DESIGN THROUGH A COMMUNICATIONAL LENS: MATTERS OF CONCERN AND AGENCY

**Jyväskylä University School
of Business and Economics**

Master's thesis

2021

**Leevi Sorri
Corporate Communication
Laura Asunta**

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

ABSTRACT

Author Leevi Sorri	
Title of thesis Design through communicational lens: matters of concern and agency	
Discipline Corporate Communication	Type of work Master's thesis
Time (month/year) May/2021	Number of pages 81

Abstract

This thesis aims to bridge the gap between two bodies of literature: communicative constitution of organizations (CCO) and design-as-practice by examining how communication constitutes a design process. This study also aims to broaden the role of communication in these practices. Lately, different design approaches have emerged to provide competitive advantage to all organizational functions which makes the research very topical. The main research question "How does communication constitute design process?" was answered through three sub research questions. The theoretical foundation of this thesis is laid out on Montreal School of thought and different domains of design literature. Following the premises of the CCO approach, this thesis took a relational definition on communication to study design process. A framework was developed for defining design practice as a series of communicative events. More specifically, the framework demonstrates how different matters of concern are evoked and collectively negotiated in a design process. This research is abductive, and the primary data is formed from observing several service design workshops. The collected data included video-recordings of the design workshops, researcher's notes of those workshops and textual material produced in the workshops. The data was analyzed using a theory-guided content analysis. In order to illustrate these practices, excerpts from the interactions in the workshops are presented. Through these illustrations, this thesis demonstrates how matters of concern present themselves through communication in a design process. The findings highlighted certain characteristics of interaction in design process that were rise from the interplay of communication and practice. Additionally, the findings scrutinized the characteristics of matters of concerns raised in the design process and the types of agency that are assigned to them. The results of this thesis demonstrate that communication is the common ground in which interactions of design occur to define which matters of concern are consequential in a given situation. This depiction serves also as a practical guide for planning and implementing design workshops. This thesis advocates for the argument of communication's constitutive role rather than positioning it as a resource.

Keywords

communicative constitution of organization, organizational communication, matters of concern, design, agency, design thinking, service design

Location

Jyväskylä University Library

TIIVISTELMÄ

Tekijä	
Leevi Sorri	
Työn nimi	
Design through communicational lens: matters of concern and agency	
Oppiaine	Työn laji
Viestinnän johtaminen	Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika (month/year)	Sivumäärä
Toukokuu /2021	81

Tiivistelmä

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää, millainen rooli viestinnällä on muotoiluprosessissa (*design process*) yhdistämällä kaksi kirjallisuuden alaa, joita ei ole aiemmin tutkittu yhdessä: organisaatio viestintänä -näkökulma (*communicative consitution of organization*) ja käytäntöön perustuva design as practice -tutkimussuuntaus. Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli lisäksi laajentaa viestinnän roolia muotoilun tutkimuksessa. Tämä tutkimus on ajankohtainen, sillä erilaiset muotoilumenetelmät ovat viime aikoina kasvattaneet suosiotaan monilla eri toimialoilla ja kirjallisuudessa. Päätutkimuskysymykseen ("Miten viestintä muodostaa muotoiluprosessia?") vastattiin kolmen alatutkimuskysymyksen kautta. Teoriapohja perustuu Montrealin koulukunnan sekä eri muotoilukirjallisuuden alojen teorioihin. Mukaillen organisaatio viestintänä -näkökulmaa, tässä tutkimuksessa viestinnälle on annettu relationaalinen määritelmä. Aikaisemman kirjallisuuden pohjalta luotiin kehys muotoiluprosessin tutkimiseen, jonka perusteella pyrittiin selvittämään, onko muotoilu sarja viestinnällisiä tapahtumia. Kehyksen kautta pystyttiin havainnoimaan eri merkityksen aiheita (*matters of concern*), joita nostettiin keskustelussa esiin ja joista neuvoteltiin vuorovaikutuksen kautta. Tämä tutkimus on abduktiivinen. Aineisto kerättiin tarkkailemalla useita palvelumuotoilutyöpajoja. Aineisto sisältää videotallenteet työpajoista, tutkijan tekemät muistiinpanot sekä työpajoissa tuotetut erilaiset materiaalit, kuten asiakaspolkukartat. Aineisto analysoitiin käyttäen teoriaohjaavaa sisällönanalyysiä. Tulosten havainnollistamiseksi tutkimuksessa esitetään otteita työpajojen vuorovaikutustilanteista. Näiden katkelmien avulla tutkimus osoittaa, miten eri merkityksen aiheet tuodaan muotoiluprosessissa esiin viestinnän kautta. Tulokset korostivat tiettyjä viestinnällisiä ominaisuuksia, joita tapahtuu muotoiluprosessin vuorovaikutustilanteissa. Lisäksi tuloksissa tarkasteltiin muotoiluprosessissa esiin tuotujen merkityksen aiheiden ominaisuuksia ja niille annettua toimijuutta (*agency*). Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että muotoilu tapahtuu vuorovaikutuksen kautta. Muotoilun syntymistä ohjaa erilaiset merkityksen aiheet, joiden tarkoitusperä määritetään ja neuvotellaan kollektiivisesti. Näistä tuloksista esitetään käytännön ohjeita muotoiluprosessia suunnitteleville. Tämä tutkimus ehdottaa, että viestintää käsiteltäisiin vastaavissa tutkimuksissa muotoilua luovana tekijänä eikä yksinomaan resurssina.

Asiasanat	
communicative constitution of organization, organisaatioviestintä, design thinking, palvelumuotoilu, toimijuus	
Sijainti	
Jyväskylän yliopiston kirjasto	

CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

In a world where we have been saturated with undifferentiated goods, the greatest opportunity to create value and to ensure customer affections is experiences (Pine & Gilmore 2011; ix, 3). Customer experience has become more complex and multilateral: customers are interacting with organizations through countless touch points in different channels and medias. Moreover, services are now regarded as a business perspective rather than a offered good (Vargo & Lusch 2004; Edvardsson, Gustafsson & Roos 2005). In fact, creating strong customer experience has become the leading management objective (Lemon & Verhoef 2016, 69). Therefore excelling in customer experience and understanding the customer's journey has become vital for organizations.

To embrace all this complexity, different design approaches have emerged to provide competitive advantage to all organizational functions (Dunne & Martin 2006, 512). Design methodology and tools are used to develop individual services or to mold whole organizational strategies (Dorst 2004, 72). Many organizations believe that designing solutions from a human-centered point of view transform them for the better.

Methods and approaches such as service design have lately gained popularity across different fields and industries. Service design is a strategic and holistic approach to improve a customer's experience (Polaine, Løvlie, and Reason 2013). Lately, even communication practitioners have embraced design methodology in communication practice to improve effectiveness and efficiency of communication efforts (Piskonen 2018). Though arguments have been raised to determine this design thinking to be just a fad, yet more and more design mentality is foisted from practice to practice (Johansson & Woodilla 2016). Therefore studying the phenomenon from a communicational perspective is very fertile and topical.

Grounded in the theory of communicative constitution of organization approach, this thesis presents a framework for defining design practice as a series of communicative events. In these events specific matters of concern are voiced and given agency through communication, defining value for the organization. To explore how communication constitutes design, this thesis positions its approach with regard to the works of Kimbell (2011, 2012) on design-as-practice.

The argument that design thinking or the practice of design is a communicative achievement has not yet been studied to the best of the authors knowledge. However, generally in the design literature, the role of the practitioners has been overemphasized, reducing the role of communication to merely a resource (e.g. Chiu 2002, Aakhus & Harrisson 2015). To fill the gap in research the purpose of this study is to examine in which ways communication is involved in a design process. The study also aims to broaden the view of the role of communication in these practices.

Thus the research problem of this thesis is to ascertain what kind of role communication plays in the practice of design. Based on the research problem and the purpose of the research, the main research question (MRQ) in this thesis is: *How does communication constitute design process?* To answer this question comprehensively, the main research question is divided into the following sub research questions (SRQ):

SRQ1: How matters of concern present themselves in a design process?

SRQ2: What communicative events constitute a design process?

SRQ3: What kind of agency occurs in a design process?

This thesis is potentially the first attempt to put together two bodies of literature: communicative constitution of organizations (CCO) and design-as-practice. To achieve this, several design workshops were observed where an emerging organization designed their services and customer journeys.

Following the works of Cooren, Bencherki, Chaput and Vasquez (2015) on communication in strategy making, this thesis understands organizing through the constitutive force of communication. Hence, this thesis follows these three key premises: (1) communication is the foundation of the analysis, (2) relational view on communication recognizes the nature of practice in design, and (3) different forms of agency constitute design process. Based on the CCO approach, this thesis formed a framework for understanding how design happens through communication, and how matters of concern are substantial for the design process.

This study seeks to answer the set research questions using qualitative methods, more specifically, ethnographic case study and observations as primary data collection method.

The study was carried out by following service design workshops in a newfound organization. The purpose of the workshops was to organize the purpose of their service and the organizations ability to provide this service. The main idea of their business was to initiate and develop a cloud-based service, where those who need different IT services and those offering them can meet and do business easily. The Amazon of IT labor, if you will. At the time of data gathering, it employed a handful people in business development, marketing and communications fulltime. Today, the organization has launched its

business and has a network of more than 1600 IT experts and acclaimed client base.

1.1   Philosophical approach

There are no absolute truths in this thesis. On the contrary, the thesis aims to portray different views of the phenomenon through matters of concern which the people observed in this study invoke.

Communication, in this thesis, is seen as the primary way of explaining social realities. This thesis supports relational epistemology, understanding that individuals' relation with one another and with all that exists to be forming the process of developing an understanding of the world. Communication mediates the observability of the material reality and acknowledges the social world in which it is co-constructed (Schoeneborn, Blaschke, Cooren, McPhee, Seidll & Taylor 2014; 303).

The ontological question in this thesis relates to the organizing property of communication. Ontology is discussed when explaining what are the axioms of reality and presenting questions relating to the nature of realities (Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara 2009, 130). Following the Montreal School of thought, any form of communication is understood in this thesis as a form of implicit organizing (Schoeneborn & Vasquez 2017, 11), thus proposing it as a starting point of the research. Moreover, in this thesis, the ontological point of view engages with the idea that social realities, not limited to human or non-human interaction, are part of the world's complexities (Connor & Marshall 2016, 4). In order to understand how communication constitutes design process, this thesis engages with relational ontology.

This thesis follows relativism research philosophy and is thus grounded in thinking that there are various different ways of seeing and understanding the world. There are different truths, that the observers interpret from their own particular point of views. (Letherby, Scott, & Williams 2013, 14.) Choices regarding the methodological approaches in this thesis obey these scientific orientations.

The axiom of communication is somewhat ambivalent. It is understood to have constitutive force, yet its overall role has not been studied in the context of design in previous research. This study aims to fill this gap in the existing research. Also, the main purpose of this thesis is to provide an understanding to the phenomena of design practices from a communicational perspective, not trying to test any theories.

2 COMMUNICATIVE CONSTITUTION OF ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter examines the theoretical background of this thesis and introduces the conceptual framework and an overview of the theoretical approaches. The most important aspects to lay out the foundation of this thesis are the Montreal School approach to communication and how it deals with the concept of agency.

2.1 CCO Theories

The constitutive role (as in form, compose, establish (Merriam Webster, n.d.)) of communication in the production of organizations has been a major topic in scholarly studies for decades (Brummans, Cooren, Robichaud & Taylor 2014, 173). Drawing from organization theories (Weick 1969) and social theories (Giddens 1979), the organizational communication scholars shifted their focus from how communication flows in an organization towards the organizing properties of communication (Bisel 2010, 125; Cheney 2000, 25).

This field of study, communicative constitution of organizations (later CCO), has gained lot of traction in organizational communication studies. It sets to explain that communication is the establishing and maintaining force behind organizations and that organizations are a ″*communicative phenomena*″ (Schoeneborn, McPhee & Cooren 2014, 286). The epistemology underlying the field of study is the assumption that reality is communicatively constituted (286, 288-289).

There are three schools of thought that share this notion and have become the main representatives of the CCO thinking; Montreal school of organizational communication (see e.g. Cooren 2010, Taylor & Van Every 2000), the Four-Flows Model (see McPhee & Zaug 2000) and Luhmann's theory of social systems (see Luhmann 2000). Though these three schools have a common ground how they theorize and analyze organizations they still have fundamental differences as they ground their work on essentially different sources such as

structuration theory, narrative and speech act theory and actor-network theory (Brummans et al. 2014, 187).

All schools base their thinking on the idea that communication is the constitutional way to explain social reality (Craig 1999, 124-126). Schoeneborn et al. (2014, 303) state that *"organizations and their members rely on communication to arrive at a mutually acceptable account of social reality and deal with its respective uncertainty."* Similarly, all three schools are unanimous with the idea that the scope of communication does not limit to the transmission of communication (e.g. Axley 1984) but that it is dynamic, uncertain and interactive (Schoeneborn, Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen & Clark 2011, 1150).

Where the three schools have most common views is the assumption of the connection between communication and the organization: organization establishes and maintains itself as a network of communication – there is no organization prior to communication (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 305). Also, all three schools acknowledge (in their own ways) non-human actors on the communication process and none centers themselves on the agency of human individuals (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 308).

However, the scholars disagree on the role of human and non-human actors, and each school has slightly different notions on communication and its relation to organizations (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 303–305).

CCO theories have been criticized for giving too much emphasis on communication while neglecting other constituting elements such as finances or contracts (Sillince 2010, 136-137) and missing material, discursive and relational power within the political context organizations operate (Reed 2010, 154). Also, Bisel (2015, 129) argues that though communication is necessary for constituting an organization, it is such a complex phenomenon that reducing its explanation to a single domain is not justifiable.

Nevertheless, CCO is recognized as well established and diverse approach to study various matters through communicational lens.

In this study a CCO approach is taken to unravel the series of communicative episodes in a service design process. More specifically, this study follows the Montreal School approach to broaden the conception of what is created in design process through talk and text. Therefore, The Montreal School approach to communicative constitution of organizations is discussed in detail below.

2.2   Montreal School of Organizational Communication

The Montreal School's approach draws from philosophical traditions, focusing on the narratives of text, speech and conversation to understand and analyze organization.

In general, Montreal School perceives communication as an action. Organization, in turn, is a discursive phenomenon, formed by the transactional dimension of communication (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 289-292). Organization

and communication emerge from the dialect between text and conversation (Taylor & Van Every 2000, 37)

Text refers to the "*string of language that materializes the human sensemaking*" (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2017, 312). This means that any discursive resource used to create meaning is considered text, not merely a written format. For instance, *text* implies the content of the conversation, a document, a form of expression or any artifact. *Texts* allow all these forms of organization to be identified and constituted and all these formats need to be textualized in order to be understood (Cooren & Martine 2016, 311; Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2017, 6).

Conversation, in turn, refers to interactions or transactions in which texts are created (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2017, 312).

All these communicative products form the abstract representation of collective identity and intention (Cooren et al. 2011, 1155). *Texts*, as a symbolic and materialized dimension allow organizations to organize conversations in many places and at many times. Taylor and Van Every refer this as the surface of the organization. In turn, *conversations* are the site of the organizations – a place where the organizing actually happens. (Taylor & Van Every 2000; 31,34.) Thus, organization emerges in generation and regeneration of conversational context of texts – in other words, the organization is a property of communication (Taylor & Van Every 2000, 37).

Organizations operate in the textual world with narrative features. The conversational world allows the textual world to reproduce, evolve and transform. (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2016, 6.) Taylor and Van Emery see organization emerging through communication in two ways: as described in texts and as realized through conversations. First, a process of sense making occurs to build a framework for understanding organizational situations to construct spoken or written intervention. This empowers a verbalized exchange in which organizational actors can speak on behalf of the organization and lay a basis for actions. (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2016, 6; Taylor & Van Every 2000, 37, 58).

Montreal School also acknowledges organizations to act on human and nonhuman contributors. Cooren (2010, 16-25) gives attention to plenum of agencies, implying that agents and actions does not limit to human beings' doings, thus recognizing nonhuman's contribution (artifacts such as logos, technologies and texts) in communicatively constituting an organization. Furthering this idea of CCO scholarship, Cooren (2010, 135-140) developed the concept of ventriloquism to suggest that agents, in various different forms, are always involved in the level of interaction. In other words, organizational agents appeal to ideologies, rules, policies and values in all of their activities, making the organizational agents to speak and act in certain way (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2016, 7).

Communication, therefore, accomplishes resolving situations interactively. In this manner, communication is seen as an action. It is not only constitutive of organizations but also cultures, identities, facts et cetera providing meaning in conversations when speaking in their name (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2016, 7).

Bisel (2015, 127-128) criticizes the Montreal School approach's conception of text and conversation to be presumptuous for seeing that presence of grammatical structure could provide sufficient condition to organizing. In his view,

mere communicative activities are not enough to constitute an organization and that communication practices are given too much emphasis describing them.

To sum up, there are three key perspectives to understand the paradoxical way of imagining organization.

Regarding the ontological question of organization, Montreal School sees *all* communication, in any form, to have organizing property (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2016, 11). This means that even a simple interaction between two people is a form of organizing. Simply, *"an organization is embodied or incarnated, or materialized, in anything or anyone that can be recognized as representing it, that is, making it present"* (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 293).

As it comes to how communication composes organization from one interaction upwards, Montreal School sees organization emerging from combination of human and non-human agencies (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 295). The importance of non-human agents is underlined for they give organization *staying capacity* (Schoeneborn 2008, 78; Taylor & Van Every 2000; 22) – the ability to contain information over time and space. The question of agency is important in this thesis. It will be discussed more in detail next.

2.3   Agency and CCO approach

The question of agency is central in the CCO approach. Between different disciplines the definition and the role of agency is understood differently and that is why the meaning of it should be clarified before discussing the contextual framework of this thesis. Looking at the dictionary definition for agency (*"the capacity, condition, or state of acting or of exerting power"* Merriam-Webster n.d.), the relational nature of people's ability that is given to human and non-human actors through communication is central. Hence, with regards to the views of Montreal School, this thesis sees agency to form in interaction, with and through someone or something, making a difference (Brummans 2015, 460; Cooren 2006, 82).

Following the premises laid out in the previous chapter, this thesis recognizes that the agency of human actors is decentered in an organization (Cooren et al. 2011, 1152). Montreal School associates agency with the combination of human and non-human actors in daily communication, realizing that these non-human agents make difference in how actions are mobilized in interactions (Schoeneborn & Vásquez 2016, 12). Both, human and non-human agencies, act and communicate on behalf of the organization, and embody and materialize it (Schoeneborn et al. 2014, 298).

Agency and action are usually discussed together as attributing agency to someone or something will consequently produce actions for organizations to exist (Brummans 2006, 197). There are many different things that invite themselves into this process through conversations that need to be acknowledged observing and analyzing interactions. While this is not a simple task it can be

scrutinized simply to understanding and translating what is said into accomplished actions, and identifying from the interaction what leads to doing these things (Cooren 2010, 4–5).

Another important component of agency for Montreal school is the collective representations of it. More specifically, agency is understood as actions of making something or someone present (Cooren 2006, 83). Organizations (or any other type of collective entity for that matter) are, following this line of thought, formed of different types of agency that take part in its activities of existence (Cooren 2015b, 477). Different agents, whether they are humans, documents or company premises, embody the "being" of the organization. Thus, organization is understood and identified through all these different entities that act and speak on behalf of it (Cooren 2006, 83). Communication (and all other forms of actions) are therefore shared between different forms of agencies (Martine, Cooren & Zackland 2015, 6).

Considering the previous reflections, this definition of agency helps understanding its organizing property. What makes organized forms so peculiar is the process how agencies are created to form an organization (Cooren 2006, 84). That is why framing these organizing processes is particularly important to understand what is happening in collective entities (Brummans 2015, 460). Positioning the analysis needs to take into account what different entities are doing in a given situation and what difference they are making (Cooren 2006, 82). More specifically, following the Montreal school approach to CCO, how the agents are acting through talk and text and mobilizing the process of organizing.

