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ABSTRACT
In Finland, experimentation and culture of experimentation have been lately driven forward by the current Prime Minister’s Office’s key project Experimental Finland, where experimenting has been promoted as a way to develop ideas, services and innovations. In this thesis, I study experimentation and service design practice in the Finnish public sector and more closely, in the Finnish Immigration Service (Migri). By using service design methods, I study how these approaches are being implemented in Finland through three case studies conducted during a 6-month internship in Migri’s service design team, Inland Design.

I argue that complex societal challenges are putting pressure on public-services and recognise that design approaches are increasingly used in public sector development, in Finland and internationally. Despite the increasing interest, experimentation and design practice in the public sector has yet not been researched much. The practical objectives in this thesis include understanding the current discussion around experimentation and design in the public sector. Additionally, objectives include opening up how designers can advance experimentation, and describing both the opportunities for and challenges in experimenting in the Finnish public sector.

I use participant observation and design experiments to study experimentation in Migri. Service design methods are used in the design experiments that form the three case studies, which I use to learn about the key features of experimentation. I understand experiments broadly as new and concrete actions, that aim to test and try new actions, functions and practices in Migri. Moreover, I use participant observation to record my experience and the occurrences in the organisation.

The main contribution of this thesis is to offer a description of the first steps of advancing experimentation by service design methods in an organisation within the Finnish government. I conclude that experimentation is affected by hierarchical structure, experimenter’s connections and networks or capability to form new ones. It is recognised that experimenting is always formed and dependent on the context. Characteristics of the public sector set challenges for experimenting, as it aims to promote light planning and learning fast from mistakes. Moreover, communication and vocabulary are crucial for experimenting. In communications, experimentation can be used to open doors, but the understanding of the word varies. Thus, it is essential to use the word wisely, build experimental approaches into projects in organisations and offer examples and stories to support understanding of experimentation as a tool for development work.

Finally, I suggest that design research could help to understand how to spread the learning results from experimentation. Furthermore, as language and communications are recognised as one of the critical features in implementing design, and starting experiments, it could be valuable to better understand how design is comprehended and experienced in the Finnish public sector.
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TIIVISTELMÄ

Käytän osallistuvaa havaintoja ja muotoilumenetelmin tuottuja kokeiluja kokeilumenetelmin tar-kasteluun Migriin. Kolmen kokeilu-tapaustutkimuksen kautta, jotka sisältävät kuuden kuuden kauttaan mittaiseen työharjoittelun Migrin Inland Design palvelumuotoilututkimuksessa. Tapaustutkimukset muodostavat kolme kokeilua, joissa käytän palvelumuotoilun menetelmiä ja työkaluja.


Lopuksi ehdotan, että muotoilututkimus voidesi kasvattaa ymmärrystä siitä, miten palveluilta voidaan levittää laajemmalta yleisölle. Lisäksi, koska kommunikaaatio ja yhteisen ymmärtämisen edistäminen on suurin teemana niin muotoilun kuin kokeilujenkin integroinnissa, voi olla arvokasta tutkia miten muotoilu ymmärreetään ja koetaan Suomen julkishallinnossa.

AVAINSANAT: kokeileminen, kokeilut, palvelumuotoilu, julkiset palvelut, kokeilukulttuuri
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INTRODUCTION
Design practice in the public sector is a fast emerging field globally, Finland being one of the countries where designers are increasingly involved in developing public services. Design skills and tools are seen as potential ways to develop and create change in the public sector, as the fast-changing world generates challenges that put pressure on public services. Budget cuts and growing complexity of problems urges governmental organisations and organisations close to government to change their way of working. As design and design thinking are slowly getting more known in governments, service designers are introducing new ways of working, developing public services and practices to address the complex challenges (Mager 2016). Similarly, new approaches are needed in the public sector in order to deal with e.g. complex sustainability problems.

This research took place in the Finnish Immigration Service (Migri) and Inland Design, the service design team within Migri, which started its work August 2017. In this thesis, I explore experimentation in Finland and the development of emerging design practice in the Finnish government through the context of Migri. Migri is a governmental agency, which operates under the Ministry of the Interior; in Migri, the Inland team is part of the digital services unit of the support services. At the time of the research, Inland employed two service designers and two service design interns, the undersigned being one of the two.

Developing the culture of experimentation on all levels of society have lately been driven forward for example by the Prime Minister's Office’s key project Experimental Finland (in Finnish, Kokeileva Suomi; Kokeilevasuomi.fi 2018b). To clarify, the culture of experimentation is defined as a social environment that encourages experimenting and accepts its features such as light planning and a great risk of failing (Berg et al. 2014, p.14). By using design research and service design methods and participant observation, I explored how to advance experimentation in Migri and what challenges and opportunities implementing these ways of working can offer for Migri, and more broadly for the Finnish public sector. Based on strategic experiment (Berg et al. 2014, p. 14; see Defining Experiments, p. 27) and Inland manifesto (see chapter 3, Research Setting), I define an experiment as:

- a new activity, action or function in Migri,
- a form of doing that has a starting point and an endpoint: a question or a hypothesis,
- a form of doing that aims to try out, test, and to learn from the action: a new work practice that is under evaluation.

Simultaneously, this thesis describes the design practice in a fast developing and emerging context. The opportunity to work in the organisation and a new service design team in an organisation in the government offered possibilities to collect insights that can be valuable for students and designers interested in working in the public sector. Additionally, the descriptions may be meaningful for people generally interested in societal change.

This thesis research required a capability to adapt to new situations, recognise and address different challenges and collaborate with different groups. Aforementioned skills are needed to address the complex challenges societies are facing, and this said, the approach in this thesis supports the aim of the Creative Sustainability program to build capacity for students to come up with solutions “for human, service, industrial and business environments” (Creative Sustainability, February 25, 2018).
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this thesis, I study the current development of an emerging design field in the government and experimentation in Finland. The research took place in the Finnish Immigration Service (Migri) and Inland Design, a service design team within Migri, where I aimed to examine experimentation.

The research questions are:
- What does experimentation offer for the public sector?
- How to better understand challenges in the culture of experimentation?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

I was hired as a service design intern and a thesis worker in the Inland Design for 6 months. During the 6 months, my goal was to make experiments in Migri. The design experiments form a selection of case studies, that are used to explore experimentation in Migri. Moreover, because the field of public sector design is emerging and changing fast, one of the practical objectives of the thesis is to offer a description of service design practice in the Finnish government.

The research objectives are:
- To survey the current discussion of experimentation and public sector design
- Explore how service design can advance experimentation in Migri:
  - How can Inland Design advance experimentation in Migri?
  - How can experimentation offer benefits for Migri?
- Document examples of experimentation in Migri, and its challenges

As part of the work practice, my work was also described in the Inland Design’s blog, where Inland’s work is shared with a larger audience (www.medium.com/inland). To read the blog posts, see appendices 8-13.

THESIS STRUCTURE

This thesis discusses the different design approaches in the public sector through the literature, the phenomena of experimentation through the literature and practice, and service design in the specific context of Migri through the practice. Through these themes, I aim to answer the research questions by using participant observation and making experiments. Here I will briefly introduce the thesis chapters.
In Introduction I introduce the thesis topic, the research questions, and the research objectives.

In chapter 1, Designing for the public services I first explore the current literature around design for the public sector, position my design approach and define service design, co-design and participatory design, design for policy and social design. Second, I give a brief introduction to experimentation.

Chapter 2, Research Setting introduces the contexts in which this research takes place, the Finnish Immigration Service and Inland Design. Through the introductions I position this research and myself as a participant observer and an Inland Design team member. Furthermore, I give a brief introduction to experimentation in Finland.

I continue by presenting the reasoning for this research in chapter 3: Research Need.

Chapter 4, Research Methods and Methodology introduces the research methods of this thesis. The data gathering of the research is divided into two parts: First, preparatory and exploratory phase and second, a practical phase. In the first phase, through participant observation I explore the work environment and work culture and gather understanding about experimenting in the context of Migri. The second phase forms around the experiments and the three case studies. Through the process I continue doing participant observation.

Chapter 5, Working in Inland Design describes the practical work I did in the team and introduces the three experiments that are used to answer the research questions. I start by opening up the process and reasons behind choosing experimentation as a thesis topic. The first case study focuses on conducting exploratory user research in Migri, and the second case study opens up how the findings from user research were presented in Migri offices in three different forms. The third case study focuses on organisational development as the Migri office moves to a new location and an open office.

In chapter 6, Discussion I answer the research questions, and offer suggestions for Inland Design and future research.

Lastly, I reflect on the design process and my personal learning results through the experience.

NOTE TO THE READER: THE USE OF “I” AND RESEARCH ETHICS

I use the first-person account to describe my own contribution to the processes. As this thesis explores my work and observations as an Inland Design team member in Migri, the work is tied to its context and my position, service design intern/thesis position, within the organisation. Thus, the first-person account clarifies the perspective of the work, the researcher’s role and what developments the research and the researcher went through during the six-month time span this research took place.

Further, the ethical concerns included informing user research participants of how and where the data from the interviews and workshop results are used. As Migri is a public service organisation within the Finnish government, the level of transparency is rather high when it comes to its practices, and the security level is very high when it comes to customers’ personal information. Participants were informed about the ways of documentation, that included taking video and photographs, and a permission to document the activities was asked by using a consent form.

DISCLAIMER

During the research, no restricted customer information was collected or handled by the undersigned.
DESIGNING FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
In this chapter I first explore and describe the development of design in the public sector from the Finnish perspective. Second, I present areas of design that are being discussed in the recent literature that crossover design into the public sector. To describe the development of design entering the public sector and becoming more embedded in the organisational practices, the body of literature examines service design, co-design and participatory design, social design and design for policy. In addition to academic publications, the literature includes reports that have been produced to introduce design practices for the public sector: to understand the development globally and in Finland, it is necessary to examine available reports produced outside Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Finally, I outline the design approach in this study, and end this chapter with an overview of experimentation.

In Finland, designers are already working in many Finnish governmental units and in the past couple years design has become more and more visible in the public sector. After Sitra-powered Helsinki Design Lab, the D9 group in State Treasury has become one of the most visible design-focused teams working in the government. D9 has been operating since 2016, from March 2017 with a full staff (Valtiokonttori, 2017a; Valtiokonttori 2017b), and will be functioning until the end of 2018 (A. Leppänen, personal panel discussion notes, May 21, 2018; Valtiokonttori 2018). In recent years designer teams and units have started to appear, instead of individual designers working in the government. Alongside the use of design services from consultants, design is getting implemented inside governmental organisations (see also Figure 8, p. 36).

Increasing or supporting collaboration between actors, stakeholders, planners and/or end-users is often mentioned as a strength of design. According to Bason (2014b), design is going through transformations of the “co” ("co-laboration, co-creation, co-design") and the social; and that this transformation is placing design as a key capability in creating solutions (Bason, 2014b, p. 4). Bason and Schneider (2014, p. 34) use the term public innovation places to describe design teams and labs that aim to develop public services and participation (Bason & Schneider, 2014, p.37). Moreover, visualizations, user involvement and project and systems design are mentioned as convincing examples (Bason & Schneider, 2014, p. 38). Indeed, these might continue to be the reasons designers are hired and design labs established in public sector in 2018 as well.

EXAMPLES OF DEVELOPMENT IN FINLAND

Helsinki Design Lab (HDL) was one of the pioneers in bringing design thinking into the public sector in Finland. HDL was working inside Sitra which is an independent innovation and investment fund that reports directly to the Finnish Parliament (Sitra, 2017). HDL’s most recent iteration was functioning from 2009 to 2013 (Helsinki Design Lab). HDL was a globally recognised initiative that aimed to advance strategic design in government and large organisations and intended to integrate design into government as a strategic tool. Through its work it made strategic design approach more visible and known and produced publications that continue to be an inspiration.

HDL’s projects were collaborations with municipalities, companies, organisations and ministries. For example, the City of Helsinki was part of the Open Kitchen project 2013. Another example of collaborations from 2013 is the Design Exchange Programme (DEP) in which partners included the City of Lahti, the City of Helsinki, the Ministry of Employment and the Economy, the Finnish Ministry of the Environment and Helsinki World Design Capital 2012. Designers who worked in ministries at the time participated in these projects. In addition, HDL also contributed to establishing the Design for Government course.
in Aalto University, as two of the course founders were involved in HDL.

Some of the early descriptions of implementing design and experimenting in the public sector come from the municipalities. For instance, Heli Leinonkoski was a visiting researcher at The Finnish Institute of London back in 2011. Leinonkoski being a civil servant herself and working in the City of Jyväskylä, researched what value service design could offer for public services and published a report “Service Design – An approach to Better Public Services? A Civil Servant’s View” (2012) (Fininst.uk, 2013). In the report Leinonkoski was looking into how service design was used in the United Kingdom at the time. This is one example that suggests that design entered project-level in municipalities first, and recent development suggests more a strategic change in both, government and municipalities. One example of this is City of Helsinki design strategy that includes a Helsinki Lab, described as an experimental collaborative platform. The city of Helsinki also assigned Anne Stenros as Chief Design Officer in 2016, being the first city in the world to have a design lead in the municipality (Helsinki Lab, 2017). Helsinki Lab was launched 2016, as a three-year program to enhance design in the development of the city.

In Aalto University, design in the public sector has been visible especially through the Design for Government (DfG) course, which gives students an opportunity to work on briefs delivered by the Finnish ministries. The course has been running since 2013 (dfg-course.aalto.fi, 2017). Ramia Mazé described in NODUS talk held at Helsinki Design Museum in November 2017, how the course has grown, and the change has been huge: starting from knocking the doors of ministries and the interest growing slowly. Moreover, more service designers are getting hired by the government (including many DfG alumni), and the course itself becoming recognizable outside academia, in places where its contribution could be taken further (R. Mazé, personal panel discussion notes, November 16, 2017). One of the course’s aims is to offer opportunities and educate designers to work in government level (EU Design Days Programme, 2017). As a DfG alumni, I see that the course is offering unique opportunities to experience working with the ministries, gaining learnings from contexts that otherwise can be hard to access.

A report published by Demos Helsinki and produced in cooperation with DfG course presented “A human-centric governance through experiments” (Annala et al., 2015a, Annala et al., 2015b). The report introduced a model for experiments and highlighted that the steps will also enhance cooperation between ministries. The report was another step in the process of making design thinking more visible in the Finnish Government.

Developing and supporting experimentation in the Finnish government was one of the core tasks of D9 team. As said before, D9 started its work in 2017 and will continue until the end of 2018 according to the original plan, as its operation was discontinued (Valtiokonttori 2018a). Ultimately, D9 was one kind of an experiment in and of itself: as another approach to support digital transformation, team with a time limit. D9’s core tasks included supporting customer-orientation in the digital service development in the public sector and improving customer-experience through fast projects and experiments (KPGM Oy Ab 2018). Additionally, D9 took part in activities arranged around the Government key project Experimental Finland, e.g. Kokeiluviiikko (Valtiovarainministeriö 2018; personal notes May 20, 2018). Further, recently it was announced that a new service based on D9 will be founded in the Population Register Centre to support the digitalisation in the Finnish public sector (Valtiokonttori 2018b).

Figure1 shows some key steps and happenings in how design has evolved in the public sector and government in Finland. After starting D9, Inland Design started its work in the Finnish Immigration Service. Inland Design is introduced in Chapter 2, Research Setting.
The number of public innovation places continues to evolve globally, and the number of actors is increasing fast. Examples of widely recognised organisations, actors and design labs working with policies, governance and public services include e.g. Public Policy Lab in the USA, United Kingdom based charity Nesta, The Behavioural Insight Team (BIT) and Design Council Policy Lab in the UK and the recently closed MindLab in Denmark. They all have been an inspiration for many and provide examples of how design can be used in the public sector. For example, Nesta and BIT have both published several publications, including articles, practical guides and project reports about design in the public sector.

FIGURE 1: How design entered government in Finland. Adapted from A.Leppänen, personal communication, Design for Government course kick off presentation February 20, 2018. A.Kokki, presentation slides, April 24, 2018.
DESIGN IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR AND GOVERNMENT

In the previous part I have briefly described the developments of design in the public sector in Finland and next I present the branches of design that are discussed in the recent literature around this theme and which I find relevant for this topic: service design, co-design and participatory design, design for policy and lastly, social design. Finally, I summarise the discussed themes and present the approach I take in this research.

A need for change is often mentioned, when asking to justify the presence of design in the public sector. Additionally, bringing a human-centred approach to the practice is mentioned as one reason to have design at the government. (Bayley & Lloyd, 2016, p. 3620; Sustar & Mattelmäki, 2017, p. 1). It has been said that design touches every aspect of human lives, as everything around us is designed. Correspondingly, Buchanan (1992, p. 9-10) presents the four forms of design practice that affect people’s lives:

- communication
- material objects
- activities and organised services
- systems and environments

The last two are of interest for designers of services, interactions, environments and systems that affect the contemporary life. Since design and designers want to be part of developing solutions for complex problems, or wicked problems as Buchanan (1992) puts it, design entering new context is a clear result of the need for new methods and the motivation of practitioners. The role and meaning of design practices in the organisations and different levels have been investigated recently (Sustar & Mattelmäki, 2017; Huybrechts, Benesch & Geib, 2017). Furthermore, many descriptions of design practice are produced by other actors than ‘Higher Educational Institutions’ (Armstrong et al 2016): examples of these descriptions are included in the master’s thesis by Fangyi Lee (2016) that analyzed what is meant by design by looking into reports published by Design Led Lab’s (DLLs).

To open up the different design approaches that are used in the public sector, I examine service design first. Service design is often seen as a way to improve efficiency and creating savings through process improvements. Service design puts the relationships and interactions between people in the middle and looks at the service and processes extensively through user perspectives and this is highlighted as a strength of the discipline, as well as a motivation to implement it. This said, user-centredness is a core value that service design as
a discipline wants to improve. In contrast, Penin and Tonkinwise (2009) have finely argued that service design approach makes it possible to treat people like pieces of the game instead of actually listening to them (Penin & Tonkinwise, 2009, p. 4328). Inland Design recognises service design as the main design discipline of the team’s practice, so it is essential to define it.

Second, I look into co-design and participatory design. Advancing user-centredness may happen through using the aforementioned approaches in the design process and e.g. when conducting qualitative design research. Furthermore, the recent research (Huybrechts et al. 2017) has argued there is a need for the term ‘institutioning’, that underlines the potential of co-design and PD as political practices (Huybrechts et al. 2017, p.158). I present co-design and participatory design (PD) since both are central approaches to how Inland Design practices service design.

Third, I briefly explore the area of design for policy. Recent research has looked into the area of policy-making by investigating experiments and what are the relations between design practice and the organisation (Bayley & Lloyd, 2016; Kimbell & Bayley, 2017). Additionally, experimentation in policy design and the Design for Government model (Annala et al. 2015a, Annala et al. 2015b) make exploring design for policy important in order to understand the current developments in public sector design and experimentation. I define design for policy as in the future Inland may work with policy implementation or take part in developing experiments that require the design of policy.

Fourth, I continue by exploring social design. To design user-centred services, the actual involvement of the users is a crucial factor and requirement to ‘do it right’. Social design touches on many areas of design practice and the discussion is on-going (Markussen 2017; Manzini 2015; Armstrong et al. 2014; Andrews 2011). In social design, designers and non-designers practice design (Armstrong et al. 2014, p. 15). Moreover, advancing experimentation and designing services in Migri, or in other organisations, held the potential that non-designers, employees, customers or other stakeholders, are designing for services. For instance, services produced in Migri have a great potential to create social value in different levels, e.g. individual, organisational and societal. Since it is in the team’s aim to create positive impacts for immigrants, I define social design.

Service Design

Service design (in Finnish, palvelumuotoilu) has become one of the fastest evolving disciplines in design, and the number of designers getting hired with the title service designer has been increasing in Finland. Still, there are different interpretations of what service design actually is, as it can be used to describe and develop parts of the service or the whole service system. It can mean design of the interaction with customer, through the process. Furthermore, the design of the service can include many parts: e.g. not only design of the interaction in physical spaces, but also an app and websites.

The book This is service design thinking by Stickdorn and Schneider (2011) offers multiple definitions on service design (Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011, p. 30-31). This thesis relies on the definition from Stefan Moritz (Stickdorn & Schneider 2011, p. 31):

“Service design helps to innovate (create new) or improve (existing) services to make them more useful, usable, desirable for clients and efficient as well as effective for organizations. It is a new holistic, multi-disciplinary, integrative field.”

—Stefan Moritz, 2005

Also, Birgit Mager refers to usability and desirability and addresses both user and supplier perspectives (Stickdorn and Schneider 2011, p. 31):

“Service Design aims to ensure service interfaces are useful, usable and desirable from the client’s point of view and effective, efficient and distinctive from supplier’s point of view.”

