. I have also taken legislation as a starting point for my work, acknowledging the importance of political process in determining the common good. Though I use the word “user” to mean the citizen using the services, I have given them more power to truly impact their services. I acknowledge that this can also be interpreted as a political act, and I understand using Nussbaum’s liberal theory (2011:19) I also brought in a political component that is entangled with the ethical deliberation in the process, and I believe this should be studied further.

In this thesis, I have carried a long fishing as a theme, whether as an analogy to explain capabilities approach (pp. 15, 19) or as an activity in the case process (pp. 37,51-52). To summarize my current understanding of capabilities approach and my changed role in design I continue the fishing analogy: The approach has been described to state that we shouldn’t give people fish [resources] if they are hungry, we should teach them how to fish, or give them rods [capabilities] (Häyry, 2017). I made my own interpretation emphasizing that we give people opportunities to choose (pp. 19). In my past, as a product designer, I might have been seen as producing the fishing rods or nets and providing accessible fishing equipment to users. As a service designer, I might be designing a combination of fishing lessons or a fishing experience. In this case in the public sector services, my case involving designing a design method for disabled users, I have been partly curating and matching the options for the users but also producing a tool for helping them make choices about the selection of available options: What kinds of rods and what kind of fishing lessons will be publicly available as opportunities, but the choice still remains with the user citizen. I have been making sure that participation is a real opportunity, that they can utilize. I see the changing designer’s role in this story through capabilities approach as providing relevant and accessible options, and providing tools curating the pool of public options and assisting users in making better, more informed decisions. However, it is also important to acknowledge, that you don’t always need to fish if you don’t want to, it is also acceptable to just go for the salmon pie, like the users in the daytime activity services (pp. 31).

In this thesis, research aims were relatively well achieved. As Oosterlaken had
suggested, capabilities approach helped me understand and consider the ultimate aims of design (outcome) (2012:224) and also the services in question. I would argue that my work with capabilities approach, reviewing literature, and my results actually did to some extent connect design and design ethics with the larger normative debate about justice and development, as was also argued about using capabilities approach by Oosterlaken (Oosterlaken, 2012:224) and Keinonen (2017:164). I contributed to the discussion of ethics in public service design and capabilities approach in design by providing a concrete example where an explicit ethical theory was used and tried in a service design process in the public sector. I have described how the theory benefitted my design process for the public services and gained new understanding of my process and my role, as well as understanding of my failings and neglect. I produced understanding especially of my own design practice and I was able to question it with the help of the theory. I also proposed new ways for myself and other designers to work by being more explicit about their ethical stands, incorporating legislation and ethical theories more into design practice. The future will only show whether designers find my approach as something that resonates and can assist with their experience of designing public services, but my thesis will be available online publicly to provide the best chances of that happening.

Future research possibilities

In order to tell, whether the approach with the method that I have chosen, works for others, or in any other case but this one, my process should be replicated, and the theory tried in different contexts. To continue studying capabilities approach in a design process one would have to do stricter planning before the design process, develop a better list of decisions to be made, what was reflected and what was the outcome or change. What also remains to be studied is using the theory as a basis for group or team design process, as a dialogical tool or common framework to reflect upon in a group design process.

In this study, I have not tried to argue for the differences in designing for public and private clients, and in the case of these services, both follow the same legislation, because the private service providers that provide similar services are suppliers for the city’s service procurement. The line between what is public and private I believe is not as clear-cut as one could assume. What we should consider, is that we designers are actively and can be poking the boundaries between what is private, public, what are the different roles, predominant ideologies, and terminologies of those sectors, as was suggested by Langergaard (2011:223). We should thus study the political nature of this kind of work, acknowledging the political philosophy aspects of designing for public services.
My results can be used in the development of tools and methods for service design that take into account capabilities approach, as I found the theory informative in my case, but I also failed in using and understanding the theory in many ways. As I have already suggested I also believe that visualization of the theory should be one of the steps taken when connecting design and capabilities approach. There are already many practical stories and examples that I have observed people use when discussing the approach, whether it is the example of the fishing or a bicycle, it is obvious to me that these stories are one integrally human way to understand ethical theories, and they could be visualized.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has been a bipartite effort: It includes a design contribution, the case, and it has also studied that case process from a theoretical perspective, capabilities approach. I have argued that ethics are relevant yet mainly implicit in the context of service design in the public sector and that we should try to make our designs more ethically acceptable. I have argued for the relevance of capabilities approach as a normative ethical theory for design and for the case and introduced it in my case design process to reflect upon.
The design contribution, the case included using various research methods to get a holistic picture of the public work and daytime activity services for disabled people. The issue discovered and defined through design research was that users of the services did not have a true opportunity to participate in the creation of service content ideas, due to the difficulties in expressing opinions, making choices, creating ideas and lack of formalized service content design process in the organization. The case design outcome, the Our Favourite Ideas design game addresses how users in the services can participate in the creation of new service content ideas in a supported way.