Brummans (2006, 207) points out that conceptualizing, attributing, and appropriating agency requires a social valuation process. Regarding this, there is a fundamental question of ethics for the author when studying and analyzing agency. It is a constant process of trying to valuate and formulate all different forms of agency of a given situation and illustrate them for the reader which requires perpetual reflection of author's own role. Moreover, understanding world as plenum of agencies (Cooren 2006) means that the analysis needs to recognize and give attribute to all the entities that give reason for making a difference – in one way or another. Therefore, studying collective activities – say, design process – through communicational lens allows interpreting the complex nature of any act of communicative expressed in interaction (Cooren, Matte, Benoit-Barn & Brummans 2013, 263).

From a communicational point of view, this thesis focuses on design practice. More than answering what the practice of design is and does, this thesis aims to examine the constitutive role of communication in a design process. Taking on the Montreal School approach, this thesis broadens this questioning from idea of mere conveyer of information to constitutive sites of conversations and texts by arguing that various different objects and artifacts also communicate themselves and are therefore also constitutive elements.

3   DESIGNERLY WAYS OF THINKING

This chapter introduces the broader concept of design in this thesis' context. Moreover, the way design thinking, service design and design as practice are understood in different domains is discussed, as they are vital for positioning this study.

3.1   Design thinking

Though the public discussion on design thinking peaked in the late 2000s, design thinking has been a part of academic discussion for almost four decades now (Johansson & Woodilla 2011, 68). Design researchers acknowledge two different discourses in design: one in the design community and one in the business community, the latter being seen as the cause of the hype phenomenon especially in business literature (Johansson & Woodilla 2011, 69).

The changes in the discourse can be seen in the academic literature. Research spanning from the 60s to early 2000s focused more on designers' thinking process and how they practice design (Boland & Collopy, 2004; Dunne & Martin, 2006). After being introduced to the business and management realm by design firm IDEO (Kelley 2001) the focus shifted to design skills and tools and how they could be applied in organizations by non-designers. Hassi and Laakso (2011, 52) note that the business literature treats design thinking differently compared to the design discourse, and often offers it as an answer to all problems in business.

There is no consensus among the design researchers and academics whether design thinking is an applicable concept for others outside the design realm and whether it has been treated properly. On the other hand, design practitioners have been publishing success stories describing design thinking as a powerful and effective approach to gain competitive advantage (e.g. Brown 2009), where-

as some doubt the validity and uniqueness of the concept or question the way it is touted as a one-size-fits-all solution (Normann 2010; 99U 2018).

Moreover, there is no consensus on what design thinking means. As Heskett (2002, 5) points out, the problem of the word "design" itself, having multiple levels of meaning, adds confusion and complicates the discussion of the issue. The same issue can be seen with the term design thinking – it is not clear enough to tell what it is precisely. Also, both terms (design and thinking) can be used as a verb or as a noun which makes interpretation difficult at the lack of acknowledged way of using them.

The way different discourses determine how design is discussed and thought of adds to the complexity. The business discourse regards design thinking more as a methodology for creating ideas and innovations. Kimbell (2009, 5-6) summarizes design thinking literature from business discourses point of view as an analytical problem-solving activity that can be applied to nearly anything. On the contrary, Dorst (2006, 135) sees that framing design thinking as problem-solving activity relies on rationalistic understanding of a problem and how that problem should be solved when in fact it should be regarded as a subjective understanding of a given situation. However, definitions of design thinking often revolve around the "descriptions of the ways designers do things" as Kimbell (2012, 130) writes.

Within the scholarly literature Simon's (1969, 111) definition of design as "the transformation of existing conditions into preferred ones" is widely accepted. This positions design as a process or a practice to understand a given situation and define course of actions. In the context of this study, design practice serves a purpose in the business context, in which design thinking begins with the people, centering on business transformation, aiding to solve the "wicked" business problems around the people it serves (Cooper, Junginger & Lockwood 2009, 49).

This outside-in perspective of design thinking in business discourse can be related to Simon's definition, meaning that design methods and processes can be applied to business context by anyone. Respectively, Brown (2009, 4) highlights how adapting a designerly mindset opens new possibilities in the business realm, as he describes design thinking in the following way:

> "Design thinking takes the next step, which is to put these tools into the hands of people who may have never thought of themselves as designers and apply them to a vastly greater range of problems.
> Design thinking taps into capacities we all have but that are overlooked by more conventional problem-solving practices. It is not only human-centered; it is deeply human in and of itself. Design thinking relies on our ability to be intuitive, to recognize patterns, to construct ideas that have emotional meaning as well as functionality, to express ourselves in media other than words or symbols."

Here, Brown indeed broadens the definition of a designer. The fundamental idea that one does not need to be educated designer to practice design thinking widened the perspective for the business world. Ever since the topic has boomed in contemporary articles and management books (e.g. Liedtka 2018,

Nussbaum 2004 & Gladwell 2001), masters' programs are offered in universities (Ornamo, n.d.), workshops are organized to fit various professions (Design Forum Finland, n.d.), cities make multi-million investments in design (Kukkonen 2018) and lately it has created buzz in broader context, inter alia, within communication practice (Piskonen 2018).

Literature identifies multiple reasons why design thinking was eagerly adapted in business context. Johansson and Woodilla (2009, 66) point out that mixed with management practice (i.e. business practice) design enables growth-intended strategic work, organizational change and innovation. Perhaps the biggest management objective at the moment is creating strong customer experience; the focus is now in creating value to the stakeholders by understanding their behavior (Lemon & Verhoef 2016, 69). Moreover, the problems faced in society today are becoming more complex and arduous. Dorst (2004, 72) describes these problems as ill-structured, which can be treated with creative solutions. A "designer mindset" is thought to tackle these problems by coping with uncertainty, developing new ideas quickly and defining problem when there is no certain solution (Cross 1982, 224; Dunne & Martin 2006, 513-514). In a sense, design thinking tries to close gap between design and business realms.

Dunne and Martin go on to say that it is vital for business students to learn design skills to cope with real-world problems. Collaborative skills are perceived as increasingly important. (Dunne & Martin 2006, 514.) Now, the prevailing way of how organizations work is to put diverse groups of people with different professional backgrounds together to solve these real-life problems. Besides collaborating with multi-disciplinary teams, the current trend is to co-create with other important stakeholder groups, most often with customers (Gustafsson, Kristensson & Witell 2012, 311).

3.2   Service design

The design practice has changed over the years but the adaptation to the business context is a fairly new phenomena, mostly due to the peculiarly high interest of business schools (Kimbell 2011, 287). The transformation of the design industry shifted from giving forms to objects to creating strategies, getting recognition for being a competitive asset (Valtonen 2007, 97-98). In consequence, practices such as service design were eagerly adopted in business context (Valtonen 2007, 83-84; Wetter-Edman 2011, 58-59).

The shift in business realm has changed services to be considered as a perspective on business instead of a category of types of goods (Edvardsson, Gustafsson & Roos 2005, 118). This view indicates the change how value is seen in scholarly literature. Vargo and Lusch (2008, 3) for example, underline that value is created together by providers and customers through interaction.

More than that, the definition of service is constantly changing because consumers negotiate the value in everchanging means. The purpose of service may therefore vary from value perceived in use to a lasting relationship.

(Edvardsson, Gustafsson & Roos 2005, 118). Along these lines, the meaning of service needs is determined in every situation customer and organization interact, building the holistic experience. In fact, creating strong customer experience has become the leading management objective across fields (Lemon & Verhoef 2016, 69). Excelling in customer experience and understanding the customer's journey has become vital for organizations, which is the main argument for the popularity of service design also in business realm (Rockwell 2010, 221).

The change in perception of value has evolved the academic and practical attention towards service design. Rather than seeing it as tactical or functional activity, it is now associated with strategic and holistic approaches to business (Polaine, Løvlie & Reason 2013, 18). Because there is little empirical proof of how service design positions in business processes, it has yet to prevail in research larger research community (Yu 2017, 26). However, bridging the realms of service design and service dominant logic, Wetter-Edman et al. (2014) studied how agents integrate their resources in value co-creation.

Moreover, service-dominant logic argues that all businesses offer services (Vargo and Lusch 2004, 2). Therefore it can be argued that when using design thinking methods to solve business challenges, service design is practiced, intentionally or unintentionally.

Involving customers, other organization members and end-users in the design process is central in service design. It follows the principles of codesign (Sanders & Stappers 2008, 6) and participatory design (Holmlid 2009, 111), demonstrating the collaborative nature of the practice. This helps those practicing design to better understand the value and the nature of the various interconnected relationships between organizations, people and things.

Service design relates closely to design thinking. It is a strategic, yet practical and a creative application of design tools, to understand, map and communicate the customer experience. Simply put, service design is planning and allocating organization's time and resources into how a service is designed.

Methods used in service design include are human-centric: figuring out touch points, storytelling and prototyping to develop or improve services (Holmlid & Evenson 2008, 342–344). All interactions between a brand and the end-user are, in this view, regarded as services. More than anything, Schneider and Stickdorn (2010, 14; 29) emphasize that service design is an interdisciplinary approach, a process, combining tools and methodology from various disciplines, not an outcome. Similarly to design thinking, service design aims to solve "wicked" problems and cope with complex issues. It helps to understand the underlying problems instead of jumping straight into solutions.

Wetter-Edelman (2011, 64-69) characterizes service design to be interdisciplinary and participatory process in which practices of visualizing and prototyping are used in understanding value creation and driving transformation. Similarly, Yu and Sangriogi (2018, 52) outline that ethnographic and empathic design practiced in service design helps understanding the customer's holistic experience, and codesigning broadens the customer involvement beyond traditional means of feedback.

On the other hand, Akama (2009, 10) considers that service design loses its power and agency to intervene complex human realities when it is removed

from the grasp of educated design practitioners. Broadening the possibilities to practice these methods outside the disciplinary boundaries, in this view, depreciates the role of the designers.

To avert any confusion or misunderstanding, the difference between design thinking and service design should be addressed. Design thinking is a design discipline, a process to follow when solving problems – a way to describe how designers think and work (Dunne & Martin 2005, 512; Kimbell 2009, 6). Service design, on the other hand, uses design thinking methodology in planning and organizing people, communication and other artifacts of service, and the strategy of it, to provide value for the customers (Holmlid & Evenson 2008, 341–342; Moritz 2005, 39).

Although the terminology may seem complex, studying these matters is not unthinkable. Confusion can be harnessed into a prosperous and adaptable resource as long as there is a framework that can comprehend the complexity of the studied matter, as Heskett (2002, 11) puts it.

3.3   Design-as-practice

Analyzing organizational events from practice-based point of view has become widespread in scholarly literature as it offers way to understand organizational and societal practices in action. Practice theories emphasize the relationship between the social world and a specific instance of situated actions, arguing that any action one can takes is consequential. (Feldman & Orlikowski 2011, 1240-1241).

Vaara and Whittington (2012, 3) define practices as "accepted ways of doing things, embodied and materially mediated, that are shared between actors and routinized over time". This view provides a tangible way for conceptualizing more complex phenomena and moves the body of analysis away from highflying terminology and methods.

Moreover, Corradi, Gherardi and Verzelloni (2010, 267) recommends to employ practice perspective for allowing the research to shift the focus from individual perspective to social and collective view that can be rooted in patterns of interconnected activities (Nicolini 2011, 602). Positioning the research with practice perspective enables socially situated analysis of an organization and how it is constituted through practices of different actors (Arnaud, Fauré, Mengis & Cooren 2018, 693-694).

The perspective of practice can be therefore argued to provide prosperous way to study design in its all complexity. One way to look at this is Kimbell's theory of design-as-practice.

Before, the design practice has been described through approaches, processes and tools (Wetter-Edelman 2011, 28). Kimbell (2011 & 2012) offers another way of conceiving design activity grounding the idea behind it to the fact that increasing number of professionals are mobilizing design in their work. Applying

practice theories, she introduces the concept of design-as-practice. Kimbell argues that other accounts of design thinking hinge on merely describing what is done rather than acknowledging "*how knowing, doing and saying constitutes and are constituted in relation to other elements of a practice*" (Kimbell 2014; 130,134).

Designing is often defined as coping with ill-defined or ill-structured problems (Simon, 1969; Goel, 1995). The solutions to multifaceted questions are not simply lying among a pile of data to be found. This means defining, re-defining and changing the problem in the light of a solution for those practicing design. In practice, it is making transactions between different domains and transforming human and organizational needs into different artifacts. (Cross 1982, 224). Examples of this can be a strategy paper derived from workshop or a new website planned together with various stakeholder members.

As this thesis has broader conception of communication, similarly, design practice is seen in a broader context; essentially as making sense of things, starting from the context and situation of the stakeholders (Krippendorff 2006, xiii). Thus, in a design practice any human activity can transform a given situation. Reflecting the earlier discussion in this chapter, the practice of design situates as a mix of meaning-creation and problem-solving activity.

Aptly, design-as-practice conceives design to be in action when a number of people, and their knowing, doing, and saying, are implicated. What is known, said and done in design process constitutes of what is possible for the designers in hand to know, do and say. Design practices are therefore recognized to be habitual, routinized, conscious and unconscious. (Kimbell 2012, 135).

This shifts the focus and the research agenda away from the comparing individual and organizational competence to an arena of discursive practices which are enacted during designing. (Kimbell 2009, 10; 2012, 135.) Moreover, it recognizes that stakeholders, other professional designers, such as managers, employees, customers and end-users, can take part in a design process (Kimbell 2012, 134-135).

This way design-as-practice can be used as an analytical tool to produce great resources for understanding design process and how to relate them to organizational outcomes offers (Kimbell 2009, 10). Perspective of practice has been used previously to study for example technology (Orlikowski 2000), strategizing (Whittington 2006) and service innovation (Dougherty 2014). Kimbell's reasoning seems rational, and positioning design into the fuzzy realities of project-oozed, sticky-note-filled, organizations offers a good way to study how people engage in this process. Kimbell goes on (2009, 11) saying that incorporating practice theories into design enables analysis of "*iterative combination of minds, things, bodies, structures, processes and agencies, and the configuring and reconfiguring of and between them*". In that sense, focusing on communication process and its outcomes adds contribution to the design-as-practice literature.

4   DESIGN THROUGH A COMMUNICATIONAL LENS

Key concepts of a CCO approach to design

Key concept	Definition	Main ideas
Communication	The establishment of a link, connection or relationship through something (Cooren 2000, Taylor & Van Every, 2005)	- Communication is more than a carrier of information - Myriad of things (feelings, concerns, principles, texts, artifacts etc.) literally and figuratively participate in communication events - Things make a difference in given action or conversation to the extent that they appear to also express themselves in what is happening
Design-as-practice	What is known, said and done in design process constitutes of what is possible for the designers in hand to know, do and say (Kimbell, 2009)	- Design is habitual practice in which artifacts are created through minds and bodies of people doing design - Design happens in discursive arenas where design activities can be related to organizational outcomes
Matter of concern	Matters that drive participants to defend or evaluate a position, account for or disalign with an action, or justify or oppose an objective (Latour, 2004)	- Issues and things that matter to or interest people - These matters are the objects of a specific attachment on the part of those who voice or invoke them

Table 1: Key concepts and their definitions

Practice-based approaches in management and organizational studies have been following similar trajectories in recent history (Cooren et al. 2015, 2). Subsequently, this thesis aims to combine the two bodies of literature: communicative constitution of organization and design-as-practice following previous

works of Cooren et al. (2015) and Vásquez et al. (2018) on studying communication in strategy-making.

This study situates itself into an emerging organization and its service design workshops. Workshops are decisive sites where organization creates it core activities collectively (Nissi & Pälli 2020, 124). In such practice, the participants interpret and propose solutions for organizational issues through interaction. Cooren et al. (2015; 6, 9) see organizations to consist of processes of interaction: they function through all forms of agency that embody it and communicate it into being.

The above definition underlines that organizations are social structures, collectivities of people, who design their activities to pursue certain purposes and obtain common goals and objectives as McAuley et al. (2007, 13) also note. This definition highlights the importance of interaction within the organization and hints about the indispensable component in all of this: communication.

This thesis goes beyond the aforementioned definition by understanding the role of communication in the way organizations are produced and maintained by adopting the communicative constitution of organizations approach. In other words, this thesis regards that communication is the key process for the emergence and transformation of organizations not only as sender-receiver relationship. Seeing communication as a process of co-construction, Shannon and Weaver's (1949) classic model is regarded plainly too restricted in this thesis.

Some scholars similarly argue that the traditional view of organizations possess a narrow conception of communication, seeing it mainly *a carrier of information* rather than having constitutive force (Kuhn 2008, 1227). Axley (1984, 433), for example, argues communication merely to revolve around understanding symbols and transferring the message. Instead, deeper understanding of communication makes ground for alternative theories (Kuhn 2008, 1228). Therefore we need to understand and assess the complex, dynamic and interactive nature of communication to engage it in how organizations are created and designed.

Previously, in academic literature, communication in design has been seen conveying information and representing design problems (Chiu 2002), or providing access to problem-solving (Stempfle & Badke-Schaub 2002). More recently, design thinking has been applied in various communicative studies (e.g. Aakhus & Harrisson 2015, Meng-Fen 2019), examining its advantages in communication strategy planning. These views, however, position communication as a resource of design.

Literature on design-as-practice proposes to understand design in broader context than design thinking, constituting the practice in what is said and done (Kimbell 2012, 135). In this thesis, practices are defined as "accepted ways of doing things, embodied and materially mediated, that are shared between actors and routinized over time" (Vaara & Whittington 2012, 3). Design is here seen as generic term describing the activities and methods used in researching, comparing and developing new solutions for organizations.

Engaging with the idea that design is constituted in daily activities of organizational actors, a communicative approach is taken. This thesis agrees with

scholars such as Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen and Clark that communication is central in the process by which organizations are composed, established, designed and sustained (2011, 1150). Moreover, this thesis argues that communication constitutes design process.

A lot of talk and text, some of the key analytical elements of this thesis, can be identified in design literature. There are sticky-notes, presentation, memos, drawings, presentations, customer journey maps etc. (see e.g. Stickdorn & Schneider 2015). As mentioned before, communication is seen in design literature as a source and the literature tends to give a lot of subject-centered emphasize to the design practitioners.

So, if we consider communication to be the force forming an organization it then means that the way communication happens in the design process can shape organizations differently. The argument that design thinking is a communicative achievement has not yet been developed in the scholarly literature but it certainly is worthwhile studying. This possesses a question: how this perspective can be applied to study design and how does the chosen approach contribute to the way the design and communication professionals regard these practices? If design is a communicative practice, a detailed study can identify what matters or makes difference to the participants of the design process and make them act the way they do.

Building on this approach, a framework needs to be developed in order to understand how design process is happening through communication.

4.1   Studying communicative events in design

Following the premises of CCO theories, and the approach of Montreal School more specifically, this thesis attempts to understand how design practice is transmitted in communication. To explore how communication constitutes design, this thesis positions its approach with regard to design management literature, more specifically to the works of Kimbell (2011, 2012) on design-as-practice.

It has become evident that a great deal of doing design involves a lot of talk and text. Therefore this thesis is studying these events through communicational lens, linking the two bodies of literature, design-as-practice and communicative constitution of organizations.

Taking a communicative perspective, this thesis aims at unfolding the recurrent and persistent activities that stimulate people to act the way they do during a design process. Communication in thesis is defined as the creation of a link between two entities (Cooren 2000; 66). This broad definition enables understanding and identifying multiple different sources of how communication is established. The link can be therefore something concrete, such as an artifact or something abstract such as the emotions or values (Cooren et al. 2015, 9).