—Birgit Mager
These definitions strongly suggest that service design is creating, developing, and facilitating user-centred and user-friendly solutions in the form of services for users and service providers. The design process then must include several dimensions: In *This Is Service Design Doing* (2018) Stickdorn presents the updated six principles of service design, adding iteration and research and prototyping to the five principles introduced in *This Is Service Design Thinking* (2011). According to the six principles, service design is (Stickdorn 2018, p. 26-27):

- Human-centred: taking into consideration how services may affect every person who is involved
- Collaborative: in a service design process, people with different backgrounds take part in creating the service
- Iterative: a service design process goes through cycles of evaluation and re-defining plans, and is an "exploratory, adaptive and experimental approach"
- Sequential: the service is visualized step by step, showing interconnected relations
- Real: All stages of a design process should be done in reality: i.e. research, prototyping, evidencing intangible values
- Holistic: Needs across the service and business should be addressed.

The six principles highlight the many areas service design touches in the practice. As said in the beginning of this section, service design may include designing several parts of what affects the user experience, from products to systems. However, one might ask how it differs from other forms of design? The difference between other disciplines of design and service design, according to Penin and Tonkinwise (2009), is that service design is about design of people: what people do and how. Consequently, it goes further than designing just e.g. products, spaces, communications for people. When service design is design of people, it becomes political (Penin & Tonkinwise, 2009, p. 4327). It can be questioned to which extent it is possible to design interactions between people. Penin and Tonkinwise (2009) brightly argue that service design process makes it possible to treat people as pieces of the game, when aiming for e.g. greater efficiency; in service design process like this, customer-centredness is only superficial. Through describing design of people and its limitations, Penin and Tonkinwise (2009, p. 4328) finely highlight the complexity and politics of design of people and questions around limits of design. Since increasing efficiency is one selling point of service design, being aware of the incompleteness of the design, politics around it and its limits is then needed.

The unfishiness of designing interactions is addressed in *Design for services* (Meroni & Sangior-}
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...gi 2011). Manzini (2011) ably states that the “for” in Design for services refers to transformation in progress; design for service means that what is designed is not the end result, but rather an action platform. Therefore, what is being designed is the place or base, where results – interactions between people, services – occur (Manzini, 2011, p. 3). Respectively, Kimbell (2011, p. 45) notes that designing for service notices that it is impossible to imagine, plan or define the final design for a service, as interactions between actors affect the results. Thus, designing for services is incomplete. This said, design for services emphasises the role of people, and aims to recognise the service can never be designed as actions cannot be predicted; thus, it is not treating people like objects that will act in a certain way. This suggests service designers must stay aware of the politics of their practice. For example, in *This Is Service Design Thinking*, the incompleteness of designing interactions is approached with the sequencing perspective (Stickdorn and Schneider 2011, p. 40-41) that should make it possible for the designer to recognise and design for the points of interaction that form the user experience: design of the interaction points instead of interaction.
Co-design and Participatory Design

I have described how design in the public sector may aim to involve users and bring citizen perspective into development processes; Service design and co-design are becoming part of development processes in the public sector and part of the public innovation system(s) and thus, are increasingly significant in the public sector (Pirinen 2016, p.27). This makes co-design and participatory design approaches worth examining. Moreover, these approaches are central for Inland Design’s work, and co-design is used to design experiments presented in chapter 5.

Pirinen (2016, p. 27) uses the definition of co-design by Sanders and Stappers (2008):

“creativity of designers and people not trained in design working together in the design development process.”

To add, Manzini describes co-design as (Manzini 2017, p. vii):

“a collaborative process between people with various backgrounds, motivations, ideas and skills.”

When arguing for the justification of design, the designer’s ability to bring a customer or a citizen perspective to the development processes through design methods is highlighted. Siodmok (2014) finely emphasises the role of co-design in bringing the citizen perspective when facing and developing solutions to public sector challenges. Additionally, co-design can support a dialogue between the different stakeholders through the use of design tools and facilitation that can create the base for collaboration and collaborative development practices. Yet one challenge for public sector is that co-design can clash with the traditional hierarchy models, because in co-design and participatory processes the boundary between different groups is lowered; the ones designing can also be the ones implementing (Siodmok, 2014, p.193). People located in the different levels of the organisation take part in the design process, that then forms the organisation.

According to Robertson and Simonsen (2013, p. 2), participatory design (PD) is:

“a process of investigating, understanding, reflecting upon, establishing, developing and supporting mutual learning between multiple participants in collective ‘reflection-in-action’. The participants typically undertake the two principal roles of users and designers where the designers strive to learn the realities of the user’s situation while the users strive to articulate their desired aims and learn appropriate technological means to obtain them.”

In their paper, Huybrechts et al. (2017) extensively look into how participatory design and co-design processes on a micro-level feed up to institutional processes and on the other hand, how operating on a micro-level has contributed to the depoliticisation of both, i.e. when the political aspects are not mentioned or addressed in the process. This is linked to the question of how today PD and co-design are addressing that PD has been political from the start (Binder et al. 2015; Huybrechts et al. 2017). The Scandinavian PD aimed to design for democracy at the workplace (Huybrechts et al. 2017, p. 155) but nowadays the focus is on public spaces and citizens instead of workplace and workers (Binder et al. 2015, p.155).

The term institutioning sheds light to the role of different institutions as places for change (Huybrechts et al. 2017, p. 151), and co-design as an approach that can advance change and be affected by the actions happening in different levels. Huybrechts et al. (2017) accurately describe how through institutioning, PD and co-design have the potential to be part of reshaping institutions and to be political practices through this context, instead of being seen as “outgrowth of policy” (Huybrechts et al. 2017, p. 151).

Design for Policy

Design for policy is one of the fast-emerging fields of design: as design capability and understand-
ing in the public sector organisations grows, design for policy as a discipline is evolving. Designing policies requires a lot of design competence and understanding of design thinking from the organisational point of view: it is pictured as the highest level of implementing design in figure 10 (p. 38). It is a direction of service design and co-design, that will keep evolving and changing, and thus it is worth looking into. While Inland Design does not work with policy making at the moment, Inland’s position holds the opportunity to work with the policy implementation. Further, although in this thesis I am not capable of addressing this issue or work with policy, either, I see a value in exploring this area further as the design community has a strong interest towards design for policy and it is a major development path in the public sector design (McGann et al. 2018; Kimbell & Bailey 2017; Bayley and Lloyd 2016; Mager 2016; Rebolledo 2016; Bason 2014a; Christiansen & Bunt 2014; Junginger 2014; Siodmok 2014). This said, the issue of transferring knowledge up to the policy makers is interesting – and possibly important for organisations within or close to government, implementing policies. It raises questions like: What is seen as legitimate knowledge and knowledge-making? Will the experiments produce knowledge that seems relevant also elsewhere?

Christiansen and Bunt (2014, p.41) describe policy as following:

“Policy in its instrumental form aspires to show direct causalities between the projected plan, decisions made, actions carried out and particular processes, outputs and results. Here, the basic foundation for policy is the production of authoritative knowledge illustrating tangible paths or routes to implementation.”

This definition sounds like a rather linear approach to creating guidelines or actions plans. Christiansen and Bunt (2014) continue finely by describing how the complexity of problems causes challenges for the policy-making tradition, as global challenges may not follow the same paths that have been used to define problems, goals and needed actions. Additionally, they note how public services are entangled in the social reality and people’s lives, but services can still be produced for the systems instead of citizens (Christiansen & Bunt 2014, p. 41-42). To object this mindset, design steps in to assist with problem definition and dealing with the complex problem landscape. Accordingly, as design as a discipline is well-suited to tolerate complexity and uncertainty, and by its nature questions and challenges the existing, including testing and learning inside its processes, design can be part of policy-making for complexity (Christiansen & Bunt 2014, p.42-43). The practice is evolving and as Christiansen and Bunt cogently argue, design does not have all the answers, but it is offering new paths for public sector planning to explore in the landscape complexity (Christiansen & Bunt 2014, p. 42-43). Additionally, Rebolledo (2016) comparably states how design fits into the complex world and environments, as design makes it possible to explore user-centred views and support learning from experimenting. This is why design has the potential to deal with the current problems public sector is facing, in policy-making and social environments. Correspondingly, Christiansen (2016, p. 50) outlines five aspects to problem solving that design can advance: understand, imagine, synthesise, experiment and operationalise. Moreover, Rebolledo suggests that design will be the way for governments “to deal public problems and create public legitimacy” (Rebolledo, 2016, p. 50).

The question of communication and shared language between different actors is often raised, e.g. communication between people from different disciplines. Recently Bailey and Lloyd (2016) have investigated the interactions between design and institutions in the governments. Their paper aptly demonstrates how design is used in policymaking in the context of Policy Lab in the UK government. The aim of the research was to shed light on the emerging design culture inside the political institutions: to describe what is happening. They in-
Interviewed 15 civil servants from the UK government and in the interviews, design was recognised to help with the needed changes and what was described as a set of tools, methods and techniques. Bayley and Lloyd (2016) also brightly open up forms of ‘knowing’ and how knowledge is present in a form of text. They describe how “knowledge is generated through description rather than acquaintance” (Bayley and Lloyd 2016, p. 3625). Moreover, there seems to be a considerable difference in designerly ways of knowing (Cross, 2007) and policymaking ways of knowing (Bailey & Lloyd, 2016, p. 3626). For instance, knowledge produced through design research methods was seen as problematic, e.g. because it was harder to put into reliable numbers. Furthermore, it should not be assumed that design would be free to operate by generating good ideas, as “Civil servants are on the lookout for “good ideas we can land” (Bayley and Lloyd 2016, p. 3626).

Some experiments require changes in the laws and policy; for example, in order to conduct the basic income experiment, it was necessary to plan the experiment so that it does not act against the Finnish Constitution which demands equal treatment of all citizens. To be able to give the basic income benefit only for a limited group of people it had to be clarified that people not included in the experiment will not be in a worse situation than the chosen group (Analysis: Finland’s Basic Income Experiment, 2018). Given the above, when the aim is to experiment with e.g. alternative system, re-designing policy might be necessary. If the public organisation carrying out experiments does not work with policy and policymakers, but as part of results finds an area for development, it becomes relevant to ask how to reach the decision makers and share this knowledge (Berg et al. 2014, p. 32). Moreover, if experiments challenge the existing structures, they can shed light into what is preventing change to happen. These can be structural problems or policy challenges (Berg et al. 2014, p. 32).

**Social Design**

Majority of the wicked problems societies are facing are entangled in the social world. At the same time, collaboration and multidisciplinary work is recognised as one key factor that is needed to develop solutions. Undeniably, design gets interconnected with the social as the results from services and systems are entangled with the human behaviour and co-created by people involved, for example, in service delivery. Thus, design becomes social. Discussion of social design is ongoing (Markussen 2017; Manzini 2015; Armstrong et al. 2014; Andrews 2011) and Armstrong et al. (2014) have argued there is a need for design research about social design.

Armstrong et al. (2014, p.15) describe social design as follows:

“Social design can therefore be understood to encompass a broad set of motivations, approaches audiences and impacts. For instance, these may be embedded within government policies or public services extremely critical of and divergent from these. Social design may be carried out by people who think of themselves as designers or who studied at design schools, or it might be an activity of designing that takes place involving people who are not professional designers.”

This description expresses a wide range of situations where social design occurs at the moment. Figure 2 illustrates three areas that make social design relevant. Large-scale complex challenges include social aspects; cross-disciplinary work creates a need for discussion facilitation and design practice can be good at bridging disciplines and design field itself is expanding. Furthermore, Armstrong et al. (2014) clearly highlight how aspects of social entrepreneurship and social innovation discussions can be useful when understanding social design. They point out five key areas (Armstrong et al. 2014, p. 37):

- questioning who has the ownership of agency to point out issues or address them
- looking at designing and change-making as participatory activity
- operating across organisational boundaries
• creating resource combinations and connections between actors and resources
• recognizing how people's needs are created through interactions in the social world.

When discussing what social design is, questions arise around for/with whom the work is done, e.g. are designers doing charity work, or how urgent the issue is. Andrews (2011) widens the understanding of the social through the aim of improving human lives. In contrast to Manzini (2015), Markussen (2017) has aptly argued that social design differs from social innovation and social entrepreneurship and disagrees about the definition of social design. First, Markussen argues that social design is not defined by extreme or difficult situations or by class. Markussen refers to Manzini’s description of social in social design meaning “particularly problematic situations such as extreme poverty, illness, or social exclusion, and circumstances after catastrophic events” (Markussen 2017, p. 170; Manzini 2015, p. 64-65). Thus, social designers work for all kinds of change that do not rely on classes in the society and are not limited by the charity mode. Second, Markussen does not give criteria for defining when a problem is extreme enough to be social design, as it can create limitations and fail to recognise social design
As more diverse than for example design for catastrophic events. Last, Markussen perceptively disagrees with the urgency to address a problem, as the problems social designers work on can remain partly hidden until they are identified.

As an example of designing for marginalized groups, Markussen (2017) uses a participatory design process project from the University of Southern Denmark. In the Social Games against Crime project a game was designed to help children to have discussions with their fathers when they visit them in prison. The result was tied to the context where it was created and thus cannot be described as social innovation, as it cannot be scaled as it is, but the project created value for the individual in micro-level and aimed to create change on the organisational meso-level (p. 167). Markussen therefore makes a vivid point that these qualities of social design should be appreciated. This being said, also public sector design can include these characteristics of social design and bring value in different levels.

**DESIGN APPROACH IN THIS THESIS**

In this chapter I have first described the developments of public sector design in Finland. Second, I have presented the design approaches that I found valuable for the area of designing public services:

- **Service design** aims to develop new or improve existing services and make them efficient, effective and usable for all involved (Stickdorn & Schneider 2011). Service design may include designing whole service environments, or parts of the product. Design for services emphasises that what is being designed is the service platform (Manzini 2011). I define the term as service design is the main design discipline Inland Design locates itself.

- **Co-design** is an approach where a group (including designers and non-designers) with various backgrounds and takes on the problem comes together in a design process (Pirinen 2016, Manzini 2017). In participatory design designers and users design together, but in comparison to co-design, in a participatory design process people also make decisions together. In PD designers aim to learn from the users and the users aim to articulate their needs (Robertson & Simonsen, 2013): the process is designer-led. I define the terms since these approaches are essential to how Inland Design practices service design.

- **Design for policy:** what is being designed is the “authoritative knowledge illustrating tangible paths or routes to implementation” (Christiansen & Bunt 2014, p. 41) and this requires high design capability from the organisation (see Figure 10, p. 38). It is highlighted how design can help to deal with the complexity and uncertainty and bring human-centred approaches to the policy making process and support collaboration (Christiansen & Bunt 2014; Rebolledo 2016; Kimbell and Bayley 2017). Furthermore, this area of design holds potential since future experiments may require policy-making.

- **Social design** aims to improve a social issue (Andrews 2011); when differentiated from social innovation, social design is recognised to be more than design for catastrophic events and it can be used to design context-based solutions that have effects on micro and meso-levels (Markussen 2017). Furthermore, this approach highlights the questions of agency, designing as participatory activity and the interconnectedness of the problem to be solved and the social world (Armstrong et al. 2014). Since Inland Design aims to support the well-being of immigrants with the design practices, it puts advancing social innovations high on the team’s agenda.

The literature offers critical views on the practice, asking questions like: *who is designing and for
whom, what are the impacts of design? and highlighting importance of acknowledging the politics of design and design of people when practicing service design. I position this thesis in the area of service design due to the use of service design tools: the three case studies do not include designing a service itself, but design methods and tools used in service design are used in the case studies. As guidelines I use the six principles of service design (Stickdorn 2018, p. 26-27). According to these, service design is:

- Human-centred
- Collaborative
- Iterative
- Sequential
- Real
- Holistic

The methods and how I define experiment are presented in detail in Chapter 3, Research Methods and Methodology. As the aim of the design action in this thesis is to experiment; Service design approaches support this since experiments should:

- be real actions
- take critical and holistic approach in the realization and problem definition
- be done to learn and thus the ideal process includes iterations

Finally, I looked into service design, co-design and social design because I see them all connected with the notion of 'social'. Understanding the different definitions of 'social' helped me to reflect on my work. Since social aspects are present through the context, defining social design enabled me to understand that although Inland Design aims to create well-being through social innovation, the experiments I did as part of this thesis place under service design and co-design. This placement is because of the use of service design tools and the processes, that are collaborative: the design experiments include collaboration in Inland Design team supporting me in my work, between other teams and me and also with customers. Additionally, co-design is relevant for supporting experimentation in Migri, since collaboration and bringing human-centred thinking to Migri are also reasons why Inland Design was started (see Chapter 2, Research Setting). Besides, I think it is valuable to look at social design, since, e.g. the holistic approach Armstrong et al. (2014) take touches on the complex societal challenges, that designers are working with when designing public services.

Additionally, understanding the term instituting and recognizing the historical development of co-design and PD widened my understanding of the notions of collaboration, co-creation and participation that come up in discussions about development work and design practice. Instituting underlines what potentials design holds for changemaking since the term sheds light on how different levels affect and are affected by participatory practices. It is highlighted that that people form institutions; people’s actions shape the organisation, but these practices are not necessarily the most visible ones.

Furthermore, the literature on design for policy shed light on the challenges design and designers face, such as communication, how to validate qualitative data and how public service is understood. These aspects were also relevant for me when recognizing the challenges for experimentation, and when I reflected on communication and use of words. Additionally, it is recognised that some experiments might require changes in policies or new ones, looking into this area of design and defining design for policy helped to understand what the possibilities for design teams advancing these ideas could be. Moreover, as an embedded design team it is possible that in the future Inland Design can work with policy implementation in Migri.
EXPERIMENTATION – A BRIEF OVERVIEW

In Finland, experimentation has been driven forward by the Prime Minister’s Office’s key project, and recently experimental approach in development has had a plenty of attention in the Finnish public sector. Internationally, for example the innovation foundation Nesta has promoted experimental approaches (Quaggiotto et al. 2017; Innovation Growth Lab 2018). This means that increasingly the word experiment is used to describe other issues than scientific experiments, e.g. experiments as tools for public sector development.

Design is one of the disciplines where practitioners are experimenting. In order to better understand what is meant by experimentation in different contexts, I explore an opposing perspective; Ammon (2017) alternatively presents that designing is not experimenting. As a starting point for exploring the relation between experimentation and design, Ammon uses the expressive description of designing as “reflection-in-action” from Donald Schön’s *The Reflective Practitioner*: According to Schön, experimenting, trying out – having a conversation between a designer and the material – is a core action of designing (Ammon 2017, p. 496). Ammon introduces Schön’s three types of experiments: exploratory, move-testing and hypothesis testing – for Schön, all three are context-specific that can happen at the same time (Ammon 2017, p. 500).

As ‘experiment’ and ‘experimenting’ are used to describe a wider selection of actions, the word starts to cover many very different issues. To argue that designing is not experimenting Ammon (2017) differentiates between the narrow and broad sense of experiments: a broad sense covers attempts, tests or trials, and narrow sense is based on the definition of the scientific method. If experiments are understood broadly, then actions that are riskier and newer in their context and may have open-ended results are experiments. Alternatively, in its narrow sense, an experiment is a scientific method that aims to produce knowledge and is guided by rules (Ammon 2017, p. 499-500).

Controversially, the broad sense of experimenting allows many actions to be described as an experiment, when the narrow sense is more limited. Ammon stresses the repeatability and reproducibility of experimenting and adds that design is rarely about the reproducibility of experiments. But as Laakso (2017, p.9) finely states, nowadays experiments are also understood as actions and inquiries that aim to learn and gain experiences and are not thought of only in the scientific sense.

Developing solution through learning and an adaptive process is a rather different approach from the traditional development processes which are characterised by heavy planning. For instance, Christiansen and Bunt (2014, p.48-49) aptly describe the Behavioural Insight Team’s (BIT) experimental approach to develop the communication of tax services, and how the approach allowed the team to learn as they proceeded with the experiment and adjust based on their learnings. Comparably, this suggests that experimentation can resemble the design process. Furthermore, experiments are not just tools to shake awake the old operational models; instead experiments can be seen as steps towards a new way of thinking (Annala et al. 2017, p. 2).

Defining Experiments

What do ‘an experiment’ and ‘experimenting’ actually mean? The word is used in scientific terms, for example in natural sciences, and designers also use the word when, for example, testing ideas. Development, innovation, collaboration and learning are words that are used when discussing experiments and culture of experimentation. Merriam-Webster defines an experiment as “test or a trial; a tentative procedure or policy; an operation or procedure carried out under controlled conditions in order to discover an unknown effect or law, to test or establish a hypothesis, or to illustrate a known law; the process of testing; experimentation” (Merriam-Webster, 2018, February 22). It follows that the word covers
a wide range of different actions aiming to show, test, justify, create and gain knowledge.

Experiments that are done in order to test and learn about specific topics are defined as strategic experiments. In the aforementioned Sitra report *Towards experimental culture* (Berg et al. 2014, p.14), strategic experiments are defined as new and concrete actions, that are limited by time, space, content and/or actors and potentially can create change in society. Societal change suggests that all experiments are large, but nevertheless, experiments come in all sizes, and the potential refers to the opportunity to scale them, although noteworthy, scaling should not be the grand goal of making experiments (Laakso, 2017, p. 15). A set of examples of local experiments are brightly described in the Sitra report: e.g. total 15 strategic experiments were done in Jyväskylä, where the aim was to find ways to reduce the natural resource usage and through the experiments, promote resource wisdom. In the report, the experiments are examined through four operating mechanisms: learning, participation, public debate and challenging existing structures (Berg et al. 2014, p. 7; Kokki/Inland Design, 2018 May 21). Certainly, through the four mechanisms strategic experiments have potential to bring new ways of doing to the organisations and society at different levels.

