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In this thesis, I explore how service design approach and co-design methods could be used in designing services for the intellectually disabled. I want to see if these approaches can help find new methods for the process of supported decision-making. My work consists of a background study, a theoretical framework, and a case study done together with Eteva, a communal service provider for intellectually disabled people in the Uusimaa region, Southern Finland. My aim is to provide a meaningful output in this field and open-up possibilities for further collaboration between disability social work and social design.

In my theoretical framework, I analyze discussions around social design and explore the possibilities and limitations of design research and social design in the field of my study. Currently there is an increasing interest for socially involved design, but it is also a field in which it is more difficult to achieve concrete results due to the complexity of the issues and lack of easy solutions. I find it relevant for a designer to be able to respond to this need and as an example response, I have chosen to address the challenges of supported decision-making in the services provided for the intellectually disabled. In order to give background to these challenges, I explain briefly how strongly the existing legal situation in Finland affects the increasing need for participatory methods within services for the disabled. The law is constantly changing and the services struggle to keep up with its demands.

The goal of my case study is to test, in practice, the findings of the theories. During my research, I organized a series of co-design workshops for the disabled people living in a supported housing unit and interviewed the service providers. The limits in communications that may stem from disabilities are identified in literatures, and I wanted to observe how these limits affect the participation in a co-design workshop.

This thesis shows through a practice and theory that service design approach can contribute meaningfully to the development of services for intellectually disabled people. Social work and service design have great potentials to benefit from each other, as being close to the customer is already familiar for social work practices. Disabilities cause challenges to communication and this affects the use of co-design. Yet the workshops had very positive feedback and we created a toolkit to help participation based on some workshop activities and a poster template created by workshop participants. Eteva is planning to test this toolkit in their services.
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TIIVISTELMÄ
Tässä opinnäytetyössä tarkastelen, miten palvelumuotoilua ja yhteissuunnittelumenetelmiä voitaisiin käyttää kehitysvammaisten palveluiden suunnittelussa.


Teoreettisessa viitekehyksessä analysoin sosiaalisen muotoilun alalla käytävää keskustelua ja tutkinmuotoilun tutkimuksen ja sosiaalisen muotoilun mahdollisuuksia ja rajoihinsa liittyen valitsemaani aiheeseen. Kiinnostus yhteiskunnallisesti vaikuttavaan muotoilun on kasvava, mutta se on myös ala, jossa on haastavampaa saada alkaa konkreettisia tuloksia ongelmien monimuotoisuuden ja helppojen ratkaisujen puuttumisen vuoksi. Koen tärkeäksi suunnittelijan kyvyn vastata tähän tarpeeseen ja siksi olen valinnut aiheensä tuetun päätöksenteon prosessin kehittämisessä.

Sosiaalinen muotoilu on kasvava ala, jossa on vaikeaa saada konkreettisia tuloksia ongelmien monimuotoisuuden ja helppojen ratkaisujen puuttumisen vuoksi. Koen tärkeäksi suunnittelijan kyvyn vastata tähän tarpeeseen ja siksi olen valinnut aiheensä tuetun päätöksenteon prosessin kehittämisessä. Työni koostuu taustatutkimuksesta, teoreettisesta viitekehyksestä ja palvelumuotoiluprojektista, joka on tehty Etevan kanssa. Eteva kunnayhtymä on vammaispalveluiden tarjoaja Uudellamaalla. Työn tavoitteena on tuottaa kiinnostava tutkimus ja avata mahdollisuuksia muotoilun lisäämisessä vammaissosiaalityön ja sosiaalisen muotoilun välille.

Palvelumuotoiluprojektin tavoitteena on testata käytännössä teorioiden avulla tehtyjä havaintoja. Tutkimukseni aikana järjestin muotoilutyöpajoja ja suunnittelun kehitysvammaisuuksien ja sosiaalityön ja sosiaalienteiden osallistumiseen. Etevan on tarkoitus testata tätä työkalupakettia palveluisaan.
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PREFACE
“Everyone, regardless of disability, is entitled to have their rights respected on an equal basis with others.” (Universal Declaration of Human Rights)

“We have a moral duty to remove the barriers to participation, and to invest sufficient funding and expertise to unlock the vast potential of people with disabilities” professor Stephen W Hawking on WHO World Report on Disabilities, 2011.

Through this work I want to examine and raise interest in a possible benefit of mutual learning between social work and social design. I want to help to tackle some of the difficult, very real problems that people in the care industry have to deal with in Finland. As a response to a growing concern on the designer’s role in contributing to wellbeing, design history professor Victor Margolin wrote together with social work professor Sylvia Margolin an article called “A ‘social model’ of design” (Margolin & Margolin, 2002). One important question they name as a base for this is: “What role can a designer play in a collaborative process of social intervention?” Also Chief executive of innovation foundation Nesta, GeoJ Mulgan, suggested that in order to improve user experience in the public sector, we designers should do more co-operation with social work and also to be more open to mutual learning in order to truly find what are the common points of interest (Mulgan, 2014).

Aalto University Vice Dean Turkka Keinonen encouraged design students in his speech when starting to plan for the exhibition to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Finnish independence in June 2016 to try to “expand the boundaries of design” and “collaborate with non-designers” in order to search what might the next 100 years of Finnish design possibly include. These thoughts inspired me to study if the design approach could be useful for the services of the intellectually disabled. I feel privileged that as a designer I have the opportunity to choose which cause I use my effort for and I have the feeling of contributing to the common good this way.
TERMINOLOGY
## Terminology

**Disability** - A physical or mental condition that limits the person’s ability in movements, senses or activities.

**Intellectual disability** - A disability that affects the intellectual and adaptive functioning.

**Supported decision-making** - An arrangement in which the disabled person is helped to make decisions and choices about their own lives with support from a team of people.

**Right to self-determination** - A core principle of international law that states that everyone should have the power to decide on their own life and on the issues related to it.

**Social work** - A profession and a science that promotes social change and development, social cohesion and empowerment of people and communities.

**Service design** - A profession and science in which the aim is to create optimal service experiences by taking a holistic view of all the related factors of the service process.

**Co-design** - A creative practice in which the user is one of the experts in the design process.
Introduction

Background

The starting point for my thesis is an interest that has developed during my design studies from the two projects I have done with intellectually disabled people’s services. The first one was my PET-project (a project to explore any subject of personal interest) during which I tested some co-design methods to develop new prototypes for textile artifacts with Luovilla, a textile workshop for the intellectually disabled. The other project was a Hackathon competition in 2017 that my team won. We created a mobile application to help the reporting done in the disabled people’s daily activities and housing services for Helsinki City. During these projects I observed that often the choices might be made by the social worker in situations that either the choice might have been left open or taken by the customer. Why this happened was due to the communication challenges that a disability might create; in most cases lack or difficulty in speech and the time needed to express oneself. These projects and observations made me very interested in doing more research on this subject with very specific issues: how might a person with difficulty in speaking and expressing opinions participate on a collaborative design process or how to adjust the methods to match the needs of a specific target group.

In my thesis I explore service design and co-design methods within the services for intellectually disabled people. I am studying how a service design approach can contribute to the development of services for intellectually disabled people. I also want to see whether new approaches to co-design methods could be developed to facilitate the limits that intellectual disabilities might present to participatory methods. I will focus on the process of supported decision-making, where the disabled people are making decisions with the help of an assistant.

Currently, the topic of intellectually disabled people being involved in the decision-making regarding their own services is politically very important. A major change was made regarding the law for intellectually disabled people in Finland in June 2016 so that the law would be on the level required by the United Nations Convention on the Rights for People with Disabilities (Kehitysvammalaki, 2016 & United Nations Convention on the Rights for People with Disabilities, 2008). The law demands e.g. “The service and management plan must include information of the measures to support and promote an individual’s independent performance and to reinforce self-determination” (Kehitysvammalaki 42 §, 2016). The changes demand more participation and participatory methods from these services as it confirms the intellectually disabled person’s rights to decide their own affairs. The law also underlines the importance of self-determination and states that this should be respected by all means necessary. However, further changes to this law will be considered in the Finnish parliament in 2021, because even though the present law supports the right to self-determination, it also pushes the services of the intellectually disabled apart from the other social services.
This law can create contradictory situations for service providers, where the social workers are not sure if they should support the right to self-determination or prevent the person doing harm to himself or herself. At the same time individual freedom should be emphasized and the disabled people protected from the possible harm that their own decisions might result in. A radical conflict of interest might occur, where for example the person living in a supported housing would like to use their self-determination and go out to a bar and drink alcohol, yet their medication is such that alcohol is forbidden (Vironen, 2017). Helsinki City intellectually disabled people’s services (Helsingin kaupunki, kehitysvammaisten palvelut) have published a guidebook in 2017 as a supporting material for the changed law and how to work according the new law in Finland. Also Sirkka Sivula, the legal counselor of Kehitysvammaisten tukiliitto (Supporting association for intellectually disabled), says that there isn’t yet in Finland a legal protocol for the supported decision-making (Sivula, 2017) even though the United Nations Convention requires it (United Nations Convention on the Rights for People with Disabilities, 2008).