Cooren (2006, 97) also notes that communication is always a selection of agency. This means that anyone or anything has to communicate itself into action and being by reasoning the world around itself. These agents, whether they are texts, feelings or artifacts, participate in communicative events figuratively and literally (Vásquez et al. 2018, 419). Therefore, to study communicative events in design, the focus needs to be on how these various agents contribute to the design process. Communicative event means any sequence of instances of communication (Vasquez, Schoeneborn & Sergi 2015, 634), that is, text and talk.

As suggested by Cooren et al. (2015, 4) and Vásquez et al. (2018, 418), the focus of this thesis is on delving into the communication events by focusing on the *matters of concern*. Latour (2004, 231; 2008, 39) defines matters of concern as anything that animates the actors and make them to say and do what they want to. They are things that matter or interest, and so, also, an object of attachment, which can be identified when people communicate with each other (Latour 2004, 242; Latour 2008b, 39). Focusing on the matters (of concern, facts, interests) that compose the world around us makes studying them from a communication perspective worthwhile as academics (e.g. Cooren 2010, 318) have previously stated communication to be the only way through which all things are expressed.

Whereas matter of facts are indisputable and obstinate, matters of concern give social scenography for them, making them subjective, symbolic and lived (Latour 2008a, 6; 2008b, 39). Latour (2008a, 2) has challenged the design discipline to allow the contradictory nature of matters of concern to be more included in the practice of design rather than focusing on material and objective nature of matters of concern. Thus, following Cooren et al. (2015, 11), *matters of concern* are seen in this thesis as anything that "drive participants to defend or evaluate a position, account for or dis-align from an action, or justify or oppose an objective".

To illustrate this, let's imagine a scene where a group of people are gathered together, developing a new concept for a client using design methods. One of them state: "I think it is vital for us to gain in-depth user insight in order to perceive a detailed customer journey". Now, looking at this imagined string of text from CCO's point of view would mean recognizing the matters of concern in the voiced opinion. A concern is raised (perceiving a detailed customer journey), which has, according to the person voicing this concern, an impact on the success of developing the new concept. Also, this matter of concern is presented imposing an action (gaining in-depth user insight), which implies it being a matter. So, this person presents this matter of concern as imposing an action that should be taken to succeed in developing the new concepts for their client.

Although matters of concern are voiced individually, they are negotiated collectively (Vásquez et al. 2018, 423). To thoroughly describe the matters of concern and how they are collectively designed in practice, the design process needs to be observed to find out what is repeatedly leading the participants to do what they do. More specifically, what are the participants invoking, convoking and evoking in talk and writing to explain and legitimize their actions. (Cooren et al. 2015, 11).

Regarding this thesis, studying design from communicational approach means that anything positioned to repeatedly lead the participants of the design process to explain, legitimize or account for their position and actions, is observed and analyzed (Cooren et al. 2015, 10). Furthermore, all different accounts that make difference in given situation are described in talk, text and action (Cooren et al. 2015, 11). Table 2 illustrates the most important aspects of the CCO perspective in design process and introduces the framework for analysis.

Key aspects of a CCO perspective in a design process

Key questions	Definitions	
What to identify in conversations?	Matters of concern, things that repeatedly can be seen to animate the participants.	
How to identify matters of concern?	Anything that is positioned in the conversation as repeatedly leading participants to do what they do.	
	Anything that the participants invoke, convoke, evoke in their conversations to explain, justify, legitimize for their positions or actions.	
	The matters that appear to define what should be done.	
How to name a matter of concern	Everything in the name of which a given design related move appears to be proposed.	
	All the elements that are supposed to count, matter or make a difference in a given situation.	
What do these matters of concern do?	Matters of concern participate in and go through the co-formulation of design process.	
	They weight or value to define or dictate what should or should not be done in the design process.	
Examples of matters of concern	Principles Arguments Values Facts	Objectives Hearsays Illustrations Texts

Table 2: Key questions & definitions (Adapted from Cooren et al. 2015).

As the matters of concern supposedly animate the actors in the design process, designing can be seen as evaluating, pondering or weighing (and so on) how

these matters impose the decisions in the formulation of the design. More importantly, matters of concern express themselves through people communicating them (Vásquez et al. 2018, 419). So, while observing a design process, it is not only recorded what the participants say but also what matters to each participant and how these matters are voiced.

In regard to the communicative approach, design is a world of plenum agencies. In design, therefore, different matters of concern make difference since they constitute the agents to communicate and express themselves according to their believes and values. Taylor and Van Every (2000, 14) and Cooren (2006, 82) emphasize that taking the communicative approach the analysis cannot never leave the terra firma of interaction for unfolding the web of different agencies.

In such manner, this study proposes to focus on communicative events of design, which are the moments where the matters of concern are discussed and decided on collectively. The conceptual framework allows to define those matters of concern and the methodological tools, discussed next, help exploring how they are consequential for the design process.

5   METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the chosen research approach and methods of the study. The approach, action research, and the methods, observation and interviews, are clarified and justified in relation to this study. Lastly, the process of data collection is explained and the data analysis methods introduced.

5.1   Research approach and methods

How can the design process and the communicative efforts – namely matters of concern – be observed and recorded? Schoeneborn and Vásquez (2017, 13) note that majority of CCO studies are done using qualitative methods and ethnographic approaches. This thesis is no exception. The premise of this thesis is that design is a communicative practice. Therefore the data for this study was collected by observing design workshops.

The research approach taken in this thesis was ethnographic case study, in which the author observed a service design process through several iterations in the target organization. Sprain and Boromisza-Habashi (2013, 182) consider ethnography to be practical in communicative studies as it involves the researcher in the way participants accomplish communication and it enables a way to address communication problems in other applied research practices.

Qualitative research relies on human perception and understanding (Stake 2010, 11). It tries to understand and present an image of the phenomenon in hand rather than pursuing for generalization. Keeping that in mind, this thesis attempts to represent and position the studied matter in a larger context, not just describe the circumstances. Moreover, there are no pre-assumptions of the researched phenomenon in this thesis as qualitative research is not built on hypotheses. Instead, qualitative research enables researcher to find new points of view, not just to verify presumptions. (Eskola & Suoranta 2014, 19-20).

Eskola and Suoranta (2014, 84) highlight the importance of theory in qualitative research. Not only does it help building interpretations of the collected data, it also helps situating the study in regards of previous research. The theoretical and contextual background of this thesis is built around previous research of two strings of literature that had never been studied together.

Within qualitative research, when the research questions relate to providing in-depth descriptions and interpretations of actions in a given context, as in this study, ethnographic research strategy is thought to be an appropriate application for research (Eriksson and Kovalainen 2011, 138). In business context, ethnographic approaches can be argued to deal with studied issues shorter periods of time than classic ethnographies, often in form of participant observation. However, ethnographic approaches in business context can be informed by the classic theories of ethnography. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2011, 140). Seale, Gobo, Gubrium & Silverman (2008, 206) regard ethnography and participant observation to be used interchangeably in the literature.

As this thesis aims at gaining overall understanding of the phenomena in hand, ethnographic approach suits the study well (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2011, 138). Neither ethnographic research nor this particular study is a linear process (Seael et al. 2008, 211). Instead, a research, such as this, happens in series of iterative loops, in which each step are reflected and reviewed, as Seale et al. (2018, 211) suggest.

Qualitative methods are suggested to use when the studied phenomenon is little known (Ghauri and Grønhaug 2002, 87-88). In qualitative research, the most common methods to collect data are observation, interviewing and examining artifacts (Stake 2010, 20).

In fact, Seale et al. (2008, 206) regard participant observation as an excellent data collection method when emerging to a community, and it enables the researcher to describe accurately the nature of the studied situation. Moreover, regarding this study, qualitative methods provide flexibility to the study and in-depth insight to the research problem. For this study qualitative research methods were the most appropriate choice as the and aim was to study never-before-studied subject and gain in-depth understanding of the phenomena.

In this thesis, observations were used to collect primary data. First, there were several workshops organized in which data was gathered using participative observation and video-recording the events. CCO approaches generally favor observation methodology as it allows to understand a person's sense making process of the communication events and enable to capture even the most mundane activities in this process (Schoeneborn & Vasquez 2017, 13).

Monitoring and video recording meetings can provide a detailed records of systematical discussions on the issue, as Cooren et al. (2015, 12) discuss. This way, it can be easily observed how agents talk about design process and reveal the moments when design is practiced unannouncedly. Understanding the possible concerns associated to video-recording (Pink 2007, 104), Cooren et al. (2015, 12) argue that video provides exceptional access to review the interaction

thoroughly as well as the material conditions of the situation. When observed a given situation all these things are heard through what the actors have to say but it can also be felt as the participants need to demonstrate for others that their matter matters for everyone and more importantly for the organization (Vasquez et al. 2018, 419).

Observation is thought to be an essential research method across fields (Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara 2009, 213). As already declared above, participant observation was chosen for this study because it enables in-depth understanding of the real-world activities from the inside (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009, 213; Myers 2013, 137). The method suited this thesis because the studied subject was very practically oriented and all activities happened in the studied organization. Participant observation involves three phases: planning, collecting and analyzing (Myers 2013, 146). In this thesis, observation was carried out following the three steps explained below.

First (1), it was planned what kind of data is wanted, how it should be collected and what kind of resources for recording the data are needed to obtain. Then (2), during workshops, the data was gathered and observation notes made. Finally (3), all the collected material was summarized and video-recordings transcribed to text.

Observation has been criticized for potentially changing the run of events in the studied environment and for that the researcher might become emotionally attached to the studied subject, which could impair the objectivity of the study (Hirsjärvi et al. 2009, 213). Moreover, the researcher need to realize their own role in the study (Eskola & Suoranta 2014, 20). To ensure validity and a level of objectivity in this study, the author entered the field familiarizing themselves and his purposes to the members of the client company before and during the first workshop. However, the author of this thesis was aware of their own potential prejudices and made actions to distance himself of this situation to ensure the validity of the research.

Regarding the ethics of the study, the author familiarized themselves with different code of ethics before observing the workshops. Following the principles for ethical observation, the author explained how the data will be collected, collected and presented in the thesis. In addition, the collected data was safeguarded by wiping the memory cards of all video material of the workshops after it had been transferred to author's own external hard-drive and after completing the analysis of the data, the material was erased for ensuing privacy and confidentiality. The author received consent from the participants of the workshops.

According to Eskola and Suoranta (2014, 17) it can be hard for the researcher to avoid mixing one's own thoughts and views with the research subject. It is common that researcher's observations are charged by one's previous experiences (Eskola & Suoranta 2014, 20). The researcher should therefore attempt to recognize these thoughts and presumptions and take them critically into consideration throughout the study. Moreover, the phenomenologist-hermeneutical tradition underlines that all previous thoughts, ideas and values shape one's interpretation things and therefore always include some prejudice (Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2018, 40). The author of this study took all of his prejudices

into account throughout the research. A very important part of this research process was that the author actively recognized and understood his prejudices and acted accordingly to ensure a reliable study.

5.2 Implementation of the study

The data for this thesis was collected in cooperation with the studied organization. The study was carried out by following service design workshops in a newfound organization. The business problem the organization aimed to tackle was finding competent IT professionals easily and reliably. The main idea of their business was to develop a cloud-based service, where organizations in need for IT services could acquire them from professionals who had accredited on the website.

Ahead of the workshops, the organization had identified the two most important customer groups that they wanted to focus on. The purpose of service design workshops was to define the customer personas in detail, map out the customer journeys and to figure out the main touchpoints along the journey. The people participating in the workshops hold different positions in the organization: managing director, business developer, marketing coordinator and communications officer. An IT professional and two people that represented the organization's target groups participated also on the last workshop.

Service design workshops were used as a medium for planning the organization's value creation as it enabled cooperative, hands-on techniques for envisioning different alternative solutions. This kind of empathetic method allows to understand experience holistically, develop clear value propositions, explore outcomes and facilitate end-user's value-creation (Yu & Sangriogi 2018, 52).

The workshops were organized and arranged together with the author. As mentioned before, the author participated in all three workshops, observing the participants, the service design process and the situation all together. Besides taking notes, all workshops were video-recorded for later observation purposes. This way the author was able to take notes while observing the workshops and later go back and fill the observation notes if some crucial information was missing. In addition, this left certain serendipity to the analysis process. The author also photographed the end-products of all workshops and took all written material (post-its etc.) produced in the workshops for analysis purposes.

The run of events in the workshops is discussed more thoroughly below.

Workshops

In total, primary data was collected in three workshops. The workshops involved people from various positions to ensure a wide collaborative perspective. Due to time constraints the workshops were divided into parts and across several weeks.

The goal of the first workshop was to identify the persona of the first customer group and begin mapping out the customer journey. There was no previous customer journey map done, however the members of the organization who participated in the workshop had exercised other means to gain understanding of the insights of the industry and the client base.

The workshop began with an overview of the goals of the workshop. Then, the persona profile was developed. Each participant was to write down their thoughts and ideas on post-it-notes about the motives, needs, aims and pain points of the customer. After that, all notes were collected and discussed together. Next, the customer's journey was mapped based on the more detailed customer profile. The journey was divided into several different phases (pre-service, joining the service, using the service, post-service) based on the service model of the organization, and from this the different touchpoints were discovered. Each stage was discussed separately and again, each participant wrote down ideas, examples and thoughts. This time the aim was to address the actions of the customer in each stage; e.g. what does he/she do, which ecosystems he/she is part of, what sources of media he/she uses. This practice was repeated on each stage. At the end of the workshop there was a full customer journey map for the first customer persona. After the workshop, the author returned to the observation notes and the recorded workshop and concluded the results of the first workshop. This information was handed over to the observed organization for reviewing purposes and as a planning tool for the next workshops.

In the second workshop the group was aiming to identify the persona of the second customer group and begun mapping out its customer journey. Similarly to the first workshop, the second workshop began with an overview of the goals of the workshop after which the persona profile was defined. Again, each participant wrote down thoughts and ideas about the motives, needs, aims and pain points of the customer and the result was discussed together. Next, the customer's journey was mapped based on the more detailed customer profile using the same phases and stages used with the first customer persona. At the end of the second workshop there was a full customer journey map for the second customer persona. After the workshop, the author returned to the observation notes and the recorded workshop and, again, concluded the results of the second workshop.

The goal of the third workshop was to return to the first customer journey and identify the most crucial touchpoints of the journey and the emotion the customer was expected to feel in each touchpoint along the journey. These exercises aimed at making the intangible experiences distinguishable for the collective discussion. The participants marked, collectively discussing, the high and low moments of engagement on the customer journey dramatizing the experience arc. Then, they went over their findings together. Similarly, after the third workshop, the author concluded observation notes and the videorecording material.

5.3 Research data

The research data was gathered in three different design workshops. Five people from the target organization and three people outside the company, labeled as "representation of potential customers", participated in the workshops. The workshops lasted in total for 9 hours and there was little less than 9 hours of video recording material from the workshops. The reason the videos totaled less time was because video recording was started when the actual "workshopping" began, leaving out personal chitchat and table talk. However, the author observed the workshops from start to finish, being the first one in and the last one out, making notes the entire time.

The video recordings were transcribed later to text, making a total of 101 A4 papers. In transcription, each participant were given a code (PAR1, PAR2 and so on) for certain degree of anonymity. Though the target organization of this thesis is no secret, it was considered to be fair for the participants that there would be a disclosure of identity, especially as this thesis presents excerpts from the workshops. When highlighting certain events from the workshops later in this thesis, the excerpts use pseudonyms for the participants for better readability when highlighting certain individual characteristics.

Furthermore, the author had access to the research materials and after analyzing all the gathered data, they were destroyed.

5.4 Data analysis

The chosen analysis method in this thesis is a theory-guided content analysis and the analysis was driven by abductive reasoning. Content analysis is an excellent way to analyze large documents systematically and objectively, resulting a compact and generalized description of the studied phenomenon (Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2018, 117). Similar methods are also used in CCO-based research, while not as often as a combination of interaction and discourse analysis (Schoeneborn & Vasquez 2017, 13). This way the analysis could focus on observing the constitutive process of communicative events.

Staying within the framework of this thesis, the purpose of the analysis was to identify the matters of concern in what was said and written in the design process. Latour (2005, 27) states that any starting point for research is as good as any other. The analysis began by identifying the key moments in studied organization's design process. For this purpose, each transcribed version of the workshops were read and re-read several times and the video-recordings observed. First, the workshops were analyzed one-by-one and later all together. The next phase was to systematically identify the matters of concern that could be heard and felt in everything that was said and done during the design process (see Table 1). To achieve this, the agents or artifacts were singled out from the data when they expressed themselves through anything that was discussed

or written in the design process. This method revealed the matters of concern that recurrently manifested the design process first by looking at individual conversations in individual workshops and then observing all of the workshops collectively. Qualitative research often follows this kind of process, moving from single observations towards more general claims (Eskola & Suoranta 2014, 83).

As Cooren et al. suggest (2015, 14), all the identified moments where matters of concern were communicatively constructed were analyzed by examining (1) which matters raised concerns for the participants, (2) how those matters were justified important, (3) which agencies were invoked, evoked, or convoked in support of those matters of concern, and (4) how those matters of concern were regarded for the organization. Forming a table from these findings, the author formed a taxonomy of these matters and how they were communicatively constituted. To illustrate the findings, the next chapter will introduce excerpts from the workshops which demonstrate the way a service design workshop is communicatively constituted through matters of concern.

Lastly, the findings were reflected to the academic literature on design and communication.

The language used in the workshops was Finnish, hence the collected data was also in Finnish. The excerpts presented in the next chapter were translated from Finnish to English. The author obeyed strict transcription practices and put time and effort to the translation for ensuring that the translations did not miss any details of the original conversations.

The data itself never discloses anything. Instead, it is the researcher's task to find and structure the key issues from the data while keeping the research problem in mind. Thus, the role of the researcher in interpretation the data is crucial; they need to select what seems to be relevant from the textual data, distinguish the parts used as excerpts and contextualize them (Krippendorff 2004, 87).

In this thesis, the findings were reflected with theory and existing scholarly literature during the analysis process. Eskola (2010, 182) states that the data analysis is not strictly based on theory or data in theory-guided research. Therefore, while the findings were reflected with theory, theory not determine the course of the analysis or the findings of the research.

This thesis is driven by abductive reasoning. Both CCO approaches and design thinking literature also use abductive reasoning to suspend rich descriptions of facts (Dorst 2004, 133; Vasquez et al. 2017, 422). The chosen analysis method, theory-guided content analysis, follows abductive reasoning, too (Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2018, 110). The conducted research combines both data and theory, thus it can be argued that chosen method suits best this thesis, and inductive and deductive reasonings could therefore be disregarded.

Regarding this thesis, the theoretical background aided the analysis process but the analysis was not directly grounded on it. Neither did theory determine the data collection, analysis process or the findings of this thesis. As said, the findings were, however, began to reflect with theory during the early phases of analysis, attempting to develop new interpretations. It is also worth mentioning that the author was very familiar with different kinds of design meth-

ods and tools, and the normal run of events in a design workshop as he had previously participated in such events and used such methods in his professional work.

Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2018, 109) accordingly note that the importance of prior knowledge in theory-guided analysis is not to test theories but rather it opens up new ways of thinking. Indeed, the previous knowledge the author had benefited the analysis process. This also justifies the chosen analysis method and abductive reasoning in this thesis.

Not having hypotheses enabled the analysis to be driven by its own force. By analyzing all the data, keeping the proposed framework in mind, the author ended up with a certain characterization of matters of concern, which are discussed in the next chapter.

6 RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter findings of this study are discussed. The main aspects of this thesis, communication and design, are then linked together based on the findings. As previous research was reflected in regards to the findings of this thesis during the analysis, they are disclosed in the results. This thesis was set to answer the main research question through the following sub research questions:

SRQ1: How matters of concern present themselves in a design process?

SRQ2: What communicative events constitute design process?

SRQ3: What kind of agency occur in a design process?