**To Experiment, to Prototype or to Pilot?**

In design, experiments, prototypes and pilots are described as design’s strengths and core expertise. One might ask, what is the difference between these three? Sometimes the word experimenting is also used to describe other kinds of actions than what is considered as a strategic experiment. Then, again, from a designer’s perspective, prototypes can be experiments. This being said, experimenting in design and experiments as part of the culture of experimentation may have a slightly different meaning and purpose. Understanding and articulating the differences becomes important when communicating with stakeholders and partners about experiments and clarifying the actions.

Motivations to experiment may include testing an idea, a need to understand better e.g. a theme or context, an urge to challenge the existing system, or experimenters may want to bring new topics to discussion and debate in order to start a dialogue. As learning is empathised and experiments are explorative by nature, experimenting is promoted as a tool to create change and innovate new solutions, through learning.

Prototypes and experiments differentiate from a pilot because when starting a pilot, there is a preconception that the pilot will function and potentially will be scaled (Personal panel discussion notes, May 18, 2018). Whereas when experimenting, the focus is on the learning, not testing a solution that is thought to be ready. A pilot and an experiment can have different goals: pilots are implemented, experiments are conducted to learn. Sanders and Stappers (2014, p. 9) define design prototypes as “physical manifestations of ideas or concepts. They range from rough (giving the overall idea only) to finished (resembling the actual end result); To give form to an idea, and to explore technical and social feasibility.” So, prototype is an idea made visible, that can be then, discussed. Prototyping is not automatically experimenting, although experiments can include prototypes.

The Designing for Public Services guide (Nesta & Ideo, 2016) describes how public sector pilots seem to be more like first phase implementation than experimentation (p.53). With often major investments made, pilots are not expected to fail. When experimenting, the expected results may be learning instead of succeeding. Alternatively, experimentation can be a way to manage risks, learn about the unknown and thus it is different from a pilot that aims to implement a ready program (Christiansen & Bunt 2014, p. 48).

**Evaluating Experiments**

If the key feature of an experiment is learning, evaluation is crucial for the experimenter. Learn-
ing fast from the experiments is highlighted as one of the produced values. Thus, when planning experiments, emphasis should be put early on the evaluation of the experiment. Examples of starting questions for planning an experiment can be seen in appendix 14.

Evaluation of experiments is currently widely discussed in Finland. In 2018, many public organisations in the government and municipalities are doing and have done experiments and are now facing the challenge of evaluation. At the moment of writing (June 2018), the evaluation of Experimental Finland is on-going, as the current government’s period of rule is close to an end: The KOKSU-project focuses on evaluating the key project, Experimental Finland, and aims to produce a suggestion for an operational model for experiments and evaluation framework (Syke, March 15, 2018). During the spring of 2018 Experimental Finland started a discussion series where different perspectives from experimental projects were presented and ways to evaluate were discussed (kokeilevasuomi.fi 2018a, February 19, 2018).

Here I briefly present two takes on evaluation. First, I look into how Design for Government model approaches evaluation (Annala et al. 2015b), and second, I open up a workshop-based evaluation model that was developed in Kumous project (Saari et al. 2018). The two evaluation models have potentially different audiences, as Design for Government is developed for the government and Kumous model has been developed in collaboration with the local actors taking part in the Kumous project.

The Design for Government model illustrated in figure 3 introduces a way to develop policies through experimentation (Annala et al. 2015a, Annala et al. 2015b). The model promotes participation and human-centred approaches, utilizing and collecting existing information and data, using both qualitative and quantitative data and qualitative research methods. The main features of the model are understanding the problem, experimentation and evaluation. The first steps of the model focus on understanding and expanding understanding; then, experiments are done in two phases: first a qualitative experiment, and second a verificatory experiment, which are then evaluated.

FIGURE 3: The experimental model for government is based on inviting others to join in by announcing an open application in order to find the best solution to the selected problem. The experiment results are verified with second experiment and after that the experiment is evaluated. In this model, experiments are designed to produce qualitative data. Reproduced from Annala, M., Kaskinen, T., Lee, S., Leppänen, J., Mattila, K., Neuvonen, A., Nuutinen, A., Saarikoski, E., Tarvainen, A. (2015b). Design for Government: Human-centric governance through experiments. Design for Government: Translation of the Final Report’s Proposed Model for organising Experimentation, Chapter 3 of the original Finnish language report. p. 8.
Design for Government model’s criteria for an experiment shown in figure 4 includes framing the experiment, defining the limits and setting goals and hypothesis for the experiment and thinking further what happens after the experiment. Furthermore, research methods, data collection and ways to measure are included in the criteria. Thus, the criteria include all aspects of an experiment plan and explain the areas in more detail, correspondingly the aspects that define the strategic experiments (Berg et al. 2014) can also be found from the criteria.

In the Design for Government model, an evaluation group is formed, and the group goes through the results together with the responsible ministries. Realistic actions to implement and scale up, effectiveness and implementation are emphasised in the evaluation and the results, as well as the experimenter’s reflections, are made publicly available. Further, by making the evaluation transparent, the media and citizens can also take part in the evaluation process. (Annala et al. 2015a, p. 41)

Kumous research project (digikumous.fi 2018) concentrates on digitalisation and developing human-centred services. The evaluation model developed in Kumous project was published as a part of a handbook for experimenting that was developed based on learnings from six digital service experiments (Saari et al. 2018, p. 4). The book includes tools for planning, framing and setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of experiment</td>
<td>The experiment must have a name that describes it concisely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>The duration of an experiment is always limited. When an experiment begins, its final date must be known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>The objectives for experiments must be clear at two levels: the concrete objectives and the post-experiment change being sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurability</td>
<td>The experiment has pre-defined and measurable qualitative/quantitative indicators that reflect the attainment of its goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>The basic aim of the experiment is to alter the activities of a party, be it an organisation, an individual, a group or social structure. Parties possible harmed by the experiment must also be defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change theory</td>
<td>Each experiment has a hypothesis that must be made visible. This is the only way of collecting information systematically. In practice, this means opening up the hypothesis and presenting the alternatives, depending on the results of the experiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of information</td>
<td>When an experiment begins, it must be clear how the information/knowledge collected during it will be documented and to whom such information will be communicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling</td>
<td>As soon as the experiment begins, there will be a review of how the potentially successful experiment will be scaled/multiplied. It is essential to consider whether the character of the experiment will change as the scale increases, because will this affect the collected data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

goals for the experiment, and evaluating experiment in different phases: before the experiment and after.

The Kumous model is workshop-based and brings together the experimenters and decision-makers. The setting is pictured in figure 5. At the core of the model is listening: through the workshop setting, it makes participants listen to each other. In the middle of the setting are the six dimensions, that are used to evaluate the experiment from different perspectives. The experimenters form the inner circle, and the decision makers form an outer circle around the six dimensions. First, the experimenters talk, and the outer circle’s task is to just listen. In the second phase, the roles are flipped, and now the experimenters listen, as the outer circle representatives with decision power share their views and suggestions for development. The extensive idea of bringing people together is to make sure the learning results spread across the different groups, and that the development does not stop at the one experiment. (Saari et al. 2018; E. Saari & K. Hyytinen, personal presentation notes, April 12, 2018).

The two approaches comprehensively suggest what an experimenter should pay attention to, and guide the thinking about evaluation from the start, e.g. the importance of documentation, in order to show the conclusions and learning results.
2 RESEARCH SETTING
The context is a critical factor for experimentation and participant observation, and thus it is necessary to open up where this research takes place. In this chapter I first describe the key tasks of Migri and some recent developments in the migration administration. Second, I introduce Inland Design. Third, I explore three perspectives on how to position design in organisations and reflect how Inland Design could be positioned based on these models. Lastly, I briefly present experimentation in Finland.

THE FINNISH IMMIGRATION SERVICE (MIGRI)

The Finnish Immigration Service (Migri) is a governmental agency. Migri operates under the Ministry of the Interior, and its financial and operational planning follows the guidelines from the ministry (the Finnish Immigration Service 2018b). The Ministry of the Interior manages issues related to internal security and migration and is in charge of the Finnish national security (Ministry of the Interior 2018a). The Ministry of the Interior prepares legislative proposals that are approved by the Finnish Parliament and ratified by the president (eduskunta.fi). Migri then implements decisions based on the legislation. Additionally, legal praxis is formed by the administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Finland. Thus, Migri does not create policies or legislation. In addition, Migri itself is a large organisation that employs almost 1,000 people across Finland and operates through eight profit units (the Finnish Immigration Service 2018c).

Migri’s core tasks include (the Finnish Immigration Service 2018e):
- matters related to foreign nationals’ entry into Finland, residence in the country, refugee status and citizenship;
- register of foreign nationals;
- produces information for authorities and international organisations.

Recently the Ministry of Interior published a policy program that aims to strengthen labour migration (Sisäministeriö 2018a). Migration review 1/2018 (Sisäministeriö 2018b) reports how labour migration is addressed through legislative changes, e.g. new permit for start-ups that is handled by Business Finland and Migri, and changes that aim to simplify processes for intra-corporate transferees and seasonal workers. Moreover, although the government aims to promote labour-based migration, a significant part of migration administration is still to take care of the asylum seekers’ matters: handling the subsequent applications of asylum seekers who arrived 2015 is still ongoing. However, the number of new applications for asylum has decreased (Ministry of the Interior 2018b).

To add, Migri is only one of the public service providers that serve immigrants in Finland. To get all the needed documents and registrations done, person may need to visit the Finnish embassy, Local Register Office (Maistraatti), Police, Social Insurance Institution of Finland (Kela), Finnish Tax Administration (Verohallinto) and Employment Services (Te-Palvelut) (TEMWISIT 2016, p. 20). These public services are still mainly produced and managed in silos, where the service comes from the service provider to the customer and not the other way around. Siloed structure is often hierarchical, and, in this system, as a result the customer is the receiver of the service while “provider remains in a superior position” (Sustar & Feast 2015, p. 8). Systems give, customers take whatever comes. Thus, in this landscape improving collaboration between other agencies, working horizontally and listening to the customers openly is still a different approach to development work. For example, recently Inland Design has collaborated with other agencies, such as in the chatbot project (the Finnish Immigration Service 2018d).

INLAND DESIGN

Inland Design (Inland) is a service design team in Migri. Inland Design is part of the digital services unit of Migri’s support services, and it serves Mi-
Migri units (M. Salgado, personal communication, December 20, 2017). It has been operating since August 2017 and in 2018, between February and August, employed two service designers and two service design interns, the undersigned being one of the two. Figure 6 shows the Migri units and the position of Inland Design.

Inland Design is developing both Migri public services and working culture, working together with the different units and teams and training Migri employees in service design. Inland’s projects include organisational design and service design; thus, the users and customers vary from Migri personnel to the customers of Migri. (M. Salgado, S. Miessner, personal communication October 26, 2017; M. Salgado, S. Miessner, personal communication February 7, 2018).

Inland Design was founded to bring experimental culture, to collaborate with other public sector organisations and actors and to kick-start new human-centred technology projects in Migri (M. Salgado, personal panel discussion notes, May 21, 2018). In the core of Inland Design’s practice is co-design, and Inland Design approach is described as follows in the Inland Design homepage (inlanddesign.fi, May 22, 2018):

“Inland is a design and innovation lab within the Finnish Immigration Service (Migri).
We combine design thinking and advanced technology to co-design services that support immigrants and their communities.

Our goal is to promote an organizational change in Migri and kick-start cross-public-agency projects that will have a positive social impact.

We put people first, we make real things, we experiment, and we are bold and visionary. We are changemakers.”

Inland Design’s operational model seen in figure 7 illustrates how the role of the Inland Design changes through the projects. The projects are kickstarted in collaboration with different stakeholders, and through the project, the role of the Inland Design changes from expert input to design lead. Inland Design does not own projects but can have more active and practical role in the beginning, to help starting the project. During the transition from expert input to design lead, Inland Design can consult the projects and have more a supervising role or support the project when its expertise is needed. Finally, the project leadership has moved to Migri units and external partners, who will maintain and finish the projects.
POSITIONING DESIGN IN ORGANISATIONS: THREE PERSPECTIVES

When design and designers are starting in an organisation that is new to design, how people and teams are positioned has been recognised as one key factor that affects how design can thrive: what resources are available, are designers’ co-workers or consultants, and through the projects, what is the impact design approach can bring. Likewise, context, position and roles are important for experimentation, especially when starting to experiment. To illustrate and understand the contextual factors from Inland Design perspective, I present three perspectives on positioning design in the organisations.

Based on the model by Sabine Junginger, illustrated in figure 8, Inland Design is positioned between stages two and three: Inland Design is part of the organisation, design is practiced somewhere within the organisation, but it is also already highly visible inside the organisation through communication, and projects like the chatbot for Migri.fi (the Finnish Immigration Service 2018d). Furthermore, the on-going work aims to integrate design into the processes and collaborate between the different units. As part of developing the design competence in Migri, Inland Design is leading a year-long training called service design ambassadors.

In the model from Restarting Britain report, portrayed in figure 9 (Design Commission, 2013),
Inland Design would be placed in embedded designer, as Inland Design team is working full-time in areas of service design and developing Migri’s design capacity, for example through the service design ambassador training programme. As Inland Design exists, Migri has partly moved from using external agency to having in-house designers – noteworthy, designers are still hired into specific projects. Inland Design’s lead designer describes in the Inland Design blog how for example facilitating workshops is also about opening up the processes of design (Salgado/Inland Design, 2018, February 2). From daily work interactions like facilitating workshops, collaboration and understanding of what service design is increases in the organisation. This action can then help open doors and break hierarchies in the organisation (Salgado/Inland Design, 2018, February 2).

As organisations capacity and capability levels increase, and design gets more and more integrated in the practices, the complexity of environments and design projects increases. This is pictured adroitly in the third graph, figure 10, adapted from Service Design Impact report (Rebolledo, 2016). As integration and complexity levels rise, the potential for design to have more significant impact naturally increases.

The position of the Inland Design thus offers many possibilities and resources that would not be available, for example, for consultants. Lykkeloft
(2014) ably examines the question of gaining legitimacy through the example of MindLab and argues that the great opportunity of being inside the organisation is the possibility to create and sustain networks, as the team members are seen as co-workers. Lykkeloft (2014) brightly points out the importance of managing resources and finding a balance between being part of the system and keeping an outsider’s view (p. 136-37). Design gaining legitimacy in the Finnish Immigration Service has recently been explored by Swan (2018). In other words, gaining trust and becoming a valued member in the organisation is a crucial factor in creating change and developing new projects. It demands certain neutrality and recognizing the right places to challenge the existing system.

Inland Design is new to the organisation and bringing new ways of working to this context also raises challenges: the time and effort it takes to gain trust, finding the people to collaborate with and spreading understanding of the ways of working. At the same time, all team members have a plenty of actual work to do. For the starting team, how much time is available for the work and other needed efforts becomes a critical resource as well. As mentioned before, bringing experimental culture to Migri was one of the reasons to start the Inland Design. For the starting team, the on-going projects have two goals: to create value for the organisation and to gain legitimacy.

I first present what is meant by the culture of experimentation and define the key terms, where I rely primarily on Berg et al. (2014) and Laakso (2017). Different levels of experimentation and experiments have been explored in Sitra’s report (Berg et al. 2014) that looks into strategic experiments done in Jyväskylä and Laakso’s (2017) doctoral dissertation explores experimental governance.

In Finland, the culture of experimentation has been promoted widely by the Finnish government as it forms one of its’ key projects, Experimental Finland (in Finnish, Kokeileva Suomi) (kokeiluvasuomi.fi 2018b). Experimental Finland aims to develop an experimental culture in all levels of society; experimenters vary from citizens to municipalities and non-profit organisations to businesses (Kokeilunpaikka.fi 2018b). For instance, a part of Experimental Finland is the Place to experiment (in Finnish, Kokeilun Paikka), a platform for experiments which aims to connect experimenters, funders, ideators and users (kokeilunpaikka.fi 2018a). It follows that the goal is to support experimenters in innovation and fast development and so forth, advance economic growth and new businesses in Finland (kokeilevasuomi.fi 2018b).

Furthermore, the strategic programme of the government attentively, but questionably, suggests “a culture of experimentation will be introduced” (Prime Minister’s Office 2015, p. 28).

Before the key project, experimentation has been promoted and powered for example by Sitra, in municipalities, public sector and private organisations. Beforedmentioned Sitra report Towards experimental culture, analyses resource-wisdom experiments, where the city of Jyväskylä offered financial support for local actors to experiment (Berg et al. 2014).

I rely on the following definitions of an experiment, the culture of experimentation and experimental society:

- **Experiment**: Strategic experiments are new, concrete actions limited by time, space, content and/or actors, and have the potential to create change in society (Berg et al. 2014, p. 14). To add, experiments are done in order to learn about the topic: experimentation is not an implementation of ready plans (Christiansen & Bunt 2014, p.48).

- **Culture of experimentation**: social environment that supports experimentation and accepts its features (Berg et al. 2014, p. 14).

- **Experimental society**: Society where experimentation is a common way of working, obstacles have been removed, and experimentation is supported by incentives (Berg et al. 2014, p. 14).

In addition, experiments are context-based, and in order to advance the culture of experimentation, the experiments and experimenters need specific space and acceptance to take action. Creating change and new systemic models are goals for both design practitioners and experimenters, who are challenging the existing structures. According to Berg et al. (2014, p. 30), these ideas can be advanced by introducing three promises in development work:

- Permission to act
- Permission to plan less
- Permission to fail

The promises can be adopted at all levels, starting from the local. For instance, Laakso’s dissertation A practice approach to experimental governance - Experiences from the intersection of everyday life and local experimentation (2017) analysed local experiments related to sustainable transitions by using a practice approach. Additionally, Laakso explored how participants adjust the experiments into their everyday life. Laakso uses the triangle model of experimental governance (see Figure 11) to analyse and clearly illustrate the different types of experiments and points out how the model can support remembering the value of different level experiments: large-scale challenges can be addressed with small-scale experiments, and a small-
scale experiment can potentially spark change in the greater system.

Noteworthy, experiments in the different levels have diverse goals and motivations, that also are affected by the context. Sitra report accurately suggests that instead of defining strategic experiments as a method, the take on experiments should be one-kind-of-approach. Laakso (2017) ably points out how experiments have different roles and make it possible for various types of ideas to be tested and emphasises the value of the learning results that ground experiments can offer. Additionally, Laakso mentions that scaling up should not be the self-evident goal of making experiments (Laakso 2017, p. 15). This suggests that there is value in the small and local try-outs, too.

Therefore, the outcomes can be experiences, evidence, mindset change, networks and/or communications benefits that can be used in many different scales and various tasks (Berg et al. 2014, p. 38). Because it is possible to create many kinds of trials from and by experimental approaches, it is important to make a difference between a pilot and an experiment – implementation and inquiry to learn (see p. 28). One example of this is the basic income experiment that is an initiative that cannot be put straight to action, but which can be examined by experimenting (Annala et al. 2017, p. 6).
Moreover, Berg at al. (2014) and Laakso (2017) both use cases from Jyväskylä and experiments done in the municipality. Not much has been written about experiments in an organisation close to the government. However, both offer valuable insights into challenges and opportunities and suggest requirements for developing the culture of experimentation and doing experiments that can be applied in different environments and organisations. Depending on the context, what is meant by experiment may vary. How familiar an organisation is with experimentation and the hypothesis or research need for an experiment therefore significantly affect what kind of experiments are done.

The Kela lead of customer services comparatively stated in panel discussion about the culture of experimentation: the context matters, as it affects what is done and how (K-P. Mäki-Lohiluoma, personal panel discussion notes, May 18, 2018). In the case of Migri, this came visible e.g. through the enabling connections who could implement proposals directly, and in the faced obstacles when projects due to time challenges did not go forward. Additionally, I observed that the words ‘experiment’, ‘experimentation’ and ‘culture of experimentation’ were understood in different ways. Furthermore, as the Inland Design was still a relatively new team, it is a different starting point for experimentation, than if a long-lived team would start to experiment: e.g. the basis for forming the needed connections is different.
RESEARCH NEED
Experimental approaches are highlighted as ways to innovate solutions and business ideas, and the idea of faster development is marketed for public sector development processes. Nevertheless, there are not many descriptions available about how these ideas are implemented in Finland. Public sector change is complex and affected by "everyday realities" which make the change simply difficult (Bason & Schneider 2014, p.38). Thus, it is valuable to document these realities since descriptions can enable and advance discussion about these developments. This thesis offers a portrayal of making design experiments in the Finnish Immigration Service.