The theoretical contribution has discussed whether capabilities approach as an ethical framework could inform decision-making in the case design process for the public work and daytime activity services for the disabled. My research method was autoethnographic: I studied my own design process by reflecting on my decisions with a semi-structured occurrence recording format. The results showed that capabilities approach could inform the process in three out of five documented explicit decisions in the design case.

My findings include that having capabilities approach as an explicit ethical theory in the design process helped me communicate with stakeholders in a more meaningful way and be explicit on ethics and helped me question how I approach users through the identification of needs. Capabilities approach could also inform the selection of design games as a method, the aims of the game and how I presented it to the client. I have contextualized the results in my own working and educational history, in the working practice of a designer moving from private product design to public service design. I have found capabilities approach informative and relevant for the questions and choices on ethics in the design of the work and daytime activity services when combined with the Finnish legislation and reflective practice.

I have presented that designers are increasingly involved in designing public services and their actions have moral implications. I conclude with the results from my study that due to these developments we should be reflective and acknowledge our ethical standings, make ethics more explicit in design processes to make communication more meaningful and to solve ethical issues and be aware of the legislation governing our work in the public sector. I have also presented visual narratives as a way to start discussing the capabilities approach more in design and developing tools for using the approach in design. Further avenues to study are similar studies with better planning, studying group design processes and the political aspects of service design in the public sector.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Ten central capabilities

1. **Life.** Being able to live to the end of a human life of normal length: not dying prematurely, or before one’s life is so reduced as to be not worth living.

2. **Bodily health.** Being able to have good health, including reproductive health: to be adequately nourished; to have adequate shelter.

3. **Bodily integrity.** Being able to move freely from place to place; to be secure against violent assault, including sexual assault and domestic violence; having opportunities for sexual satisfaction and choice in matters of reproduction.

4. **Senses, imagination and thought.** Being able to use the senses, to imagine, think and reason - to do these things a “truly human” way, a way informed and cultivated by an adequate education, including, but by no means limited to, literacy and basic mathematical and scientific training. Being able to use imagination and thought in connection with experiencing and producing works and events of one’s own choice, religious, literary, musical, and so forth. Being able to use one’s mind in ways protected by guarantees of freedom of expression with respect to both political and and artistic speech, and freedom of religious exercise. Being able to have pleasurable experiences and to avoid nonbeneficial pain.

5. **Emotions.** Being able to have attachments to things and people outside ourselves; to love those who love and care for us, to grieve at their absence; in general, to love, to grieve, to experience longing, gratitude, and justified anger. Not having one’s emotional development blighted by fear and anxiety. (Supporting this capability means supporting forms of human association that can be shown to be crucial in their development.)

6. **Practical reason.** Being able to form a conception of the good and to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one’s life. (this entails protection for the liberty of conscience and religious observance.)

7. **Affiliation.** (A) Being able to live with and toward others, to recognize and show concern for other human beings, to engage in various forms of social interaction; to be able to imagine the situations of another. (Protecting this capability means protecting institutions that constitute and nourish such forms of affiliation, and also protecting the freedom of assembly and political speech.) (B) Having the social bases of self-respect.
and non humiliation; being able to be treated as a dignified being whose worth is equal to that of others. This entails provisions of nondiscrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, caste, religion, national origin.