6.1 Communicative constitution of matters of concern in a design process

This chapter examines the gathered data. Findings are illustrated through excerpts from the workshops. All names presented in the analysis are pseudonyms.

These excerpts are highlighted here as they can be seen as moments where matters of concern are communicatively constructed and presented. Thus, going deeper into these excerpts provides a clear view of what matters concern participants (and the organization for that matter) raise during the workshops, how those matters of concern are justified and which agencies are called upon to support these matters of concern.

It is important to acknowledge that no matter how indisputable a conceptual framework may be, it still may attract a certain degree of controversy. Theory might become contested, if it does not fit into the accepted models of work. The purpose of this study, is to combine different domains of knowledge to ob-

tain a perspective for service design through communicational lens, something that has not been studied prior. In more concrete terms, to understand how communication makes service design process a collective practice. It is easy to argue that without communication nothing would work, meaning that if everyone would have participated these workshops in complete silence there would have not been any design activities, per se. However, in this study, communication is seen to serve a greater purpose: it has a constitutive power. It makes service design a process, even a practice, by allowing participants to interact, co-define, give meaning and design through it. These aspects are presented below in more detail.

Lastly, it is due notice that calling the observed workshop as "service design workshop" is not the author's view or interpretation of the nature of the workshops. Rather, it was the organization's perception of the situation. The decision to call the workshop service design was not contested, neither were the categorization of the methods and tools used under the grand theme of design thinking.

As explained previously in this study, giving communication a relational definition recognizes the nature of practice in design. By adopting communicative constitution of organization approach to study the design process positions the study to see how design practices are repeatedly communicated into being and focuses on which actors and how they participate in these practices. To illustrate how this happens in practice excerpts of the observed service design workshops are presented, illustrating the way matters of concern are presented and how they matter in interaction.

In a service design workshop, the point of observation is therefore not only on what people are saying but also what seems to matter to each of these people. In other words, what they need to take into consideration when making a collective decision on a course of action. (Vasquez et al. 2018, 419). This is why communication is interesting to study in this context: it is the way to compose and construct the given situation the participants of the workshops are in. The world "cannot but express itself through communication", as Cooren (2010, 318) states.

Throughout the workshop the group is evaluating the situation from their customer's point of view, pondering over the and weighing the pros and cons. Similarly to Cooren et al (2015) who noted in their research that evaluation of these events does not originate only from human participants, it its noticeable in the observed workshops, that these moments of pondering, weighing and evaluating evoke also from the situation itself. These moments in design does not arise before they are practiced collectively into effect.

The discussion shifts between high-level conceptual talk to the nitty-gritty conversation regarding the actual product, which is common in design process (Glock 2009, 6). This demonstrates that together, through communication, the participants constitute the raised issues as matters of concern. As these matters of concern are constituted, they are naturally followed by an action that needs to be taken based on the matters they have raised

New matters of concern were introduced actively in the conversation, which demonstrates the rapid nature of design workshop and the collective nature of it. The group moved from ill-defined matter of concern towards a set of obtainable matters. This shows that through interaction, interventions and validation of the group, the matters became tangible in communication and therefore center of their actions. Moreover, the discussion is a demonstration and justification of interest for designing which validates the idea that designing is discursively implemented in practice.

Certain characterization of matters of concern and the premise of communicative constitution of organization was identified from the observations. These are talked further in detail below with demonstration and description.

Co-defining situation through matters of concern

It is inherently human thought that we construct the world around us. Co-constructing the world is an essential idea of CCO approach, as it demonstrates why communication is something significant (Cooren 2015a, 309). Communication matters, because when broadening the conception of it being just a carrier of information, communication can be seen as co-constructing the situation in which people are evolved.

In the excerpt below the group is going through customer profile and first versions of the customer journey they had drafted. Everyone has put down their thoughts on post-its which are then put on the wall to resemble the phases of the customer journey. The discussion turns to ways they could potentially identify their customers throughout different touchpoints. They have identified a problem reaching these potential customers. This ill-defined problem is turned through conversation into clear matters of concern.

(Excerpt 1)

Pilvi   [taking a post-it from the wall] "Erm, I wrote that we need to understand that essentially this is network marketing, so we need to find those… find all the people that they [their target group] are in contact with. They don't go to bank… well, nobody does anymore… but I guess they visit business development people and all these regional business service units and, you know, places like CrazyTown and Startup Factory so we'd need to evangelize them [business developers] to talk with these people [target group], tell them that they should call us when you have customers who are in their misery and have money but don't know what to do with it".

Kaisa   "–– And they should also have trust [with their customers] that they can recommend ... because I remember asking from Jykes and they could not recommend anyone, they only can give you a list of all the businesses in Jyväskylä in certain industries but they could not recommend a single organization for you… So what happens when you try to ask from these business devel– … because if you ask from the

city services, they are in the same position! The people in the city's business development services can give you recommendations under the table or they can give you a hint who you should be in touch with. They're all tied with all these stupid rules. So how can we get into that list of few names that is given when someone asks or how can we become the one that is recommended?"

Jaro "Yes, we ought to have that kind of people who could recommend us".

Pilvi "Influencers are a big, big thing for us, I feel… Not that we find our customers out of nowhere but we need to find those people that our customers are speaking to, one way or another, and banks and authorities are one way to do it… Because when I think about that one case with Woolman, that co-operation was a god damn blessing for them. So, where do we find these contacts? Do we need to lobby Tekes? Well, they can't recommend anyone either but that whole world is a grey area in a good sense, so the more we know regional business developers and they are aware of us, they have a pretty good story to tell to their customers. And it should be transparent all the way, and all these trust issues – when we address the policy makers with these people, they are going to slip a name or two, I know that they are asked about them all the time… And there is a lot of people that try to locate businesses to their regions and help businesses in their region to grow, so it's their job to get that money from somewhere so they –"

Jaro "Yeah, those regional [business –"

Pilvi "–regional business developers] development organiz… Well now they all are going to be blown up with the regional government reform, so it might be a good thing for us that they are now all scattered…and there might be some changes to all those principles… So we need to move through networks, or we need to work on two levels: where we can find these customers directly that we just make cold calls to and find out if the time is fruitful for this, and then by influencing opinions through our networks… erm, well I don't know whether this makes any sense, there is not that much action in what I said or was it mostly just erm… a vague rant [chuckles] about where these people are and how we can connect with them".

Jaro "Well there was something in there, or, we made an action plan with Pilvi yesterday based on that first person draft so now we need to make an action plan based [on–"

Pilvi ["And I think we need to keep in mind who is doing what and that we get leads through Peppiina and get that lead generation process going on and then we need a process to close those leads".

Peppiina "Exactly".

To understand how this episode demonstrates designing, the matters that seem important to the participants need to be recognized. Pilvi notes that the change in the way people are organized in general is the root of problem for them in finding the potential clients. The room agrees on Pilvi's reasoning of network marketing with head nods and acceptive murmurs. This leads discussion to circle around different agencies involved in their decision-making process. What animates the group's discussion in this excerpt is their perception of how difficult it is to acquire customers as a new business: first written as individual post-it note on the wall then leads participants to legitimize it through discussion.

Pilvi and Kaisa, who are doing most of the talking here, justify and explain their position regarding the conversation and both of them voice actions they should be taking to solve the matter. Moreover, the raised matter of concern seems unquestionably something that makes a difference for them as an organization. Something that dictates what the group should do.

What makes this discussion especially relevant is Kaisa's remark that city authorities and development agencies are not allowed to promote individual organizations through their networks. Frustration in Kaisa's tone of voice can be clearly sensed; she has ran into the same problem frequently which bothers her. Here, the emotion of frustration can be noticed not only from her tone but also from her gestures (dramatically opening her arms as in portraying there's nothing she can do), in other words, analyzing the way she ends up describing the situation, as Cooren (2010, 59) suggests. Kaisa's frustration in this situation animates her to make a difference – to voice a matter of concern. Consequently, this seems to be a matter that concerns the others also: everyone has stopped writing notes or glancing the post-its and are listening carefully.

The matters of concern here, and Kaisa's original concern of the city's impact in aiding them to find potential clients, widens the topic as she tells her own story on how the city's practices has affected previously her in acquiring customer leads. "They can give recommendations under the table". For her, not only does city's contribution to help local companies seem trivial but also it seems that the role of the city determines how they should go on in the design process.

Others clearly support the raised matter; their heads are nodding and acceptive murmur can be heard. As the conversation moves forward, both Jaro and Pilvi voice the need of good references and the role of industry influencers in this quest. Pilvi invokes the blurred lines of how city representatives might operate on to support Kaisa's claim. They need to seem trustworthy and transparent for the city to "slip out" some information for them.

Pilvi then widens the topic even more by starting to talk about the regional government reform. She argues that the reform and its result might be in fact a good thing for them. It could potentially change cities' principles. Guiding the conversation towards conclusions she says: "I don't know whether we got anything reasonable out of this". To this, Jaro answers that the discussion has given them plenty to work on, thus supporting Pilvi's account, and then continues by saying that they need to make a plan of operation based on what is their out-

come from the design workshop. Therefore, it can be argued that these matters of concern take the participants to a ruminative place, where their thoughts might not otherwise enter in the normal run of events, to construct a decision collectively.

In other words, using design methods, they have little by little uncovered a matter of concern, which everyone in the group recognize crucial for them and the organization. The city's power (with regards to them) has an important role in co-defining the situation. Before the conversation, not many had considered it to be a consequential matter for them, nothing to be considered about even, but after it has become more urgent. Therefore, it guides them not only to make decisions during the design process but also it changes their perception of the outcome.

This interaction demonstrates co-defining matters of concern. It is not only the participants who, through text and talk, define the matter in hand but also the situation itself determines how the matter is transformed into set of issues that they need to take into consideration in the design process. This shows as Pilvi, who again mainly led the discussion, answers, reacts and guides the conversation when others intervene, to voice their potential matters into being. In such a way, matters of concern participate in the co-formulation of design process: the discussion is widened and then again narrowed down closer to the original problem and concluded with an action.

What is also noteworthy, is that the excerpt demonstrates well how several matters of concern are communicatively co-constructed: first on post-its these were merely matters of concern for each individual but with collective discussion they were constructed into collective understanding of the situation and further into clear points of action.

To illustrate how together found matters of concern change through conversation, another excerpt is presented. Here the group is forming an understanding of their customer by designing a set of personas, a reference archetype of their customer. They have recognized a set of behaviors and needs of the persona and are summing up the discussion.

(Excerpt 2)

Pilvi   "Okay, let's sum this up [glancing the post-its] … Interested in IT from young age… And if you don't agree with these just say or ask what they mean, we need to all agree on these… A free spirit – who wrote this?"

Peppiina   "I was also thinking about putting that up there myself!"

Pilvi   "Yes I was thinking the same way. I wrote that self-determination is high and freedom is important, that's why they have their own firm".

Jaro   "Erm… I was left wondering if… whoever that is, are they young [or –"

Peppiina ["I was thinking about that too!"

Jaro " – or are they old fogeys who want to do things in their own way".

Peppiina "Someone who's stuck in the past".

Jaro "That's what I'm wondering; which one is the one we could… which one is more potential or which one is there more of? Because I feel… erm… youngsters have [different –"

Peppiina ["Experience".

Jaro "– yes, or expectations and ambitions I guess. Compared to those who have been doing that for a living for twenty years".

Pilvi "What do you all think?"

Tuomo "Actually, I was thinking about how we could recognize them… or like in terms of finding the right people for the platform… in my mind, the younger people are easier to find and attract. I'm thinking ten years back, we were not encouraged for entrepreneurship, back then you had to have permanent job and a thirty-year-career in that one job. It's different now. So I'm not feeling that those people would go freelance or have entrepreneurial mindset, something's just missing… I don't know if it is wrong but it's just a gut feeling".

Pilvi "I'm with you. I remember from my old job – well, he was not a young man – but I had to take something to him from Helsinki. He was a freelancer, very high-paid, and he was living in the middle of nowhere in a mansion. And all this because he had very niche expertise and he had no trouble of finding the next paycheck. He had his networks and he was respected but… You know, someone younger… like it said in here [reading from a post-it] his hobby became his job, he values freedom but no way he has as good networks at that age. Maybe the old-timers don't either if they were in one job until retirement but if they have that kind of niche knowledge and things quite good, maybe this service has nothing to offer for them…"

Jaro "There are businesses of one or two or three people, who have been on this industry for years. Should we even consider trying to attract them on board? I think they are an asset but would they be willing to…?"

Peppiina "I'm thinking of those kinds of businesses but maybe ones that have also younger people involved".

Pilvi "Twenty to thirty. Thirty-five?"

Peppiina "Something like that".

Pilvi   "I would lean towards this group in terms of getting started. I think they have better ability to operate on the platform and it's more likely that they don't have that extensive networks yet".

Kaisa   "Maybe they are easier to get excited".

Emma   "Young people have that passion to try new things and find out what is meaningful".

Tuomo   "Could those more experienced people bring added value for the younger people on the platform?"

Peppiina   "Well they could be the specialists there! Share their [knowledge and –"

Kaisa   ["Yes, they could come and do gigs as consultant… see if there's some extra money to be made. And then give something back for the community at the same time".

Pilvi   "I think that if we focus on these modern technologies… cloud based services and all this new kind of digitalization… we could find people that have twenty years working with these things. And they have all that knowledge… for people who are still finding their place and looking for things to learn that's definitely an asset!"

Jaro   "And the younger they are, the more ambitious they are to promote and sell their services then. Do the marketing and selling. Those with more experienc could focus on the work itself and help others… the younger ones with ambition".

Pilvi   "Well, this is a tempting situation. There's definitely decisions to be made but… I feel like that if we start from the idea that we have these two groups and build on that… We need to elaborate more on that other group and workshop the [other] persona… But for the time being let's focus on the younger group as it is the key persona for now… and later we work on both customer journeys".

As demonstrated, the discussion moves from an anecdote about the age profile to how the group should go on about designing the service with two customer personas in mind. When the group is going through an exercise where they try to describe their customer, Jaro brings up something that puzzles him. His question introduces a matter of concern, the need to talk about the age profile of their potential customer. This notion receives approval from Peppiina ("I was thinking the same thing") and by Pilvi's decision to address this question to the whole group indicates that this matter should be collectively discussed. Though Jaro is the one voicing the matter of concern, they happen upon it collectively through conversation, and agree collectively that it makes a difference.

While the group has narrated the different types of behaviors and attributes of their potential customer, they have not discussed the factor of age – it has not been a matter of concern before. Now, Jaro is guiding the conversation towards the demographics of the customer and whether there's a group they should focus on ("which one is more potential"). This leads others to ponder over and weigh in on the matter. In other words, they are practicing design by assessing the situation at hand and addressing possibilities they have.

The group continues to elaborate on this matter of concern. Tuomo, for instance, speaks about entrepreneurial mindset of younger people, which makes a difference for him to substantiate the idea of focusing on the younger demographic. Pilvi, too, weighs in by telling a story that is related to this matter. Her story culminates to a perception that younger people don't have extensive networks to rely on professionally. Nevertheless, she notes that the older experts might benefit from their service too.

This exchange leads Jaro to ask whether they should try to get people from small businesses on board. His remark is interesting for two reasons: firstly, he sees these businesses as a potential customer group for them, thus questioning the decision to focus on young people, and secondly, he disputes his own remark by asking the group should they even consider the idea. His indecisive tone expresses that he is not convinced about the group's thought process. His deliberation confirms that a matter of concern is at stake here: the group needs evaluate the situation and decide on actions.

The discussion moves on and Pilvi suggests a decision for the group, which Peppiina, Emma and Kaisa support – to focus on the younger demographic. However, Tuomo intervenes the conversation asking if the more experienced people would bring added value to their service. Before Tuomo's intervention no one else is voicing other opinions, which reads as agreement to follow Pilvi's suggestion. Therefore, the original matter of concern is back on the table as the discussion shift back to weighing and pondering.

This shift in discussion makes the group unitedly to consider the matter and circle back to Jaro's question prior ("should we even consider?"). Tuomo having evoked the matter, the group substantiates it to be important for them at that point of time.

This excerpt highlights how a matter of concern, collectively found, can change through and in conversation. While at first the focus of the matter was how they define a persona, it was renegotiated in the conversation to what added value two personas would mean for the group, and consequentially, for the organization. This arbitration did not only change the course of discussion, but also the matter itself.

The relevance of this conversation can be assessed from the point of view whether the raised matter evoked a course of action. As a matter of fact, Pilvi puts it in words: "There's definitely decision to be made". The matters of concern that were collectively found and changed through the communication point to the fact that they need to do something. Pilvi, indeed, then voices an action they should be taking. This decision is possible because the matters of concern led the group to the conclusion.

Agency and matters of concern

Cooren (2006, 82) talks about agent and agency in the context of difference mak-ing; *agent* as something or someone who makes a difference and *agency* as mak-ing a difference. Focusing on agency, the point of analysis moves on to how de-sign emerges from human and non-human interaction, how it makes difference in given situation. Through different forms of agency matters of concerns com-municate themselves into action and being by reasoning the world around them. These agencies give, in their own way, a course of action for the raised matters, and so, involve themselves to the design process.

As this thesis is taking a relational view agency is understood to form in and through interaction and so making different entities, their behavior and ac-tions possible in this process. Thus, they construct the design process into being in communication.

Following the discussion of the first workshop, the conversation turns to another co-defined matter of concern. The group ponders over what kind of other communities they could easily enter to promote their organization and acquire new leads. They have identified such communities and certain key in-dividuals and are yet again debating the content of post-its. The conversation is circling around different types of influencers they should identify and contact when an outside authority affects formation of matters of concern.

(Excerpt 3)

Kaisa   "By the way, I know that there is this one gentleman who's leading that digital… erm …. what is it called… anyway, I know that he was on his toes about us".

Pilvi   "Oh, okay, I think I know who you're talking about. He fits the pro-file perfectly!"

Jaro   "Did anyone contact him?"

Kaisa   "He was away and then it got postponed, I don't know if anyone fol-lowed on this after that…"

Pilvi   "It's a good thing you brought that up because that is a good repre-sentation of our fear that someone is stealing our ideas".

Jaro   "Mmm… I feel he was not quite what we – "

Kaisa   "Yes but his perception was that we are on wrong track, that's what I heard him saying on that networking thing anyway".

Pilvi   "Okay… it might affect this now… do you feel we need to add some-thing for that first part – do we mark this as a critical thing or should

we just move on that journey? Do we give a damn what's happening somewhere else or should we focus on what we have here?"

Jaro [referring to post-its on the wall] "I think the last three and then all of those over there are worthwhile".

Pilvi "Because I argue that if we cannot fulfill our service promise – that if people think that this is not a trustworthy service – then it does not matter at all if we just waste all of our leads. We need to get a word in edgewise that you can trust it [the service] all the way and your trust deepens when you use it. We need something that … some content that we can strengthen the relationships with. That our service is worthwhile".

Jaro "Erm.. yes…. I'm thinking that we should forget that comment but I feel that the most [important –"

Pilvi "– that the critical thing is that if we don't solve this first then we don't even need to focus on those other ones… but erm… maybe the question is about what is reliable and trustworthy and how we can tackle that issue on the platform. Do we have anything we can use? Any further thinking or…"

Jaro "Well we should [have]. I mean it all starts with the recruiting or the quality of applicants we get to represent on the platform. It's important that it goes smoothly, the logins all that are simple and so on. We're on it with Kaisa".

What is at stake here is the reputation of the organization. Kaisa's raised matter of concern relates to the issues of trust they had been talking earlier. As a side-note, she tells others that she is aware of a person who fits their target profile and who has been "on his toes" about the organization and its pursuits becoming public. This causes positive murmuring around the room. The situation reads favorable for them and some of the group seem excited for this potential new lead. However, Kaisa immediately voices her concern regarding something this person had said previously: that the organization is on the wrong tracks. This hearsay makes a difference for them as it seems to question the integrity of their service.