The societal challenges are putting pressure on practices in the public sector. When claiming for alternative practices, learning fast from successes and failures instead of slow and hierarchical development process starts to sound promising. Since the area of service design has developed, designers are increasingly working with societal matters instead of designing only products. Similarly, Rosenqvist and Mitchell (2016) have described how designers are working with large-scale challenges “such as climate change, poverty alleviation or rethinking public service delivery” (Rosenqvist & Mitchell 2016, p. 1). Since public organisations are facing complex problems and dealing with uncertainty and risks, experiments could offer ways to learn about new ways of working (Nesta & Ideo, 2016, p. 7). Therefore, experimenting is marketed as a useful tool because it offers ways to try out ideas, accept possible failure and learn from it. Similarly, in design, prototypes, testing and experiments are used in the design process, but generally, this approach aims to promote trying out new ways of working as a way to do development work and advance innovation. In the same way, these ideas could support addressing other wicked problems that societies are facing. E.g. it has been suggested that tackling sustainability challenges requires the similar skills and approaches. Likewise, addressing other wicked problems may similarly require learning about the unknown through try-outs.

Municipalities have been involved in projects, which aim to develop potentially scalable solutions and innovations through experimentation. For instance, the City of Jyväskylä supported citizens and organisations to try out new resource-wise ideas, that drive change by new ways of working and organising functions (Berg 2014). Recently Demos Helsinki published an Experiment Co-creation Platform (ECP) model, that offers a framework for developing experiments collaboratively (Airikkala et al. 2018). The ECP model aims to support research-based teams in experimentation for innovative solutions to wicked problems and targets High Education Institutions, cities and non-academic actors. Nevertheless, there is not much research done about the design practice itself or experimental culture in organisation within or close to government.

I explore experimentation through literature and practice and aim to understand and describe opportunities and challenges for experimentation in the public sector. Since these ideas are affected and dependent on the context, it is meaningful to explore them not only generally but also locally, in Finland. The opportunity to work in a new service design team in a governmental agency offered a possibility to look closely into these approaches in this context. Therefore, this thesis intends to describe where design experiments happen in an organisation within the Finnish Government, and how designers can advance these actions in Migri. In design experiments, design methods are used to plan, implement and evaluate the actions. This thesis offers an examination and description of the first steps of advancing experimentation by design methods in Migri.
RESEARCH METHODS AND METHODOLOGY
This thesis aims to describe and produce new knowledge about experimentation driven by design in Migri. I aim to capture a phenomenon in a real-life setting and thus this research is qualitative (Muratovski 2016, p. 37). The research is practice-led as it aims to advance knowledge of the practice (Muratovski 2016, p. 192). I use participant observation and design experiments as research methods to answer the research questions. Additionally, through the process, I reflect on the practice and my experience through reading literature on the subject. The used methods are illustrated in figure 12.

In this chapter, I first open up reasons to use participant observation, and then, define an experiment as a method based on design research. Lastly, I introduce the used design research methods, that are used in the three experiments: developing and conducting the user research as a design experiment, the spatial interventions resulting from it as an experiment and design tools in organisational development as an experiment. Moreover, my roles in the work are clarified in appendix 1, which lists the used methods.

FIGURE 12: Timeline illustrates the used methods and actions during the research.
PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

Participant observation offers the possibility to study a practice in real life setting and gain insights through personal experiences. It is qualitative research and part of anthropological and ethnographic research, as it happens in the contexts that make it possible for the researcher to experience and observe how the people in that context understand, feel and experience the world. Participant observation is a way for the researcher to learn, understand and collect more information through their own experience, through participation in the phenomenon. (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, p. 35).

As I work as part of the team and organisation, the research is tied to my role and position in the organisation as well as to the organisation and Inland Design team. This is why participant observation is used as a method: through the observations, I record the developments in the practice and how I define and develop the experiments. Since experimenting is depended on contextual factors, my position and role in the organisation affects how I approach experimenting in Migri. With participant observation, I aim to record these contextual developments and then use the observations to reason and map out the choices I make on the way.

Since the method is tied to the researcher’s experience, it is necessary to think about the role of the observer. For instance, Baszanger & Dodier (2004) describe how the observer enters the group, becomes part of the group, and how it is necessary to find the right distance between the group and the observer. As the work forms around the researcher’s – observer’s experience, Baszanger & Dodier (2004) differentiate participant observation from observation that aims to accomplish an empathic approach. In participant observation, the observer and the work done by the observer are the pieces that form the study, and thus, the research is fabricated around the researcher’s experience. This means that the process demands the observer to be aware of the undergoing developments and requires staying present in the environment(s) where the study takes place, and through this, developing an understanding of the subject of study. Therefore, through understanding oneself and one’s own experience, the observer can study and verify the insights she/he gathers, through putting them to function as part of the participant observation. (Baszanger & Dodier 2004, p. 14-15). I present field notes in the next subchapter; I use field notes for documentation, but also as a tool to reflect on my position as an observer. Writing is a tool to stay aware of the happenings and developments, as it makes thoughts concrete and visible.

For the reasons described above, the research is entangled to the observer’s experience. Nevertheless, the opportunity to be within a group, inside the place where the studied subject is taking place, offers a way to study interactions that are not accessible in other situations. When examining a phenomenon in an organisation, the participant observer experiences the functions and actions that either happen or do not happen. The actions people take and do not take form the environment and the organisation. This, in the end, affects for example in which ways experimentation can be advanced, e.g. inside Migri, which makes participant observation a valuable method for this research.

Field Notes

The research process is documented with field notes that record development of thought, happenings, decisions and/in the working environment. Other observations and notes are collected from events considering design in/for government and experimentation. As the name suggests, field notes are researcher’s notes from the field (Arthur & Nazroo, 2003, p. 137). What is included in field notes is guided by the focus of the study and/or researcher’s interests: this said, field notes are a somewhat filtered collection of data, as the action of writing down the observations is selective (Ritchie, Spencer & O’Connor 2003, p.221). In this study the field notes are used to record obser-
Observations about the context, everyday happenings and possibilities for experimenting: *What happens, How, When?* On top of that, field notes record my experience as a group member: *What I experience and think?* These then form the base for first, understanding the context of Migri and Inland Design, and second, designing the experiments.

**Observations from Field Notes into Insights**

As said, the observations are used to reason the choices for the experiments. To grasp the insights from observations in a practical and a systemic level, I use a two step-process based on the tools presented by Kumar (2013, p. 138-141). First, in *Observations to Insights* (p.138-139) the observations are gathered, described and organised: in this phase, I write my observations on post-its as they occur and happen: as such. Second, in *Insights sorting* (p. 140-141) these insights are turned into statements, clustered and then the clusters are defined: here I describe the happenings and then, organise them into broader, named groups and create insight definitions. This analysis process is used to define the final findings from the experiments and to study the experience as a whole, and it allows me to zoom out and examine my observer’s experience from a distance.

**DESIGN RESEARCH THROUGH EXPERIMENTS**

The case studies create the setting to explore experimentation in Migri and Inland Design. Therefore, experiments are tools that are used to answer the research questions by using design research. I study the outward-directed approach of design described by Muratovski, who presents two ways to approach design as a practice: in inward (style driven) or external (research-driven) manner; in a style or research driven action. This means that design can be either tied to the designer as person; to be a form of self-expression – inward-directed. On the contrary, when design puts other needs to the front and becomes a way to solve problems, it is directed outward. Before looking for a solution, a designer approaching design externally first tries to identify the problem (Muratovski 2016, p. XXX). To conclude, I base my research on the idea of research through the design work itself; the design project as a tool to examine two sets of questions: the design need for the experiment and the research questions. In other words, my work is research driven.

**Design Research**

Friedman (2016, p. XXIV) argues the difference between design and design research is in what they make visible and accessible for others: *"Showing a product shows us ‘that’ a designer knows ‘how’ to do something. Research shows us ‘how’ to do it ourselves"*. In other words, through presenting this research, the aim is to show both: what and how the researcher did and through the learnings, share how others may do it as well. To define what kind of design research this research is, I use the three notions from Frayling (Frayling 1993; Lunenfeld 2013): this research is a research through design, since I use service design methods to conduct design experiments in order to learn about experimentation.

The three ways Frayling (1993, p. 5) offers to define design research are:

- “Research into design and art,
- Research through design and art,
- Research for design and art.”

Furthermore, Lunenfeld (2003, p.11) uses Frayling’s definition for design research and explains the differences between the modes: research into design includes examinations of the aesthetics and historical perspectives; research through design is project-based; in contrast, research for design aims to show the worthiness of the research through the design outcomes. The design experiments in this thesis form the ‘projects’. When the three categories by Frayling (1993) examine the product features, practices and the outcomes,
Cross (2007, p. 124-125) uses three categories to locate design knowledge and what is examined with design research: people (how people design), practices (what design strategies are used) and products (what results from design knowledge). The three categories that Cross (2007, p. 125) uses to define design research are:

- “Design epistemology – study of designerly ways of knowing,
- Design praxeology – study of the practices and processes of design,
- Design phenomenology – study of the form and configurations of artefacts.”

When examining the categories Cross (2007) presents, this research falls to design praxeology and phenomenology, since it examines the process and practice of experimenting and what results from the experiments, where design methods are used. To add, the study of processes is highlighted, because the aim of experimentation is to learn from the process, and thus this research does not mainly focus on about how design knowledge is embedded in the design outcomes.

To conclude, this thesis is project-based and thus, it is research through design. It examines the process but focuses on learning instead of justifying its worthiness only through the produced solutions. Burdick says: “Designers who are conducting research through their creative practice create work that is intended to address both a particular design brief and a larger set of questions at the same time” (Burdick 2003, p.82). In other words, even if the final design outcome does not meet the goals that were set for it, the learnings from the process can offer valuable knowledge. This mindset is also central for the idea of experimentation. This being said, this research addresses both: the questions set for the case studies, the experiments, and the research questions addressing the whole action of experimenting.

Design Experiment

As described previously in Experiments in Finland – An Introduction, experiments in scientific sense have a different meaning than how the word is used in design field or when describing experiments as part of the culture of experimentation. These approaches bring the goal of learning (about) something into the front and are less focused on reproducibility. Actually, experiments in the landscape of culture of experimentation, are tied to their context, and the idea is not to reproduce them as such; but to reproduce the learnings. This difference is also described by Lunenfeld (2003, p.13), who writes about the scientific method and how experimenting is understood in this sense: experiments are about testability and reproducibility that is how science is made. For instance, Lunenfeld (2003) adroitly describes the difference between the scientific and the design-erly approach: the scientific characteristics of experiments are less important in design, as design solutions are tied and affected by their context. Thus, designs are not necessarily meant to be replicated elsewhere as such.

As this thesis is process-based, it examines the practices and also evaluates the methods used in the design experiment process. Additionally, this research happens through the design case studies: through use of designerly skills, the design experiments are used to answer the research questions. As the main design abilities, Cross (2007, p. 38) presents “abilities to:

- resolve ill-defined problems,
- adopt solution-focusing strategies
- employ abductive/productive/appositional thinking,
- use non-verbal, graphic/spatial modelling media.”

The design abilities emerge in the process of doing the design experiments: the process starts with the recognition of a leverage point for design, and, requires deciding on the steps and strategies that are used to create the solution(s). Design research in this thesis is thus a way to examine the process of experimenting in Inland Design, learn from the
process and the outcomes and describe the ‘how’ for others. Although the experiments may only be experimental within this context, the learnings can benefit others’ doing design work in other contexts.

Based on the definition of a strategic experiment (Berg et al. 2014) and Inland Design manifesto (see p. 34–35) I define an experiment in Migri as:

- a new activity, action or function in Migri,
- a form of doing that has a starting point and an endpoint: a question or a hypothesis,
- a form of doing that aims to try out, test, and to learn from the action: a new work practice that is under evaluation.

Since Inland Design is a new team, it brings a number of new activities and methods, thus almost every activity could be described as an experiment. I focus on the activities I took part in and these are described in chapter 5, Working in Inland Design.

DESIGN RESEARCH METHODS

Next, I present the design research methods I use in the three case studies. There is a plenty of design methods to choose from, therefore these methods represent small selection of the available methods.

In-depth Video Interviews

The video interviews conducted were in-depth interviews, as the structure of the interview varied based on the interviewees’ story. Arthur & Nazroo (2003, p. 111) describe the differences between the two types of qualitative interviews and note that when conducting unstructured, non-standardised and in-depth interviews the way the phenomena is explored varies between each interview: the wording, order of questions and follow-ups the interviewer makes. As their strength, individual interviews provide a way to examine the explored matter in detail, from the interviewees’ perspective: during the interview, it is possible to zoom in also sensitive experiences and for example, explore the reactions in relation to a system. For the interviewer, this means acknowledging the active facilitator role and requires abilities to listen and to hear. (Arthur & Nazroo 2003, p. 36-37;168).

Moreover, video as format was chosen in order to examine how video can be used to collect and show user research in Migri: seeing and hearing people telling their stories can be a powerful tool to communicate findings forward and base the projects on actual reality (Ylirisku & Buur 2007, p. 12). (see Case 1: User Research in Inland Design; Case 2: Spatial Interventions: Exhibiting User Research Results in Migri)

Semi-structured Interviews

In semi-structured interviews, the questions are asked in the same way in each interview, and although the interviewer may ask follow-up questions, the changes are more limited than in unstructured interviews (Arthur & Nazroo 2003, p. 111). As a challenge for semi-structured interviews, Portigal (2013, p. 8) mentions the data collection: between interviews it is difficult to compare data points objectively, as every interview is unique. For instance, when focusing on personal experience, each story will be different: and so will be each interview. Semi-structured interviews were used in street interviews and during a field visit (see Case 1: User Research in Inland Design), where the set of questions was used, and additional questions were asked based on the answers. Furthermore, being present in the actual places gives an opportunity to see and understand the interviewees’ reality, and on the other hand, the interviewees could show and explain their perspectives through the context (see Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 121).

Design Workshop

Workshopping is a fundamental form and set up that is used in service design, among the design teams and project planning, and as a way to in-
volve and/or co-create with stakeholders and users. Workshop can be a good method to build mutual understanding between different actors and to learn about each other, to map the current situation or to co-create, ideate and develop solutions; gathering a group together to think and work on a subject is a strength of workshops, as during a relatively short time it allows exploring many views and perspectives. Workshop arrangements and set up is formed around the aim and goal, which in this case was to understand the students and search for experiment opportunity. Noteworthy, the role of a facilitator and facilitation as a skill is central for arranging a successful workshop. (Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 390-391;394-403)

When in interviews it is easy to collect ideas, in a workshop setting it is possible to get a larger number of ideas and together develop them forward. Lauttamäki (2014, p. 2) outlines the background of futures workshops, developed by an Australian futurist Robert Jungk, whose aim was to advance the participation of citizens in municipality decision making. Lauttamäki describes futures workshops as a setting to bring different people together in order to increase participation through the shared activity where people attempt to solve a shared problem; it is “an instrument for collaborative problem solving” (Lauttamäki 2014, p. 2). This being said, design workshops share the idea of enhancing participation and collecting multiple views from users.

Inland Design wanted to try out workshopping with different user groups as part of user research. I used the workshop method in a design workshop with students (see Case 1: User Research in Inland Design), that aimed to understand the challenges students face. Furthermore, it aimed to collect and develop solution ideas to the found problems.

**Design Probes**

Design probes are tools to examine design opportunities and human phenomena, where the user has an active role: they might be filling diaries, documenting an event, e.g. with photographs, or creating something. The probe kit guides this interaction, and record users’ personal experiences and perceptions. Furthermore, probes examine and explore rather than aim to develop solutions. (Mattelmäki 2008, p.39-41).

The first cultural probes were creative and experimental, and designed to improve the dialogue between the user and the designer. Probes were designed to collect stories that could prompt ideation. Later, design probes developed to be a way to explore users’ dreams and hopes, and in some cases to encourage the users’ involvement in the designerly process as well. To add, the results from the early probes were not analysed, but as the use of probes developed, so did the analysis of the gathered data. (Mattelmäki 2008, p. 42-50).

Design probes differentiate from cultural probes in the way they are used and designed to work: cultural probes are used as a playful tool to collect material for the designer to use as an inspiration and not as a scientific research method, as they are uncontrollable. In comparison, design probes have been used in research projects in Aalto University (former the University of Art and Design Helsinki), and the aim has been to find a balance between the playfulness and requirements for the research. (Mattelmäki 2008, p. 65-66). On the other hand, Muratovski (2016) states that cultural probes in design can be used to gather information about factors that affect participant’s daily lives and mentions how probes can help to understand, e.g. organisational factors. Noteworthy, probes are an opportunity to conduct ethnographic research fast and with low cost (Muratovski 2016, p. 67). Design probes were used to collect insights and feedback from the personnel (see Case 3: Organisational Development).
“Observation as a method makes it possible to examine the people’s behaviour and interaction in the moment as they occur, without the researcher affecting the situation (Ritchie & Lewis 2003, p. 35).”

Observation

I use observation to evaluate spatial interventions (interview video, user journey poster and origami; see Case 2: Spatial Interventions: Exhibiting User Research Results in Migri), and thus the observation differentiates from participant observation presented in the beginning of this chapter. Muratovski (2016) states that the observer should focus on two issues: structures & settings and behaviours & interactions (p.65). In other words, by observing I aim to grasp the relations between the space, the experiments and people. Observation as a method makes it possible to examine the people’s behaviour and interaction in the moment as they occur, without the researcher affecting the situation (Ritchie & Lewis 2003, p. 35). This being said, observation offers an opportunity to collect both vocalised and silent reactions, verbal and non-verbal.

P.O.I.N.T. Analysis

P.O.I.N.T. analysis (Social Innovation Lab Kent 2008; Bennett 2015; J.Kronqvist, personal lecture notes, 2017) was used to go through the user research data (see Case 1: User Research in Inland Design) and to analyse the answers from design probes (see Case 3: Organisational Development).

The letters stand for Problems, Opportunities, Insights, Needs and Themes. This approach made it possible to go through all the different forms of data in a way that makes them comparable and general. When the findings are divided following the P.O.I.N.T., it is easier to zoom out and see the bigger picture: e.g. connections and similarities. When the bits of data are clustered to broader themes, it allows one to examine the different findings under each theme very easily.

The P.O.I.N.T analysis steps include:

- Going through the data: marking and clustering data according to P.O.I.N.T
- Clustering the findings into themes
- Naming and describing the themes
WORKING IN INLAND DESIGN
When I got involved in Inland Design’s work in February 2018, the Inland Design team had been working for seven months. During my time in Inland Design, I conducted exploratory user research and did spatial interventions based on it and worked on projects related to organisational development, as Migri’s Helsinki office not only changed location during the spring but transferred from a traditional office to an open office with hot desks.

I briefly describe the development of the projects in chronological order. This is pictured in figure 13 (to better understand the used methods and my role in each part, see appendix 1). The user research project was started after I had worked for one month in the Inland Design. The aim was to find potential leverage points for experimenting based on insights from users. From March to May, I concentrated on conducting user research and doing my other tasks in the office, simultaneously being conscious of the need to present the user research results in one way or another. During May-June, I concentrated on creating the interventions: an interview video, origami and a user journey. At the same time, the move became actual, and in late April I started to work with human resource development (HRD) team regarding the move. The move happened mid-May, and after the move, I proposed a project to collect space use observations from the personnel. Before the summer holidays started in late June, together with HRD, we worked to conclude the project. In July together with the HRD team, we worked on the analysis of the space use observations. Simultaneously in June-July, I continued with the evaluation of the spatial interventions. Lastly, in August when my contract ended, HRD started the next process resulting from the project, and I supported the team in developing the plan and activities and supported the facilitators in the workshop.

I start this chapter by describing the background of why experimentation was chosen to be the thesis topic. First, I describe the findings from Inland Design’s poster campaign, spatial interventions that lead to exploring the phenomena; culture of experimentation in Finland, and furthermore,
improving experimentation in Migri. I continue by presenting the three case studies, three experiments: user research as experiment, spatial interventions as experiment and design tools as experiment in organisational development. Case by case, I first open up the background and motivation for each project and then zoom in and describe the experiments: the used methods, data analysis and evaluation. To point out, I use the word customer when I talk about Migri’s external customers: whose matters are being handled by Migri.

PREPARATORY PHASE: DEFINING THE THESIS TOPIC

I started to orientate to the subject and the work itself by taking part in Inland Design activities and visiting Inland Design, before starting the internship in Migri. As a first orientation task, I went through answers from a poster research Inland Design conducted in the fall 2017 and analysed the results. The aim of the posters was to better understand what is going on in Migri (Salgado/Inland Design, 2017, October 20) and collect and map out ideas and expectations of service design in the organisation. In addition, posters were also a way to introduce service design and the new design team that had just started. The poster intervention was conducted in Finnish. This analysis was also published as a blog post; see appendix 9. The questions in the posters related to three topics/areas (M. Salgado, email, November 21, 2017):

- How is service design perceived in Migri by its workers?
- Well-being at work
- Who is Inland Design reaching with a poster campaign?

Each poster had one question related to one of the three topics. To answer the questions, employees were asked to vote by using stickers; they could also write down answers on post-its. In one of the posters, employees placed themselves on a diagram with a round sticker, showing how they experience the nature of their work. The set of posters are shown in Figure 14. Additionally, posters with more open questions offered a possibility to leave free comments. (Kokki & Swan/Inland Design, 2018, April 3; see also Appendix 9 for the blog post) The posters were sent to the nine Migri offices around Finland, where the staff placed them to the walls. In Helsinki office, where Inland Design team is located, the posters were placed in the staircases.