Currently, a lot of social, medical and legal research has been done and is going on regarding the issue of supported decision-making and self-determination described above (for example Devi, 2013, Mykkänen & Puukkonen, 2014, Kähkönen, 2018, Lauri 2019, ongoing VamO-project). My intention is to look at the issue from a designer’s perspective and see if this could contribute something new and meaningful. In cases where the law results in contradictory situations, I want to examine whether with the help of service design and co-design new means and methods could be found to solve these problems. Service design and co-design also have their own limitations, could some of these be bent to match the needs of a special customer group?

My work consists of background research, a theoretical framework and a case study done together with disabled people’s services. The background research will be done to analyze the issue from a service design perspective and the case study is to explore co-design methods. The case study will be done together with Eteva, a communal service provider for intellectually disabled people’s services in Uusimaa region, Southern Finland. My aim is to conduct a series of workshops to get interesting insight and produce some meaningful results for Eteva.
Research questions and objectives

What kind of means or tools could service design provide to the process of supported decision-making?

What are the limitations of service design and codesign with services for intellectually disabled people?

What means could codesign methods offer for the service provider to better meet the requirements of the new law?

These questions are answered through background research and by testing codesign methods with research partner Eteva in the case study. I aim to provide meaningful new participation methods for Eteva to use in their everyday work.

As this is a master thesis I will do collaboration with only Eteva, but in the future it would be ideal to continue this work and collaborate with many service providers, the people who make the decisions regarding these services and to develop the methods to work on a wider level for other service providers, not forgetting to include the families. I also want to see if this thesis could provide new questions and areas for further research and I could continue research with this subject and in the field of social design.

Thesis structure

My thesis has four main parts. In the first one I present the topic in the light of the theoretical framework, e.g. what subjects relate to the themes I want to discuss. This gives a broader understanding of the topic. In the second part I present the idea of supported decision-making and discuss the current political situation, the change of law in Finland and how these affect the services for intellectually disabled. In the third part I present my case study done with Eteva and in the last part I discuss the results, possible future research and how my work answers to the need of collaboration between social work and social design. All the translations in this work, for the citations of the Finnish law for example, are my own.
Ethical aspect

When doing research with human subjects, the ethical aspect is always present in research. The different methods of collecting data and the test situations can be ethically suspect if they are not organized correctly. When doing research with the intellectually disabled it has occurred to me that one needs to be even more delicate and protected in order to avoid any misunderstanding from either part of the research. Therefore while doing research with Eteva and their customers, I have decided to keep all the data anonymous, including the names of the interviewed experts and the assisting persons in the supported housing unit where the case study was conducted. All the participants of the workshops signed a form of consent (appendix 1) to prove their awareness of participating voluntarily in the research and also it was made known that all the participants were free to leave the workshop at any moment without giving any reason for it.

Disclaimer

During the research, no restricted customer data was collected or handled by the undersigned.
1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
In this part I explain the theoretical basis of my work and present a few theories that discuss justice and social impact in the field of design. I will begin by explaining these theories that I have found important when doing social design. I have chosen these based on their relevance when working in a social design project and also I find them personally motivating to try to challenge my own skills as a service designer. Furthermore I will present what is important in service design and co-design within this project. Finally, I give a short definition of intellectual disabilities and social work in order to explain what details can be similar between co-design and social work and what are the reasons that co-design might be different and require special attention when done with the intellectually disabled. Through this framework we can draw an idea of the limitations that intellectual disabilities might cause to design activities.
Possibilities and limitations of social design

Designer and educator Victor Papanek stated in 1971 that design must respond to the true needs of people instead of polluting the world with more unnecessary products (Papanek, 1971). As a reaction to Papanek's declaration there has been an awakening trying to develop design for social needs. In 2002 when Victor and Sylvia Margolin wrote about their idea of a "social model" for design (Margolin & Margolin, 2002), they found that designers hadn't yet played their part in this and that little attention had been given in the education of product designers to understanding social needs. The Margolins write: "architects, psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists, and others (except designers) have worked together to explore the intersection of people's psychological needs and the landscapes, communities, neighborhoods, housing, and interior space." According to them a broad research agenda for social design must be started to see how designers can contribute to the human welfare. Margolins also claim we should research how designers could work together with human service professionals. Fortunately in the last fifteen years there has been improvement, but according to Doctor of Philosophy Ilse Oosterlaaken in 2009, this area of design still remained neglected (Oosterlaaken, 2009).

John Rawls presented a theory of Justice in 1971. He states in the second part of the second principle of this theory, called "the difference principle", that "inequality in the distribution of income and wealth, positions of responsibility and power, and the social bases of self-respect are acceptable only if they benefit the disadvantaged" (Rawls, 1971). Yet forces that invite us to do the contrary drive our society and way of doing. In discussing justice in the context of design, Keinonen refers to this theory. According to him, Rawls' rationale means for a designer a motivation to make the worst-off the least capable in order to benefit the most and that the designer cannot enjoy the fruit of their work if he or she doesn't do so (Keinonen, 2017). In other words this could be understood so that we need to take responsibility in what we do and pay attention to the least capable in order to fulfillment in our work. But on the other hand, this could also mean that we cannot ever truly enjoy our work if we don’t succeed. I state that it is important to find a balance in the work so that the satisfaction of trying is not killed by not always finding solutions. Maybe it is difficult for designers to take the challenge of Margolins because not only being afraid of not contributing but contributing well enough.

Keinonen and design academic Ezio Manzini discuss that the designer should approach users through their needs or their capabilities (Keinonen, 2017, Manzini, 2009). According to Keinonen, one mission for designers is to satisfy the users' needs (Keinonen, 2017). Manzini on the other hand prefers to look at users not only through their needs but what they are able to do (Manzini, 2009). One starting point for a designer to learn to take social needs into consideration could be to...
take economist and philosopher Amartya Sen’s Capability Approach as a base (Oosterlaaken, 2009). This economic theory, which started in the 1980s, states that in order to measure welfare one should think what individuals are able to do. This means also that there isn’t any predefined list of capabilities or priorities among different ones but they depend on purpose and context (Sen, 2010). Sen’s theory has helped to understand how different people are and also to understand that the world we design isn’t similar to everyone. This will also help designers to understand the importance of participatory methods and human-centered design (Oosterlaaken, 2009). Manzini presents the capabilities approach as a means to look at users through their opportunities and capabilities and thus the user can take a more active and collaborating role in the service development (Manzini, 2009).

The issue here to me is that sometimes there isn’t any needs or capabilities. Certain disabilities for example, can cause such cognitive lack, that recognizing own opinions and wishes are very limited. I would state that the designer should be prepared to recognize a lack of needs or capabilities and then adjust his or her work to be better delivered for different conditions. This could be valuable for other conditions too than intellectual disabilities, e.g. in situations where needs are expressed differently or not at all from cultural reasons for example. For me this is a fundamental problem in current design activities. If we only produce activities for people who are able to express themselves in the way we expect and are used to, we might make our design very exclusive and end-up deepening the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged. Instead of waiting for the users to offer us opportunities, we should provide them the opportunities and go beyond. Maybe there can be even found a way to teach people to recognize and express their needs and capabilities through co-design activities.

In her theory of Design as Freedom, designer and researcher Claudia Garduno Garcia gives us a different, more emphatic approach to design that the economical and technological one. She says about design: “In contrast, it embraces the diverse ways of life that different people might have reason to value. Design as Freedom is a reasoned alternative, a highly complex practice in which socially committed designers co-design with people who are acknowledged to be living in clear situations of injustice” (Garduno Garcia, 2018) According to Garduno Garcia, design is aiming towards a positive change and designers have capabilities to imagine better futures. This and a moral responsibility give designers what is needed to make the world better: means to tackle the wicked problems and take all the potential end-users into account. Garduno Garcia also states that designers worldwide should use this skill and that “design should incorporate the most urgent matters of the world into its research agenda, and contribute to global justice” (Garduno Garcia, 2018). I think this theory of providing people designerly skills and thus giving them more freedom in their lives, is a good approach to be more motivated in doing social design.
Yet there is a critique towards current design interventions that they are only short quick exercises and not long processes that would lead to a systemic change and that designers offer too simple proposals and that they don’t recognize the need for other skills than creativity (Hillgren et al. 2011; Mulgan 2015). Chief executive of innovation foundation Nesta, GeoJ Mulgan also suggests “design should play a humbler role and acknowledge the need to closely collaborate with other disciplines” (Mulgan, 2015). As an answer to these concerns and statements of justice, I will try to answer to the need of more socially involved design with the choice of my subject. I argue that with the approach that Rawls and Garduno Garcia offer us, designers have a possibility to create valuable outcomes in the field of social design which is already very well established. This can mean for instance creating new working methods that are easy to adapt and would not require a great effort to implement. Therefore I argue, that there is a strong demand to do more research on design together with fields close to social work and also offer means to help people who don’t necessarily recognize their needs.

**Service design and co-design**

There exists multiple ways to define the terminology in the field of social design. Even though already in the latter part of 19th century designer and social activist William Morris was concerned both in the quality of the designed objects and the effect that the production had on the social conditions, this field remains quite new. In the report ‘Social Design Futures’, social design is understood especially as an activity towards a common good rather than something commercial. It can also be understood as an activity that is done by “people who think of themselves as designers … or it might be an activity that takes place involving people who are not professional designers” (Armstrong et al. 2014). Personally I find this aspect very important as under the term ‘service design’ exists more and more commercial outcomes and as a designer I would like to contribute more to the above-mentioned non-commercial conditions. This is a detail that can affect strongly to the earlier mentioned lack of social design and means to do it, maybe there is so much of attention to this ‘commercial service design’ that it overrides the social one.