At first it seems that Pilvi is ready to drop this raised matter, as she vaguely comments on Kaisa's remarks and turns back to the wall to talk about the post-its ("do you feel we need to add something for that first part") but she then circles back to the issue, clearly discontented, and now addresses to the room about the matter raised by Kaisa ("do we mark this as a critical thing or should we just move on that journey?"). Her discomfort makes her to talk about the matter on this outside authority's voice and why it is consequential; the group knows that this matter is important for them and for the organization, but they are uncertain how to act on it.

This exchange can be read as a co-definition of the issue through other agency. Someone outside the company giving remarks defines the way the group should make design decisions in the future. First, voiced by Kaisa and then further talked into actionable insights by Pilvi, this agency literally participated in the design process through communication. In other words, the matter of concern is given an agency and thus takes part in the process.

What is also interesting in this excerpt, is how a matter of concern was introduced from a side remark that is not per se an effort to practice design. By chance they happen upon something that eventually is consequential for them. Cooren et al. (2015, 33) noted similar occurrence in their study on practicing strategy. It could be argued that sometimes design does not happen on purpose but it arises through communication in a favorable situation.

Communication is, however, not only about humans interacting and affecting the course of discussion. For instance, principles, norms and rules can partake in communication. These different *non-human agents* also have effect on how the human actors of given situation are acting. (Cooren 2010, 58). In the excerpt below we can see that the group is talking *through* the regulations and rules of the city and the government. This is a good example of non-human agency and how they make difference.

The group is discussing how to reach their target customers and where to find information about them. While Kaisa and Pilvi are both doing the talking, they are actually speaking on the voice of city and government regulations. (Note: the excerpt below was presented in full from page 35 onwards).

(Excerpt 4)

Kaisa   "–– And they should also have trust [with their customers] that they can recommend ... because I remember asking from Jykes and they could not recommend anyone, they only can give you a list of all the businesses in Jyväskylä in certain industries but they could not recommend a single organization for you… So what happens when you try to ask from these business devel– … because if you ask from the city services, they are in the same position! The people in the city's business development services can give you recommendations under the table or they can give you a hint who you should be in touch with. They're all tied with all these stupid rules. So how can we get into that list of few names that is given when someone asks or how can we become the one that is recommended?"

Jaro   "Yes, we ought to have that kind of people who could recommend us".

Pilvi   "Influencers are a big, big thing for us, I feel… Not that we find our customers out of nowhere but we need to find those people that our customers are speaking to, one way or another, and banks and authorities are one way to do it… Because when I think about that one case with Woolman, that co-operation was a god damn blessing for

them. So, where do we find these contacts? Do we need to lobby Tekes? Well, they can't recommend anyone either but that whole world is a grey area in a good sense, so the more we know regional business developers and they are aware of us, they have a pretty good story to tell to their customers. And it should be transparent all the way, and all these trust issues – when we address the policy makers with these people, they are going to slip a name or two, I know that they are asked about them all the time… And there is a lot of people that try to locate businesses to their regions and help businesses in their region to grow, so it's their job to get that money from somewhere so they –"

Jaro   "Yeah, those regional [business –"

Pilvi   "—regional business developers] development organiz… Well now they all are going to be blown up with the regional government reform, so it might be a good thing for us that they are now all scattered…and there might be some changes to all those principles… So we need to move through networks, or we need to work on two levels: where we can find these customers directly that we just make cold calls to and find out if the time is fruitful for this, and then by influencing opinions through our networks… erm, well I don't know whether this makes any sense, there is not that much action in what I said or was it mostly just erm… a vague rant [chuckles] about where these people are and how we can connect with them".

Here, the focus is on Kaisa's remark about the city's authority. She states that there are rules that inhibit the city organizations, virtually, to help them because they cannot recommend organizations for them. Even though the group's motive is to provide aid for these organizations. This rule, a non-human agent, becomes a hindrance for them and has a big impact on how they define the situation. In this case, the matter of concern expresses itself through agency making different agents act according to the city rules. Here, the agency is referred as a hindering agency.

Pilvi, on the other hand, brings up the regional government reform. She argues that the reform and its result might be in fact a good thing for them – it could potentially change the city's principles. In this way of staging the situation she positions herself to talk in the name of the principal: reifying their account, the design process is now dictated, in some degree, by the city. While the group's actions remain yet to be determined, all these things weigh in for the importance of designing. They need to find solution how to design their service around these rules and principles affecting them. Thus, reaffirming that their actions in fact take place through these matters of concern.

These two excerpts demonstrate how non-human agencies are making difference in the design process. Though both Kaisa and Pilvi are voicing a matter of concern, they are speaking through someone else's mouth. As noted by Taylor and Van Every (2000, 88), the agents don't need to be present in the situation

to make a difference. These forms of agency make the group act in the name of rules and principles set by outside authorities. The power the city possesses over the group links back to what is at stake for the organization, forcing them to overcome the obstacles by collectively setting actions.

While these excerpts showed how different agencies possess insurmountable power over the given situation, they also highlighted that these web of agencies come to make a difference in a design process through interaction.

Dominant matters of concern

Matters of concern animates the actors to say and do what they want to (Latour 2004, 231; 2008, 39). In the context of this thesis, service design is understood as a collaborative approach. A single person can voice a matter of concern, but negotiating it is a collective effort (Vasquez et al. 2018, 423). Negotiation is important, because through collective interaction each raised matter is determined whether they are of significant importance to the organization.

Some matters of concern, however, were found to have *dominant effect*. These matters of concern were voiced by a single person, giving weigh on certain issue, which then were silently accepted by other actors involved in the situation. This means that a matter of concern does not need to be negotiated into being as it embodies a dominant effect that no one contests it. These matters evidently do not need to be further discussed as they are accepted by all actors.

In the excerpt illustrated below the group of people is in the middle of discussing the customer profile and mapping the customer journey. The group has taken time to individually fill post-its on the issue and now they are collectively going through them. Already, everyone in the workshop have individually written down issues which they have felt to be noteworthy regarding the given subject. These notes are thus matters of concern for each participant but they are yet to discussed into being collective matter of concerns. The excerpt begins as Pilvi shifts the discussion towards the customer profile by going through the post-its.

(Excerpt 5)

Kaisa "-- If one has to, or erm if you lose your job then, you know, I don't see them as early adopters in that sense but they are part of the funnel in some stage and the service is then sort of necessity because when I think people of that age group they have paid off their debts, they have good income and they can just be and do nothing for a certain amount of time because they have savings so there is not that kind of a need for them… I-I … if you are doing OK, the motivation needs to be rooted in somewhere or you need high motivation to go and do something that is radically different. Or then you become a consultant and do some gigs here and there and it can grow into, erm, to have similar effect that many people who retire have that they

don't fully retire but do consultancy, so I feel that this could essentially become something".

[everyone glances at post-its on the wall]

Pilvi   [pause in conversation] "There must be good skilled workers where technologies are devaluating that would like to unwind but still stay in work life and do something because they have that deep knowledge, but if we start to target modern technologies and cloud-based solutions and-and, you know, this new digitalization which has a lot of demand from the customers' point of view or maybe, I guess, more clear needs compared to all these traditional technologies, then I feel that it might be a better group for us, because no-one yet has the knowledge and those kinds of people are still finding the right place for themselves in the market".

Kaisa   [Looking at her notes] "It is that kind of age when you are finding a partner and starting a family, and your life is in turmoil and you are torn in every direction and at that stage your networks, I mean businesswise, are quite limited and… erm, you know sales and all that is hard work, so in a sense you have too little capacity to do all these things but you need make that a stepping stone for yourself that carries you a long way but you have no resources because you have three kids at home and all those things are a burden in that stage of life".

[a quiet moment]

Jaro   "A young entrepreneur is more devoted for all sales related stuff where as someone in their fifties or, you know, a senior entrepreneur can do with steady income but if you are young you have more ambition regarding".

The most important concern manifested in this excerpt is the profile of organization's customer segment. The definition of the profile of the customer segment is guided by other matters of concern, voiced throughout the conversation, and leading the group to the major concern. Vasquez et al. (2018, 423) talk about this project as an organizing principle.

To understand how this episode demonstrates designing, the matters that seem to matter for the participants need to be recognized. The participants of the workshops on the other hand need to convince that matters they raise matter not only for them but also for the entire group and the organization. *The dominant effect* arises as the group discusses on various matters.

The talking here is done by three people who all voice matters that are of their interest. The shared concern seems evident for everyone. The discussion is triggered by forming a customer profile which will direct the rest of their design process, and is led to continuous voicing of matters of concern.

Kaisa starts by talking about the underlying motivation of their target customer, something that repeatedly makes her justify the things written on a post-it. As the group ponders over the topic, Pilvi continues on the same issue but voices her own concerns, defining and justifying and action the group should be taking. These arguments and conjectures can therefore be identified as matters of concern as they are something that makes a difference for the group – and for the organization. They appear to define what should be done.

Rather than discussing matters that one had voiced before, the next person talking keeps voicing new matters. While observing the situation, no visible evidence of skepticism or distrust could be identified from others in the group (no rolling of eyes, no shrugs of head, or anything that could be conceived as questioning the voiced matter). This silence and adding on the subject can be interpreted as acceptance, a validation of the matters: they do not need to be discussed in further detail because it makes sense for everyone. In same terms, it can be argued that these dominating matters of concern close these mini-sequences by themselves, as no-one questions or challenges the raised matters.

The group's evaluation of the situation and broadening the view can therefore be understood as designing. It is the group's ability to critically appraise and address the situation that enables the design process, and allows them to take control (over non-human agencies, here the city's rules) in that process.

As no one raises their voice to indicate that they disapprove these notions or in other manner suggest to question them, the situation can be read as approval for each of their reasoning. The matters of concern are important in regards to the design process – they make a difference for the group. These matters of concern are silently validated by the group as they all support the organizing principle.

In that sense, it can be argued that it is not only humans who communicate, but it is evident that matters of concerns express themselves through communication. Cooren (2015a, 309) shared same notion and summarized that humans are not only actors of their own talk but also passers. Passers as in intermediaries through which certain matters of concern express themselves. This view is closely related to a classic model of communication by Shannon and Weaver (1949) which identifies that human participants are identified as means for other authors to express themselves through.

Interestingly, Cooren (2010, 93) talks similarly about dominant position some agencies acquire through *ventriloquism* by examining the interactional consequences of how different artifacts make humans do things and speak through these artifacts.

Ignored matters of concern

Whereas some matters of concern wield control over the discussion, some matters of concern are abandoned when they are not consequential. Though matters of concern are communicated into being, they need constitute something for the other participants as well to have a collective meaning for the design

process. Below, the group is talking about the customer journey they have mapped out when the discussion drifts to technical side of their service platform.

(Excerpt 6)

Emma "In general, it [the platform] needs to be easy but it also should have all the best people in the industry. So the value would come from the community. That's why we need to get the best people we can get to join it".

Peppiina "Like an inner circle Stack Overflow? When I come to think of it, I know a few people already who are always struggling because they have no one to ask… So instead of Googling, they could just ask there and get someone to do it as well!"

Emma "Yeah, so you could work with people who have the knowledge, like have them in your team. Imagine: all the Finland's top workers and you could get their help just like that".

Pilvi "Yes, okay I think we have a lot of good ground to cover here. We have ideas on how to get people to the platform… Word-of-mouth, that's important. And then, well, I think that registering… whether you are an individual or if you want to register as an organization, it should be automatic process. You know, input your VAT number and it will automatically fill your details. It recognizes that you are a freelancer or not. We need an API for Suomi.fi [or ––"

Jaro "Not our biggest problem at the moment".

Pilvi "Well, no, but the easiness is important… Okay, erm… So he reads blogs and clicks CTA… Okay, based on this [customer journey] that discussion is plain utopia… Well, he reads blogs, let's have that as a starting point. But how in the hell do we get him to click through, that's the question…"

This quite straightforward exchange between the group members demonstrate how raised matter of concern is ignored when it is not consequential for everyone in the design process.

Here, Emma and Peppiina are talking about the platform they are designing. They both justify their points of views which implies that this is a matter of concern for them. They also substantiate the matter impacts the organization as well. What emphasizes this raised matter is that they are bringing it to the conversation even though they were talking about something else.

Pilvi agrees with them and voices that they have a lot of work to do on that area. She then continues with a list of technical solutions she thinks they

should have on the platform. By continuing voicing the matter on her part she is trying to co-construct the matter to set of actions.

However, Pilvi is cut short by Jaro who bluntly states that the raised matter is not their biggest problem at the moment, which is another way to say that the matter is not consequential for them. In other words, Jaro is voicing what they should do: to kill the conversation about the technical set up as it is hindering the conversation about what really is at stake here. For matters of concern to be constructed, they need constitute a collective meaning (Taylor & Van Every 2011, 203). Jaro's interpose means that they are ignoring this matter of concern.

Pilvi continues the discussion, admitting Jaro's point, and leads the discussion back to its original tracks. Interestingly, she then points to the customer journey map on the wall and says that the discussion about the technical side is utopia, directing her words to Jaro. That is to say, she validates Jaro's interruption and reasoning for ignoring the matter of concern. It is not something that they should be focusing now, as it not making difference, it is plain utopia at the moment. The group goes on to talk about the customer journey: they collectively decide to ignore the matter of concern.

In the next excerpt, the group is in the middle of discussing the customer profile and mapping the customer journey. The excerpt begins as Pilvi shifts the discussion towards the customer profile by going through the post-its.

(Excerpt 7)

Pilvi "Okay, hey, I'll leave that bloke there [a collection of post-its describing the customer] because we have now narrowed down this enough but let's see what you got … I think this is going to be an awesome addition here, at least I'm getting excited… So, erm, well so what do we have here - - [going through post-its] yes, this goes well under what we just discussed - - okay okay… New contacts, doing things you enjoy, getting new contacts, getting reputation, able to pay bills… Career planning, steady income, personal growth and development… Okay so wants to grow but it'd be nice to get some dough as well".

Peppiina "I doubt anyone does it for [charity ––"

Pilvi ["I don't think we're quite there yet… Steadier income so there needs to be money as a driver but another driver is learning and new technologies and erm – being able to work in a team and interaction which means that you are able to–to get new contacts, earn money and grow your own market value… [pause] So what ya'll say about this? I also wrote down that the operating environment he's familiar with is – or erm that he works on a computer the whole day, do you think this is the environment he's in?"

Kaisa "Yes there's many displays and [he's at home - -"

Pilvi	″ [Do we all agree that this is relevant?″
Peppiina	″Do you mean he aims to be at home for the most of the time?″
Pilvi	″In principle yes, let me think, if you work on coding so the work is then on a computer sooo… he will be on his computer and online and on smartphone but –″
Kaisa	″He tests stuff out″.
Pilvi	″Yeah″.
Kaisa	″Because when he needs to test something then he's - -″
Pilvi	″But is computer, or the big screens, is it the channel through which he interacts with the world? From our service perspective we then need think how to optimize it. So that it is not only a mobile version. Jaro, what do you think?″
Jaro	"Makes sense".
Pilvi	"Makes sense, why not".
Jaro	″Well… ″
Pilvi	″If we go now and ask from the guys at the other cubicles there how many days a week they have their laptops open, what do you reckon they would say?″
Jaro	″Well, many, but I was thinking from our perspective that is our service - -"
Pilvi	″Yeah, does it really matter?″
Peppiina	″Good question″.
Emma	″Well it might from a communication point of view. As in how we reach people″.
Kaisa	″Yes and also from the usability point of view″.
Jaro	″Yes, well… erm…″.
Peppiina	″I mean we have tried to optimize the website and, well, I'm looking it on a laptop and update it but we've made effort to optimize it for mobile as well″.
Jaro	″Freelancers are on their laptops and then business clients might be a different case″.
Peppiina	"Yes".

In the first part of the sequence, Pilvi is summarizing the post-its and categorizing them with themes as the others are watching, some indicating acceptance with nodding their heads and giving supple utterances. She again reminds everyone what is the point of this exercise – mapping out the aims and aspirations of their customer – and continues to invoke a matter of concern, the need to talk about the financial aspects of their customer: "It'd be nice to get some dough as well".

To determine whether this constitutes a matter of concern to the others in the workshops, all things that potentially animate participants to say or do has to be looked at. Here, Peppiina attempts to continue the discussion and raise another point ("I doubt anyone does it for charity ––") but is cut off by Pilvi, who then dismisses this raised concern ("I don't think we are quite there yet") and segues into another topic to talk about "drivers" of the customer, asserting that for them to design their service for this specific customer profile in mind they need to view the financial reasoning from many perspectives.

While at first it seems that Pilvi is dismissing this evoked matter of concern, her ignoring and evaluating the situation and offering broader view can be understood as designing. She is ignoring the raised matter because, for her, it does not seem consequential at the time. As no one raises their voice to indicate that they disapprove Pilvi's decision to move on, the situation can be read as approval for Pilvi's interruption and decision to ignore the matter for now. The matter is not consequential for them collectively.

While the above excerpt presented how a matter of concern is ignored or abandoned, it also shows how design process in constituted through communication in many different ways. This highlights how turmoil the conversation and the actual design process can be.

The conversation turns to another topic, introducing a new matter of concern, as Pilvi takes a pause to shuffle the post-its and continues "Well, what do ya'll say about this". She then voices another matter of concern from the post-its: the operating environment of their service. This matter is given weight as it is an essential part of their business – the main environment where end-users are in touch with the organization.

Pilvi continues the defining of the matter of concern by furthering the conversation to the various scenarios the customer might find himself. As Kaisa begins to weigh in on the matter, Pilvi abruptly says: "Do we all agree that this is relevant?" and thus questions the matter of concern she herself has raised. No-one directly answers her questions, neither are there any recognizable signs of body language or other manners that would suggest that her questioning the matter is critical. Instead, Peppiina continues the discussion, substantiating that this is indeed relevant for them to discuss. So, the relevance of this matter is validated by her decision to continue the discussion.

The discussion goes on for a while, when Pilvi brings yet another matter to the discussion. She raises the need to speak about how they should offer their services in various digital environments. This can be seen as a completely new

matter of concern but also as a remark deepening their previous conversation about the operating environments. She explains herself and directs her question to Jaro ("What do you think?"), asking directly his opinion. This direct question can be read as a way for Pilvi to substantiate this matter. Jaro validates her point with a slight hesitation and clearly contemplates the importance non-verbally (grunting, scratching notes aggressively, no eye contact), as Pilvi goes on, but does not verbalize it. Only when Pilvi steers the issue towards a co-definition of the issue by suggesting that they should ask people they know about this matter, Jaro questions the relevance of the discussion.

However, both Emma and Kaisa weigh in by providing other points of view: the reach of the communication efforts and usability of the service. The matter is closed as Jaro in a dubious way agrees to the point others were making. This can be read as his validation for the matter since he does not voice any concerns regarding the design process. The acceptance to end the discussion there by other participants may be understood as contentment of how the discussion had gone and its result.

To design in this case consists of them weighing and evaluating together the different options for actions they can take.

As we can see, in relatively short time frame, the group collectively construct matters of concern to arise to their discussion, thus making design a process. These moments of design originate from the practitioners themselves. In other words, design does not exist before it is collectively practiced into being. Thus, design process cannot happen without communication as it co-constructs the given situation.

6.2   Designing through matters of concern

The previous chapter outlined and demonstrated through the developed framework the communicative approach to design, noting that the moments of design do not appear before they are practiced into being. More specifically, they are collectively generated effects at the level of conversation and text.

Throughout the observed discussions, presented above, we see the group evaluating the situation from their customer's point of view, pondering over the actions and weighing the pros and cons for them as an organization. Similarly to Cooren et al. (2015) who noted in their research that evaluation of these events does not originate only from human participants, it its noticeable in this study as well that these moments of pondering, weighing and evaluating evoke also from the situation itself. These moments in design do not arise before they are practiced collectively into effect.