The results from the poster survey were analysed by counting the votes from all offices and units and collecting the written answers together. Then, the answers were arranged according to the number of votes and the repetitive themes in the written answers. After I compiled the answers, the results were analysed together with the director of the Inland Design. When going through the results, the guiding question was: “What is the service Inland Design can offer?” (M. Salgado, personal communication, December 20, 2017). As a result, possible themes for my thesis project were listed and paired with the existing resources.

One of the posters asked, “How can service design benefit our unit” and bringing a culture of experimentation got the most votes from all units. After the culture of experimentation, most votes called for “bringing new and comprehensive thinking to recurring problems and making the bottlenecks visible”. From the written answers two topics stood out. First, organisation of work and second, bringing a human-centred approach to the organisation. Furthermore, participants expressed that the term ‘service design’ could be explained through examples, as not all were sure of its meaning. (Kokki & Swan/Inland Design, 2018, April 3).

Another poster tackled the well-being at work theme: “I love my work because..” This poster is pictured in figure 15. One option made it to the top 2 in all units: The best co-workers collected 68 votes in total and the flexible workways, a nice boss and a chance to utilise personal skills followed the great colleagues and got majority of votes. From the written answers, diverse work environment and nice customers and work community arise as the most
mentioned themes. Additionally, one poster asked employees to imagine a day when they could freely re-arrange their work. The answers included 50 ideas for re-organizing from the different units, and repetitive answers included the following themes: defining job descriptions and goals, work-life balance, work-life cycles, and staff refreshment and teambuilding days. When employees were asked to position their work habits in a two-by-two matrix, this shed light to the different situations between units. In the matrix, “the flexibility-rigidity of work was placed on the vertical axis and heaviness-lightness of workload on the horizontal axis". (Kokki & Swan/Inland Design, 2018, April 3)

FIGURE 14: Inland Design Spatial Intervention posters 1-5. The posters starting from top right corner: 1) “How can service design benefit our unit”, 2) “You wake up in the world where you can re-arrange your work completely. What would you do?”, 3) “What do you think about your unit’s ways of working?”, 4) “I love my work because...”, 5) “Let’s use the stairs! One climb one dot.”
The answers showed that a part of Migri employees were not yet familiar with service design and its vocabulary. Additionally, the answers showed that there is interest towards advancing experimental culture in the organisation. For instance, the work environment, actions that support individual worker’s ability to manage their work, and the importance of co-workers came across as highly important for the personnel. These themes stood out from the ideas employees shared for re-organizing their work.

From the results, *Culture of experimentation and Tools to support development discussion* were recognised as potential themes for the thesis and were supported by the available resources and were suitable to develop by using service design Inland Design’s expertise. In the early phase, Inland Design’s director had ideas for experiments generated from the work that had been done previously. These are listed in table 1. Tools to support development discussions had been voiced out before, and also connected to the area of job descriptions. Here the main idea was to make a design game that would support the discussion between employee and boss. Another theme, the age group/generation management, job descriptions and development fell under human resources (HR), one of Migri’s supportive services that offer services for Migri units. Inland Design is part of Migri Digital Services, and culture of experimentation touches

---

**FIGURE 15:** I love this job because...” The employees were asked to vote for two options and offered a possibility to add comments to the poster.
both, the units that support the substance units and the actual Migri customer services. Since one goal of Inland Design is to create organisation-al change, a theme that can touch across the unit boundaries can help in achieving this goal.

Culture of Experimentation and the question How to advance experimenting inside Migri? was chosen as a design project topic for the practical part of the thesis: Employees’ interests supported this option and it is connected to the reasons why Inland Design was started. Since service design is entering the organisations within and close to government, experimenting can support developing design capability in the organisation and vice versa, as service design is better understood, it also supports experimentation in the organisation.

After this analysis, I started to explore the following questions:

• How to advance culture of experimentation inside the organisation?
• What is an experiment in this context?

These questions were the starting point for my work. How to enhance a culture of experimentation inside the organisation? referred to the need to recognise where and what kind of experiment would be strategically smart to do. What is an experiment? represents the importance of understanding the background and what differentiates experiments from other actions. Additionally, it was important to think and critically examine what were the existing needs and available resources, and what would be the desirable effects the experiment can create. To add, the starting points for my internship in Inland Design and master’s thesis research were published as two blog posts, where I introduce myself and my thesis topic; see appendices 8 & 10.

### Table 1: Potential themes for the master’s thesis research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL AREAS TO WORK WITH THAT ARISE FROM THE POSTER INTERVENTION:</th>
<th>IDEAS GENERATED FROM PREVIOUS WORK DONE IN INLAND DESIGN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group/generation management inside the organisation (in Finnish, Ikäjohtaminen)</td>
<td>Tools to support development discussions (in Finnish, Työkalut tukemaan kehityskeskustelua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions (in Finnish, Tehtävänkuvat)</td>
<td>Work introduction and familiarization (in Finnish, Perehdytys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of experimentation in Migri units (in Finnish, Kokeilukulttuuri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After this analysis, I started to explore the following questions:

• How to advance culture of experimentation inside the organisation?
• What is an experiment in this context?

These questions were the starting point for my work. How to enhance a culture of experimentation inside the organisation? referred to the need to recognise where and what kind of experiment would be strategically smart to do. What is an experiment? represents the importance of understanding the background and what differentiates experiments from other actions. Additionally, it was important to think and critically examine what were the existing needs and available resources, and what would be the desirable effects the experiment can create. To add, the starting points for my internship in Inland Design and master’s thesis research were published as two blog posts, where I introduce myself and my thesis topic; see appendices 8 & 10.
CASE 1: USER RESEARCH IN INLAND DESIGN

The Inland Design teams’ motivations to do user research included intentions to listen to Migri’s customers and search for project ideas based on user needs because as a co-design lab Inland Design wants to develop services with both, Migri employees and customers. Starting to do exploratory user research without a project was an experiment for Inland Design. Additionally, user research contributed to learning about the context and the organisation by listening the users. Since doing user research is central to a customer-centred service design, conducting and presenting qualitative user research is one way of introducing service design practice to the organisation.

Project Background

I observed that it was challenging to start doing experiments right away: during the first work month it became evident that some pre-work and need-finding is needed to set the base and to understand what, how and where to act. To start, it was necessary to understand the context, because context affects experimentation as it sets limits and determines the needs and motivations. Thus, collecting data and forming hypotheses, questions and design insights may be the first step to take, if it is not clear what should be experimented. Listening to customers and users is a way to discover potentials for development as questions and hypotheses for research and experimentation (Christiansen & Bunt, p. 52). It is possible to use design research, different stages of the process; It can be used to e.g. identify problems, look for inspiration, and collect feedback to mention a view (Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 100). In this case the user research was conducted as an exploratory research, where the aim was to learn more without having a detailed assumption; This means the aim was not to confirm assumption or research specific services (Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 100). Moreover, contextual factors make it possible to frame conducting user research as experiment, as exploratory user research was new to the team within the Migri context and its focus was on learning. To add, conducting a user research independently, without a project in mind is also an experimental approach.

Design research often produces qualitative data and so-called ‘soft’ information. Siodmok (2014) defines design insight as the result of the process where observations and intuitions are transformed into a vision or plans of actions (p.191). With this in mind, three tracks for collecting customer experiences and ideas in an exploratory way were started: design workshops, video interviews and street interviews.
When starting to conduct user research, the team wanted to explore the following questions:

- What experiences Migri customers have during the application process? What are the challenges, what works well?
- What possibilities exist for experimenting based on customer needs?

The first question targeted to the aim to collect different perspectives on customer experience. I learned about Inland Design’s projects by participating in meetings and presentations. I was aware that Migri was already working on many areas in order to increase customer experience and efficiency of processes, e.g. Inland Design was involved in the chatbot project (The Finnish Immigration Service 2018d, May 14). Moreover, all substance units are constantly working on their development projects. Still, it felt necessary to map customer needs and collect evidence. Furthermore, Inland Design wanted to understand the customers’ struggles through listening to them. As a Finnish citizen, I was aware of the fact that I am not at all a customer of the Finnish Immigration Service. Thus, I felt I cannot assume what to experiment: I needed to learn about the processes Migri handles, and customer’s reality. To add, even if the designer would be part of the target audience of any design project, it would be important to do user research in order to avoid biased thinking. Additionally, as Inland Design way of working was also still forming, it was important to see how and what kind of user research is needed and useful for Inland Design, and which way it could benefit Migri. This being said, conducting user research was a learning experience for the Inland Design team. Additionally, for me as a new intern, it offered a way to learn about customers, about qualitative user research and Migri as an organisation.

Project Description: User Research as Experiment

The four areas of user research included: semi-structured video interviews (6 persons), semi-structured ad-hoc/street interviews (7 persons), and field visits (6 persons) and lastly, a workshop with students about students’ residence permits (9 participants). The research was conducted between March and May 2018. Additionally, I assisted the director of the Inland Design in a workshop with asylum seekers (9 participants). In the analysis session, we included the findings from another workshop facilitated by the Inland Design team members: HR relocation teams in gaming and software industry (7 participants).

Total 44 people were involved in the user research. Migri receives around 100,000 applications in a year: when examining the Migri statistics between April 2017 and March 2018, a total of 101,335 applications were submitted (The Finnish Immigration Service, 2018a). Yet we in Inland Design wanted to collect individual stories and experiences, since analysing the numbers seemed to offer little to grasp on: numbers do not tell about the user experience or the service. Because of the used methods and the small sample of users, the collected data is strongly qualitative, and its value is not in the numbers, as design insights have different features. Siodmok (2014) describes design insights as “holistic, qualitative, ‘softer’, contextually based and empathic” (p. 192). This means that the group of users involved in the study can be rather small. In addition, design methods may ask issues and questions that are broad and open-ended, designers may deal with issues that are connected to behaviours, feelings and interconnected to individual experience. As the last characteristic of gathering design insights Siodmok (2014) mentions that interactions with users happen where users are – in their environments. This said, user research conducted in Inland Design focused on the users’ experiences, their needs and ideas developed. People were also asked about their experience with the Migri services, positive and negative, and how they would develop the service or what would make it easier for them.

As described before, user research started as exploratory, and the aim was to collect different experiences and challenges. When looking
for participants, the aim was to find people from different user groups. In the case of Migri, this means the different permits and application processes customers go through. For this reason, video interviews and ad-hoc interviews concentrated on personal experiences, needs and challenges and what would make the service better for them individually, and in workshop, the aim was additionally to co-create and ideate for solutions (see appendix 2 workshop plan; appendix 5-6 for interview questions). For the workshop, an open invitation was published in the networks of international students. For the video interviews, street interviews and field visits, personal connections and networks were used to contact people with different backgrounds.

In-depth Video Interviews

Video interviews were done as in-depth interviews that were video recorded. The interviewees were chosen to represent the different customer groups, based on the application processes they went through. To add, attention was paid to include perspectives outside of Helsinki. Personal networks were utilised to find the interviewees.

The five interviews took place between March and May 2018. The interviewees represented five nationalities. Two interviewees arrived in Finland as students, one as a refugee, one received citizenship ten years ago, and two of the interviewees had not used Migri services themselves but were involved with many Migri’s customers through their work. The interviews focused on the overall experience of the Migri services, what application processes a person went through and what happened during the process. The interview formed around a person’s personal experience: the guiding questions were around the positive and negative experiences and development ideas; for the questions, see appendix 5. Interviews were turned into a video that is presented in case two.

Semi-structured Street Interviews

Street interviews were started as an experiment to collect a randomised set of data about experiences with Migri. The interview structure with persons who went through application processes in Migri followed the video interview structure, but the discussion formed around the person’s own story more strongly, as there was not any pre-information of the interviewees’ situation. We went to do the interviews once as an Inland Design intern team (two persons), and the second time I went by myself.

First, after a person agreed to speak with us, we asked about the kind of interaction they had had with Migri: did they apply themselves or were they there to help? How was their experience, what was positive and what was challenging? The structure of the interview evolved slightly depending on the interviewees’ answers, and themes that came up (see Arthur & Nazroo 2003, p. 111). It was likely and expected that some people did not want to discuss and be interviewed, but the ones whom we spoke to were friendly and calm and spent around 10-20 minutes speaking with us. A challenge was that as they shared their story, some of them had specific questions that we were not able to answer. As preparation, we had printed out a sheet with the available customer info services and services offered by the city of Helsinki.

I stopped doing street interviews because after conducting the first interviews I observed that this format could be somewhat challenging: for me it required a lot of time and skills I did not have, yet. Also, during the short interaction, it is challenging to gain knowledge that is new. I experienced that for one person most of the time went to finding a person who agreed to the discussion. When the time I had was limited, it felt strategically better to invest the time in interactions located in places where the probability of getting answers was higher. Moreover, I was inexperienced in doing street interviews: for me approaching people on the streets was a real challenge. The stories of randomised experiences did not include much new information and collecting wide-enough dataset
was too challenging at the time for me. Because of these reasons, I chose to try a field visit: go to a place where I know people have a connection to or work with immigration, and are more likely to share their experiences, and where I could appoint for a visit beforehand. Moreover, it is arguable that not enough interviews were done in order to do a comprehensive analysis of the method.

Field Visits

As an alternative method to the street interviews I visited a cultural centre in Kouvola and a start-up located in Maria01 area in Helsinki, which both offer services and work with immigrants. The aim of the cultural centre visit was to listen to the social workers, NGO workers and if possible, customers. In addition, with Inland director we visited a centre for the homeless, and during the time of the research Inland Design visited NGO, a multicultural women’s association in Helsinki. The motivation was to get to know their work and the challenges they and their customers face when interacting with Migri. When visiting the start-up in Helsinki, I wished to collect experiences from Migri’s customers from various backgrounds. The same starting point, *What is your experience with Migri*, was also used during field visits. Additionally, during the visits to the cultural centre, homeless centre and the start-up the personnel was asked about their perspective on the rumours about Migri.

During the field visits, I aimed to listen and learn from the contexts I was not familiar with. Being there, at the place, gave me an opportunity to see and understand the interviewees’ reality, and on the other hand, the interviewees could show and explain their perspectives through the context (see Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 121). In comparison to street interviews, I found the experience of the visit itself a valuable way to learn about migration. Nevertheless, more visits should have been done in order to make reliable conclusions about the method.

Design Workshop with Students

Inland Design is doing a lot of co-design workshops in Migri, and Inland Design team wanted to experiment the co-design workshops with different customer groups as well. A workshop with students was arranged in March 2018. As a result, students were chosen as a first user group to try the set up with. The Inland Design team supported in the planning of the workshop. I facilitated and made the documentation of the workshop. During the workshop, the director of the Inland Design documented it and supported in the facilitation.

The nine workshop participants were university students who represented seven different nationalities. The workshop theme formed around the student perspective of the Migri services. The three-hour workshop was divided into two parts: first sharing a personal experience through Experience Pizza activity, which is shown in figure 16, and second, a group task concentrating on the application process and how to improve it. Experience Canvas pictured in figure 17 was used as a tool to develop the solution ideas. To see the complete canvas, see appendix 3.

When preparing for the workshop, I familiarised myself with the application processes students go through. As I expected to collect a wide range of experiences from the workshop participants, I studied user journey maps as a tool to structure the process. User journey map is a tool that illustrates the different levels of the service from the user’s perspective. In addition, a user journey map can be designed to be assumption-based or research-based, a map can illustrate current state or future state of service, or the map can be focused around products or experiences (Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 50-51). To clarify the connection to the Migri service, I used the analogy of a user map to position the student’s personal experiences in relation to the Migri process.

The participants were divided into two groups, and the groups used the experience canvas as a base
for the group work. Since the starting point for the workshop was open and explorative, I made the Experience canvas open as well: it only had the two main touchpoints from both customer and Migri point of view: Application and Decision. Typically, what happens before, during and after can vary a lot between individuals, and thus I wanted to allow flexibility in the positioning of the problems. As a facilitator, in the workshop script, I paid attention to the translation moments between the activities and made sure the time is flexible, if/when changes have to be made during the workshop.

As a result, the two groups presented their proposals to develop the user experience of applying for a residence permit as a student. For digitised results, see appendix 4. The solution ideas were formed under the placed problems in the experience canvas. Finally, this workshop produced more descriptions of the challenges students have faced, than fully-developed solution ideas.

Data Analysis

To analyse the user research data, we collected all memos and documentation and sat down with the director of the Inland Design to analyse them. As we read, we used the P.O.I.N.T. analysis to mark all the findings (Social Innovation Lab Kent 2008; Bennett 2015; J.Kronqvist, personal lecture notes, 2017). The letters stand for Problems, Opportunity, Innovation, Needs and Threats. The analysis allows us to discuss the user’s experience in relation to their needs and opportunities, and to identify gaps in the user experience.
ties, Insights, Needs and Themes. This approach made it possible to go through all the different forms of data in a way that makes them comparable and general. For instance, when the findings are divided following the P.O.I.N.T., it is easier to zoom out and see the bigger picture: i.e. connections and similarities. When the bits of data are clustered into wider themes, it allows one to examine the different findings under each theme very quickly.

The P.O.I.N.T. analysis process went as follows:
- Going through the data: We wrote the findings on post-its and marked and clustered them according to P.O.I.N.T.
- Clustering the findings: we went over the findings again and clustered them under 14 different themes.
- Documentation: The themes I then turned into a digitalised document that included the named themes and descriptions in sentences.
- Finally, the director of the Inland Design continued working on this document and arranged the findings under more prominent themes, resulting in five headlines.

The five final themes that resulted from user research analysis, are: 1) Choose the right application, 2) Language issues, 3) Time issues, 4) Interaction with Migri, and lastly 5) Collaboration with supporters. From the themes, it is possible to see that customers struggle with unclarity and uncertainty, which are caused by, for example, not knowing what is happening in the process and difficulties in choosing the right application. At the same time, customers have to deal with the waiting time, and they take a proactive role and seek for answers, but often face obstacles and are not capable of getting answers. Lack of answers and a small understanding of the processes creates rumours and beliefs about the service. For some user groups, low literacy and limited language skills end in limited capability to understand the provided information and the processes. This said rumours create more work for employees through the public sector and NGO’s.

Evaluation of the Used Design Methods

To clarify, this evaluation of the used methods is self-reflective. The data from the video interviews were turned into an edited video, which will be presented in more detail in case two.

With the video interviews, it was possible to collect rich personal stories from different people told by themselves. More interviews with people with even more diverse backgrounds could have been collected. However, since the results followed the set goals, and these were the first video interviews I did, use of the method was positive.

Street interviews and field visits can be seen as a try-out. More interviews and visits should be done in order to do a comprehensive analysis of the method, although in this process it did not produce the benefits the method has. The results from the workshop with students were mainly about the challenges students face. The Experience Pizza activity would have worked better if participants were only asked to share positive and negative experiences. This would have made the second part clearer. Nevertheless, as one kind of result, also stories about challenges are valuable.

After the P.O.I.N.T. -analysis session, we discussed the Inland Design team’s observation that the user research had resulted in more learnings for us as a team than new insights for the substance units. We agreed that the research had been important to do. In the future Inland Design aims to conduct user research in collaboration with substance units. Moreover, the suggestions we collected from the customers were turned into What If – cards by the director of the Inland Design. Inland Design is going to use the cards in future brainstorming sessions with co-workers. In addition, Inland designer described how user research produced material and examples, that are valuable for Inland Design and its future work. E.g. user journeys are examples of customer experiences in Migri context (see case two for details). Moreover, I describe the findings from user research experiment in chapter 6, Discussion.
CASE 2: SPATIAL INTERVENTIONS: EXHIBITING USER RESEARCH RESULTS IN MIGRI

Inland Design actively presents their work in Inland Design medium blog (see medium.com/inland), in the Migri office(s) with posters, internal pages and presentations to the units. We wanted to present the results and findings together related to the user research and explore new ways to present our work. Thus, the findings were turned into three different spatial intervention experiments: 1) interview video that was placed in Migri lobby, 2) fortune-teller origami that presented the users’ development ideas and quotes, and 3) a user journey poster.

To evaluate how the three new formats were received, I observed and interviewed Migri employees. In addition, I will also describe how the user journey poster was analysed before evaluating all three experiments, because the user journey poster was also made to serve as a tool to understand the user research findings. Moreover, the origami and user journey poster were also described in a blog post; see appendix 11.

Project Background

These interventions aim to introduce user research findings and at the same time, tell about the service design methods. For example, visualizing the user research results and exhibiting them is one way to introduce service design methods and ways of working for co-workers in Migri. In addition, visualization has been recognised as an essential and influential part of service design, as it helps to understand the complex interactions and happenings (Halse, 2014, p. 203).

To examine how to present the findings, I started with the following questions:

- What new ways can be used to present Inland Design’s work in Migri?
- How to present findings in a way that is interesting and easy to understand?
- Can presenting findings from user research advance user-centred thinking in Migri?

My motivation was to create something that would be approachable and fun and would stand out from the usual ways of presenting in Migri. I had also observed that increasing understanding of the used language and methods were necessary, as service design and Inland Design were still unfamiliar for some co-workers. Thus, in the interventions, I also tried to explain the work.