Bank executive G. Lynn Shostack first used the term “Designing a service” in 1982 in her research paper “How to design a service” (Shostack, 1982). She presents a very systematic means to analyze and develop a service to improve its effectiveness from a business and management point of view (Shostack, 1982). Moreover, according to Birgit Mager, President of the Service Design Network, service design means designing a service experience and situation from the users and participants’ point of view by using the means of design (Mager, 2008). This means taking into consideration the stakeholders, e.g. users and participants, point of view to different actions of the service in all the situations and demands from the designer a capability to place oneself in the user’s position or means to reveal their needs. The purpose of service design is to assure that the different parts of the service are
useful, usable and desirable from the users' point of view and distinct from the service provider’s perspective. Therefore ensuring the benefits and value of the service and developing its interaction processes are an essential part of service design (Stickdorn, 2011). Furthermore, service design should also provide information regarding which parts of the service are important, missing or insufficient in order to develop the service and also identify new services to develop. The role of a service designer is to find out the challenges and problems of the service and develop new innovative solutions to these with all the stakeholders. The designer needs strong skills in social interaction, empathy towards the stakeholders, imagination and visual thinking. To understand people’s needs and interpreting their behavior are relevant knowledge to develop a successful service. (Meroni & Sangiorgi, 2011)

Co-design is an approach to creative practice within service design. Co-design comes from the participatory design developed in Scandinavia in early 1970s (Ehn, 1988) and it is a term that is used for many participatory and co-creation methods. Nowadays in popular literature it can be seen used for multiple definitions of almost everything imaginable from crowdsourcing marketing to any design activity that is done by more than one person. An often used definition of co-design in academic design research is the one made by specialists in the academic definition of design, Elizabeth Sanders and Pieter Stappers: “creativity of designers and people not trained in design working together in the design development process” (Sanders & Stappers, 2008). Manzini describes co-design as “a collaborative process between people with various backgrounds, motivations, ideas and skills.” (Manzini, 2017). Sanders has explained that there are three approaches to interact with users in a design process: say, do and make (Sanders, 2002). In this theory ‘say’ and ‘do’ can be understood as parts of service design but the ‘make’ would be the one that relates to co-design. Interviews and observations for example tell us what the user ‘says’ and ‘does’ and they are very relevant to find more information on the customer for a service design process. Creative workshops give us an answer of what kind of solutions people ‘make’. Co-design helps to own the service, be more close to the customer and create a culture of open atmosphere and exchange.

From these different approaches professor of interaction design, Pelle Ehn states that there are two strategic values to participation in design, either a democratic approach of participating everyone or the use of the participant’s tacit knowledge for the design process (Ehn, 2008). Sanders and Stappers also state that more creative the participants are, less support they need in co-creation (Sanders & Stappers, 2008). In other words this would mean that the designer should support more those who are less creative. It is a demanding task for as designer to analyze what is creativity.
Within the context of my thesis, I would argue that creativity not only depends on the participants, but also on the context and situation that affect the participant's capabilities. This leads to thinking whether the designer can be capable of analyzing all this. I would argue that not truly, but the designer can try to be aware of this fact and adjust the design activities and proposals such that they can address different needs and capabilities. As mentioned earlier, the definitions of 'capability' and 'need' and how they affect the design process should be more researched in situations that are different from the western, well-educated and very capable one.

**Intellectual disabilities**

Intellectual disabilities can be defined in many ways. Usually it means a disability that is affecting the capability of understanding. In other words this would mean that learning new things and abstract thinking are causing difficulties for a person with a disability. Measuring IQ has often been used to describe the intellectual disability but this shows only partially the truth. Intelligence is only a part of the personality, it is affected also by how we are brought up, what are our surroundings and what experiences do we live. (Matero, 2012)

In Finnish literature on intellectual disabilities the definitions often used are the ones done by the Finnish disabled peoples law (Kehitysvammalaki), the WHO (World Health Organization) and AAMR (American Association for Mentally Retarded). The Finnish law defines the intellectually disabled as a person whose development or intellectual activity is disturbed by a disease or disability that is congenital or becomes apparent during development phase or before the age of 18 years and is such that the person cannot receive the services he or she needs without any other law (Laki kehitysvammaisten erityishuollosta). In this context the disability means a physical or psychical shortcoming that permanently affects the capacity. One criterion to define an intellectual disability in Finland is an IQ lower than 70 and a socially weak capacity. According to the World Health Organization's disease classification, intellectual disability means a state in which the development of mental performance is hindered or inadequate. Lack of development concerns skills emerging during development. These include cognitive, linguistic, motor and social skills that affect overall performance. Depending on the disease classification, intellectual disability can occur either alone or with any physical or mental condition. (Matero, 2012)

According to AAMR an intellectual disability means important challenges in the dominant capabilities. This means in other words...
remarkably weaker intellectual capability together with constraints on two or more abilities that are required for independent living. Areas of independent living include communication, independent initiatives, housekeeping and social skills, community mobility, self-regulation and health, safety, literacy, leisure and work. What is relevant in this definition is the interaction between the intellectual capabilities and the demands of the environment. Hence it is said that better the needs are taken into account in our society, less the disability effects everyday living. It is possible to reduce the harm caused by the disability by supporting those self-contained skills that are restricted by disability, but the support measures must be balanced so that the excess aid does not cause the learned helplessness, and too little support, in turn, fails to achieve the goals of rehabilitation. (Matero, 2012)

Intellectual disabilities can also be divided according to the level of the disability. It is yet relevant to notice that the effect of the disability to different individuals vary a lot. On the same time the person can lack of certain capabilities but have remarkable abilities on another field. Especially persons with a light disability understand usually well their difference and often face situations where they feel inferiority. This may have negative effects to their self-esteem. Depending on the level of the disability, the amount of needed support varies a lot. If it is well organized and such that it supports the individual needs but still encourages to independent initiatives, it can have a positive effect to the persons capabilities. Yet this demands a lot of flexibility and resources to personalize from the organizing part. (Matero, 2012)

As mentioned earlier, Sanders and Stappers define co-design as an activity that demands creativity and on the same time intellectual disabilities are described to be such that they strongly affect the persons capability of being creative. We could deduce from this that co-design is not possible with the intellectually disabled, but I would regard it an ill-judged conclusion, as creativity is not a term that can be defined on a simple and clear way. This is why I want to do also a case study part in my research, so that I can see in practice that how these pre-assumptions are supported or not. Also we must take in consideration how participation is currently supported in services for the intellectually disabled; people have support in many activities so I would argue that creativity should be one also.
Social work

Social work is both a profession and an academic subject. Social work is based on scientifically-researched knowledge, professional knowledge and ethical principles of social work. One of the specialties of social work is disability social work, which is of great importance for the inclusion of people with disabilities (Global definition of Social work). The ethical role of social work research and practices is to call for human rights, human dignity and social justice.

The aim of social work is to increase the wellbeing of people, lessen the inequality and enhance the participation. Social work is done on a societal, communal and individual level. On a societal level the aim is to affect the structures of society that create inequality and problems. On a communal level social work promotes participation, sharing responsibilities and cooperation. On an individual level it aims to decrease the stress caused by difficult situations in life and help people to cope with their lives. (Kananoja et al., 2017)

Interaction is essential in social work. Practical work, developing work and research within social work are all strongly related to people. Work is done with service users, other professionals, laymen, service providers and policy makers in different areas of management at both national and local levels. Social work can thus be described as an interdependent interdisciplinary interaction where the key is the ability to establish and maintain communication and to resolve conflicts related to them. In addition, social work means constructing, dismantling and interpreting a wide range of relationships (Mönkkönen, 2018; Sarvimäki & Siltaniemi, 2007).

Specific to disability social work is that the psychological elements of social work are constantly present. This field of social work is very overall and the psychical, physical and social elements of the customer’s life need to be taken into consideration. Also the relationships with the customers are much longer than in other fields of social work (Mönkkönen, 2018).

What can be challenging when combining design and disability social work is how to implement new elements to an already well-established system. Also when dealing with issues related to human psychology, not just anything can be tested, as we don’t want to risk the wellbeing of the customer. This is where becomes crucial the capability of being humble and collaborating with human service professionals as mentioned earlier. It is essential that more of this sort of research is done to see if mutual benefits are not just possible but if they can also contribute to develop a stronger base for social design.
Social work is a very interactive profession, which is strongly based on an established system to listen to the customers and take their opinions into account. This is also a key element in co-design activities. I would state that this similarity can help the field of social work to benefit from co-design in an efficient and wide-spread way as they are already familiar with being close to the customer and developing the services together. On the same time, a service design approach can give social work a more broader view on their services and help to develop them from new perspectives. Similarly the designer can test and challenge their own skills when discussing very multi-faceted issues, which don’t necessarily have simple solutions, or solutions at all.

Intellectually disabled people cannot be defined in one simple way. The different needs and communication capacities vary a lot from an individual to another and also from a day to another. As communication is very essential in both social work and service design, a lack in communication skills can be a crucial challenge when trying to do co-design. Yet we must understand that there are many means to communication and not only speaking and writing which tend to be the most used ones.