As mentioned earlier, the discussion shifts between high-level conceptual talk and a nitty-gritty conversation regarding the actual product, which is common in a design process. This demonstrates that together, through communication, the participants constitute the raised issues as matters of concern. As these matters of concern are constituted, they are naturally followed by an ac-

tion that needs to be taken based on the raised matters. The excerpts presented in the previous chapter demonstrated how the participants of the workshops argue, justify and explain their grounds for the raised matters. Seeing the participants evaluate what the matters require from them or what the matters impose, rationalized the line of thinking to consider design as a discursive practice.

Matters of concern that repeatedly animate the participants were identified from the data. As seen in the previous chapter, the matters participated in and through the co-formulation of design process by widening conversation topics, introducing important issues, justifying actions and defining situations.

As new matters of concern were introduced actively in the conversation, it demonstrated the rapid nature of design workshop and the collective nature of it. The group moved from ill-defined matter of concern towards a set of obtainable matters. This shows that through interaction, interventions and validation the group enabled the matters to become tangible in communication and therefore center of their actions. Moreover, the discussion is a demonstration and justification of interest for designing which validates that designing is discursively implemented in practice. The excerpts also highlighted how the group moved from ill-defined issues to clear and justified set of matters of concern.

The idea of the design workshops are arranged to discuss collectively about the set topics and create something new through practicing service design inherently invites the researcher to observe these interactions. For this reason, it was important not to limit the analysis to a single type of communication, as Cooren et al. (2015, 28) suggest. Therefore, the focus was on anything that is positioned in the conversation as meaningful, important, justified and elaborating what should be done.

Although the workshops were grounded in designing, not everything that happened during the workshops can be labelled as designing. Similarly, designing does not always appear from clear set objectives "to design", but it can happen unexpectedly by, for example, by replying to an unrelated comment. It could be argued that design is waiting to be discursively practiced if the correct situation arises. Thus, this thesis broadens the perspective of thought compared to previous design literature.

Essentially design research is about finding the engagement of thinking and doing (Cooper et al. 2009, 50). Therefore, analyzing the things that repeatedly are perceived to animate human agents through different values, principles and objectives ("thirdness" Taylor & Van Every 2011) institute practice. This idea suggests that communicating them through practice implies constitutive force. Therefore, arguing that design is a practice of communicative process adds new perspective to the existing literature.

6.2.1 Design as a process

What makes design a process, then? Viewing the practice of design from a CCO perspective means that the analysis always starts from communication. As said, through communication, different matters of concern are evoked. These matters of concerns need to be consequential for all participants, if not, they are ignored

or abandoned. In other words, the actors shape the situation they are involved in by negotiating collectively the matters of concerns. These moments are crucial, as a significant decision can be made in very short period of time only by disregarding a thought, idea or hearsay.

Now, following this line of thought, communication can be seen as the constitutive force behind a design process. For design to happen, it needs to be materialized through, for example talk, text or actions. Design process constitutes of singular temporary moments where matters of concern are constructed and, through communication, presented. It can be argued that, in fact, designing happens in these moments when the ill-defined problems are collectively constituted as matters of concern and through communication constructed into something tangible and viable.

That is where the nature of a design process culminates: some matters of concern are accepted, others are rejected and some are reshaped.

Without communication, the design process can simply be all about thinking but then it would lack all of the doing. The scholarly literature of design (justly) focuses on thinking from hermeneutic, analytical perspective; e.g. reflection-in-action (Schön 1983), conceptualizing (Cross 2006) and simply thinking how to do things (Kimbell 2009). The design process itself is indeed a great way to unravel all the necessary things to solve ill-defined problems, but without communication the ideas won't lead to any concrete actions. Communication is the crucial factor that makes design process *a process* and not an acclamation. It makes consequential matters of concern to arise to the collective discussion where they are weighed and questioned, and consequently they provide actions for a given situation. For design process to be successful, it needs to be communicatively constituted.

Reflecting this from design literature's stand point, similar views on the definition of process can be found, for example, in Cross' (2007) proposal of design cognition. He sees the design process to span over three main areas: problem formulation, solution generation and creating a process strategy towards the solution. This broad view of the design process indeed shares the same notions as found in this thesis (from communicational perspective).

Similarly, based on this line of thought it can be argued that process of designing is not about individual achievements but collective efforts instead.

It is difficult to pinpoint the exact moment where communication "invites itself" to the process. Rather, it is easier to describe the ways in which communication shapes the process through matters of concern.

Giving communication a relational definition, this thesis positions design as something that, in fact, invites itself into the situation through communication. This view posits that practitioners of design express themselves, and anything that is to make a difference, through communication. Thus underlining that the analysis provides evidence for understanding design process communicatively. To illustrate this more in detail, the phases of the process, from an ill-defined problem to a well-designed matter of concern, can be scrutinized from communication point of view.

First, (1) the human agents formulate thoughts and ideas in their head and compile them into different textual artifacts or into speech. Second, (2) through

conversation, individual agents (human or non-human) invoke matters of concern which makes them a collective matter. Third, (3) matters of concern are discussed collectively: they are weighed by other agents, they can change the course of conversation, justify an action, close a topic. Collectively strong matters have dominant effect and matters, that do not meet collectively agreed qualifications, are abandoned. Lastly, (4) through communication, concrete measures and actions are planned based on the realized matters of concern.

Looking at this from practice point of view, and adding on the arguments from design process (Krippendorff 2016) and communication (Weick, 1986) literature, the shared notion of meaning creation can be perceived. This is an insight to how communication and practice produce together "organized doings and sayings with artifacts", as Schatzki (2017, 129) describes the discursive actions. In other words, they collectively construct knowledge which helps them to act together.

6.2.2 Characteristics of interaction in design process

To further analyze the moments when communication is adhered to design, the level of interaction should be examined closer. Now that the role of different matters of concerns in dictating the nature of interaction (animating the participants) is discussed, the focus shifts to the process itself and the functions found in the interaction. Arguing from relational stand point that designing is a process, the specific features the process takes from interactional point of view of needs to be taken into consideration.

Reflecting design process through interactional lens it becomes noticeable that by nature it is multi-dimensional, formed on both individual and collective level. In general it can be argued that, on interactional level, collective design process forms through individual expertise that each member brings to the team affecting discursively to its processes and outcomes. Consequently, through interaction, the participants collectively (and thus intentionally) developed the shared meaning and knowledge of the design process.

An embedded nature of structurization could be also identified from the interactions. These different functions, through separate interactions, produce the design process as they are the discursive moments of design emerging to practice. While different agents are recognized to participate in giving structure to the design process, that is not to say that the views presented here are diminishing designing into a mere structure. Instead, it corroborates the argument of design as a collective process. Through structured discursive process meanings are given, objectives made and actions planned.

In addition, the excerpts illustrated earlier present the communicative situations in which designing is adduced. We saw the group pondering over the situation and defining the problem at hand, identifying possible solutions and creating potential points of actions. These situations can be observed through different domains that partake in the discursive process. Firstly, through domain of knowledge the participants demonstrated their skills to participate in the design process, they were active listeners and spoke in the name of effective

messages. Secondly, they demonstrated motivational domain by showing willingness to find common meaning, expressing their emotions (for instance excitement or hesitation). Thirdly, the participants demonstrated behavioral domain by being practical and goal oriented in their conversations.

Functions of interaction in design process

Function	Manifestation/interaction
Defining matters of concerns that are valued or devalued (problem identification)	- Legitimization of decision by individuals - Dramatization of events to focus attention on past or present experiences, opinions, decisions - Co-construction of arguments, objectives, values
Enforcing decision making (diagnosing solutions, creating points of actions)	- Leading others to decision making - Coordination of meaning - Guiding discussion towards tangible ideas that result more conversation or clear action points
Developing shared rules for the process	- Acceptance for disruption, motives and feelings displayed by other participants - Openness for critique, understanding the limits of own knowledge - Unchallenged views do not hinder the meaning creation but foster the validation of them
Voicing agency	- Forming a web of interactions that links human and non-human agents to generate interaction around the topic - Achieving richer understanding of the situation through presenting multiple forms of agency - Providing capacity for making a difference
Organizing narrative evolution	- Temporary moments of interaction in which design happens, not always deliberately - Cumulative process of evoking matters of concerns through interaction creating reflections of design - Nature of performativity[1], "designing" does not pre-exist the interaction

Table 3: Communicative events in design process.

As mentioned earlier, designing is formed in temporary moments, meaning that it constitutes from the different interactive contributions. Therefore it can be argued that there is no designing prior to practicing it through interaction. Meaning creation by evoking matters of concerns happens in these temporary moments, which implies that design evolves and varies over time. Moreo-

---

[1] Performativity in CCO approach is understood to form in communicative practices and in their materiality, that is, something that organizational actors through conversation and text do (Gond et al. 2016, 456).

ver, designing can be happened upon through a cumulative process of interaction which is called reflections of design in this thesis. What is meant by this, is that although the conversation distances from the original exercise, it can still produce cumulative conversation that leads to evoking matters of concerns, and thus designing.

6.2.3   Agency in design process

The capacity to make a difference is a assigned through interaction. Action in design process is shared between human and non-human agencies which means that displaying and assigning agency is done to fulfill the objective of the workshops.

Even though agency was presented explicitly through two excerpts, it is important to recognize (as discussed here) that all interaction is shared between different agencies and actions therefore assigned to different agents. The participants and their work in the design process exist through all these different entities.

The processes of difference making presented in the excerpts was accounted to different verbs describing the action; determining, guiding, recommending, indicating, suggesting, justifying, questioning, asserting, ignoring, and so on. Besides the human participants, textual artifacts were produced during the workshops. Also, other aspects of agency participated in the design process that were not physically present in the workshops: city authorities and rules, associates, platforms and websites. All these different entities generated capacity to fulfill the objectives of the design process by contributing to the process in various ways.

First of all, agency could be assigned to the values the participants explicitly and implicitly expressed through their interaction. They are the beliefs and concerns that generally guide the participants to do and say things. For instance, in the excerpt 6, the participants are speaking in the name of easiness (the value of the service) and deciding on actions in keeping with this value. This highlights also the performativity of agency, as it organizes actions in the meaning creation process. Values having agency can drive the conversation forward but they also can, as illustrated in excerpt 6, create friction between the participants and obstruct the interaction.

As a way to invoke values, ideas, motivations and other matters of concern the group could be seen using different kinds of demonstrations during the workshops. Stories and anecdotes are filled with different matters that are given agency to *relate others with* them. For example, in excerpt 2 where a story is being told directs what is important for the group and guiding them towards the decision making agency is assigned to empirical knowledge that Pilvi, voicing the story, has. In these situations communication competence of the participants is emphasized as demonstrations become ineffective if they don't resonate with other participants or are not understood.

To influence how matters resonate with others in the group, the participants attributed emotions (e.g. excitement, frustration) to the difference making

process. It appeared that attitudes lead the participants to adopt a behavior in the observed workshops. While humans in general, and the participants in the studied situation, are able to balance and rationalize between different motives (van Vuuren & Cooren 2010, 96) sometimes the undecidable emotions can take over. For example, as illustrated in the excerpt 1, Kaisa's determination to act sprung out of her frustration towards the city. Her determination thus animated her to do and say things. Understanding that attitudes can be given agency offers a practical aid for participants to recognize and consider their own behavior in a design process.

Going a step further, this thesis recognizes also ventriloquial (see e.g. Cooren et al. 2013) characteristics to agency in design process. As illustrated in the excerpt 1 regarding city's role, a form of agency made the human agents to say something in that specific situation. Similarly (in excerpt 3) the participants voice matters of concern *through* an agency of an outside associate. So, through interaction the participants transmit and embody the matters. These agencies possessed also a shared authority, especially when regarding the city, as the participants had a responsibility to act in the name of the rules and regulations of the city, thus representing the agency of the city.

With this in mind, design literature regards the competence of the participants to practice design highly influential for the outcome of the process, especially those running the workshops. Each observed workshop were led by the same person. This role, embodying the structure of the process, is a form of agency that animated the person in charge. Not only did the status make the one in charge to act in the way they do but the learned habits for the procedure of leading design workshops are as significant for this particular agency. The agency of habits and assumptions also participate into the process by leading the human agent to adopt a behavior.

Being an iterative process, the noteworthiness of textual artifacts and how participants orient to them is also a demonstration of agency. Texts *display* agency by objectifying things that matter for the participants, and, interestingly, in a design process agency is produced during the process. One moment, writing things down on post-its seems a mundane task, but then sticking them on a wall the next moment, makes these pieces of paper possess a guiding force. This action demonstrates how agency is attributed. Similarly, the agency of the customer journey maps that were formulated during the workshops demonstrates appropriation as the participants refer to the posters on a wall for evidence and invoke to them for decision making.

While the arguments for effective process have been given on behalf of collective practice, the author noticed that the collective nature of the process can also hinder agency if the participants do not possess adequate communication competence. In other words, low assertiveness, hesitation to voice concerns or shyness to challenge views in collective interactions can prevent participants to participate in the meaning creation process. For that reason it is essential to develop shared rules for the process and note any unchallenged views to prevent such events to occur.

Summarizing all this, different forms of agency can be categorized under two groups: those enhancing the design process and those hindering it. Reflect-

ing this to the findings about the matters of concern there are potential consequences if the found extremes clash. For example, if a dominant matter of concern is given agency of hindrance the primary function of the design process, to shape ideas, solve problems and produce something new, will not fulfill. Similarly, if abandoned matter of concern is given agency of enhancement, the process might shift tracks to a wrong direction and lead to faulty conclusions.

In contrast to other studies on design practice, this thesis gives consequential role for different forms of agency constituting organizational actions. Whereas design research gives emphasis on individuals rational choices, this thesis takes into account other factors as well. Understanding that human agents are animated by different values, motivations or habits implies that they express themselves through practice in the given situation. Moreover, analyzing the interaction through all these various agencies enabled understanding the matters of concerns raised and the role of the participants in the outcome of the design process.

Concerning agency, in its different forms, engaging with relational ontology highlights the role of practice in a design process. Individual agency, driven by design, can have constitutive force but it needs to be negotiated through communication with other practitioners. For that reason the workshops produced collective design. In other words, design is, because of communication, not an individual performance but a collective effort.

Communication was defined in this thesis as "the creation of a link between two entities". Reflecting what is being said here, it can be stated that communication indeed becomes the host of different people and things in a design process. Therefore design can only evolve from different forms of interaction.

This thesis did not aim to look for a unique definition for design. Instead, the purpose was to broaden the view on the role of communication in these practices. Design was earlier in thesis defined as method to shape decisions. As demonstrated through the analysis, to design (verb) means perceiving and shaping new realms along the current state of the real world. Through communication, designing becomes a process in which different matters are defined and given a solution. Individual matters or arguments are not collective design by themselves. Design is a collective process that allows those matters and arguments to constitute and enable something new. In the observed workshops, designing shaped the way the participants decisions were related to the matters of concerns they evoked.

Returning to Kimbell's (2011, 2012) earlier notion about positioning design in a context of practice truly aided the analyzing the iterative combination of agency, minds and processes. In a broader sense the way communication happened in the design process shaped the observed organization itself. More specifically, communication enacted the organizational knowledge.

Though the workshops provided just a glimpse of potential results regarding the organization and its future, it can be argued that the "shaping process" started during the workshops by inducing concrete course of actions, conferring a reality that is difficult otherwise to contest.

7 DISCUSSION

This thesis was constructed on the idea that communicative constitution of organization approach could provide new ways of comprehending the currently popular design methodology and tools used and adopted across different fields. Inspired by the work of Cooren et al. (2015) and Vasquez et al. (2018) on strategy-making, and design literature in general, this thesis aimed to understand how design as practice performs through communication and to bridge the literature on design and CCO. Previously, the idea that design thinking is a communicative achievement has not been studied. This thesis aimed to fill this gap in the existing literature.

The CCO approach, and the one of Montreal School in particular, was used to gain broader understanding of communication rather than just a function of transporting a message. This constitutive view of communication can be therefore seen as generating different organizational phenomena. Thus, this thesis conceived design thinking as series or communicational events where matters of concern specify actions.

Communication, in this thesis, is seen as the primary way of explaining social realities. Taking a relational view on communication this thesis demonstrates how a design process is a communicative accomplishment. Building on this approach, a framework needed to be developed in order to understand how practice of design is happening in and through communication. Using the framework, a design process was studied by examining the construction of matters of concern.

7.1 Summary of the results

This thesis was laid on three key premises: communication is the foundation of the analysis, relational view on communication recognizes the nature of practice in design, and different forms of agency constitute design process.

The aim of this study was to examine in which ways communication is involved in a design process and to broaden the view of the role of communica-

tion in these practices. Before answering the main research question, the three sub research questions are presented individually and their results discussed in more detail.

SRQ1: How matters of concern present themselves in a design process?

Matters of concern present themselves through communication in a design process. They participate in and go through the co-formulation of design process by repeatedly animating the participants to conversations to explain, justify, legitimize for their positions or actions and define what should be done.

Giving communication a relational definition posits that practitioners of design express themselves, and anything that is to make a difference, through communication. The design process, from an ill-defined problem to a collectively concluded courses of action, emerges from these different interactions as shown in the analysis with the use of excerpts.

The human agents formulate thoughts and ideas in their minds. They ponder over what is consequential for them and for the organization. Then, they compile these thoughts and ideas into different textual artifacts (e.g. post-its, customer journey maps, storyboards) or into talk. It is the matters of concern that animate the human agents to voice them.

Through conversation, individual agents (human or non-human) iteratively invoke the matters of concern into a collective discussion. The role of each matter needs to be collectively discussed to determine whether they are consequential or not. The matters of concern are weighed, evaluated and pondered over by all agents. These matters participate in the design process, for example, by changing the course of conversation, justifying a certain action or by closing the topic.

Singling out the matters of concern they were found to have different characteristics in the context of this study. They can be co-constructive, dominant or abandoned. Table 4 presents and describes the nature of matters raised from the data in more detail. These findings show that matters of concern rise to the collective conversation by their own weight or by animating the actors do what they did in observed situation.

The lifespan of a single matter of concern is not determined by the one performing it, but everyone interpreting it – determining its value. Concrete measures and actions are, through communication, planned based on the matters of concerns when they have become collectively consequential. This thesis therefore share similar findings with Cooren et al. (2015), who noted that "specific matters of concerns lend their weights to various courses of action".

Contrary to design literature in general, which has been overemphasizing the role of the practitioners, this thesis gives a central role to different forms of agency in constituting realities and actions. Therefore, when determining what seems meaningful or important for each participant, the role of agency was expanded to include values, principles and emotions. It is through them, and talk,

text and different artifacts, that matters of concern literally and figuratively present themselves in a design process.

Moreover, leaning on the CCO approach taken in the research, this thesis argues that, in fact, design (process) does not exist before it is collectively practiced. Design is not an end result, it is a process. More specifically, it is a process that is constructed through communication. Therefore, in this thesis, design is seen to stem from different forms of interaction that attempt to define what matters or makes a difference in a given situation, and determine what these matters define to be the course of actions.

Categorization of matters of concern in a design process

Characteristics	Formed in communication	Description
Co-constructive	Collaboratively found and negotiated	- Matters are composed, shaped, produced in communication together by actors - Different forms of agency (human & non-human) participate in voicing the matters - A product of the agency that is "performing" it, but also of all of the agencies interpreting it
Dominant	Voiced by a single agency, not negotiated	- Rise to collective discussion by their own weight as mutually agreed matters - Embody "tacit acceptance", do not necessarily need collective negotiation or authorization - Matters wield relative control over the actor voicing them (i.e. make them do what they do)
Abandoned	Voiced by a single agency, ignored or negotiated as not consequential	- Are not act upon as they rise to collective discussion - Justified as not (collectively) consequential by the actors in given situation - Do not constitute a collective meaning, is not attributed in interaction

Table 4: Matters of concern in design process.