Interview Video

Inland motivation to place video interviews in the Migri lobby was to make customer’s voice visible
in the physical phases. The video includes clips from five video interviews with six interviewees that were conducted between March and April 2018 and presented how customers experience the service and what are their views on how to improve the service.

In July 2018, a 7-minute-long video was placed in the Migri lobby accessible for Migri’s workers, guests and customers. The setting is shown in figure 18. In the previous office Inland Design had a screen in the entrance lobby, but in the new office, although the screen is placed in the lobby, it is different as the area is also a common area for workers. In addition, the screen set up was temporary, as setting up the permanent screens was incomplete.

On the video, I chose to concentrate on three perspectives: the experience, challenge and an idea.

I had approximately three hours of raw material to edit, and as Ylirisku and Buur describe, the amount of data video making produces can be a challenge for the editor. The data always holds many possibilities on how and what to present, since the answers and descriptions can be approached in many ways (see Ylirisku & Buur 2007, p. 91-93). I chose to keep the perspective of individuals and let the people tell their thoughts and ideas.

Three versions of the video were made. The most extended version included longer and more detailed stories that also described the challenges people faced in the application process. Another version had somewhat less description of the challenges, and in the final version, the description of challenges is included in the customers’ development ideas. Before setting the video on the screen, we in Inland Design watched the most extended video with the head of customer services and discussed the set up. After the discussion, it was decided that the shortest video will be placed in the lobby, as the area is open for guests and thus part of Migri’s external communication. The video included critique and the interviewees also shared negative experience, and Migri’s other external communications do not include critics or negative experiences from clients. Because of this the video was not considered to be in line with other communication. The chosen approach was more neu-
The motivation to create the poster included both showcasing the findings and creating a tool for Inland Design: to take findings from different branches of user research and present them in a form that advances comparability. A user journey canvas is a well-known tool used in service design, which is used to visualize the steps and different levels and interconnections of user experience (see Kimbell 2017, p. 86-89; Stickdorn et al. 2018, p. 50-53; Kumar 2013, p. 182-183).

When designing the user journey poster and choosing what levels and perspectives to include, I based my approach mainly on Lucy Kimbell’s Service Innovation Handbook (2017, p.86-89). In the layout I included four levels:

- What (the steps)
- Touchpoints (interactions with people, services and platforms)
- Issues (problems and challenges) and
- Ideas (how to improve the situation).
Five interviews and two workshops were visualized through these levels. The aim was to show how the experiences from users are connected to Migri’s process and services. Some of the journeys were based on a user journey sketch made during the interviews and the workshop. Others were based on the interviews and workshop notes from where it was possible to place the findings following the two main steps: application and decision. For a sizeable image of the poster, see appendix 7. Figure 20 shows the placement of the poster near the Inland Design office. Additionally, it was also presented in an Inland Design Advisory Board meeting.

Data Analysis of the User Journey Poster

To better understand what value a user journey poster could create, I went through the user journeys included in the poster. I compared them and looked for similarities, connections and on the other hand, disconnections. When analysing the user journeys, I could see Themes, Ideas and Questions arising. These are illustrated in figure 21 in relation to the user journey levels. Themes are based on the reoccurring findings and Ideas and Questions originate from the insights. The analysis results were similar with the user research analysis.
session findings, including themes around 1) finding and gathering information, 2) language related issues, 3) trust, 4) proactive customers, 5) rumours and 6) roles of other agencies and NGO’s. Ideas and Questions were related to the holistic view of the service, empathic approach, developing collaboration with other agencies and actors and what are Migri’s expectations for the customer and what support does a customer need in order to meet these requirements.

The user journey canvas helped to visualize where interviewees’ challenges occurred, with who and what they interact and how their ideas could be positioned in relation to Migri’s service process.

The user journey canvas helped to present the different streams of information in a form that advanced understanding about the relation between the findings and the Migri system, presented details in a short and easy to grasp way and improved comparability. Next part, I will describe how our co-workers approached the poster.

**Evaluation of the Experiments**

To find out how the video and origami were received, I observed how people engaged and commented on the materials, and additionally, did ad-hoc interviews on the spot (6 persons). Three of the interviewees also commented on the user journey poster. Based on these observations and findings, I evaluate and reflect on the chosen three formats.

I wanted to grasp how people will interact with the interventions, and if the experiments supported the aims that were set for them. I observed people’s reactions in the lobby area and common spaces, where I was working. I did not interact with people or made my position known, as I did not want to affect the reactions I observed. Moreover, in the interviews I asked if interviewees were familiar with the materials, what they thought about the different interventions and how they understood them.
The video aimed to make customer stories present in the office and showcase the work of the Inland Design. The video was placed in the Migri lobby that is also accessible for guests. However, I did not observe any guests in this space. Together with the edited interview video, Inland Design introduction video was showcased. I spent three days, 2 hours per day, observing the reactions during the first week when the video started to play in the lobby. Based on my observations, people were interested in the material, and if they had time, they stayed and watched. To add, I observed that also group dynamics played a role in the comments that were outspoken. Additionally, a person’s familiarity with the Inland Design seemed to influence how the videos were received. When watching the interview video, simultaneously people had discussions about Inland, and I observed that for many it was not that clear what Inland Design does. The location affected on who saw the video: although the idea of the office is to move around and change location, many employees work within the same area.

During the first days, I observed several negative reactions to both videos. Based on the comments, it was seen as a critique towards how people do their work, and I overheard several times that it was described as ‘propaganda’ from the Inland Design. The location affected on who saw the video: although the idea of the office is to move around and change location, many employees work within the same area.

The origamis were made to share the ideas and quotes from the user research, share Inland Design work and try out a different way of communicating about the work. The findings of how origamis were received are based on the Helsinki office. The origamis were sent to eight Migri offices in Finland, where I did not receive any follow-ups to emails. In Pasila, the origamis were placed on the common areas around the office: tables in the kitchen areas and working cafés. Some of the origamis were removed for reasons not clear to me, but most of them were where I left them.

I interviewed six co-workers about the origamis. Three discussions were shorter 5-minute discussions and three longer, 20-minute discussions. When I asked about what people thought about the origamis, all said they liked how the origamis...
looked like: they described them as fun-looking and how the fortune-teller reminded them about childhood. The form was seen as positive and different from the usual communication channels that are used in Migri. On the other hand, they also expressed their confusion: where to start, how to use this? I observed similar reactions in the working cafes: the amount of information was said to be too much. One person suggested she would like to get short guidelines how to approach the origami; another one wished there had been some communication in the internal channels when I placed the origamis on the tables in the Helsinki office. Since I used the origami-form, but I did not include the aspects of the fortune-teller game, it may have created confusion.

This said, I conclude that visually the origami was received well: it looks different and brings the user research findings to the spaces in an interesting way. But as it contains a lot of information, it can be too experimental in this form for people to grasp during their break. Looking back, communicating about them in other internal Migri channels would have supported the aim of the intervention: e.g. publishing an article about them in the internal pages. For instance, at the beginning of this chapter, I introduced the poster survey. In comparison, the survey posters were introduced in an article, and there were not any problems in getting answers and reactions from the other offices. Nevertheless, because I received many positive reactions as well, it suggests these kinds of three-dimensional forms can work as a communication channel in the office. As the interviewees said, there might not be time to search and read about the work from digital channels, but during a break, they might more easily take the time and without having to hurry, explore the materials. In contrast, I observed that origamis were also moved away from tables, which suggests the opposite: having the main kitchen areas free from a work-related material.

**User Journey poster** was made to develop a way to synthesise the collected data and make the different experiences comparable. The user journey poster was placed into a wall near to the Inland Design office. We wanted to show the work done in the Inland Design also near to where the Inland Design team is located. Co-workers from one substance unit mainly use the corridor, which limits the audience. At the same time, multiple printed materials were being placed on the office walls, and I observed that it is necessary to limit the areas where we exhibit a little bit: I did not want to put something on every area. Looking back, if I had communicated more on the internal channels and wrote articles, maybe placing more materials would have been a stronger option.

Based on the poster analysis session I could evaluate how the poster as a tool worked for me,
“To summarise, based on the small sample the visualizations were found as a good and different way to present and communicate in Migri, but gathering more comments would have been necessary for a comprehensive evaluation.”
CASE 3:
ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

When I was conducting the user research, I kept looking for an experiment opportunity within Migri. It was suggested to me that there could be a possibility for collaboration with the human resource management. When I met with the team, I observed that the move offered a possibility to experiment and additionally, could be an opportunity to contribute to the organisational development. The moving process to the new open office space with hot desks had been prepared for a long time before I joined the Inland Design. The new space guidelines had been created in a series of workshops together with the personnel during the preceding year.

In this part, I describe how observations and feedback about the space use guidelines were collected from the employees and managers one month after the move. The project was co-designed and put into practice together with the human resource development team of 4 people (later referred as Kepa: shortening from the Finnish name Kehityspalvelut).

My initial thought was that the move holds an opportunity to experiment with something in the new spaces, do something spatial, as many conditions change at once. As we discussed the opportunities with the Kepa team, it became clear that there was an existing need to support the personnel during the move. To understand the situation better, I started to work with Kepa on small matters like creating the layout and icons for the printed guidelines to be placed in the working spaces in the new office. This led me to be more involved in the move than I first anticipated: I facilitated a planning session for supporting personnel in the move, made feedback posters for the first weeks. Additionally, I planned how to observe the space use during the first months and collect more feedback from the personnel. This would become the experiment.

Project Background

Migri’s Helsinki office moved to a new location in May 2018. This means that approximately 530 people moved and needed to change their daily working routine, adapt and develop new working routines in the new space. In the new office the employees do not have their own desks anymore; instead the office is divided into different areas for individual and group work. This requires that the employees adopt and internalise the new space use guidelines.

When I approached Kepa, my initial thought was that the move holds an opportunity to experiment with something in the new spaces, do something spatial, as many conditions change at once. As we discussed the opportunities with the Kepa team, it became clear that there was an existing need to support the personnel during the move. To understand the situation better, I started to work with Kepa on small matters like creating the layout and icons for the printed guidelines to be placed in the working spaces in the new office. This led me to be more involved in the move than I first anticipated: I facilitated a planning session for supporting personnel in the move, made feedback posters for the first weeks. Additionally, I planned how to observe the space use during the first months and collect more feedback from the personnel. This would become the experiment.
I looked for initially. During the process we discussed the next steps and developed the final solutions together with the Kepa team: I made suggestions based on the needs and then, the plans were evaluated and modified together.

The questions guiding the process were:

- How to support employees during and after the move?
- How to collect feedback and observations about the space use guidelines in the early phase, as the working culture starts to develop?
- What service design tools can support achieving these goals?

Project Description: The Move Godparents and Collecting Feedback from Personnel as Experiment

A role of moving godmothers and fathers (in Finnish muuttokummit, later referred as the move godparents) was set up to support personnel during the first weeks. The idea was that a specific group from the personnel could help others to navigate in the new space and answer the questions people have during the first weeks. Later, feedback about the space use and how space use guidelines were being implemented was collected with a design probe: a diary that 6 employees kept for two weeks and 15 managers filled for one day. Additionally, three survey posters were placed for three weeks into the kitchen areas in Migri office. The probe diary can be described as a small-scale experiment, as it is a new way to collect information from personnel and management in Migri.

Planning Workshop: Defining the Role of the Move Godparents

A two-hour workshop that I facilitated and planned was arranged to define the role and the tasks of the move godparents. Approximately ten participants consisted of the move specialist, representatives from the space provider and a group of potential move godparents; representatives from the substance units who were familiar with the move and already had a significant amount of information that was a good basis to this task.

The key questions to answer in this workshop were: First, from an employee perspective: What are the employee’s expectations, when they arrive on the first day? What do they want to know? Second, from the moving specialist perspective: How do we make sure the personnel get the information they need, and we have prepared for them? What are the key things they should know? And lastly, regarding the role of the godparents: What is the knowledge they need to have? What do they do and do not do? Where should they physically be? How do they communicate? How do their actions link to other actions and support them?

In the workshop, these questions were discussed, and a plan was made based on the gathered answers. It was decided that the move godparents will be helping others during the first week in a more active manner and then, in the second week, they will be available for assistance. In the workshop the aim was to describe the tasks that are not their responsibility; for example, some technical questions should be directed elsewhere. Nevertheless, it was decided that the move godparents need to have the information where and to who guide people. To add, feedback posters and digital channels were set for the first weeks to collect instant feedback.

Already in the workshop, the need to collect feedback and react to it came up. During the first weeks, a set of feedback posters were placed in the cafeterias, and people gave a good amount of feedback. An observation experiment was conducted in June for two weeks in order to support longer-term observation.

Space Use Observations: Design Probe Diary as a Method

There was a need to collect information early on about the guidelines and how personnel start to...
use the different spaces. Together with Kepa, this was agreed to be the theme of the experiment. This way of collecting feedback and observations was new within Migri. There are efficient systems available to measure the percentage of space use, but at this point, the need was to know what personnel think and feel, and how they act in the spaces. For these reasons, probe diaries and feedback posters were used to collect this information. Both addressed the question of how guidelines are understood, how the spaces are working and if there are needs for development. The design probes and posters are displayed in figure 22.

The diary was designed based on the idea of design probe (see Mattelmäki 2008). Since the intention was to gather knowledge about the happenings and developments, that may stay invisible otherwise, getting the findings based on personal perspectives was seen as a valuable approach for the experiment. The probe was used to collect insights from the personnel from different units and to learn about the current developments and happenings, that were not visible for me or the Kepa team, with the aim to understand the on-going changes and adaptation to the new spaces.

When designing the probe, several formats were considered. A traditional paper form was chosen because it requires little effort from the participants: it was small and easy to carry, and there was not a need to find digital platforms or
sign in to other systems. By making it small, I also wanted to emphasise that filling the diary was not meant to create extra work burden and that all observations were valuable. On the pages, the observation diary reminded of the guidelines and in instructions encouraged people to write down all of their observations and thoughts under each area. The goal was to collect views that may stay silent otherwise and get to know possible practices that may start to form between different working groups. Additionally, problems and development needs were a great interest for Kepa. (See figure 22)

Six people were recruited from personnel by sending an open call via email. The invitation was sent to three mailing lists, that included people who had been involved in the move or organisational development. Additionally, the invitation was sent to the managers’ mailing list. These lists were chosen because the people already had a connection to the subject and the recipient list became smaller: sending the invitation to the whole organisation or trying to take a randomised sample could have been another option, but there was not any guarantee of better results. This is why it was decided that we start with the three mailing lists.

The six employees observed the space use for two weeks. Observers used a probe diary to record their thoughts and observations. Additionally, same properties were used to collect feedback from 15 managers, who filled the diaries for one day. This was done in order to collect feedback from managers in an efficient way.

**Space Use Observations: Feedback Posters**

Also, to get a more extensive understanding of how Migri employees experience the new working spaces, a poster campaign was realised. It consisted of one large and seven small posters that showed the guidelines for space use and a success meter of how well the guideline functions. The large feedback posters were placed on the three staff cafeterias for three weeks, and small posters were located near the working areas. People were asked to place themselves on a line based on how happy they were with a specific space, and they were encouraged to write down their thoughts and development ideas.

**Data Analysis**

Kepa arranged an analysis session to go through the findings. I suggested that the findings would be analysed by using the P.O.I.N.T -analysis. The participants consisted of representatives from Kepa team (3 persons) and myself. My role was to guide activity and I also took part in analysing. The method had been used in the Service Design Ambassador training led by Inland Design, but the method was entirely new to the rest of the team. In the analysis we followed the same steps that were also described when analysing the user research results:

- Going through data: We went through the answers and wrote down observation findings from the perspective of Problems, Opportunities, Insights, Needs and Themes.
- Sharing the individual findings: All shared what they had written, and the findings were discussed in the group.
- Clustering and creating themes: the findings were clustered into more prominent groups according to the themes that arise from the findings. This way, we could see what kind of issues arise from the observations.

As a result, the themes can be grouped into two major categories: themes related to the physical spaces, and themes connected to human behaviours. The themes arising from findings included: Insights about different spaces including e.g. group work, individual work and project workspaces; New working practices; “Home base” challenge; Sound and noise levels; Space maintenance and cleaning; and lastly category with
smaller detailed issues, Purchases and small development areas.

From the groupings, it was possible to see the areas where adjusting and specifying the space use guideline was necessary, together with other development areas and ideas regarding space use or shortage of supplies. Additionally, valuable new insights were collected about how people act and what challenges are occurring: e.g. the idea of hot desks is that work tables are not reserved, but the observers described how and where people are reserving spots for themselves. This was also shown in the answers from the survey posters: one discovery was that people were asking for guidelines on how to reserve spots although that kind of behaviour should not be happening in the open office.

Additionally, another insight was that some staff members experienced no difference between individual and group workspaces. When exploring this issue further, it seemed that this was partly because same groups of people tend to gather the areas and form their own culture. E.g., a space that was meant to be silent, became a louder space, although another area had been reserved for group work. Many findings were linked to the fact that although the new office is said not to have areas for different units, people organise their work around their unit and talk about "their unit’s spaces". These findings represented different levels of development work, some being rather small and some part of the larger organisational change and long-time goals. Later, numeric space use measurement system can be used to gain statistics and support the development efficiently. Finally, the Kepa team took the results and worked on defining the next steps, as summer holidays started and the end of my internship was getting closer.

### Evaluation of the Used Design Methods

Based on my observations during the analysis session and the answers that were collected from the diaries and posters, the probes and survey posters produced the necessary information. The diary probe sample was rather small, but it is also a characteristic of a design probe: Mattelmäki suggests a target group between 5-10 persons (Mattelmäki 2008, p.67). The goal was to understand what is happening through individual people’s perspectives. Based on the analysis results, the employees’ and managers’ observations produced new knowledge or brought back to table thoughts that had been speculated, about the on-going implementation of the guidelines and the forming working culture.

The move godparents mini-workshop received positive feedback from the participants and Kepa. Also, when I was recruiting people to take part in the diary observations, the plan received many positive comments and the observers were committed to the observing. The posters collected more votes than comments. When putting together, the answers from diaries and posters show in general how the situation is right now: the general feeling. One issue that became visible was that not all had used all of the spaces.

P.O.I.N.T analysis method was found to be useful in the analysis session, as it guided the discussion and helped to form themes and to recognise the different kinds of observations from the diaries and posters. Kepa team also took the analysis method and used it to analyse other feedback that was collected from the employees during the summer. To conclude, from the themes and insights, Kepa can further steps to develop the space use and the working culture. They were able to react fast to small needs, that in the end have a surprisingly significant effect on the office atmosphere.
In this chapter I answer the research questions and describe the learning results reflecting on the research objectives. To answer the research questions, I use my observations from participant observation and learning results from the three case studies. Additionally, I use the literature to reflect on the practice, my experience as a participant observer, and the findings.

First, I describe the opportunities and challenges of experimentation based on my experience in Migri and answer the questions What does experimentation offer for public sector? and How to better understand challenges in the culture of experimentation?

Second, I describe ways to advance experimentation and the benefits it can offer in order to shed light into the research objectives; How can Inland Design advance experimentation in the Finnish Immigration Service (Migri)? and How can experimentation offer benefits for Migri?

Third, I offer suggestions for Inland Design and future research and lastly, I outline the limitations of the research.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR EXPERIMENTATION

The opportunities and challenges are connected to three main themes: 1) hierarchical and siloed structure, 2) importance of networks and connections and 3) challenges in understanding vocabulary and wording.

The public sector is hierarchical and on average things happen slowly; the context itself creates a challenge for design and experimentation. As Bason & Schneider convincingly describe, public sector change is complex and affected by “everyday realities”, that make the change simply difficult (Bason & Schneider 2014, p.38). The challenges concretize as rejections, and as I experienced, difficulties to get answers and time issues, e.g. difficulty to schedule meetings or having to wait for an answer. Respectively, these challenges lead to conducting user research in order to find leverage for design experiments, as other inquiries did not go forward. Moreover, order and certain stability are results of the hierarchical structure and bureaucracy (McGann et al. 2018), but for experimentation this is a challenge, as it creates an environment that aims to avoid risks and failure. This, then, results in a step-by-step approach that makes development slow. Experimenting aims to promote ‘Fail fast, learn fast’- thinking, and it requires acceptance of failure. If it is accepted that failure cannot be avoided, it has been comparably suggested that the take on failures must develop through reflection, reflective collection of combinations of strategies to work towards the desired goal and “a self-reflexive irony” (Jessop, p.43-44). In experimenting this could mean adopting changes to initial plans: an ability to notice the possibility of failure but continuing towards the desirable goal (Jessop, p.43-44).

A challenge for experimenters is how to communicate the learnings from the failures, and show how the learnings can be valuable, although the project was not successful if one examines the goals that were set in the beginning. Additionally, the on-going discussion about evaluation of experiments is important for the development of the culture of experimentation. (Personal notes, Arviointi-aamukahvit March 1, 2018, April 12, 2018; Kokeilujen kevätjuhla May 18, 2018).