8. Other species. Being able to live with concern for and in relation to animals, plants and the world of nature.

9. Play. being able to laugh, to play to enjoy recreational activities.

10. Control over one’s environment (A) Political. Being able to participate effectively in political choices that govern one’s life; having the right of political participation, protections of free speech and association. B) Material. Being able to hold property (both land and movable goods), and having property rights on an equal basis with others; having the right to seek employment on an equal basis with others; having the freedom from unwarranted search and seizure. In work, being able to work as a human being, exercising practical reason and entering into meaningful relationships of mutual recognition with other workers. “

(Nussbaum 2011; 33-34, italics Nussbaum’s)
Appendix 2

Legislation and its predicted changes in Finnish

Finnish Social services act, 2002, states the following in Finnish.
27 e § (1.2.2002/68)
Vammaisten henkilöiden työtoiminnalla tarkoitetaan toimintakyvyn ylläpitämistä ja sitä edistävää toimintaa.

Finnish Services and support for disabled people act, 2006, states:
8 b § (22.12.2006/1267)
Vammaisten henkilöiden päivätoimintaan kuuluu kodin ulkopuolella järjestettyä itsenäisessä elämässä selviytymistä tukevaa ja sosiaalista vuorovaikutusta edistävää toimintaa.

Finnish Position and rights of the customer in social services act, 2000, reads:
8 § Itsemääräämisoikeus ja osallistuminen
Sosiaalihuoltoa toteutettaessa on ensisijaisesti otettava huomioon asiakkaan toivomukset ja mielipide ja muutoinkin kunnioitettava hänen itsemääräämisoikeuttaan. Asiakkaalle on annettava mahdollisuus osallistua ja vaikuttaa palvelujensa suunnitteluun ja toteuttamiseen.

The TEOS report preparing the legislative changes reads in Finnish:
“Työelämävalmiuksia edistävä sosiaalinen kuntoutus ja osallisuutta edistävä sosiaalinen kuntoutus olisi järjestettävä siten, että henkilö voisi osallistua palvelun tai palvelukokonaisuuden suunnitteluun, sisällön määrittämiseen ja palvelun tai palvelukokonaisuuden vaikutusten omakohtaiseen arviointiin. Sosiaalihuollon olisi siis kehitettävä entistä enemmän osallistavia toimintatapoja, joissa asiakkaat aidosti pääsevät vaikuttamaan omien palveluidensa suunnitteluun, toteutukseen ja vaikutusten arviointiin. Lähtökohtana olisivat asiakkaan omat toiveet ja näkemys siitä, minkä hän kokee mielekkääksi ja elämäänsä sisältöä tuovaksi. “ (Sosiaali ja terveysministeriö, 2011:45)
Appendix 3

Vision for the services in Finnish

1. Polku palvelun ja palvelussa
Kun asiakas etsii palvelua itselleen, hän voi selailla materiaaleja eri paikoista, ja oman palvelutarvekartoituksensa mukaan hän voi tuetusti valita paikan, joka parhaiten kehittää niitä ominaisuuksia, jotka ovat hänellä heikommat. Asiakas ja asiakkaan lähipiiri ymmärtävät hyvin, mitä palvelut tarjoavat niistä tuotettujen materiaalien pohjalta ja voivat haarakoida myös asiakaan kiinnostuksen kohteiden mukaan. Palvelut ovat lähtökohtaisesti joustavia ja palveluun ohjauduttaessa voi testata montaa eri paikkaa. Yhdistelmäpalvelun luonti asiakkaalle yksityisistä ja julkisista palveluista onnistuu myös. Ihmisen elämänvaiheet tunnistetaan ja osataan tukea muutoksissa ja ohjata eteenpäin oikealla hetkellä. Tuettuun työhön ohjautuu yhä enemmän asiakkaita, ja se on otettu selkeästi myös visuaalisesti tavoitteeksi, jonka merkityksen toimeentuloonsa asiakkaat ymmärtävät. Työllisyyteen tähtäävä polku on selkeä ja visualisoitu asiakkaalle.

2. Roolit ja oppiminen
Asiakkaiden ja henkilökunnan rooleja sekoitetaan entistä enemmän ja opitaan uusia asioita yhdessä. Opitaan tarkoituksellisesti myös nk. metataitoja eli opitaan oppimaan ja mm. kysymään apua. Palvelu sisältää yhä enemmän vertaisoppimista ja vastuuttamista. Rooliutumiseen ja jämähtämiseen palveluissa puututaan tietoisesti kehittämällä prosesseja, joihin muutos on turvallisella tavalla sisäänrakennettu.