Table 4 presents a summary of the special characteristics of communicative matters of concern raised from the analysis. As the results show, matters of concern present themselves in various ways in a design process. What these results have in common is the fact they are driven by a communicational practice: communication is the common ground in which interactions of design process occur. These findings also embody the collaborative and human nature of design (as defined in design management literature) – from a diversity of voices a common meaning is created.

In all of its forms, communication materializes the matters of concern and gives meaning to them. As there is little to none previous literature on this topic, the findings and characterization of matters of concern do not only contrib-

ute to the current academic literature but they also provide practical knowledge for those applying design approaches for one reason or another in their work.

SRQ2: What communicative events constitute a design process?

Design emerges from communication. Communication is the common ground in which interactions of design occur to define which matters of concern matter in given situation. The findings show that the moments where design is practiced can happen unexpectedly; from a sidenote of a hearsay or an idea outside the agreed scope of a project. Moreover, the meaning creation process is always situated in specific situation characterized by the communication it happens in and through. Previous studies have similarly acknowledged the temporary moments in which communication constitutes the studied phenomenon (e.g. Cooren et al. 2015, 26).

While focusing the analysis on the local practices, the findings enabled to see role of communication in larger space-time spectrum. It is not only creating collective action but also a major component of the organizational reality. The CCO approach extended the direction of findings to everything that the participants of the workshops were defining the value of matters of concern in their interaction. Communication provides a site for constant negotiation of what is consequential for the organization. Thus, everything that, in the interaction of the participants, seemed meaningful or insignificant constituted the design process. More specifically, how the accounts of motives and rationalization are justified in the collective discussion. An important notion of the findings is also that these activities lead to elaboration of a course of action when constituting design process.

The findings show that even the most mundane form of communication can have constitutive nature. That is why the point of analysis was furthered to focus on emotions and motivations the participants portrayed in their discussions. Regarding the ontological stand, the relational definition of communication taken in this thesis was the right medium to recognize the connections between the slightest hints of a matter that would be then voiced. These findings are contrary to general arguments of design literature (e.g. Sanders & Stappers 2008, Verganti 2009) which sees design as a human achievement instead of a result of interplay between various agents.

Positioning the study with the CCO approach makes it is rightful to argue that design is constituted in series of communicative events. Segueing from one flow of interaction to another, the co-construction and negotiation of matters of concern in these communicative events demonstrate the gradual nature of collectively forming matters of concern through interaction. This emergence makes design a communicative process.

Instead of getting to a right design decision, the communicative events highlighted in this study show that they guide the participants to getting a design decision right. Therefore, any event that support the value that is created from practice of design is seen to constitute design. The interplay of practice and communication, in regards of these findings, need to be acknowledged. The

articulated significance, as the findings show, translate the practice to collective attempts to achieve something.

From the various communicative events the characteristics of typical functions of interactions in design process were identified. There is a shared understanding of what is to be done in a design process among the participants. Besides defining the matters of concern, the shared meanings and attitudes towards orientation of the process, idea generation and action planning are negotiated through interaction. Providing this capacity through different forms of agency and forming a web of interaction between these entities. However, organizing the cumulative process of presenting, justifying and negotiating matters of concerns highlights that design does not pre-exist communication.

For communicative events to be successful in a design process it requires high communicative competence from the interactants. The participants were found to have a major impact on the outcomes of the process. Communicative competence impacts greatly how interaction is accomplished in the process, because if the interactants do not have capability to take action (as in question things, challenge views, react to matters) the matters of concern voiced can lead to decisions that are impartial and subsequently wrong conclusions.

It also became evident that the findings for research questions one and two are rather entwined: matters of concern present them through communication and the constitutive nature communicative events is grounded on matters of concern rising in and through the interaction in the practice of design. Communicative events bring forth the practice of design that is woven into matters of concerns that are evoked by human and non-human agents providing a valuable contribution to future studies of design as practice.

SRQ3: What kind of agency occur in a design process?

In design process different matters of concerns are given agency and the matters of concern express themselves through these agencies. Agreeing with Cooren's (2006, 84) depiction of world as a plenum of agencies, it was noticeable that design process is repleted with different forms of agency.

Whereas design literature in general has overemphasized the role of human practitioners (while recognizing forms of non-human agencies in those practices) this thesis decenters that role and adds values, attitudes and emotions to that mix by giving constitutive responsibility for them. Human non-human agents are through conversation and text in their own weight making a difference, and so devote to designing.

In the midst of various agencies, the role of agency was seen to be twofold: enhancing or hindering. They can either restrict and prevent the process or amplify and enable it.

Hindering agencies could be seen to prevent the design process by not allowing certain matters of concerns to rise to the collective discussion. It was also noticed that hindering agencies also restricted conversation causing it to stall, not advancing to the point where the interactants could decide on actions. Assigning hindering agencies to matters of concerns could also direct the conver-

sation to wrong tracks leading it to go around in circles with inconsequential topics. Conclusions arising from matters of concern with this type of agency is therefore a hindrance to the decided action.

Enhancing agencies, on the other hand, enable cumulative founding of matters of concern, raising them into collective conversations. It allows the interactants collectively to mold and carve the presented matters of concerns to make them collectively accepted. Moreover, enhancing agencies provide ability to critical appraise matters of concern and process them, which essentially enables the design process. This gives the interactants the ability to take power in the design process from non-human agencies, such as rules and regulations, identify the problem areas that prevent actions and then work around these hindrances for example by widening the perspective on the matter.

Recognizing the roles of agency is important for paying attention how the extremes might perform in the process. Dominant matters of concerns should avoid hindering agency similarly as abandoned matters of concerns should not be assigned enhancing agency because then they would not lead to conclusions that are relevant for the design process.

This calls for communicative competence from the interactants to identify these situations and respond to them. Those matters of concerns that through their agency dominate the conversation are not designing. They do not further the design process but instead stay afloat as a surging debate. This might lead to "everything goes" and "who cares" attitude when in fact caring is the fundamental condition for difference making, leaving out the emphasizing, iterative essence of design that should be naturally embedded in it. Similarly, abandoned matters of concern might have potential to be consequential but they are ignored because of the agency imposed on them.

Therefore the nature of the design process is embedded in the way it is accomplished through different agencies. Through various agencies, matters of concerns are valued and devalued. Some of them are collectively accepted, some rejected. Some are reshaped.

Arguing for relational ontology, agency in design process is also seen relational. Thus, agency cannot be predicted or entirely controlled by the interactants. Instead, communication forms a web for interaction where all agents and agencies connect through the process of design. Whereas previous studies have observed agency in ways to see design problems in design process (e.g. Kocaballi, Gemeinboeck, Saunders & Dong 2011) argue for strict procedures which, from thesis' point of view, seems restricting the world of actions. Contrary to the previous studies this thesis therefore argues that it is in fact the various agencies that organize the design process.

As the purpose of using design approach in the workshops, and utilizing design methodologies in general, was to solve problems, challenge assumptions and identify solutions, the way agency is assigned to different things has a significant influence on how the design process pans out. If the elaboration (presenting, justifying, negotiating) is left out of the equation what the interactants of a given situation are doing , it could not be called a process. The role of agency is to make a difference in the process of design.

Lastly the author would like to point out that this wider perspective on the concept of agency provided a possibility to depict the phenomenon of design while keeping the analysis on the level of local interactions.

7.2 How does communication constitute design process?

Having discussed the three sub research questions, the main research question is answered here before addressing the practical implications.

This thesis presented a framework for defining design practice from a communicational perspective. The findings illustrated design as a series of communicative events in which different matters of concern are presented, valuated and decided on by the interactants. Through this communicational lens design is therefore perceived as multi-dimensional, formed on both individual and collective level. Designing happens in sequences of different moments when ill-defined problems are collectively constituted as matters of concern and through communication constructed into courses of action.

For this reason this thesis talks about temporary moments of design, in which design emerges as a result of collective effort of interaction. Following this revelation, design is seen as a communicative process, and furthermore this thesis argues that designing cannot happen before it is constituted through communication. Instead, design invites itself into the situation through communication.

Therefore design can only evolve from different forms of interaction. It occurs in cumulative sequences where things are constituted into being through talk and text. Thus, design is waiting to be discursively practiced if the correct situation arises. This line of thinking broadens the perspective of thought compared to previous design literature.

Communication is the site where design interactions occur and where matters of concern account each other. From this communicative perspective, design is a practice of negotiating and constructing matters of concerns collectively to determine which matters are consequential for the collective entity deciding on them. This thesis does not limit design process to a single type of communication, which means that anything positioned in the conversations to explain, justify or legitimize for the positions and actions of the interactants accomplishes design.

 In a design process matters of concern are either co-constructed, dominant or abandoned in and through interaction. Through communication, the interactants define which matters are consequential in a given situation and what actions need to be taken. In this process, the matters of concerns are assigned agency that can either enhance or hinder the design process.

Besides human agents there are different non-human agents participating in the design process. While design literature recognizes and has an emphasis on different textual artifacts generally produced in design, this thesis took a

step further and accounted for other non-human agents such as values, motivations and emotions that are voiced and given agency in the design process.

There are certain characteristics of interaction in the design process that should be accounted when performing these practices. These include developing shared rules for the process, defining matters of concern, enforcing decision making, voicing agencies and organizing a narrative evolution of performativity. Without communication the design process can be argued to be merely thinking and subsequently lack all of the doing. If the elaboration of presenting, justifying and negotiating through interaction is missing, the design process will not produce anything.

Accordingly, the role of the practitioners in design processes is emphasized from the perspective of communication. It is crucial for the practitioners to obtain a certain level of communicative competence to participate in the collective process and to understand different forms of narrative demonstrations used in this endeavor. The practitioners need to recognize weak signals of matters of concern that might otherwise be ignored. Similarly, the practitioners are responsible for how comprehensively they present their views, argue for them and negotiate against other.

While this thesis borrows from two stems of academic literature, namely communicative constitution of organization and design as practice, it also provides new findings for both of them. Design literature has given high emphasis on the design professionals and their expertise. On the contrary, this thesis gives emphasis on communication as it is, as argued and illustrated here, the constitutive force behind the practice of design.

Practical implications

The results of this thesis have practical implications. Firstly, as mentioned many times before, the broad definition of communication highlights not only the role of human actors but also other artifacts, such as texts, to make a difference through communication. Therefore it has to be noted that the tools used or individual knowledge are actually actors of design too, influencing the practice of design. Based on this, the practitioners can be more knowledgeable on their owns actions and how their choices affect the design practice.

Additionally, having presented arguments for communication's constitutive power this thesis proposes practitioners to pay more attention to communication in general. Following the notions presented here, practitioners can examine their own behavior in regards to the choices they make that might be conferring reality. For instance, Barge (2004) suggests that keeping these choices in mind can enhance also practitioners' reflexivity.

Also, it is important that practitioners or future researchers do not reduce communication to only human actors if the focus on construction of social realities. This will result in confined and flawed understanding of the situation the practitioners are established.

Finally, this thesis presented different functions of interaction occurring in a design process. This depiction serves as a practical guide for planning and

implementing design workshops, presenting activities that make a process a design process instead of an unadorned conversation about designing. The characterization of matters of concern in design process and the types of agency they are assigned to also aid practitioners to eschew potential pitfalls of interaction in the design process.

7.3   Evaluation of the study

The credibility of a qualitative research should be evaluated using four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of the study (Lincoln & Guba 1985, 315).

Credibility of this thesis should be assessed first, to demonstrate the trustworthiness of the research. Credibility has been emphasized in the thesis by presenting direct quotations from the observed workshops for the reader to see how the matters of concern were evoked. The researcher also used theoretical triangulation, applying the theories of communication and design literature to analyze the data. In addition, the researcher provided a summary of each observed workshop for the participants so they could clarify their intentions if needed, which establishes the high credibility of this study.

This thesis provided a thick description of the phenomenon, which provided a comprehensive understanding of the research setting. Also, this thesis provided connections to the previous research and studied the chosen phenomena from a holistic view. The level of transferability is also supported by how theory and data was linked in the research. However, it is noteworthy to point out that the researcher cannot prove the applicability of the findings of this particular thesis.

To verify the dependability in this thesis, the research process has been described very transparently and meticulously to allow the reader to be able to appraise the way data was collected and analyzed. By explaining the research process in length, this thesis allows a future researcher to repeat the study.

Concerning the confirmability of this thesis, the finding were linked to theory to highlight that the interpretations were grounded in the data. Providing excerpts of the research data in regards to the analysis prove that the findings were based on the data and not on researcher's potential biases.

When assessing the reliability of the study, researcher's own thoughts and assumptions need to be taken into account. It can be hard for the researcher to avoid mixing one's own thoughts and views with the research subject and it is common that researcher's observations are charged by one's previous experiences (Eskola & Suoranta 2014; 17, 20). Understanding this, and their role in the research, the researcher critically examined their presuppositions throughout the study. In the same breath, it should be noted that decisions made about the

methodology, research setting and the layout of the workshop all contribute to the results of this thesis but do not define the ethics of the study.

While it can be argued that one cannot be objective in the context of observations, objectivity is not a necessity when studying dynamics of individuals (Öksüzoglu-Güven 2016, 55). Similarly, it is not a disadvantage for the study when the nature social realities and connections of different phenomenon are studied. The researcher recognized their own potential subjectivity as a process of being as objective as possible. Similarly, the researcher took into consideration how the potential reader might evaluate the study, and therefore described every step of the research process as transparently and accurately as possible.

The questions relating to ethics and reliability of using observations as primary data collection method were discussed earlier, in the methodology part of this thesis. It should be acknowledged, however, that there was an extensive amount of data collected using different methods in relatively short amount of time. If the researcher would not have been able to directly access the studied organization (and record their workshops) there would not be any empirical evidence to display in this thesis. Also, the data collection method enabled to recognize layers of interaction (gestures, tone of voice) that would not have been able to discover using other methods. That is why these methods are highly recommended for any study with communication-centered perspective by Cooren et al. (2015, 33) as well.

While arguing for the constitutive role of communication in a design process and reflecting the results with previous research this thesis cannot state . The purpose of this thesis was also to develop and test a framework theoretically and empirically on a setting that has not been studied before. Doing that, this thesis build a comprehensive illustration of the studied phenomenon. These decisions also underline the strength of the chosen approach as this thesis successfully demonstrated how design is practiced in and through communication.

Lastly, it is also important to note the limitations of the study. In this thesis, the limitations mostly arise from the empirical setting. The fact that there is not previous research on the field might seem as a limitation for a study of this level. The framework developed, however, is heavily based on research that has been previously focused on strategy-as-practice with CCO approach. Therefore, the functionality of the framework is validated, yet it still can be contested.

Some could argue that communication is given too broad notion when stating it has constitutive role in a design process, something that CCO approaches have been generally criticized before. The communication-centered perspective, however, enables to study different social collectives in a relational manner rather than upholding them from the organization. Also, putting attention to different organizational artifacts in the role of evoking matters of concern is a counterargument for reducing the interpretation to just a simple matter.

The study was carried out by observing a small organization that operates in a versatile industry and therefore the results should be placed in the same context as well. That is why any characterization of larger organizations (e.g.

isolation, siloing, finding common language, role of designers) utilizing design methods were not highlighted in this thesis and transferability of this study to a larger organization's context cannot be guaranteed. Based on the results, the framework could (and should) be used to study communicative events in a larger scale of design practice to reveal what characteristics might arise from the situation, and analyze them by looking how matters of concern are evoked.

7.4   Future research

Although academic literature on communicative constitution of organization is vast, the recent trend to incorporate practice-based studies is still findings its peak. As this study aimed to fill the gap in the research of design and communication there is still ground to cover. For future research it is important to argue for communication's constitutive role rather than position it as a resource.

As there is still little research of the combination of CCO and practice approaches in general, further research could increase the knowledge of the interplay of this area. Arguing for this study, it can be said that combining these approaches provides plentiful opportunities for research settings.

As of this thesis, it deliberately studied the expanded the definition of communication following the CCO approaches, mobilized before in practice-based research. Hereafter, narrowing the study of design process to the level of text can provide interesting findings for the performance of design, extending the role of text from tools to non-human agency. How are they specifically transmitting matters of concern in given situation? More detailed study of what is the transaction between text and conversation would provide to the literature of design-as-practice.

Also, in the future, it would be fertile to extend the study from matters of concern to matters of authority in a design process. This thesis studied a small organization of which all employees participated in the design process, but what would happen in a larger organization where necessarily not everyone can take part in designing? Under such conditions, it could be worth studying what are the things that legitimize the matters of concern to dictate the set course of action and how the matters change to end up embodying authority. What is the link of matters of concern and matters of authority in design process?

Additionally, the findings on agency in design process presented in this study should be furthered as it is an less explored area. Moving the study to another context, for example studying communication professionals using design methods, could provide an understanding how agency is assigned in changing communicative conditions. Moreover, studying the phenomenon from communicational point of view makes understanding practices of collective entities other than organizations more comprehendible.

All in all, the topic of this thesis provides vast possibilities for future researchers interested in the subjects of design and communication that could benefit both stems of literature.

REFERENCES

Aakhus, M., & Harrison, T. R. (2015). Design Thinking About Communication in Health System Innovation. *Organizations, Communication, and Health*; 402–419.

Akama, Y. (2009). Warts-and-all: The real practice of service design, 1st Nordic Conference on Service Design and Service Innovation (pp. 1-11). Oslo, Norway: The Oslo School of Architecture and Design.

Arnaud, N., Fauré, B., Mengis, J., & Cooren, F. (2018). Interconnecting the practice turn and communicative approach to organizing: A new challenge for collective action? *M@n@gement*; 21(2), 691.

Axley, S. (1984). Managerial communication in terms of the conduit metaphor. *Academy of Management Review*; 9, 428-437.

Barge, J.K., (2004). Reflexivity and managerial practice. *Commun. Monogr*; 71 (1), 70e96.

Bisel, R. S. (2010). A Communicative Ontology of Organization? A Description, History, and Critique of CCO Theories for Organization Science. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(1), 124–131.

Bolton R.N., Gustafsson A., McColl-Kennedy J., Sirianni N.J. & Tse D.K. (2014). Small details that make big differences A radical approach to consumption experience as a firm's differentiating strategy. *Journal of Service Management*; 25(2): 253-274.

Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review*; 6, 84-96.

Brown, T. & Katz, B. (2009). Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation. New York (N.Y.): HarperBusiness.

Brummans, B.J.H.M. (2006). Montreal School and the Question of Agency. In Cooren, F., Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (Eds.). Communication as Organizing (pp. 197–211). Routledge.

Brummans, B.J.H.M., Cooren F., Rochibauld D. & Taylor J.R.. (2014). Approaches to the Communicative Constitution of Organizations. In Putnam, L. & Mumby, D. K. (Eds.), The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods (pp. 173–195). SAGE.

Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2015). Forum Introduction: Organizational Communication and the Question of Agency. *Management Communication Quarterly*; *29*(3), 458–462.

Brynjolfsson E., Yu J.H. & Mohammed S.R. (2013). Competing in the Age of Omnichannel Retailing. MIT Sloan Management Review; 54 (4): 23–29.

Cheney, G. (2000). Interpreting interpretive research: Toward perspectivism without relativism. In S. R. Corman & M. S. Poole (Eds.), Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground (pp. 17-45). New York: Guilford Press.

Chiu, M.-L. (2002). An organizational view of design communication in design collaboration. *Design Studies*; *23*(2), 187–210.

Clatworthy, S. (2010), "Service innovation through touch-points: the AT-ONE touch-point cards", Proceedings of ServDes, Linköping University Electronic Press, Linköping, pp. 25-38.

Clatworthy, S. (2011). Service innovation through touch-points: Development of an innovation toolkit for the first stages of new service development. *International Journal of Design; 5*(2).

Connor, L. & Marshall J. P. (2016). Ecologies, ontologies and mythologies of possible futures. In L. Connor & J. P. Marshall (Eds.), Environmental Change and the World's Futures: Ecologies, ontologies and mythologies (pp. 1–14). New York: Routledge.