Guy Julier and designer Lucy Kimbell have studied the alignment of different bureaucracies within social design research. They define social design research in their article “Confronting bureaucracies and assessing value in the co-production of social design research” as follows: “In social design research, a project’s objectives, intended outcomes, constituencies of actors, participants and stakeholders, its questions, methods, data and its outputs have the potential to be reassembled and reconfigured. Issues, questions, publics, relationships, methodologies and artefacts are not specified in advance or pre-determined. Instead, the exploration and (re)-assembling of these is an intrinsic part of the research practice” (Julier & Kimbell, 2019). I think this is the reason that even though there are all these above-mentioned constraints that might limit a co-design project with the intellectually disabled, we can test and see what will happen, or eventually, if anything will happen. I think that at least trying is already valuable and will give some interesting results.

To conclude this analysis of theories, I want to say that this debate and discussion is why I am personally interested in doing service design research for intellectually disabled people. Good design outcomes to me are trying to benefit the disadvantaged, finding suitable solutions to conflicting situations and identifying at least a small thing that can sparkle a positive outcome even if it is only temporary.
2. SELF-DETERMINATION, SUPPORTED DECISION-MAKING AND FINNISH LAW
2. Self-determination, supported decision-making and Finnish law

I have chosen to present these themes as their own part. Firstly, these are currently the most important issues affecting the situation of services for the intellectually disabled. Secondly, it is important to frame the legal and political context to understand more broadly what are the currently affecting reasons in these services. One essential tool for service design is to look at issues from a distance and seek what are all the details affecting them. In many situations it reveals to be the problem number one, on one hand, how to accept that a person with an intellectual disability can 'decide wrong' and on the other hand how to help that person to be sure to make the decision, even wrong, with a full understanding of the possible consequences.

In the final report of the VamO-project, which was released in April 2019, we can read that currently in Finland the human rights of the disabled are succeeding poorly, even though law supports them nationally and internationally (VamO-project, 2019). This is a relevant current issue that I am trying to take part in with my research.

Right to Self-determination

"The right to self-determination is one of the core principles of international law and it is the responsibility of all states to ensure that this right is realized." In the opening chapter of the UN Charter, respect for the right to self-determination is presented as one of the purposes of the United Nations (UN Charter). In the context of my thesis we talk about the right of self-determination as it is used in the services organized for disabled people.

Self-determination can be seen as meaning two things. An individual has the right to self-determination if he or she can choose from any of the options available to him or her at any given time without anyone intervening in his or her choices. On the other hand, an individual has the right to self-determination in the situation that his or her life is arranged in such a way that he or she is offered the same range of options as all other people. The difference between these two forms of self-determination is essential. The first form does not necessarily require resources but the other option requires extra resources, when arranged for example for people with different disabilities. These additional resources include, for example, assistant and interpreter services. (Pursiainen, 2005)

In the law regarding the rights of the customer in social care (Social Welfare Act) it is mentioned that the hopes and wishes of the customer should be the primary guidance to organize the social care and also the right to self-determination should be taken into consideration at all times. The customer should participate to the planning of his or her services. The law also states that in a special situation, which in this case means if the customer cannot fully decide by themselves, because of an intellectual disability for example, the will of the customer must be determined with the help of a legal representative, a relative or some other close person if the disabled person cannot participate and influence the planning of his or her services (Social Welfare Act, 2000).
A social worker must respect the client’s right to self-determination and help it to be realised. This means that the employee helps the client to understand and clarify his or her objectives. When providing ready-made solutions and instructions, the employee will support the customer’s dependency, which in turn prevents to recognize the capabilities of the customer. Taking decisions and making things on client’s behalf does not support the customers problem-solving skills. To help the customer so that they become helpless weakens the customer instead of strengthening. Customer self-determination and affirmation are best achieved through collaboration between the employee and the customer. The employee should therefore be an enabler who helps the customer not only to look at their problems in a realistic way, but also to consider the various options, including to implement the taken decisions. The employee should also help the customer to see their own strengths and opportunities for development and support their choices. (Rostila, 2001) A customer’s right to self-determination may be overridden if the employee considers that the customer’s actions could be a serious threat to either for themselves or other persons. However, the employee should limit the loss of self-determination to a minimum. The realization of human and fundamental rights requires self-determination, so limiting it prevents a person to enjoy these rights (Ahola, 2017).

According to Finnish National Supervisory Authority for Welfare and Health, Valvira, the customers right to self-determination is a leading principle of social and health care. The Patient Act (potilashuoltolaki) states that the patient must be treated in agreement with him or her. The patient also has the right to make decisions that may harm his or her own health or life and have the right to refuse treatment planned or already started. Professionals involved in patient care must respect the patient’s own decisions. Yet according to the survey made in 2012: “Coping with the challenges of day-to-day operations at the units hinges on mutually agreed procedures and policies. There is a certain degree of vagueness in the legal provisions and concepts related to the realisation of the right of self-determination and the use of restrictive measures. The boundaries for permitted practices should be drawn more clearly.” The survey indicated that the respondents were often incapable of differentiating between restriction and ordinary care. (Valvira, 2012)
The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) entered into force in May 2008. The Article 12 of the Convention calls for an equal recognition before the law and it suggests that instead of a guardianship the persons with disabilities would have supported decision-making (UNCRPD, 2008). This means in other words, to organize the decision-making such, that it is possible for the person with a disability to take part on it and express their wish by themselves. In the European Court of Human Rights it is stated that lacking the ability to exercise legal capacity does not mean to be unaware of ones situation (European Court of Human Rights, 2018). The UNCRPD identifies in its article 12 an equal recognition before the law and people with disabilities should be provided with the support they need so that they can exercise their legal capacity.

In practice this would mean for example that the person is given more time to understand the consequences of the decision, he or she has better explanation of what the different options of the decision would result to through examples and for example in case of more serious disabilities a group of people is gathered to observe the person and make decisions such that they support the activities that the person appreciates. As the nature of the disabilities vary a lot, also the need of the support should be adjustable to it. The idea of supported decision-making is that a person genuinely decides on matters himself or herself after being told about the backgrounds of the case, the different solution options and the possible consequences of different solutions. Supporters must be able to describe things as neutral as possible without affecting the final decision. For example, people working in a supported housing unit may not be the best option to discuss whether the person should move to another unit. Often own parents or friends understand the situation better. Multiple supporters reduce the risk of deciding on their behalf, the possibility of abuse and the formation of overly dependent dependencies. (Sivula, 2010) Supported decision-making must be a real option for the individual, increasing his or her independence, self-confidence and ability to take responsibility. It can allow wrong decisions and take a certain risk. In principle, however, the person must make the decisions himself. The other person only assists in identifying the necessary alternatives and describing the consequences of the alternatives. (Arajärvi, 2010) So far, Finland has no legal system as expected in the UN Convention to supported decision-making, but before the legislation develops, operational practices can be developed in the direction of supported decision-making. Supported decision-making in many countries has evolved through the development of operational practices, and legislation has subsequently been amended to safeguard this right (THL).
Mental Capacity Act: 
Five key principles

Principle 1: Assume a person has capacity unless proved otherwise.

Principle 2: Do not treat people as incapable of making a decision unless all practicable steps have been tried to help them.

Principle 3: A person should not be treated as incapable of making a decision because their decision may seem unwise.

Principle 4: Always do things or take decisions for people without capacity in their best interests.

Principle 5: Before doing something to someone or making a decision on their behalf, consider whether the outcome could be achieved in a less restrictive way.

(Mental Capacity Act, 2005)
**Situation in other countries**

In Europe legal arrangements for supported decision-making are most advanced in England (THL). On the same time there are still countries in Europe where it is not possible to vote in the coming European elections in May 2019 if you are under tutelle, for example in Roumania this means an estimation of 70,000 people (Inclusion-Europe, 2019).

England has a Mental Capacity Act (2005) that names five key statutory principles. These principles are a good example of clearly stated details that give frames for supported decision-making. There are many examples of brainstorming guides, tools for supported decision-making and other that exist online and they offer various methods to support the intellectually disabled in framing their personal need for support. For example, Simon Cramp and Simon DuJy from English InControl association have set up a program for local authorities aimed at improving the autonomy of people with intellectual disabilities. The basic principle is that everyone can make decisions about his or her own life if he or she is given enough time, attention and support.

Also British Cumbria Learning Disability Services supports a positive risk-taking policy that is strongly supported by decision-making. There is no need to avoid risks, but they must be manageable. The person only needs to have the information, time and support needed to make the decision. Positive risk taking does not mean prohibiting risks or not taking them at all. Risk-taking can provide an opportunity for independence, self-confidence and responsibility for one’s own life. You cannot always choose the safest option if it is not the best for the person (Sivula, 2010). Similar kind of systems do not exist yet in Finland, but there is a lot of discussion that a national system would benefit everyone and create a clear basis for services.