Building the relationships within the organisation and gaining trust is crucial for experimenting as new actions need support to get over boundaries set by hierarchies. When experimentation has the support of the networks and relationship in organisation, ideas can move forward rather fast, and the experiment gets fuelled by the support: e.g. in the case three, which happened around the move. Especially if the goal is to do strategic experiments, the supporters are an essential part of
“A challenge for experimenters is how to communicate the learnings from the failures, and show how the learnings can be valuable, although the project was not successful if one examines the goals that were set in the beginning.”

The experiment, e.g. when challenging the existing structures, support helps to take down obstacles. Small contextual experiments can be useful in the beginning when starting experimentation in the organisation. But it is necessary to clarify and present the different scales of experiments, so that the meaning of experimentation is not reduced to stand for a new way of having a meeting.

The word experiment can be used to open doors: right now, it seems to garner interest from people, and is supported by the Government’s key project. At the same time, this is a challenge for experiments and the culture of experimentation, as the word is used to describe many actions from small and local to larger projects. It can make it hard to grasp what the experiments are, and why a try-out is conducted. Strategic experiments suggest a wider scale and potential impact, when smaller try-outs, still called experiments, miss the potential for societal change. A broad understanding of the word and many different actors implementing these approaches in different contexts makes the landscape of experiments rich, but also somewhat messy (Personal notes, Arviointi-aamukahvit March 1, 2018; April 12, 2018; Kokeilujen kevätjuhla May 18, 2018).

For instance, I observed how understanding of the word differed in Migri, e.g. in meetings with potential collaborators. Additionally, experiment in a scientific sense differ from how experiments are understood when talking about culture of experimentation. Experimenting can be a way to start discussions, but a challenge for the experimenter looking for collaborators is to make sure that they share the same understanding of the word. A buzzword carries the danger of becoming something “which can mean anything or nothing” (Jessop 1998, p. 30).

To conclude, the position of the experimenter and the ability to form networks defines many starting points for experimenting, and when starting experiments, self-reflection and exploring the systemic picture can help to put thoughts in perspective and find the suitable leverage point(s). I would stress this especially when proposing an experiment as an outsider: it is an opportunity for the experimenter as much as it is a challenge. Furthermore, designing is not only about experimenting, although designers are doing experiments. This thesis is one example of the challenge that comes with the use of word experiment: as can be seen, in this particular context the three case studies can be framed as experiments, but it is not self-evident that they would be considered as such elsewhere. For instance, user research without a project or using design probes may be usual practice elsewhere. It can be concluded that the opportunities and challenges resulting from the characteristics of the public sector have also been described widely before (see e.g. Design Commission 2013, Bason 2014a, Steinberg 2014, Berg et al.)
2014, Mager 2016) and thus follow the earlier findings and on-going discussion (Personal notes, Arviointi-aamukahvit March 1, 2018; April 12, 2018; Kokeilujen kevätjuhla May 18, 2018).

ADVANCING EXPERIMENTATION IN MIGRI

Lighter planning and being open to change direction during the experimenting process are highlighted as key features of experimentation. These, with the addition of fast problem definition, are also described to be features for designers defining their goals (Cross 2006, p. 114). Comparably, this suggests designerly ways of knowing can support the implementation of these ideas because the processes share similar aspects, e.g. dealing with complexity and redefining the set goals. The design approach and its tools can thus support experimentation, as many tools address these aspects and challenges, and it seems like the teams like Inland Design and D9 are doing exactly this. Ultimately, adopting a designerly approach can be an experiment for public sector organisations. Nevertheless, because of everyday realities, continuity matters. Mariana Salgado describes this:

“But we do not want that Inland and D9 are experiments, we need them to be ongoing endeavours. Why? Because we need trust. And you get trust over time and through long time commitment and relations. So, even though D9 and Inland Design support experiments, we need them not to be experiments.”
– Mariana Salgado, Inland Design Director (personal exchange, September 20, 2018)

As an example, in the process in case three, organisational development can be divided into following parts: my project suggestion, my analysis of the current situation and proposal, plan defined in collaboration, preparing materials and analysis and definition of next steps in collaboration. Using the new tools required me to listen carefully and make plans based on what I learned, so I was capable of suggesting a new approach to be used in the collaboration. My proposals and prepared materials were beneficial because they were planned together, and I had the support of Inland Design team and Kepa team, e.g. to find the right people.

I have described how language affects experimentation, and the understanding of the word varies. For example, to support mutual understanding D9 has especially paid attention to increasing dialogue, sharing new tools and ways of working in the public sector (A. Leppänen, July 25, 2018). I see one way Inland Design can advance experimentation in Migri is to provide examples and stories: what can experimentation be in Migri. These stories could then be included in
the collaborations, and published in the Inland Design blog and Migri internal channels. It is important to communicate about successes and failures; make the learning results from both visible. In addition, these descriptions can be valuable for experimenters in Finland.

Correspondingly, advancing experimentation can be supported by using the word wisely: avoiding an over-use of the word and being clear about the experimental parts. I would question if the word is always needed, sometimes small-scale experiments could be done without labelling them as experiments: using the word to open doors could be saved for larger events. Furthermore, as the teams’ network keeps growing through the collaborations and in small-scale experimenting can be woven into the projects. This can be one way to introduce the ideas. This requires an understanding of phases in projects and recognizing what is useful and when; as not everything is, experimenting during different phases may be beneficial (personal panel discussion notes, Kokeilujen kevätjuhla May 18, 2018).

BENEFITS EXPERIMENTATION CAN OFFER

Experimenting is an opportunity to learn about the context, theme or topic. In the case of user research project and the follow-ups resulting from it, the benefits were not what was first anticipated. Instead of new projects, the benefits include:

- learning about customers, the organisation and communication
- producing examples and material to use in the future

In case of organisational development, the benefits include:

- Understanding early-on the challenges the personnel had with the space use guidelines

By conducting a user research, we in Inland Design learned about Migri. Moreover, we learned that there is a lot of on-going development projects that are tackling the issues we came across when listening to the users. In addition, from the spatial interventions presenting user research, we learned that it is possible to make the fragmented data comparable and understandable in Migri context (user journey). Furthermore, the interventions create attention to details in communications, e.g. the use of similar graphics and when and how to utilise the internal communication channels. Finally, I learned more about not only Migri but also how Migri is perceived by the customers, what ideas and challenges they have, and for me doing user research became close to work training.

From the organisational development done in collaboration with the Kepa team, the results went to use faster, as the team could put them into use themselves. The project was a small part of a bigger picture, and it served the organisational development right after the move: the methods supported understanding of the space use and collecting qualitative data, before using a calculation system that will be effective as personnel has set down their practices. At this point when the move was still a new and fresh change, and the process of adapting to the new situation is still on-going, the findings made visible which parts of the guidelines were difficult to understand for the personnel.

To conclude, the experimental approach can be an option when doing something that is new for both, workers and the organisation. In case of organisational development, the open office with hot desks was new to Migri, and although the guidelines were developed in cooperation, there were spaces that no one knew how people would adapt to. The alternative approach therefore helped to understand the ongoing situation. Moreover, it is noteworthy that experimentation can produce benefits faster when used in a context where people involved also have the power to take ideas forward immediately. The need to bring experimenters and decision-makers together was also emphasised in the Kumous evaluation model (Saari et al. 2018). Finally, the experiments
may create benefits for the workers of the organisation faster, as the development work of customer services takes longer. The relations between service providers and customers in the public sector have been ably described as “asymmetrical power relationship”, where the customer is the receiving side, and the service actions do not flow to the other way, from customer to organisation (Sustar & Feast, 2015 p. 8). However, if people working with customers and customer interactions are included in experimentation, the benefits for the customer may become visible faster.

Finally, because experimentation should start from understanding the context and being sensitive to it, the approach could offer ways to address sustainability problems that are typically “wicked”. The possibility to learn about the unknown can support developing e.g. sustainable solutions to problems that are challenging for the public sector to deal without public contribution.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR INLAND DESIGN**

As a conclusion from the user research analysis, user research should be done in collaboration with other units. Empathy approaches came up in discussion with one of the Inland designers when talking about how to use the material from user research. In the case of the lobby video, the idea was to bring customer stories to the office, but the new lobby changed how and by who the video would be seen. Nevertheless, it could be beneficial to explore different ways to use design empathy as Inland Design is trying to bring a user-centred approach to Migri. For example, different ways to use video could be tried out; e.g. video diaries could work as a method to increase understanding of other’s work or as research method of making every day challenges visible.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Based on my notes and observations from events arranged by Experimental Finland, there is a need for descriptions of experimentation in government, and how to pass on the learning results (Personal notes, Arviointi-aamukahvit March 1, 2018, April 12, 2018; Kokeilujen kevätkuistinta May 18, 2018). The on-going KOKSU-project aims to answer some of these. Since experiments are context-based, descriptions of different level experiments can be beneficial in better understanding the implementation of these ideas. Furthermore, as passing the learnings is a hot topic at the moment, it could be interesting to look into how design and designers can support dialogue about the learning results.

“The experimental approach can be an option when doing something that is new for both, workers and the organisation.”
making the learning results visible and support knowledge sharing. Finally, language and communication are widely discussed in design and experimentation. Therefore, it could be valuable for design research to examine how design is understood and experienced in the Finnish government. This could open up ways design approaches can be made understandable for others locally.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH**

Characteristics of the public sector, time constraints and contextual factors set limits to this research. As described before, development is slow, but the internship and thesis project had a limited time: this affects what can be done. As the team is new to the organisation, the working practices are still evolving and changing, and the team is still being introduced to the organisation.

Depending on the definition of experiment, it can be questioned if the work can be repeated elsewhere, as the work is qualitative and contextual. Nevertheless, contextuality is a characteristic of experimentation and should be acknowledged when starting an experiment.

The contextuality of design is addressed in the quote by Löwgren & Stolterman (Salgado 2009, p. 121):

> "The combination of these three elements – the designer, the resources, and the situation – is always unique, which makes every design process an ultimate particular."  
> – Löwgren & Stolterman, 2007, p. 9

This means design projects are always unique. Similarly, experiments are always unique, when understood in a broad sense and not in a scientific sense that is based on reproducing the same results.

As the design cases are experiments about developing experiments, I was aware of the risk of failing. However, the learning results from failures can still produce valuable insights about the practice, and thus, also provide opportunities for the research. Additionally, it has been said that experiments do not succeed or fail, they are a journey one takes (K-P. Mäki-Lohiluoma, personal panel discussion notes, May 18, 2018).

“It could be interesting to look into how design and designers can support dialogue about the learning results, making the learning results visible and support knowledge sharing.”
PERSONAL REFLECTION
During these 6 months, I have had many roles: an intern in Migri, a member of the Inland Design team, a master’s student in Aalto University, thesis maker and, lastly, a private person. As I used participant observation as a research method, I kept reflecting on these roles, which also came with different expectations, opportunities and limitations that eventually also affected the work presented here. Thus, the learning results originate from all of these roles.

Looking at the three case studies now, I see these experiments as exploratory inquiries to learn about the organisation itself, the working culture and what happens when design enters the organisation. Because change in the public sector is slow, it can be a real challenge for a master’s student, when doing a practice-based work that requires certain knowledge-base and readiness from the organisation’s side. As I have described, experimentation requires capabilities from the organisation and also the experimenter. Since events do not move forward if working alone, ability to build connections is crucial part of experimentation. In addition, when starting the thesis, I recognised that as it is about experiments, it has a certain risk of failing. Therefore, I would highlight the importance of being able to take a systemic perspective, being open and sensitive about forms of communication and self-management: handling stress and complexity. Now looking back, I would start with a systemic analysis and try to understand what is going on in Migri at the moment, try to understand the different substance units and their functions, and the on-going development projects. Likewise, systemic analysis could have supported recognizing potential opportunities to collaborate, that could have also been framed as experiment. Additionally, the value would have been in the gained understanding about the context.

On a more personal level, the work was an opportunity to practice different user research methods and documentation. My learning results include: 1) planning and conducting interviews independently, 2) recognizing areas that I need to improve when doing interviews, 3) video-making: shooting videos, recording voice and editing, 4) use of many design tools such as design probes and user journeys, 5) recognising my personal needs when organizing independent work and which approaches work better for me personally, 6) how to structure documentation, 7) workshop planning and facilitation, and many more. The interview video, origami and user journey offered me an opportunity to practice editing, explore how to present ideas and quotes and familiarise myself with user journeys. Additionally, I learned that in the future I must pay more attention to plan the evaluation part in detail. Besides the workshop I facilitated as part of user research, case three: Organisational development offered an opportunity to work with non-designers and facilitate in different workshop setting. This was a good collaborative project to learn from: it required me to take responsibility and at the same time, give responsibility. To add, here I needed to make design vocabulary understandable to others as well.

Looking back, the time pressure forced me to do and try out things that I did not yet feel comfortable with. This was challenging, but the struggles taught me many lessons about the design practice and on which parts I need to improve as a designer. In addition, I described my internship experience, and lessons learned also in a blog post; for the post, see appendix 13.
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## APPENDIX I: Table: Clarification of the used methods and the researcher role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>RESEARCHER’S ROLE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory observation</td>
<td>Participant observer, thesis position; done individually.</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Participant observer, thesis position; done individually.</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations into Insights</td>
<td>Participant observer, thesis position; done individually.</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Interventions: Survey poster analysis</td>
<td>Received material and went through it: collected all answers together, made calculations. Went through results together with Inland director.</td>
<td>Preparatory work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth video interviews</td>
<td>Interviewer; planned, conducted, documented individually. Interview questions and structure developed further based on comments from Inland director.</td>
<td>User research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews; street interviews</td>
<td>One of two interviewers. Planned questions, questions developed further together with Inland intern. Documentation done as collaboration with Inland intern.</td>
<td>User research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews; field visit</td>
<td>Two field visits planned, conducted, documented individually. One field visit participated as observer.</td>
<td>User research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design workshop with students</td>
<td>Planned, organised, facilitated, documentation individually. Documentation developed further based on comments from Inland designers. Photography and video during workshop by Inland director.</td>
<td>User research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design workshop with asylum seekers</td>
<td>Assisted in the workshop; photography and video during workshop. Documentation individually, developed further based on comments from Inland director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial interventions: video, origami, user journey poster</td>
<td>Interventions created individually. Video idea proposed by Inland team. Idea for interventions individually. Ideas discussed and developed in a group: interventions chosen based on discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation (Used to evaluate spatial interventions)</td>
<td>Conducted individually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis of User Journey Poster</td>
<td>Comparison of visualized journeys conducted and documented individually. Documentation developed further based on comments from Inland designers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design probe</td>
<td>The goals of the project and probe defined together with Kepa group. Designing probes, planning and organizing probing process done individually, supported by Kepa group’s comments. Using probe diaries during the meeting with managers facilitated by HR representative. Material included in the analysis done together with Kepa team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey posters</td>
<td>The goals of the project and posters defined together with Kepa group. Designing posters, and poster set up done individually, supported by Kepa group’s comments. Using posters during the meeting with managers facilitated by HR representative. Material included in the analysis done together with Kepa team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.I.N.T-analysis, User research</td>
<td>Done together with the Inland director. Basis for documentation done individually, developed further based on comments from Inland designers. Documentation developed further by Inland director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.I.N.T-analysis, Organisational development</td>
<td>Done together with the Kepa team. My roles included leading the session and participating in the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Workshop plan: Design workshop with students

Total 140 min scheduled - 10 min extra.

Goals and outcomes: Map out the experiences and challenges participants have with the current process. Brainstorm solution ideas to improve the experience.

Results will be used: The workshop is part of user research Ireland is doing and not yet connected to existing project. The results can be used to start a new project or communicate ideas for development. To improve the processes in the future.

Participants: 7-10 international students

PART I / 45 min: ice breaker, problem finding and selection

5 min Introduction & consent forms

10 min Icebreaker: find 5 things in common
- In pairs: interview and find out what have in common (Finland and body parts do not count) - 5 minutes
- Interview, 7 min share

35 min Activity one: Experience pizza
- 15 min Individual: My experience when arriving to Finland and applying for the Residence permit (outside EU) and the Right of Residence (EU)
  - Create your overall experience about pizza slice about the resident permit process
- Write on post its and use paper placed on the table to describe the overall experience
  - Slice “Dough” the same: can add spice from home country
  - Sauce: the overall feeling you had about the process
  - Toppings: Details
    - Red post it (Tomato): Challenges with the service
    - Yellow post it (Cheese): Needs and hopes
    - Green post it: positive things
- 10 min Share for the whole group: 1 min /person
- Divide to two groups
- 10 min cluster problem areas and challenges: Using user journey canvas
  - Place topics (from toppings) to the canvas and create outline of process

*** BREAK 5 min

PART II / 50 min: brainstorm, solution finding, close up and feedback
16:00-17:40 (20 min extra)

Activity two: User journey canvas brainstorming
- 45 min Group Brainstorming: Solutions
  - 5 min Individual: spend 5 minutes thinking solutions, write on post its in one sentence
  - 10 min Share and place under the development areas
  - 30 min Building new user journey with play dough:
    - Paper on the table: Have some points as starting points, encourage to change/develop/add
    - What are the different stages? Where you place the solutions? How it solves the challenge?

25 min Close up discussion:
- 5 min Small group: Get ready to present the new journey to others
- 20 min (10 small group) Big group: two groups share small group discussions

15 min Wrap up and Feedback:
- Feedback activity: 3 minutes: use DIXIT cards to express how the workshop experience was
- 10 min Share 1 min /person
- 2 min Ending words
APPENDIX 3: Experience canvas

Student's Residence Permits

Application experience NOW

FUTURE application experience
APPENDIX 4: Digitised versions of the solutions the two student groups produced in the workshop

## Group 1: Solution

Documents can be simplified and combined. By accessing older submissions, the process can be faster. The experience can be advanced with playfulness and the service can offer links to other sources of information. This way the service takes care of it’s core task but supports customers when they navigate through other public services, that affect their stay in Finland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional services</th>
<th>Info</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Issuing process</th>
<th>Getting the permit</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One place for services to survive in FI</td>
<td>&quot;Learn by playing a game!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Does this information need to be updated?&quot;</td>
<td>Know your place in line</td>
<td>Flexible identification</td>
<td>&quot;Anything else I need to do?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify documentation. Improved Information. Simplified process.</td>
<td>Combine documents. Show examples. Experience-based information, that shows Finnish culture</td>
<td>Access old applications to avoid double submissions. Online documents only online, less printing.</td>
<td>Inform about process. Check documents before the meeting. Same standard for staff in Migi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish ID. Short residence permit</td>
<td>Examples, One platform. Game Experience map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information included in the letter: Offer links to other services. Remind about other registrations. Reminder to apply for extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 2: Solution

The solutions were presented through two users: Rabbit who is applying for the first time, and Cat who is applying for extended residence permit. Improving the beginning of application process and getting the right information is achieved by having only one website and having a chatbox for questions, that can serve outside office hours. Development areas include improving the system for counting credits and giving more links to other sources of information.

Unclear information
Many sources
Helps to find information, navigate and be ready to apply

Different life situations
Possibility to explain "Why" these documents
Many websites

Did not know what is best way to get security code
Inform about best/fastest practice

Not knowing about other permits. Other organizations not aware of Migri processes
Inform students during their application process and organizations.

Application
1st time application
Chatbox
Real person offers help to questions also outside office hours

2nd time application
Possible to add comments to the application/attachments
More flexibility in time: time also reflects priority
Better system to count/follow credits

Service on one website
Application and time reservation systems connected

Decision
Mandatory to include personal code in application

Being informed about the application process, when waiting for decision

Reminders: Apply for extensions. Remember these documents: registrations. Offer links to other information sources.
APPENDIX 5: The interview questions and plan for video interviews

Goal: make immigrants more visible and present at Migri’s office: show the different stories, do user research, better understand our clients and show them beyond the application experience

Estimation of interviews: 5-10
Edited video version: 5-10 min

Questions

General: about the person and personal history
  ● Can you tell me about yourself? Your name, work or studies...
  ● Why did you come to Finland in the first place?
  ● How did you end up doing what you do now?
  ● How has Finland been so far?

Migri related
  ● What were the first steps when you knew you’re going to come to Finland?
  ● What happened when you arrived to Finland, what you needed to do first?
  ● How was the experience with the Immigration Service?
  ● Which application and decision processes you went through or are going through?
    ○ How did it go
    ○ What was the challenge, what was good
    ○ Did you wish something was different
    ○ What could have helped you in the process?
  ● Where did you get information and/or help?
    ○ Was it good?

Draw user journey with interviewee.
APPENDIX 6: The interview questions and plan for street interviews and field visits

Finding interviewees:
- Hi would you like to talk about your immigration experience
- Do have any experience with the Finnish Immigration Service?
  - Can you spare a minute to talk about your experience?

About us:
- We are two designers working for the Finnish Immigration Service
- Collecting experiences about our services from the people

Type of experience with Migri
- ...Were you applying for residence permit citizenship... Or do you mind to say?

What were your impressions about the services?
- Do you remember how was your first interaction with Migri?
- Why?

Advice or help with applying
- If/when you had challenges with the process...
- From where you find information or guidance about your application process?
  - Was the information you received good and helpful?
  - Where did you get help? How was it to find help?
- Did you receive any advice before going to Migri or when you were waiting for the decision?

Anything else? ...that you want to share? ...that comes to your mind?