Cooper, R., Junginger, S., & Lockwood, T. (2009). Design Thinking and Design Management: A Research and Practice Perspective. *Design Management Review;* 20(2), 46–55.

Cooren, F. (2000). The organizing property of communication. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Cooren, F. (2006). The organizational world as a plenum of agencies. In F. Cooren, J. R. Taylor, & E. J. Van Every (Eds.), Communication as organizing: Practical approaches to research into the dynamic of text and conversation (pp. 81–100). Mahwah, NY: Erlbaum.

Cooren, F. (2010). Action and agency in dialogue: Passion, incarnation and ventriloquism. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Cooren, F., Matte, F., Benoit-Barné, C., & Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2013). Communication as Ventriloquism: A Grounded-in-Action Approach to the Study of Organizational Tensions. Communication Monographs, 80(3), 255–277.

Cooren, F. (2015a). In medias res: communication, existence, and materiality, *Communication Research and Practice;* 1(4), 307-321.

Cooren, F. (2015b). Studying Agency From a Ventriloqual Perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly; 29*(3), 475–480.

Cooren, F., Bencherki, N., Chaput, M., & Vásquez, C. (2015). The communicative constitution of strategy-making: Exploring fleeting moments of strategy. In D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, & E. Vaara (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice* (pp. 365-388). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooren, F. & Martine, M. (2016). Communicative Constitution of Organizations. In: C. R. Scott & L. K. Lewis (Eds.). International encyclopedia of organizational communication. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley

Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., & Clark, T. (2011). Communication, Organizing and Organization: An Overview and Introduction to the Special Issue. *Organization Studies;* 32(9), 1149–1170.

Corradi, G., Gherardi, S. & Verzelloni, L. (2010). Through the practice lens: Where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? *Management Learning;* 41(3), 265-283.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. Communication Theory, 9, 119-161.

Crosier, A., & Handford, A. (2012). Customer journey mapping as an advocacy tool for disabled people. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cross, N. (1982). Designerly Ways of Knowing. Design Studies 3(4), 221-227.

Cross, N. (2007). Designerly ways of knowing. London: Springer.

Design Forum Finland. (n.d.) Muotoiluosaamisen Avulla Kasvua, Kilpailukykyä Ja Menestystä. Retrieved August 1, 2019 https://www.designforum.fi

Desmet, D., Markovitch, S., & Paquette, C. (2015). Speed and scale: Unlocking digital value in customer journeys. Retrieved April 18, 2018, from https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/operations/our-insights/speed-and-scale-unlocking-digital-value-in-customer-journeys

Dorst, K. (2004). Investigating the Nature of Design Thinking. Eindhoven University.

Dorst, K. (2011). The core of 'design thinking' and its application. *Design Studie; 32*(6), 521-532.

Dougherty, D. (2004). Organizing practices in services: Capturing practice based knowledge for innovation. *Strategic Organization*; 2(1), 35–64.

Dunne, D., & Martin. R. (2006). Design thinking and how it will change management education: An interview and discussion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education; 5*, 512–523.

Edelman D.C. & Singer M. (2015). Competing on Customer Journeys. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2015/11/competing-on-customer-journeys

Edelman, D. C., & Singer, M. (2015). Competing on customer journeys. *Harvard Business Review, Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services; 93*, 88-100.

Edvardsson, B., Gustafsson, A. and Roos, I. (2005). Service portraits in service research: a critical review. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*; Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 107-121.

Eriksson, P. & Kovalainen, A. (2011). Qualitative methods in business research (2nd edition.). London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Eskola, J. (2010). Laadullisen tutkimuksen juhannustaiat: Laadullisen tutkimuksen analyysi vaihe vaiheelta. In J. Aaltola & R. Valli (Eds.), Ikkunoita tutkimusmetodeihin II: Näkökulmia aloittelevalle tutkijalle tutkimuksen teoreettisiin lähtökohtiin ja analyysimenetelmiin (pp. 179–203). 3rd revised and completed edition. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus.

Eskola, J. & Suoranta, J. (2014). Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen. 10th edition. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Feldman, M.S., & Orlikowski, W.J. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science*; 22(5), 1240–1253.

Giddens, A. (1979). Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contra- diction in social analysis. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Gladwell, M. (2001). The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference. Abacus.

Glock, F. (2009). Aspects of language use in design conversation. *CoDesign*; 5(1), 5–19.

Goel, V. (1995). Sketches of thought. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gond, J.-P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N. and Learmonth, M. (2016), What Do We Mean by Performativity in Organizational and Management Theory? The Uses and Abuses of Performativity. *International Journal of Management Reviews;* 18: 440-463.

Gustafsson, A., Kristensson, P., & Witell, L. (2012). Customer co-creation in service innovation: a matter of communication? *Journal of Service Management;* 23(3), 311–327.

Heskett, J. (2002). Toothpicks and logos: Design in everyday life. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P., & Sajavaara, P. (2009). Tutki ja kirjoita. 15th renewed version. Hämeenlinna: Kirjaston Kirjapaino Oy.

Holmlid, S., & Evenson, S. (2008). Bringing service design to service sciences, management and engineering. Service Science, Management and Engineering Education for the 21st Century (pp. 341-345).

Holmlid, Stefan (2009), "Participative, Co-Operative, Emancipatory: From Participatory Design to Service Design," in Proceedings of the 1st ServDes, Conference on Service Design and Service Innova- tion, Simon Clatworthy, Janne-Valtteri Nisula and Stefan Holmlid, eds. Oslo, Norway: Linko ̈ping University Electronic Press, 105-118.

Johansson, U. & Woodilla, J. (2011). Creating a Synergistic Dialogue Among Design Thinking, Strategy, and Innovation. IDBM papers vol 1, pp. 64-73.

Kankainen, A., Vaajakallio, K., Kantola, V., & Mattelmäki, T. (2012). Storytelling group - a co-design method for service design. *Behaviour & Information Technology; 31*(3), 221-230.

Kimbell, L. (2009). Design Practices in Design Thinking. Journal paper for European Academy of Management, Liverpool, 2009. UK: University of Oxford.

Kimbell, L. (2011). Rethinking Design Thinking: Part I. Design and Culture. Volume 3, Issue 3, pp. 285-306. UK: Berg Publishing.

Kimbell, L. (2012). Rethinking Design Thinking: Part II. Design and Culture. Volume 4, Issue 2, pp. 129-148. UK: Berg Publishing.

Kelley, T. (2001). The Art of Innovation: Lessons in creativity from IDEO, America's leading design firm (first ed.). New York: Doubleday.

Kocaballi, A.B., Gemeinboeck, P., Saunders, R. and Dong, A., (2011). Towards a relational approach to design process. Proceedings of the 45th Conference of the Architectural Science Association, ANZAScA 2011, Sydney.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (2006). The semantic turn: a new foundation for design. Boca Raton, FL.: CRC Press.

Kukkonen, L. (2018, April 16). Helsingin kaupunki valitsi kahdeksan yritystä jakamaan viiden miljoonan euron palvelumuotoilupotin. Retrieved April 04, 2021, from https://www.kauppalehti.fi/uutiset/helsingin-kaupunki-

valitsi-kahdeksan-yritysta-jakamaan-viiden-miljoonan-euron-palvelumuotoilupotin/41226675-52fa-3ff4-ad9f-ba7f1cc58eb5

Latour, B. (2004). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry*; 30, 225–248.

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social : an introduction to actor-network-theory. Clarendon lectures in management studies. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press

Latour, B. (2008a). A Cautious Prometheus? A Few Steps toward a Philosophy of Design (with Special Attention to Peter Sloterdijk). In Hackney, Glynne, and Minton (2008).

Latour, B. (2008b). What is the style of matters of concern? Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

Liedtka, J. (2018). Why Design Thinking Works. *Harvard Business Review*; *96*(5), 72–79.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Lemke F., Clark M. & Wilson H. (2011). Customer experience quality: An exploration in business and consumer contexts using repertory grid technique. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*; 39(6): 846-869.

Lemon K.N. & Verhoef P.C. (2016). Understanding Customer Experience Throughout the Customer Journey. *Journal of Marketing*; 80: 69-96.

Letherby, G., Scott, J., & Williams, M. (2013). The Philosophical Basis of Objectivity and Relativity. In K. Metzler (Ed.), Objectivity and Subjectivity in Social Research (pp. 13–32). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Luhmann, N. (2000). Organisation und Entscheidung [Organization and decision]. Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Martine, T., Cooren, F., Bénel, A., & Zacklad, M. (2015). What Does Really Matter in Technology Adoption and Use? A CCO Approach. *Management Communication Quarterly; 30*(2), 1–24.

Madden, H. & Walters, A.T. (2016). Using an action research approach to embed service design in a higher education institution. *Swedish Design Research Journal*; 14(1), 40-50.

McAuley, J., Duberley, J. & Johnson, P. (2007). Organization theory: Challenges and perspectives. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Meng-Fen, G. C. (2019). Design Thinking Applied: Faculty Communications and Strategic Planning. Presented at the AECT. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335871049_Design_Thinking_Applied_Faculty_Communications_and_Strategic_Planning

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Agency. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved January 4, 2020, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/agency

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Constitute. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved November 5, 2019, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/constitute

Miettunen, E. (2017, August 7). Palvelumuotoiltua viestintää. Retrieved April 18, 2018, from http://www.ground.fi/palvelumuotoiltua-viestintaa/

Moritz, S. (2005). Service Design: Practical Access to an Evolving Field. Köln International School of Design, Cologne, Germany.

Myers, M. D. (2013). Qualitative research in business & management (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage.

Nicolini, D. (2011). Practice as the Site of Knowing: Insights from the Field of Telemedicine. *Organization Science; 22*(3), 602-620.

Nikulainen, T. (2016, November 25). Palvelumuotoilu ja viestintä ne yhteen soppii. Retrieved April 18, 2018, from https://brunnen.fi/blogi/palvelumuotoilu-ja-viestinta-ne-yhteen-soppii/

Nissi, R., & Pälli, P. (2020). Textual artifacts at the centre of sensemaking: The use of discursive-material resources in constructing joint understanding in organisational workshops. *Discourse Studies*; 22(2), 123–145.

Norman, D. (2010). Design Thinking: A Useful Myth. Core77. Available at: https://www.core77.com/posts/16790/design-thinking-a-useful-myth-16790. Accessed on 26 July 2019.

Nussbaum, B. (2004). The Power of Design. *BusinessWeek, 3883*, 96–94.

Olkkonen, L. (2015). Stakeholder expectations: Conceptual Foundation and Empirical Analysis (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Jyväskylä University Digital Archive.

Orlikowski, W. and Scott S. (2008) Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. Academy of Management Annals, 2(1), 433-474.

Ornamo. n.d.. Muotoilualan koulutus. Retrieved October 16, 2019, from https://www.ornamo.fi/fi/teema/muotoilualan-koulutus.

Oxman, R., & Oxman, R. (1994). Cognitive models in design case libraries. *Automation in Construction, 3*(2), 113-122.

Patrício, L., Fisk, R. P., Falcão e Cunha, J., & Constantine, L. (2011). Multilevel service design: From customer value constellation to service experience blueprinting. *Journal of Service Research; 14*(2), 180-200.

Pine, B. J. & Gilmore, J. H. (2011). The experience economy (Updated ed.). Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business Review Press

Pink, S. (2007). Video in ethnographic research. Doing visual ethnography (pp. 96-116). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd doi: 10.4135/9780857025029

Piskonen, E. (2018, February 27). Palvelumuotoilu – alaa mullistava muutos vai markkinointikikka? Retrieved April 18, 2018, from https://viestijat.fi/palvelumuotoilu-alaa-mullistava-muutos-vai-markkinointikikka/

Polaine, Andy, Lavrans Løvlie, and Ben Reason (2013), Service Design. Brooklyn, NY: Rosenfeld.

Ponsignon F., Durrieu F. & Bouzdine-Chameeva T. (2017). Customer experience design: a case study in the cultural sector. *Journal of Service Management*; 28(4): 763-787.

Ponsignon, F. (2017). Customer experience design. *Journal of Service Management; 28*(4), 763-787.

Pullman M.E. & Gross M.A. (2004). Ability of Experience Design Elements to Elicit Emotions and Loyalty Behaviors. *Journal of Decision Sciences*; 35 (3): 551-587).

Qualey, M. (2017). Designed Leadership. New York: Columbia University Press.

Razzouk, R. and Shute, V. (2012),"What is design thinking and why is it important?". *Review of Education Research*; Vol. 82 No. 3, pp. 330-348.

Reed, M. (2010). Is Communication Constitutive of Organization? *Management Communication Quarterly*; 24, 151-157.

Rockwell, C. (2010). The mathematics of brand satisfaction. In Lockwood, T. (Eds), Design thinking: Integrating innovation, customer experience and brand value (pp. 221–231). Allworth Press.

Rosenbaum, M. S., Otalora, M. L., & Ramírez, G. C. (2017). How to create a realistic customer journey map. *Business Horizons; 60*, 143-150.

Sanders, E. & Stappers, P.J. (2008). Co-Creation and the New Landscapes of Design. *Co-Design; 4* (1), 5-18.

Schatzki, T. (2017). Sayings, texts and discursive formations. In A. Hui, T. Schatzki & E. Shove (Eds.). The Nexus of Practices: Connections, Constellations, Practitioners (pp. 126-140). London: Routledge.

Schoeneborn, D. (2008). Alternatives Considered But Not Disclosed: The Ambiguous Role of PowerPoint in Cross-Project Learning. Germany: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.

Schoeneborn, D., Blaschke, S., Cooren, F., McPhee, R. D., Seidl, D., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). The Three Schools of CCO Thinking: Interactive Dialogue and Systematic Comparison. *Management Communication Quarterly*; 28(2), 285–316.

Schoeneborn, D. and Vásquez, C. (2017). Communicative Constitution of Organizations. In The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication (eds C.R. Scott, J.R. Barker, T. Kuhn, J. Keyton, P.K. Turner and L.K. Lewis).

Schön, A. D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. London: Basic Books Inc.

Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J. F., & Silverman, D. (Eds.) (2008). Qualitative research practice. SAGE Publications Ltd

Segelström, F. (2009), "Communicating through visualizations: service designers on visualizing user research". Proceedings of ServDes, Linköping University Electronic Press, Linköping, pp. 175-185.

Segelström, F. (2013), "Stakeholder engagement for service design", PhD Thesis No. 586, Linköping Studies in Arts and Sciences, Linköping, available at: www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:647878/FULLTEXT03.pdf

Seppälä, M. (2016, March 16). Service-Dominant Logic and How It Reframes Our Business Operations. Retrieved April 18, 2018, from https://medium.com/@mikaelseppala/service-dominant-logic-and-how-it-reframes-our-business-operations-bc769439cfe1

Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). The mathematical theory of communication. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sillince, J. A. A. (2010). Can CCO Theory Tell Us How Organizing Is Distinct From Markets, Networking, Belonging to a Community, or Supporting a Social Movement? *Management Communication Quarterly*; 24,132-138.

Simon, H. A. (1969). The science of artificial (3rd ed. 1990). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Sprain, L. & Boromisza-Habashi, D. (2013) The Ethnographer of Communication at the Table: Building Cultural Competence, Designing Strategic Action. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*; 41:2, 181-187.

Stake, R. E. (2010). Qualitative research: Studying how things work. New York: Guilford Press.

Stein A. & Ramaseshan B. (2016). Towards the identification of customer experience touch point elements. *Journal of Retailing & Consumer Services*; 30: 8-19.

Stempfle, J., & Badke-Schaub, P. (2002). Thinking in design teams - an analysis of team communication. *Design Studies*; *23*(5), 473–496.

Stickdorn, M. & Schneider, J. (2015). This is service design thinking: Basics, tools, cases (5th printing). Amsterdam: BIS Publishers.

Teixeira J., Patricio L., Nunes N.J., Nóbrega L., Fisk R.P. & Constantine L. (2012). Customer experience modeling: from customer experience to service design. *Journal of Service Management*, 23 (3): 362-376.

Tuomi, J. & Sarajärvi, A. (2018). Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi (Uudistettu laitos.). Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Tammi.

Vaara, E. & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy-as-Practice: Taking Social Practices Seriously. *The Academy of Management Annals,* 6(1):1-52.

Valtonen, A. (2007). Redefining industrial design: changes in the design practice in Finland. Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki.

van Vuuren, M., & Cooren, F. (2010). "My Attitude Made Me Do It": Considering the Agency of Attitudes. *Human Studies*; 33(1), 85–101.

Vargo, S. & Lusch, R. (2004) Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing,* 68: 1-17.

Vargo, Stephen L. and Robert F. Lusch (2008). Service-Dominant Logic: Continuing the Evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*; 36 (1), 1-10.

Vásquez, C., Schoeneborn, D., & Sergi, V. (2015). Summoning the spirits: Organizational texts and the (dis)ordering properties of communication. *Human Relations*, 69(3), 629–659.

Vásquez C., Bencherki N., Cooren F., Sergi V. (2018). From 'matters of concern' to 'matters of authority': Studying the performativity of strategy from a communicative constitution of organization (CCO) approach. *Long Range Planning*; 51(3): 417-435.

Verganti, R. (2009). Design driven innovation : changing the rules of competition by radically innovating what things mean. Harvard Business Press: Boston.

Verhoef, P. C., Lemon, K. N., Parasuraman, A., Roggeveen, A., Tsiros, M., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2009). Customer experience creation: Determinants, dynamics and management strategies. *Journal of Retailing; 85*(1).

Voorhees, C. M. (2017). Service encounters, experiences and the customer journey. *Journal of Business Research; 79*, 269-280.

Waloszek, G. (2015, June 24). Introduction to Design Thinking. Retrieved February 5, 2018, from https://experience.sap.com/skillup/introduction-to-design-thinking/

Weathers, N. (2010). A study of the experiential service design process at a luxury hotel. PhD thesis University of Westminster Harrow Business School, The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.

Weick, K. E. (1979). The social psychology of organizing. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Weick, K. E. (1986). The concept of loose coupling: An assessment. *AERA Organizational Theory Dialogue;* 8(11).

Wetter-Edman, Katarina, Daniela Sangiorgi, Bo Edvardsson, Stefan Holmlid, Christian Grönroos, and Tuuli Mattelmäki (2014). Design for Value Co-Creation: Exploring Synergies Between Design for Service and Service Logic. *Service Science*; 6 (2), 106-121.

Wetter-Edman, K.. (2011). Service Design: A Conceptualization of an Emerging Practice. Göteborgs universitet, Konstnärliga fakultetskansliet. Gothenburg: ArtMonitor.

Whittington, R. (2006) Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies;* 27(5): 613-634.

Yang, X., Mao, H. & Peracchio, L.A. (2012). It's not whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game? The role of process and outcome in experience consumption. *Journal of Marketing Research*; 49(6): 954-966.

Yu, E. (2017). A Reflection on and Suggestion of Service Design Processes: From Activity-Centered Descriptions toward Outcome- Oriented Demonstrations. *Archives of Design Research*; 30 (1), 25-39.

Yu, E., & Sangiorgi, D. (2018). Service Design as an Approach to Implement the Value Cocreation Perspective in New Service Development. *Journal of Service Research*; *21*(1), 40–58.

Zomerdijk, L. G., & Voss, C. A. (2010). Service design for experience-centric services. *Journal of Service Research; 13*(1), 67-82.

Zomerdijk, L.G. and Voss, C.A. (2011). NSD processes and practices in experiential services. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*; 28(1), 63–80.

Öksüzoglu-Güven, G. (2016) Objectivity and Research Ethics in Participant Observation. *The Anthropologist*; 25:1-2, 52-59.

99U. "Natasha Jen: Design Thinking Is Bullsh*t." YouTube, (19 Mar. 2018), www.youtube.com/watch?v=_raleGrTdUg. Accessed on 26 July 2019.