**Change of law in Finland**

During 21st century the shift to supported housing from hospital like conditions has been strong. In 2016 the new law regarding intellectually disabled people’s services (Kehitysvammalaki, 2016) came into effect in Finland and it demands more participation and more support in the self-determination as mentioned earlier. This change of law has helped many disabled to become more autonomous and live in a less tutelled structure. The original purpose of this law is to strengthen inclusion and independent performance. However, according to the Committee of State this has not been fully realized in practice. Although separate legislation and special care services based on it have secured a comprehensive service package and the expertise required in services, they have also contributed to the differentiation of services for people with intellectual disabilities. Even though the services have...
started to be more individualized, the existing service structure still defines the services that people with intellectual disabilities receive. Therefore this law is currently under discussion in the Committee of Social Affairs and Health and they have prepared a suggestion for a new law that would come into effect in 2021. The aim of this new law would be especially to promote equality between persons with disabilities, regardless of the nature of the disability and the person’s place of residence, to promote equality for people with disabilities in relation to people without disabilities, so that disabled people have the right to participate and make the same choices as others and not from an existing list of ready-made choices. (Hallituksen esitys HE159/2018)

**VamO-project**

To better meet the demands of this new law, Eteva together with the University of Lapland, the Cities of Espoo and Rovaniemi, Kynsys ry association, the National institute of Health and Welfare (THL) and Eksote (South Carelia Health and Social Welfare District) have had a three-year project VamO that ends this year. The project explores and develops, together with researchers, developer workers, social workers and customer’s now existing customer processes and customer participation. The aim of the project is to produce a description of the client process for social work that ensures customer participation by assembling, testing and installing working methods and practices that support customer participation. Social worker Heidi Lauri has done her masters thesis as a part of this project. Her subject was to investigate through customer feedback wether the participation has successed after the change of law. According to her the findings, the client processes are not yet such that would really promote the right of self-determination and they lack facts that would enable the customer’s participation and self-determination. According to Lauris research, customer process development, eJective interaction, alternative communication methods, and an assistant would be needed in the future to help the participation demanded by the law. (Lauri, 2019)
As a summary to the legal situation, I would say that the law seems to change faster than the existing structures are able to respond. This is one of the reasons behind the conflicting situations in which the social workers are not sure if they should let the customer decide even if it creates challenging risks and how could they better explain all the possible effects of so-called ‘wrong decisions’. There is a great demand to build structures in which social workers could rely so they wouldn’t need to feel unsecure in their work. With the VamO-project Eteva and their partners are looking at the situation from the social works point of view, but I believe that these issues are such that social design could give valuable input also and a different perspective. This also means a bigger need for different kinds of participatory methods and this is why I have done research and workshops with Eteva, which I will present in the next part of my thesis.
3. CASE STUDY WITH ETEVA
3. Case Study with Eteva

In this part I will present the cooperation done with Eteva, a communal service provider for intellectually disabled people’s services in Uusimaa and Häme region, Southern Finland. This project is the design contribution of my thesis. With Eteva I have done interviews with a social worker who is responsible for service development and assistants in a supported housing unit. Furthermore, I conducted a series of workshops with the volunteer habitants of this housing unit. After the workshops I presented a design proposal to the housing unit and later also for a group of Eteva’s social work planners and their manager. In order to proceed on a mutual sense of good ethical procedure, we decided together with Eteva that all the research done with them should be anonymous, including the names of the places and the workers. For this reason, there is also a limited amount of photographs taken during the workshops. Eteva has the permission to use the names in their own communication if they wish to do so.

Presentation of project partner Eteva

Eteva is a public service provider for disabled people owned by 45 municipalities. It is Finland’s largest center of expertise in the field of disability. They provide services to approximately 1,600 people with disabilities and intellectual disabilities annually. There are also services for mental health rehabilitation and for people with special needs. There are about 140 locations, 700 apartments, work and daytime services for around 1,000 customers and different expert services for over 300 customers every year. The company employs 1,300 people. Over 95 percent of them work in customer service. These include housing services, daytime activities and psychiatric units for the intellectually disabled and specialist services.

The key elements of the customer process for Eteva services are the initiation of the case, the assessment of service needs, the drawing up of a service plan, the adoption of customer-specific decisions, the implementation of services and the monitoring of services and impact assessment. In some cases, the client process also includes the end of the relationship, as the customer no longer needs the services. In different parts of the customer process the responsibility of implementation may vary, but the person in charge of the whole process should nevertheless work seamlessly with the client and the professionals involved in the process. There exists customer-worker collaboration in Eteva at different stages of the customer process in information, service planning, decision making, service implementation, evaluation and feedback.

Depending on the customers’ need for support, the customer lives either independently, in a supported housing unit or a group home. In supporting housing units the customer is in contact depending on his or her needs on a daily or weekly basis with Eteva workers. The customer might need the support of an assistant for some daily activities such as cooking or cleaning the house. The customer
and the assistant plan ahead on their calendar the meetings and in case there is need for some other support, it is agreed between the two. The activities done with the customers need to be reported by everyone who works in the services for disabled. The assistant is usually for the customer the closest person who knows the most about the customer’s life, habits and needs. The social worker is the person with whom the decisions on the need of caretaking and support are done. This is very important because depending on these meetings, the customer gets the support from the society.

The most used material to support communication when there are challenges is the “Picture Exchange Communication System”, which literally means a series of pictures and symbols. Papunet-service in Finland is a collection of over 28,000 pictures that are freely available for everyone to use and that come also with different online tools and games to learn how to use them (example of tool in picture 1). This system is very well established and used worldwide with success. I decided not to use these cards in my work, but rather see how the workshops will go with only speaking and writing. Also the customers with whom I worked had all a light disability so they were capable of communicating by speaking. To include the communication cards would be a topic for possible future research, once the challenges that speaking and writing might create are defined.
Case Study with Eteva

Picture 1: Example of Papunet tool. Words and expressions have their own pictures.
In 2017 I participated on a Hackathon course organized by Aalto University School of Business. One of the collaborating partners for this project was Helsinki City disabled people’s service together with Eteva and Apotti. Apotti is a company owned by Helsinki University Hospital and several Capital region municipalities. The aim of this company is to build world’s first information system that combines social work and health care. I applied to take part to this course, as my interest in service design development within the services for disabled people had already started with my PET-project. The aim of this Hackathon was to create new solutions for the challenges that the current reporting and information sharing system has in different disability facilities and housing environments. The challenges were related to the current reporting practices that take time away from the actual customer work. Our team created a solution that won the whole competition and the collaborators bought it to develop it further and actually put it in use later. Our solution was different from the other similar solutions as it was based on the idea of having the customers also participating in the reporting practices and thus increasing participation.

During this Hackathon project I discussed about my interest in disabled people’s services with the representative of Eteva, who took the opportunity to ask if I wanted to do my thesis for them. Undertaking this project helped Eteva to understand that service design has great potential to help them get closer to their customers and this opened the door for my thesis project. We decided by e-mail in January 2018 that I would do my thesis for them, and they asked to do research on participation and the right to self-determination and its development. As the law had changed in 2016, it was said that ‘this (participatory methods) is a very important subject’ and that ‘there is a need for service design from the perspective of personalizing services’ (from e-mail in January 2018 with Eteva service manager). To meet the requirements of the new law Eteva wanted to examine all the possibilities and see what a service design project could bring. We decided to start the project together in January 2019 as that fit the schedule of my studies and it suited Eteva very well. We decided that I would work together with a supporting housing unit as it was where the right to self-determination was supported the most.
In order to conduct research with Eteva, I needed to apply for research permission. Eteva gave me freedom to decide on the details of the scope of the study with my university advisors, but they needed to accept it. Special attention was given to confirm that the research is ethically correct and that the subject and methods are such that customers are not taken advantage of and that the research would not harm them. Also the field of social work has a confidentiality obligation, so I needed to sign an agreement that I will not collect or use any restricted customer information. As I wanted to have my thesis project done during the spring of 2019, I was very pleased that the research permission was granted very fast and Eteva have been very supportive and easy to work with.

The short presentation of my project in the research permission was as follows (own translation):

«The purpose of my research is to find out what kind of assistance service design and co-design could provide for the supported decision-making process in services for people with intellectual disabilities. The research is carried out using literature and method analysis, as well as practical observation and participatory workshops. The aim is to explore the challenges that intellectual disabilities might cause for service design and co-design and how these challenges could be overcome. The goal is to produce practical methods that could benefit the customer. The research subjects are all anonymous in both the research material and the final work.»

My main goal was to organize workshops with the customers and test different methods with them. I think doing the workshops was crucial, as otherwise my research questions would not have been fully answered and also I think that it is not possible to conduct reliable service design research without implementing the customer. In order to proceed in this I went through the following process (picture 2). In the following chapters I will describe in more detail the different steps of the collaboration.
Picture 2: Project process
Interviews

During my research I conducted semi-structured interviews with a social worker of Eteva and assistants of the supported housing unit which I observed and where I conducted the workshops. With the social worker we discussed how the services are organized within Eteva and how in general the participation was being developed after the change of law. We agreed that the interviews with the assistants weren't programmed in advance. The assistants of the supporting housing unit are available at all times for their customers. If a customer asks to have help in some situation, the assistants make themselves available as soon as possible. These situations are usually related to normal daily routines, but still I found it more flexible for them to have no obligation to participate at a certain time to my interview. This also helped to make the interviews less formal. The questions to the assistants were about the participatory methods used with customers, how the right to self-determination is expressed in their daily work and what were their experiences on supported decision-making. All my interviewees were also very interested in what the means and purpose of service design is and what the collaborative methods could be that design could offer.