Thanks a lot for your time!!
APPENDIX 7: User Journey Poster, 1/3 pages
Inland Team: Anna

What have you been doing before?

I have worked in various projects related to event production, art and design learning. After graduating as a shoe and textile designer from Helsinki University of Applied Sciences, I have been a facilitator in events arranged by SuMu—the Finnish Association of Design Learning and lately started to host a weekly SuMu design club for elementary school students. Currently I am finalizing my Master’s degree in Aalto University’s Creative Sustainability (CS) programme, in the design study track. What brought me to CS was the program’s multidisciplinary approach, my interest in public services and its focus on issues like climate change and environmental sustainability. CS aims to educate design students to work on environmental and social challenges and I want to improve things related to these by using design. I have had the possibility to explore these themes during the year 2017, for example by participating in the Design for Government course and ChemArts summer school.
Why did you come to Migri?

During my studies I have become more and more interested in designing for public services. As the majority of study themes link the big transformations with the fast changes in the world, the role of public services has become extremely interesting. Furthermore as the world has become smaller and smaller and many of us can now belong to many global communities, also working on migration feels more relevant than ever. The chance to join Inland Design to work on my master's thesis is exciting and inspiring, and a great opportunity to learn and gain experience about these things together with service design. As I was first trained in product design where processes were driven by individual expression, it is now important to me to be part of a team and work in a collaborative manner with the stakeholders.

How do you want to work in Inland?

I believe in listening and being sensitive to the environments around us. Being empathic, searching for and recognizing the right problems and maintaining a humble but critical perspective on projects is important for me. Collaborative design and co-creation are thus the core of engaging with other people and creating a shared understanding of practices. I believe I will gain a lot of knowledge, insights and valuable experiences from collaborative projects and learn from the Inland Design team during my time here.

How do you envision Inland in the future?

Inland can be the key actor on building the capacity of a user-centred approach on service development, and enhancing cooperation across different groups. I look forward to seeing Inland, and other design studios in Finland and around the world, form networks that can share and set examples of developing solutions for complex challenges that the public sector needs to deal with.

What do you do when you're not working in Inland?

I am either reading, cooking or at the museum. I have always two or three books on my table and I discover new ones to read faster than I can finish the previous ones. I try to enjoy nature wherever I am, taking long walks, skiing and of course hunting for mushrooms—what is the most important thing every autumn. I also like to draw and make shoes.
The results from Inland’s spatial interventions

During the Fall of 2017, Inland placed a set of participatory posters in corridors and common spaces in Migri offices all around Finland. The goal of this spatial intervention was to inspire a participatory culture in Migri and collect ideas for future projects. Questions in the posters related to well-being at work, how service design is understood within Migri, and how it could benefit the units. Participants gave their vote by using stickers and they were encouraged to leave comments with sticky notes.

When we asked, “How can service design benefit our unit,” a culture of experimentation got the most votes from all units. Second and third place went for bringing new and comprehensive thinking to recurring problems and making the bottlenecks visible. Two bigger themes arose from the sticky notes: 1) ideas that related to different ways of organizing work and 2) increasing the human-centered approach. Additionally, participants identified the opportunity to unwrap and explain the term “service design” through examples.

APPENDIX 9: Blog post 2: The Results from Inland’s Spatial Interventions
I love this job, because...

When asked about factors creating well-being at work, most people responded great co-workers. The best colleagues got 68 votes, being in the top 2 in all units. Additionally, flexible workways, a nice boss and a chance to utilize personal skills got the majority of votes. Other important themes that arose from the free comments on sticky notes included: a versatile and challenging work environment, a nice work community and customers.

One of the posters asked participants to imagine a situation where they could freely organize their work in a new way. Altogether 50 ideas were collected from nine different units. Recurring comments regarded work-life balance, work-life cycles, spending casual time together with coworkers outside the office, and the importance of defining job descriptions and work goals. Different working habits of the specific units became visible in the two-by-two matrix, where the flexibility-rigidity of work was placed on the vertical axis and heaviness-lightness of workload on the horizontal axis.

The intervention results show that people in Migri are interested in a culture of experimentation. Sitra defines a ‘culture of experimentation’ as a social environment that encourages people to experiment and approves the characteristics of experimenting, such as the risk of failure (Berg A., Hilden M., Lahti K., 2014, Sitran selvityksiä 77, p.14). All of this is inline with the recent public discussions, as the government has recently started a key project on enhancing the culture of experimentation in all levels of society.

We in the service design team are glad to see that the posters were received well and we want to thank all the participants for their time and effort. As service designers we are inspired to see the interest towards a culture of experimentation and wish to support the future experiments and experimenters!

Read the previous post about spatial interventions here:
https://medium.com/inland/spatial-interventions-why-12470c29b5e5

References:

Article author: Kristin Swan & Anna Kokki

Article contributor: Mariana Salgado
Experiment on experiments

In a recent Inland blog post “The results from Inland’s spatial interventions,” we described the results of our spatial interventions focusing on the interest in the culture of experimentation in Migri. Perhaps the best-known example in current public discussions is the basic income experiment. This experiment has gained interest worldwide, along with the government’s key project Experimental Finland (“Kokeileva Suomi”), which aims to enhance the culture of experimentation in all levels of society.

Another good example is the series of experiments in the city of Jyväskylä, Finland in 2013, analysed in Sitra’s report, “Towards experimental culture” (Berg et al 2014). The aim of the experiments in Jyväskylä was to find everyday solutions for reducing the use of natural resources and promoting a wise use of resources. 15 different experiments were done, including one that focused on reducing waste food from the municipal central kitchen. Later other localities started initiatives based on the Jyväskylä model (p. 20). These Jyväskylä “resource wise” experiments are examined through four operating mechanisms: learning, participation, public debate, and challenging existing structures. The focus is on strategic experiments, meaning: actions that are new and concrete, limited by time, space, content and/or actors, and can possibly change the society (p. 9). Again, the
culture of experimentation means a social environment that encourages experimentation and accepts the features of experimentation, such as light planning and such as light planning and the risk of failure (p.14).

On March 1st, 2018, Experimental Finland kicked off a morning coffee session series on evaluating experiments (Arviointiaamukahvit-sarja). During the first session, Senja Laakso and Annukka Berg gave an introduction to experimental culture. One question of evaluation that was discussed among many others was: when not to experiment? The next session will take place on April 14th, 2018, and more details can be found here.

In order to answer the question when to experiment, as a service design intern, I take part in ongoing Inland projects to understand what kind of experiments other designers in the team are working on and kick off some new one as well. In Inland, we are also conducting user research to better understand what kind of possibilities we have for experiments. I am interested in what role service design has in developing the culture of experimentation, and I wish to find some answers or ideas related to this question through participating in experimenting. The goal is to develop models, that make it possible for people in other units to continue the development or do another experiment and cherish the possibility of failing.

Here you can read more about the spatial interventions (1) and the results (2). https://medium.com/inland/spatial-interventions-why-12470c2e65e5

https://medium.com/inland/the-results-from-inlands-spatial-interventions-704608f9795d

Author: Anna Kokki

Contributor: Kristin Swan and Mariana Salgado
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Workshop results: Student’s experiences of residence permit application processes

In late March 2018 Inland arranged a workshop about student’s residence permits. The workshop included eight current students in Helsinki universities, representing seven different countries (both EU- and non-EU countries). The aim of the workshop was to collect student’s experiences of Migri’s services and develop ideas for improvement.

The workshop started with sharing personal experiences of the service when applying for a residence permit, positive and negative, and also exploring what wishes students had for the service. Then, the group was divided into two smaller groups, where they placed the challenges from the discussion on the application process timeline. Next, participants continued with ideating solutions based on the challenges mapping. As a result, the two groups suggested improved application process experiences.
During the workshop, a couple themes emerged:

- First, the participants were happy with the EnterFinland website, Migri’s digital application platform, but wished that applying and booking appointments could be handled through the same platform.

- Second, many said that the staff in service points are nice and helpful. However, some described how they rely on information from friends because finding and recognising the right information can be challenging.

- Third, the participants would like to keep being updated on the application process, and receive reminders or notifications after applying. At the moment getting the decision can take several months. While waiting for the decision the system only informs the customer that their application is being processed, and customers receive notification in case they need to submit additional documents. At the time of the workshop customers could get an estimation of how long it will take to process their application, by using a calculator in Migri website. This service is now extended with the use of Migri’s chatbot.

**Group 1**

Group 1 worked on clarifying the application process steps. In their suggested application process, the documents are simpler and elements are combined. For example, when applying for a renewal, it should be possible to access older submissions. This in turn speeds up the process as there is no need to re-submit information that did not change.

Furthermore, the group suggested that the experience can be improved by increasing playfulness of the website and if the service could offer links to other sources of information. This way the service would take care of its core task but support customers when they navigate through other public services, that affect their stay in Finland.
Group 1: Solution

Documents can be simplified and combined. By accessing older submissions, the process can be faster. The experience can be advanced with playfulness and the service can offer links to other sources of information. This way, the service takes care of it, and it's a service that supports customers when they navigate through other public services, that affect their stay in Finland.

Group 2

Group 2 presented their solutions through two imaginary users: Rabbit who is applying for the first time, and Cat who wants to extend their residence permit. When mapping challenges, it became apparent that most of the challenges occur in the beginning of the application process. After submitting an application procedure is quite straightforward, and not many posts were added there. To clarify the beginning of the application process and support getting the right information, the group suggested gathering the service on one website, including a chat option for questions. After applying and getting the permit, the suggested system also sends notifications and reminders during the application about the status and later about the need to renew the permit. Other suggested development areas include improving the system for counting study credits, and giving more links to other sources of information that support a student's stay in Finland.
Conclusions

During this workshop we heard some great positive feedback about students’ experience applying for residence at Migri. The EnterFinland website makes the application process nice and easy. Migri’s customer service points and staff was another highlight for the workshop participants. Finally, attendees discussed that once an application is submitted, the process is straightforward and easy. We collected many ideas for improvement, that will be taken further in the co-design process. Ideas varied from smaller improvements like using less plastic cups in the service points to broader ideas of rethinking websites.

In Inland, we talk a lot about “co-design”. We often get questions about what it means, because it’s a very new term to many people. Perhaps this workshop provides an illustrative example of “co-design” in action. The “co-” in co-design stands for collaborative or cooperative. Thus, co-design is all about collaboratively designing solutions together with your users and stakeholders, to ensure that solutions truly meet their needs and are usable.

Some links to the current issues regarding student’s:

New chatbot answers questions about processing times and contact details (Published May 14, 2018)

Tips for international students applying for a residence permit (Published June 5, 2018)

Student: follow the processing queue on our website or in Enter Finland (Published June 28, 2018)

Legislation on students and researchers from outside the EU to be amended (published March 22, 2018)
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How we presented Inland’s user research in the organisation

During spring 2018 we did user research in Inland. We interviewed customers, workers in NGO’s, and arranged three workshops with special groups: students, asylum seekers and HR & relocation specialists in software and gaming industry. The aim of conducting explorative user research was to find opportunities for future experiments, listen to customer stories and together discover development ideas. By doing user research, we were learning about both, Migri’s customers and Migri itself.

The different branches of user research consisted of three workshops (25 participants), ad-hoc interviews (7 persons) and field visits (6 persons) and lastly, video interviews (6 persons). A total of 44 persons took part in the research. The participants represented different customer groups, customers that apply for different residence permits. Additionally, we spoke to workers at NGO’s working with immigrants in Helsinki.

From these interactions, we collected many individual stories and customer ideas for development. We wanted to show the work we had done to our co-workers in the office and at the same time, explore different ways of presenting results and findings. In Inland, we actively present our work to the public and our co-workers through posters, blog posts, and presentations. After some discussions with the team members, I wanted to try two new ways of presenting findings in Migri: informative origamis and a user journeyposter.

Turning findings into user journeys

User journey canvas is a well-known tool used in service design, that is used to visualise the steps and interconnections of user experience (see Kimbell 2017, p. 86–89; Stickdorn et al. 2016, p. 50–53; Kumar 2013, p. 182–183). One of our goals was to show our co-workers who were not familiar with user journeys, how it can be used. Our second goal was that the canvas would help to make our findings comparable and visually connect them closely to Migri’s application processes, which vary depending on the permit type.
The challenge was to present many different kinds of experiences and make them comparable: there are as many processes as there are permits, and furthermore, every application is as unique as are people’s lives. In the poster, I wanted to make the different dimensions and levels visible, but still, keep the poster rather simple. When designing the user journey poster and choosing what levels and perspectives to include, I based my approach mainly on Lucy Kimbell’s Service Innovation Handbook (2017, p. 86–89). In the layout I included four levels:

- What (the steps in the application process)
- Touchpoints (interactions with people, services and platforms)
- Issues (problems and challenges) and
- Ideas (how to improve the situation).

Through these levels, I aimed to make visible the characteristics of each story and experience. The typical steps in the application process include:

- gathering the information about the application
- filling the form and collecting attachments
- submitting the application
- booking a time for identification in the embassy or Migri service point
- processing time
- receiving the decision
Five interviews and two workshops were visualized through these levels. Some of the journeys were based on a user journey sketch made during the interviews and the workshop. Others were based on the interviews and workshop notes from where it was possible to place the findings following the two main steps: application and decision.

**Sharing ideas from users in a form of a fortune teller origami**

Migri recently moved to an open office space with hot desks. In the new office, there is a lot of common spaces, and I wanted to utilise the tables and create something approachable and nice looking, that people could read and play with when they have their breaks. First, I sketched other three dimensional forms, but as we discussed with the team, the idea of the origami took off. I concentrated on experimenting with the form of the fortune-teller origami.

In the origami, I included development ideas and quotes from users and additionally, shared shortly what we had been doing in the user research project. As I went through the user research data, I thought about what kind of information would work in the playful form and would best fit the situations in which people will be reading them: during their coffee or lunch breaks, or on their way to a meeting. Which information can be described shortly, but entirely, on the origami?

Ideas and quotes seemed to fit this purpose: the ideas were easy to describe in short sentences, and the quotes were connected to the idea or the theme the idea was tackling. The customers’ ideas were placed on the top, and the quotes were placed inside, for people to discover. The ideas also addressed parts for example about the challenges customers had faced. The quotes and stories about challenges were often complex and had many levels from the customer and Migri point of view, and with limited space, it is hard to show the many-sidedness of each situation.
For example, these ideas from the customers were included in the origami:

- *Interactive checklist of requirements for the customer and employer*
- *Using videos and animations on the website to help customers to understand the application process*
- *Visualising the application process and showing the steps or providing a map of the process*

The scope of the themes in the quotes varied, from smaller details to broader descriptions, and included both positive feedback and stories of challenges customers had experienced:

"I love it (E-service website) very much! It's quite understandable and intuitive! Also, I like the adorable emoji when there is a 404 error page, or your application has been made."

"At least if it (EnterFinland) shows in what stage my application is or, how many applicants are ahead of me and are waiting for the decision, then I can relax a bit (because I know my place in the line)"

**Conclusion**

Recently I had short pre-organised discussions in the office to find out how the origami and poster were received by our co-workers, and what they thought about them. When I talked with six Migri employees, they thanked the different forms and were happy to see different ways of sharing results and information in the office. They described that even though the origami was very nice looking, they found the form bit hard to grasp at once and felt that there was too much information. As an improvement, it was mentioned that there could have been more communication in other internal channels about the origami and the user journey poster. When I asked about what they thought about the user journey canvas, it was seen as understandable and easy to follow. To conclude, based on the small sample and observations from the office, the visualisations were received well, but I could have improved the communication around the origami and posters.

Personally, the process of creating these presentations was a nice creative task to do. For me as a service design intern working on the poster and origami offered an opportunity to examine user journeys and user maps in more detail. For me, it was a good time to practice how to deal with a big amount of data and how to present the work to others in Migri who are not familiar with user research.
User research done was useful to prioritise themes that Inland had deprioritised before and to concentrate on the issues that are relevant for our customers. It is a way to redirect our work with a user-centred perspective. When examining the user research performed, it is clear that many findings are obvious and already well-known challenges for some of our units. This is why, in the future, we aim to conduct user research together with other teams in Migri, instead of being a separate endeavour conducted independently. We, in Inland, believe that we needed to do this first step independently in order to embrace the complexity of the challenges our clients are dealing with. Later on, we can focus on specific applications, together with other workers in the substance units. Looking forward to this collaboration!

Text: Anna Kokki
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My 6 months as an Inlander — the lessons learned

I joined Inland in February 2018 for six months as a service design intern and a thesis maker. I was welcomed by the team that a month before had grown to be three persons as Kristin Swan started her internship in Inland as well. The next months we worked together with the team but also on our projects and theses. Starting the internship was an exciting time for me: the first time I was working in a service design team, and it was the time to put the learnings from Aalto University Creative Sustainability program into practice.

The internship and thesis work came with many challenges and learning opportunities: I was originally trained as a product designer and had worked a lot with artists, so this was an entirely new environment for me. Additionally, during the last one and a half years, I was mostly doing group work: now my role was going to be much more independent. Moreover, working in Inland was an opportunity to deepen the understanding about design in the public sector, an interest originating from Aalto University’s Design for Government course I took spring 2017. I shared my motivations and first thoughts also in my first blog post.
The first months were filled with new information as I settled in and got to know bit more about the place and started to work. We, two interns, shared a room that we filled with maps and post it’s as we began to get going with our projects. The starting point for my thesis was an analysis of the spatial interventions Inland had done in the offices in the Autumn. Based on the results, my focus was on experiments and a culture of experimentation: How can Inland Design advance experimentation in Migri? To answer this question, I aimed to do experiments in Migri and learn from the design team. In a way, this master thesis project was an experiment on experiments, and it meant that I had to deal with the risk of failing. However, I had the chance to participate in events and workshops that improved my understanding of what is happening around experimentation in Finland. When I listened to the experts in experimentation, I realised that I must keep in mind that this is a learning experience: I should work towards the hypothesis, and actively reflect on the process.

What I did in Inland

I ended up working on three areas, which form the experiments for my thesis: user research as a design experiment, spatial interventions as design experiments and experiments related to organisational development. Additionally, I was lucky to assist in workshops Inland did in Lappeenranta and Joutseno.

The starting point for the user research project was that Inland had been working a lot internally with our co-workers, and now it felt like it is time to work together with customers, too. The project had two primary objectives:

- Search for future projects and experiments that can bring value for customers. Inland and Migri
- Arrange co-design workshops with different customer groups

The findings from the user research project were turned into three spatial interventions, as we wanted to present what we had done to others in Migri. These included an interview video, informative origami and user journey poster. One part of the user research was a workshop with students and you can read more about it and the results from this blog post. Designing the interventions gave me the opportunity to practice how to handle and analyse data, how to present it to others, improve visualisation skills and learn video editing.
During my internship, Migri's Helsinki office moved to a new location. The relocation opened an opportunity to work together with the moving and development team, and we tried new ways of collecting feedback and insights from the personnel. Working more closely together with another team was also an excellent way to learn more about Migri as an organisation. On the other hand, this project was an opportunity for me to practice facilitation and communication with other teams.

Conclusion: the learnings to cherish

In this post, I have briefly described the things I got to do during the six months in Inland and Migri. Of course, there were many other things, small and big, and many phases and learnings not included here. At this moment, as the most significant learnings and valuable experiences, I would highlight that through the different tasks and roles—assistant, interviewer, facilitator, managing my projects—I had to leave my comfort zone and challenge myself. Second, on a practical level, my colleagues here taught me a lot about project documentation, planning and attention to details. Third, in the different projects, I got to practice facilitation also on my own. In other words, during the internship I have to build connections between the theory and practice, that is a good base for me to continue my personal development. I am going to present my thesis in October, and those who are interested can find it from Aalto database around Christmas time.

As I look for the next challenge, I thank my co-workers in Migri and especially the Inland team: Mariana, Suse and Kristin. I warmly welcome the new Inlanders onboard!
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HOW CAN I EXPERIMENT?
WHAT SHOULD I EXPERIMENT?

WHAT

- What is the need?
  - How much do we know about the subject?
  - Do we need to know more?

- Think about the size of the experiment and from where to start.
  - Am I testing something
  - Or am I aiming to deepen understanding of this subject?
  - Is the goal to scale impacts?
  - Or are we creating systemic change?

- What I want to achieve?

HOW

- What skills are needed?
- How the experiment is documented?

Plan
Set goal / hypothesis
Time
Location
Actors
Evaluate
Reflect

HOW TO EVALUATE?

Did we reach the goal? Did the goal change?
What kind of impact does the experiment create?
What did we learn?
How can we use the information?
How to develop the experiment further?

KUMOUS MODEL

Workshop based model that brings decision makers and experimenters together to discuss the project.
Role of service design?

Design process is reflective

Design process includes trying out, experimenting, prototyping and doing pilots: design methods can be applied to experiment process

To learn and plan together
Human-centered and empathic approaches
Iterative processes
Flexibility
Solution oriented

Service design introduces new ways of working
to organizations

What if ... ... if ... then?

Light planning + accepting failure

Need for change and innovation: experiment as bridge to new ways of doing

Document!
Evaluate, reflect, share:
make use of the learnings

Kiitos!