3. Palvelu & tavoitteet
Palvelut toimivat lain sisällä omissa profiloituissa raameissaan, joita kehitetään jatkuvasti eteenpäin asiakkaiden tarpeiden pohjalta. Työelämään ja osallisuuteen tähtäävät palvelut eroavat selvästi toisistaan. Niiden molempien merkitykset, tarkoituksset ja tavoitteet on yhteisesti määritelty ja ne motivoivat kehittämään asiakkaiden toimintakykyä parhailta mahdollisilta tavoilta.

4. Työntekijät
Työntekijöiden työnkuvat ovat eriytyneet ja selkeytyneet. Henkilökunta tuntee toisiaan ympäri koko organisaatiota. Työpaikkojen henkilökunnan määrä on suhteutettu palvelutarvekarttoitusten mukaisiin toimintakykyihin ja asiakasmääriin, ja henkilökunta voi mahdollisuuksien ja haluansa mukaan joustavasti liikkua eri toimipisteiden välillä. Itseohjautumisen myötä valtaa on luovutettu henkilökunnalle mahdollisimman paljon ja käyttävät sitä viisaasti ja luovat kontakteja läpi organisaatiorajojen.

5. Osallistuminen
**Asiakkaat osallistuvat palvelujen suunnittelun ja toteutukseen sillä tavalla kuin tuetuusti pystyvät, ja mikäli he eivät pysty, heidän edustajansa osallisuuksuun.** Uusien ideoiden tuottamiseen on olemassa prosessi, jonka avulla erityisesti asiakkaat voivat osallistua palvelujen suunnittelun, osallistua voidaan myös henkilökuntaa ja sidosryhmiä. Kokeiluja varten on kehitetty prosessi, joka tukee kokeilun mittaamista ja analysoimista sekä kokeilun tulosten käyttöönottoa ja jakamista muille. Asiakkaille on kehitetty lisää mielipiteensä ilmaisemista (palveluista) tukevia tapoja, jotka ottavat asiakkaiden tuen tarpeen huomioon.

6. Sisältö

7. Toimintatavat
Työllistymättä edistävistä palveluista tai osallisuutta edistävistä palveluista ei enää puhuta työä, vaan kuntoutuksena tai harjoitteluna. Asiakkaille, heidän lähipiirilleen sekä henkilökunnalle palkallisen työn ja toiminnan ero on selvä. Myös työoikeudellisesta näkökulmasta työllisyteen tähtäävää toiminta ei enää näytä työsuhteisena työönä. Haastaminen, kokeileminen ja itseilmaisun harjoittelu ovat päivittäisiä toimintatapoja, joilla löytyy asiakkaita uusia taitoja ja kokemuksia.

Asiakkaita osallistetaan myös heidän kyvykkyyksiani ajatellen. Jatkuva testaus siitä, mitä kaikkea asiakas osaa ja voisi tehdä on käynnissä. Palveluiissa on mahdollista liikkua ryhmänä ja kokeilla kaverin ja ohjaajan kanssa - niin uusien asioiden kokeileminen ei ole niin pelottavaa ja muuallekin voi mennä. Palveluiissa käytetään jatkuvasti ja johdonmukaisesti kuvakommunikaatiota ja kuvituksia selventämään kaikkea toimintaa, myös palveluiissa ohjautumista ja kehitysprosesseja.
8. Tietopohja ja verkostot

9. Kommunikaatio

10. Markkinointi ja viestintä
Jokaisessa toimintakeskuksessa on viestinnästä vastaava koulutettu vastuuhenkilö ja riittävästi resursseja toteuttaa viestintää, joka saavuttaa kohderyhmät mielekäällä ja ymmärrettävällä tavalla. Palveluiden markkinointi ja tiedotus on selkeä ja ammattimaista mm. sosiaalisen median, että kaupungin omien verkkosivujen kautta. SOTE uudistuksen läpivienti on viestitty hyvin läpinäkyvästi ja tehokkaasti.