From these interviews I have found out that the collaboration between the social workers, assistants and customers is very close. People know each other very well and the atmosphere is very warm and friendly in these services. Yet the methods and ways of doing are not that structured and the way customer procedures are done varies a lot depending on the worker or the customer. Most of the service details are decided through analyzing the needs of the customer in a meeting with the customer and the assistant or with the family depending the situation, but it varies how the customer is prepared to these meetings. Often the social workers face a situation where the customer doesn't comment at all in the meeting, but this is due to an intimidating situation with many, sometimes unfamiliar, people talking about the customer's personal life. These situations could be made easier with a more structured preparation where the difficult subjects would be discussed beforehand with more time. This is something that I thought would be interesting to discuss in the workshops. Together with the social worker we drew a map of the communication between the customer and the different parts of the service (picture 3). The map helped clarify that the means of communication were multiple, but for instance a direct communication method between the social worker and the customer was often lacking.

The assistants of the unit I visited were not facing major problems with anything. The customers living there all have a very minor disability, which would be from the assistant's point of view also the reason behind this. Some of them gave examples from other workplaces, where the use of right to self-determination had gone from common sense to almost non-sense. I was told an example of a situation where a customer played video games so much that he or she didn't sleep.
Picture 3: Service communication mapping
Even if it was commonly known that the customer suffered from epilepsy and the change of sleep rhythm made it worse, the assistants had suggested changing the day rhythm so that the customer could play more during the night. The current law supports that in situations similar to this the customer’s health should be prioritized, but according to the social worker, there has been a lot of mistakes in how to interpret the law in these situations. This is a very crucial finding of the problem. Through this example the assistants wanted to tell how often the issues were not related to the right for self-determination but the lack of understanding the consequences and the responsibility that self-determination brings with. This inspired me to try to find solutions for supporting material for responsibility in the workshops. Eteva has a lot of interest in the previously presented VamO-project and they hope that it will help them to overcome the majority of the current issues related to the change of law. Still they remain very interested in investigating all the possible means.

**Workshops**

To prepare the workshop material I went through different types of support material that is used for disabled people’s services and supported decision-making. The different associations for disabled people and also THL provide many guidebooks and material to help with communication. What is typical for this material from my point of view is that it is very heavy e.g. demands a lot from the user. Many of the supporting guides are planned so that they can answer to all possible situations and needs and that leads to them being very long and containing a lot of material that is not necessary all of the time. When discussing these guidebooks with workers of Eteva, they thought that it was not really making customers participate, as there were too many pages to go through. In agreement with everyone the workshops were recorded so I didn’t need to take notes while facilitating the workshop.

As mentioned earlier in the theoretical framework, intellectual disabilities may cause difficulties in communication. This is why I chose to test in my workshops if and how the writing and speaking might limit the activities. With the chosen methods I wanted to see whether speaking and writing limit a lot and with the choice of the subject I wanted to see how the customers themselves discuss these subjects. In the first workshop we went through what kind of things we meet in our daily life, are there some things that are more difficult and how do we like to share our thoughts on issues. In the second workshop we discussed decision-making and what is difficult about it and also how to make responsibility easier to understand. The idea was to relate the subjects of the workshop to the issues found in the theories and the interviews.

Eteva asked me to prepare an invitation letter (appendix 2) and a consent form (appendix 1) in plain language for the participants of the workshops. This was to ensure that all the participants were aware what they were
participating in and with the consent letter also Eteva wanted to ensure that all the procedures would be ethically correct. I suggested myself that I would come and present my research and workshops at the housing unit in an unoficial meeting. This idea came from my previous experience with Luovilla during my PET-project, where it was recommended and also useful to come and present oneself for the participants of the workshops. This also is understandable, as some disabled people require more time to get used to new situations. Thus I would not be a complete stranger when we would do the workshop and that would help create a more relaxed atmosphere and discussion.

For both workshops I had prepared some nice snacks to eat. The idea was to tempt the customers to participate, to have the situation more convenient and to help give the participant some energy as the workshops were organized in the evening after everyone’s workdays. Also this was a good reward to oJer for the participants.

Both workshops had six volunteered participants, partly different for both groups. When interviewing the workers from the housing unit, they expected that at the most three people would participate. It wasn’t required to register in advance so that it would be less oficial and also easier to come. I decided to keep the workshops in one hour, because that way it wouldn’t be too heavy and concentration would not be lost.
The whole workshop was conducted as an open discussion and I as a facilitator took notes on post-its for everyone to see. This was done to make it easier to just discuss without the need to write and also to start with more simple approach.

**Task 1**

“Daily routines”

We discussed what was done in different parts of the day, each part was on their own paper. I was encouraging those who didn’t suggest new ideas on their own and asking them directly what they did during the day. This was a good method for some participants and some said that they did the things that were already mentioned. Yet everyone added at least one topic that was new at some point. There was an interesting discussion that came when we talked about what happens during the night as it appeared that many people had some issues with sleeping and had for example nightmares.

**Task 2**

“What happens during a week”

We discussed what was done during the different weekdays and what we didn’t mention when talking about the days. As all the participants had work from Monday to Friday this also made a clear difference between the weekdays and weekends. This created a lot of nice discussion as it made people talk about their hobbies and other leisure time activities. (picture 4)
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Task 4

“How do I like to share my thoughts”

In this the idea was to more elaborate on how people wanted to share their issues. In the end we didn’t spend that much time on this one because everyone who said their opinion out loud more or less agreed that speaking things through was the best way.

Task 5

“What is easy and what is difficult”

In this task we listed what things were easy to talk about and what were difficult. This task didn’t evoke that much discussion, partly because the subject was already touched upon in the previous task and this wasn’t that different.
Feedback of the Ärst workshop

Feedback was given generally for the workshop and this discussion was not very long, people just said it was nice; of course that is a good result too. Also we had already used little more than one hour for the workshop and I had the feeling that participants wanted to finish. For the second workshop I decided to have the feedback given on each task separately.

Workshop 2

The materials for the second workshop were finalized once the Ärst workshop was done in order to make the tasks more difficult or easier depending on how the Ärst workshop went. This of course required quick adaptation from me to prepare the material but also it allowed me to have more relevant information from my research. Also the prepared material was to be kept simple so that it wouldn’t look too official and complicated, as my experience was that the documents needed to be in plain language. As all the tasks of the Ärst workshop went well and had answers I decided to have more complex tasks for the second workshop in order to challenge the participants.

Task 1

In the Ärst exercise the participants needed to fill in individually by writing the task of ‘capacity poster’ (picture 5), in which it was asked to fill in the boxes under the text with the person’s own thoughts on the matter. This task was inspired by one of the tasks that the “Supported decision-making toolkit” of English Incontrol has. This task has a positive approach to capacities and it can also help to create a more positive image of oneself. All the participants could write at least one answer to each of the questions and most of them had many ideas to each subject but not all were capable of doing this without the help of assistants. Some customers who had trouble participating in tasks that required speaking did surprisingly have a lot to write in this task though. After the workshops the assistants were very interested in this task and thought that it would be a good tool to create discussion and that for example those who didn’t write so much here could find answers with the help of an assistant.
In this task I had written three imaginary stories that describe a situation that can be confusing and in which a person with a disability was in a perplexing situation concerning decision-making. I read the story out loud and after that the participants were asked to explain how in their opinion could the person be helped to make a good decision and what would it be in their opinion. The idea was to test and see how the imaginary situations could be understood and what kind of answers the participants of the workshop could find to the complex situations. In this task some of the participants had many ideas and some didn’t have anything to add but later on commented that it was interesting to listen to these stories.

The third task had two phases. First we did a mindmap about what responsibility means (picture 6) and then with the help of that we ideated a poster template for everyone to fill in with his or her own areas of responsibility. The idea behind this was to have the customer’s own definition of what responsibility means and how do they understand it. With the help of this task we also created together the poster template. I expected that it would be difficult to define the word ‘responsibility’ but together the participants found relatively easily a very broad definition of the word.

Feedback was given for each task separately. This created more open discussion than the general discussion that we had on the first workshop.

Overall my personal analysis of the workshops is that it is difficult to be certain if everyone contributed fully to the tasks. Some of the participants said most of the time that they agreed with what was already mentioned and didn’t add anything personal. Some participants talked a lot and some needed to be asked to tell their opinion. On the other hand some of those who did not give that much of personal input did anyway mention that they enjoyed the discussion and that it was interesting to listen to the others. It is very difficult to analyze with only one set of workshops how did the participants truly feel or think about the tasks, but this is not necessarily related to the disabilities, as we cannot analyze that with any other participants either.
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4. RESULTS
4. Results

In this part I will present the design proposal that resulted from the workshops, the comments that it received from Eteva customers and workers and the key findings on the project. I will analyze how I have answered the research questions. Furthermore, I will also discuss what could have been done differently and what the future possibilities of this work are.

**Design proposal**

One of the aims of my thesis was to be able to deliver to Eteva a concrete result that could help them in their everyday work. During the workshops, it could be clearly seen that some of the tasks we went through were more interesting and created more discussion. The assistants whom I interviewed and who had been following the workshops also commented on some of the tasks that they would be interesting to use in their work. Also from the last task of the second workshop, where we wrote down thoughts about responsibility, we found a very good way to define it. As these seemed to be encouraging the customers, I had the idea of collecting the best tasks in one document, a design proposal (appendix 4), and give this for Eteva for further use. The tasks are such that they don’t require long explanations to be understood, so that it could be easy for Eteva’s workers to try them even if they hadn’t been part of my research.

The little introduction text is translated here:

“A toolkit to help discussion

These four assignments are part of the master’s thesis work done by Annukka Svanda in spring 2019 at Aalto University Design Department. The tasks are designed together with Eteva’s supported housing unit residents. The idea is to help with discussions on developing services for people with disabilities. The purpose is to facilitate the discussion of decision-making issues and the planning of one’s own life. Tasks can be completed together with an assistant or supporting person, in a group to support a conversation, or alone. Tasks work as a series or as a separate task. You can easily use picture cards to discuss the tasks. Nice moments with the tasks!”

The idea of this toolkit is to have something that is not too long as mentioned earlier was the problem with many of the current supporting materials. Also it aims to create discussion about the important issues that
need to be decided. As mentioned earlier, the decisions are made in situations that often the customers don’t feel themselves so comfortable in and don’t necessarily feel so secure to talk about their personal lives. This toolkit could help the assistant to prepare the customer for the meeting with the social worker for example and it would also show participation from the customer’s side if the customer doesn’t wish to talk that much in the meeting. It would also help the social worker to discuss about the issues that need decision-making if they are better prepared.

The idea is to make it look less like an official document which the workshop participants mentioned many times are often difficult and unappealing. This is also why there are some color effects added. The social workers also liked that the look is less official so it is more appealing to use. As it has only a little text, it can more easily be explained and used with the help of the picture card communication when needed.

Feedback from the design outcome

After the workshops I had a presentation at the housing unit of my research and the design outcome. I had prepared a short summary of my research in plain language (appendix xxx). The customers were all very satisfied with the workshops and they found it was interesting to participate in the research. They also found it useful to discuss the important issues and hoped that I would come there again. The design outcome was interesting but they all thought that they would not fill it in by themselves but to discuss with an assistant it could be tested. This is something that in my opinion should still be tested to see if it has real value or not, the opinions alone do not tell anything yet other than at least is not a completely strange idea.

Quotes from the feedback I received:

“You are always welcome here, thank you for coming.”
“I thought this would be boring, but it was really interesting.” (customers on workshops)

After presenting the research to the customers I also met four social workers and the leading social worker of Eteva to present my project and have feedback on the design outcome. Here are some quotes of their comments:

“Wow it shows immediately that we deal with a designer now! How nice this looks!”
“This is very useful for us. We can immediately start using this.”
“How flexible this is, it is very good as our customers are all so different”
“Hey we could use these two last exercises when young people are becoming independent, it would help a lot to define the needs for the place to live.”
“It can be clearly seen that the participants you had were very capable, I don’t see how the customers who can’t speak or write could use this.” “But you could try it with the communication cards?”

(speaking of the design outcome)
"It would be nice to learn more about other similar methods, they could be very useful for us."
"Sounded really interesting and sounds like service design could be more used in the area of social work. Social work and design are close to each other, but design can challenge differently and the pre-assumptions are different"
"We are very pleased that you worked with us and it would be nice to somehow continue the collaboration" (speaking of the project)

It was pleasing to receive such positive feedback but also it was clearly mentioned that it was difficult to see what the design outcome should be tested to see its true value.

Key findings

My research questions were:

What kind of means or tools could service design provide to the process of supported decision-making?

What are the limitations of service design and co-design with services for intellectually disabled people?

What means could co-design methods offer for the service provider to better meet the requirements of the new law?

As found in my research, supported decision-making is not yet a well-established practice in Finland. Yet this research has proved through literature and practice that service design could help to find suitable tools for supported decision-making by benchmarking what is already done within the field and by testing ideas in practice with the service customers and providers. The design outcome is one possible tool that was created during the project I made on the subject. It can help the assistants, the social workers and the customers in their decision-making.

From the case study and the theoretical framework we can see that service design as such does not have any limitations within the services for the intellectually disabled, as long as it is done in mutual understanding and with adapted methods. These adaptations could mean for example that there is more time taken for different processes, the use of plain language in communication, an assistant helping workshop participants, picture card communication or other similar tools and methods that are already familiar to social work and from which service design can learn. In this research it was found out that the writing and speaking are such activities that divide a lot in a co-design activity. Some participants did talk a lot and some didn’t say anything if not encouraged. I would say though that this is a phenomenon I have seen in all the workshops, whether the participants are...
disabled or not. The choice of my workshop activities was such that they could be done in discussion and I did not have any more complex design activities. In future research it would be interesting to test in concrete situations where the customers should need to participate in the planning of the future housing unit for example. Also in Etevas part it was chosen that the customers with whom I worked had very minor disabilities. I think the workshops should have been done very differently if the customers would have needed to communicate with the picture cards for example.

The requirements of the new law are to have more participatory methods within the services. Disability social work has many participatory methods and what co-design could offer to it is a less customer-assistant point of view to how the situations are handled. In this research it was seen that the communication skills in speaking and writing would be close to the capability of participating to co-design so in that sense it would depend on the customers communication skills if a co-design approach would be beneficial. In my research I think it was valuable that I could keep my process very flexible and for example adjust my workshop material to meet the requirements of the customers. This is something that could be designed in the future solutions of participatory methods within these services. Writing and talking are excluding but might also be surprisingly including. It would be best to test different methods and also in group and individually. In this way I would state that a service design approach would benefit a lot in the search for solutions to meet the requirements of the new law. The design proposal can be also used as a tool together to better confirm the understanding of the customer.

Benefits and challenges

Personally this research has taught me a slower approach to design activities. For some customers it took time to answer to the questions and it taught me to give more time to the customer and just to listen to them and not rush on to the next task. This is crucial to understand also in other design activities, to be capable of listening enough. It has also opened to me the possibility of doing more interesting research and Eteva has expressed their interest in possibly continuing the project.

For my project this case study gave a real customer insight and information on what kind of details should be taken into consideration when doing a design project with disabled people. These include for example making certain that all the tasks are understandable for everyone, to provide enough help for everyone to complete the tasks, to give enough time for people to answer and to adjust the difficulty.
of the tasks depending on the needs or capabilities of the customer.

Eteva got to see as they wished how the current situation would be discussed from a design research perspective. Eteva got to see an interesting point of view of design and insight of service design, which they had heard as term but which was not familiar more profoundly within the organization. Organizing and participating in co-design can help an organization to foster creativity or to develop its capabilities to innovate. Eteva received the design proposal to use immediately in their customer work. It was also proved that service design has a useful and interesting point of view for the disability social work that could lead to more opportunities for research.

**Conclusion**

There are no universal means or tools that can answer to all situations as the intellectual disabilities and hence their needs and capabilities vary greatly. This research didn’t directly benefit the most disadvantaged as such, but I found out that offering different solutions can give new insights and that could help the social workers to find new solutions even for more severe disabilities. Trying and testing design activities and methods can reveal ways of communicating and inspire creative thinking in the disabled customers and also the social service providers system. It helps both the customer and the service provider to think outside the box and see the situation in a different light. Also it helps the social workers to think less on behalf of the customer and make preassumptions on the customer’s wishes.

When tested in practice, the demand of Margolins to do research on how designers could work together with human service professionals has proved to be successful. It could be expected, that the designer would find his or her limitations when not knowing enough of the other field with whom he or she would be working, but I found that the humble approach that I had, the flexibility of the tasks, the respect that I showed towards the demands of my partner helped me to have the support on the areas I wasn’t familiar with.

In their article ‘Confronting bureaucracies’, Julier and Kimbell say on social design research that: “Valuation practices and devices and project outcomes are made during social design research. They do not have to be taken as given, pre-existing, or pre-determined. Their value comes into view through their unfolding materiality and performativity. As such, social design research offers a distinctive approach relevant to contexts in which knowledge is co-produced with, for and by social actors. (Confronting bureaucracies, 2019)” I think that this has been relevant in my research which has been very open from Eteva’s side, in other words they haven’t expected any outcome.
from me other than interesting research. On the same article it is explained that in a report by the UK All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing (2017) « sense of belonging, identity or mutual support are seen as secondary.» I would argue that what i have seen in this project was contrary to this. The social workers were very fond of the small achievements on individual level and found very valuable the general good feeling created with the workshop. The leading social worker of Eteva said on her feedback about the project that « Sometimes it is the things that look small that are the most meaningful. » This was as a comment to the analyze of the result whether it can create a small or big change. I am personally very pleased of this finding as it is against fast products and efficient design, which might often be very exclusive.

In the report of the VamO-project, which was published in April 2019, it is said about participation (my own translation): "According to the respondents (the customers), inclusion would increase if the communication to the customer was not based on general norms and the relationship with the client’s life situation is unclear. Employees were hoped to justify their solutions to suit individual customer situations.» (Heini et al., 2019). I found that in this research it was proven that service design can provide tools to meet these goals.

Reflection

As this is a master’s thesis I have done the research alone. It is possible to do a thesis work as a group study but it is not a well-established practice yet. These kinds of service design projects are usually done as a group work and also this is the experience I have received from my design studies. When doing the project by myself, it teaches responsibility to take decisions alone but it also lacks a certain discussion that is very valuable in service design. Creativity is supported by other people’s comments and analysis and also critical reflection is different when done alone. It has been very useful for me to learn to conduct alone all the phases of the project but I think that the project would have been more successful if it had been done as a group work.

Reading and analyzing theories related to social design have given me personal
motivation for this research and also understanding that the impact that this research has may not be immediately visible but already paying attention to these issues is valuable. This is also part of the feedback I received from my research partner Eteva that not everything is always visible and great, sometimes the small things and changes matter the most. It has created some obstacles that I have written my thesis in English but my research was done in Finnish. I chose to write in English, as I want to address my findings possibly to a larger audience. Also most of the research in this field as well as our studies is done in English so it was a natural choice in that sense. At the same time since I needed to translate a lot of my work to both languages, it has also taught me more of the terminology in both languages.

Going through the legislation related to participation in disabled people’s services and also searching material from other countries and context has helped me greatly to create a deeper understanding on this topic. Even though I don’t have experience on social work and my knowledge on disability work remains still limited, this study has given me a broad view of the phenomena that affect these services. Further preparation was necessary to do research within the field of intellectual disabilities as I needed to prepare more materials such as consent forms and research permissions, but otherwise I have felt very welcome everywhere and it has been surprisingly easy to work in a field that I was not very familiar with previously. This is partly thanks to an open mind and interest I have had towards my subject but mostly thanks to the interest that my research partner has had and the positive attitude that people have expressed.
Future

In his interview that is quoted in the ‘Social Design Futures’ report, professor Pelle Ehn says: “In this field, there is a need for long-term infrastructuring where relationships continue...that is, that a social design project instigates a conversation and relationships that can be on-going beyond the ‘life’ of the project itself. But that also makes the impact of social design very difficult to evaluate.” (Armstrong et al., 2014) I think this is what would be needed for social design to succeed, not only short projects but also a long-term relationship in which the continuity of the project would be guaranteed.

Eteva has expressed an interest in putting the design outcome to use. They suggested that I should write a short introduction that explains my research and also present some examples of the situations in which this tool could be used. We have agreed that Eteva will do a short presentation of my research on their webpage and that I will also make a presentation for other social workers on this subject. This will be done once my thesis is accepted and published by Aalto University. Also within this context I can suggest that we continue the research regarding the design outcome I made and see if it can help them in the daily work. This way I could continue the project more as a group task not just alone. To include the communication cards would be a topic for possible future research.

The VamO-project ends in autumn 2019 and there is discussion to continue further research on how customer participation could be supported. With the social worker we discussed that it would be interesting to implement a design perspective to this research as well. We will discuss this option further with Eteva and I will contact also THL, which is also responsible for that research. I think that Eteva would benefit the most from a holistic plan for the future in which their service would be analyzed from a service design perspective. It would be interesting to test in concrete situations where the customers should need to participate in the planning of a future housing unit for example.
I would like to thank everyone who participated in this process that has successfully come to completion on the planned time schedule. A special thanks to the participants of the workshops, people I have interviewed and Etava, for making this research possible. I would like to also underline the especially positive support, interest and learning process that my advisor Kaisu Savola and supervisor Guy Julier have provided me; thanks to them I have achieved my goals and sensed a progress in academic research. I would also like to thank my peers and family for being very supportive and for making it possible to do this research.
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SUOSTUMUS TYÖPAJAAN OSALLISTUMISESTA OSANA TUTKIMUSTA

TUTKIMUS  Aalto-yliopiston muotoilun laitoksen maisterin lopputyöhön kuuluva työpaja. Työpajan vetää maisteriopiskelija Annukka Svanda.

AIKA  Työpajat ovat maaliskuussa 2019

KUVAUS  Aalto-yliopiston muotoilun laitoksen maisteriopiskelija Annukka Svanda haluaa maisterin lopputyössään tutkia osallistamisen keinoja vammaisten palveluissa palvelumuotoilun näkökulmasta. Palvelumuotoilu tarkoittaa palvelun suunnittelemaa ja yhdessä asiakkaan tarpeiden mukaisesti.

Työpajoissa on tarkoitus keskustella siitä miten vammaisten palveluita suunnitellaan. Annukka haluaisi kuulla Lampipuiston asukkaiden mielipiteitä ja ajatuksia osallisuudesta. Työpaja on kaksiosainen.

Ensimmäisellä kerralla kerätään yhteisiä ajatuksia aiheesta ja toisella kerralla suunnitellaan uusia ideoita.

Työpajaan kerätään kaikkien osallistujien suostumukset hyvän käytännön noudattamiseksi. Lopullinen tutkimus tehdään nimettömänä eikä ketään voida tunnistaa siitä.


PAIKKA JA AIKA

ALLEKIRJOITUS

NIMEN SELVENNYS

TUTKIJAN ALLEKIRJOITUS
Hei!

O sallistu tutkimukseen!


O sallistumalla olet mukana mielenkiintoisessa tutkimuksessa!

Lisätietoja ja tarkempi aikataulu 5.3.2019 asukaskokouksessa klo 18. Silloin voi myös ilmoittautua.

Ystävällisin terveisin,
Annukka Svanda
Aalto-yliopiston muotoilun laitos
annukka.svanda@aalto.fi
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appendix 2 -invitation letter
Selkokielinen tutkimusraportti Etevalle


Toteimme esimerkiksi, että itse voi määrittää sen, mitä asioita haluaa hoitaa. Eteva saa tällä tavoin käyttää materiaaleja ja asioita, joita on tehty jo ennallaan. Osa auttaa auttaa olemassa olevia tietoja ja omahenkityötä.

Lämpimät kiitokset kaikille osallistujille ja ohjaajille avustal! On olut toden tulaa mukaavaksi ja auttaakseen tulevaa viikkoa. Kaikki asiantuntevat on tehtävän tehtävän käytön.
A research report in plain language for Eteva

Annukka Svanda, Master student in Aalto University, organized two workshops at the Eteva housing unit in March 2019. The workshops are part of Annukka's master's thesis. Annukka is studying participation in disability services from a service design perspective. Service design means planning a service according to the customer's needs and with the customer.

Six people participated in each workshop. Workshops were very successful and feedback from them was positive. "It was hard to think first, but then ideas came." "It was interesting to think about taking care of yourself." "It was interesting to think about the difficult things together and the answers to them."

In the first workshop, we first thought about what we do during the day and week. Then we wondered what things are difficult and how to deal with them. We said that things are quite easy to do in general. Visiting a doctor, filling in forms, and money related issues could be difficult. Even these things are easier when help is asked and with enough time.

In the second workshop, we first thought by ourselves in what we are good and about what we are proud. There are a lot of these things! After that we were thinking how to solve difficult situations with the help of examples. Finally, we discussed what responsibility is.

The way to work in a workshop was nice for everyone. There were several different tasks, some more difficult and some easier.

It was both interesting and challenging to discuss things in a group and think about one's own things by writing. In a task where you had to write down your own capabilities we got very various answers. It was also very good to think together about difficult terms, such as responsibility, and we got a good definition. It is also nice to hear others talk freely about difficult things, get ideas from it and listen, on the other hand.

Together we created a poster-like tool that everyone can fill up freely. In this poster it is possible to list alone or with the help of an assistant the things one manages alone and what is taken care of together. After the workshops we thought with some assistants that some of the tasks of the workshop might be interesting to use with customers to help with discussion and decision-making. Eteva receives a toolkit made of these materials for free use.

A great thanks to all participants and assistants for their help! It has been really nice to work together. Annuka's thesis will be completed by April 29th, 2019 and will be presented during the last week of May. All interested are welcome to listen or read the finished work.

Annukka Svanda,
annukka.svanda@aalto.fi

Mukavia hetkiä tehtävien parissa!

**KESKUSTELUAPUA**
**tehtäväserja**

---

**MINUN PÄIVÄ**

**MINUN VIIKKO**

**KUKA MINÄ OLEN**

**4 VASTUUTAULU**

---

*appendix 4 -design proposal*
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10-13
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17-21

YÖ
21-6
Annukka Svanda, keväällä 2019
Aalto-yliopiston muotoilun laitos
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VASTUUTAULU
näin huolehdimme
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Minä
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4

Muut
DISCUSSION toolkit

These four assignments are part of the master’s thesis work done by Annukka Svanda in spring 2019 at Aalto University Design Department. The tasks are designed together with Eteva’s supported housing unit residents.

The idea is to help with discussions on developing services for people with disabilities. The purpose is to facilitate the discussion of decision-making issues and the planning of one’s own life. Tasks can be used together with an assistant or supporting person, in a group to support a conversation, or to think alone. Tasks work as a series or as a separate task.

You can easily use picture cards to discuss the tasks.

Nice moments with the tasks!

appendix 4 -design proposal
MY DAY
what happens at these moments

MORNING  
6-10

LUNCH TIME  
10-13

AFTERNOON  
13-17

EVENING  
17-21

NIGHT  
21-6
# MY WEEK

what I do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO AM I:

I LIKE ABOUT MYSELF THAT

I AM PROUD AND EXCITED ABOUT

I KNOW WELL
RESPONSIBILITY
these we take
care of

Me

Others

Dependant