Staging aesthetic disruption through design methods for service innovation



Katarina Wetter-Edman, Academy of Design and Crafts, Gothenburg University, Kristinelundsgatan 6-8, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden, Experio Lab, County Council of Värmland, 651 82 Karlstad, Sweden, FoUiS, County Council of Sörmland, 632 20 Eskilstuna, Sweden Josina Vink, Centre for Service Research, Karlstad University, 651 88 Karlstad, Sweden, Experio Lab, County Council of Värmland, 651 82 Karlstad, Sweden Johan Blomkvist, Linköping University, 581 83 Linköping, Sweden

Within the discourse connecting design and innovation, there has been a growing emphasis on the importance of cognitive processes in relation to design methods. However, the over-emphasis on cognition fails to clearly identify the triggers of change necessary for service innovation. In response, this article draws on classic American pragmatism and service-dominant logic to highlight the underappreciated role of actors' bodily experiences when using design methods for service innovation. The authors of this paper posit that design methods stage aesthetic disruption, a sensory experience that challenges actors' existing assumptions. In doing so, the use of design methods can lead to destabilizing the habitual action of participating actors, helping them to break free of existing institutions and contribute to service innovation.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Keywords: aesthetics, design methods, innovation, service design, design cognition

There is growing interest in the idea that design methods can help to drive service innovation (Miettinen & Koivisto, 2009; Ostrom, Parasuraman, Bowen, Patrício, & Voss, 2015; Ostrom et al., 2010; Sangiorgi & Prendiville, 2015). However, design researchers increasingly argue that the popularized versions of design thinking are often superficial, reducing the value of the design practices in which they were originally developed (Buchanan, 2015; Johansson-Sköldberg, Woodilla & Çetinkaya, 2013; Kimbell, 2011a). More specifically, much of the extant research and popular discourse linking design and innovation emphasizes a cognitivist perspective on design methods (Brown, 2009; Cross, 2006; Dorst, 2011; Kolko, 2010; Martin, 2009), inadvertently downplaying the role of the body.

Corresponding author: Katarina Wetter-Edman katarina. wetter-edman@oru.se



stood as ideation with post-it notes around a boardroom table. Such a www.elsevier.com/locate/destud 0142-694X Design Studies **55** (2018) 5–26

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2017.11.007

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

This overly-cognitive perspective advances a view of design that is often under-

hollowing out of design methods risks the erosion of their value for catalyzing service innovation as they are implemented at scale. As such, this article sets out to highlight how design methods spark the change necessary for service innovation, a core aspect that is often omitted within the existing discourse on service design. By adopting a pragmatist stance, we emphasize the creative, embodied nature of all action and recognize its inherent interactional and aesthetic dimensions (Johnson, 2015; Shusterman, 2012). Through this perspective, we highlight the importance of aesthetic disruption, a sensory experience that challenges actors' existing assumptions about a situation, as a central catalyst for changing habitual action.

We argue that aesthetic disruption helps to spark the divergent action required for service innovation by adopting a service-dominant logic (S-D logic) view of service innovation as a process of changing institutions (Koskela-Huotari, Edvardsson, Jonas, Sörhammar, & Witell, 2016; Vargo, Wieland, & Akaka, 2015). While S-D logic is gaining traction within design research (Kimbell, 2011b; Sangiorgi & Prendiville, 2015; Wetter-Edman, 2009; Wetter-Edman et al., 2014), there has not yet been an adequate understanding of how design connects with service innovation from an S-D logic perspective. Accordingly, this article delineates how aesthetic disruption on the micro-level is a critical part of service innovation on a macro-level by catalyzing institutional change. Thus, this article contributes to service design research by demonstrating the role of participatory, embodied ways of working, which often get overlooked in cognitive narratives of using design methods for service innovation.

This paper begins with a brief review of the existing literature on design methods and service innovation, demonstrating the need for an alternative perspective. To establish the theoretical framing of the paper, we delineate our pragmatist position on the role of experience in catalyzing change among individual actors, connecting it with an S-D logic view of service innovation. This provides the foundation for the conceptualization of aesthetic disruption staged through design methods as a driver of service innovation. We then contextualize this theoretical development through the use of an empirical illustration. The paper concludes with a summary of the ways in which this alternative theorization challenges and advances service design research and practice.

l Design methods for service innovation

Design methods, which include a variety of approaches for changing situations in the direction of an ideal, have played a prominent role in the design field since the late 1950s (Bayazit, 2004). Over the last decade, interest in design methods has expanded beyond the field of design due to the popularization of design thinking (Kimbell, 2011a). With the rise of the service economy, design methods have increasingly been positioned as a valuable means of achieving service innovation (Andreassen et al., 2016; Holmlid & Evenson, 2008, pp. 341–345; Ostrom et al., 2010, 2015). This growing interest has corresponded with the development of a host of compilations of design methods positioned for service innovation (e.g. Kimbell, 2015; Miettinen & Koivisto, 2009; Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011). Prominent methods have included: service blueprinting (Bitner, Ostrom, & Morgan, 2008; Patrício, Fisk, & Falcão e Cunha, 2008; Shostack, 1984), AT-ONE touchpoint cards (Clatworthy, 2011), prototyping (Blomkvist, 2012), roleplaying (Kaario, Vaajakallio, Lehtinen, Kantola, & Kuikkaniemi, 2009), mapping and modeling (Morelli, 2002; Patrício, Fisk, Falcão e Cunha, & Constantine, 2011) and contextual interviews (Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011). In the many toolkits and method books, and even within academic literature, the emphasis has been on articulating the unique functions of each design method, such as identifying insights on customer experiences (Zomerdijk & Voss, 2010) or supporting new service development (Bitner et al., 2008; Shostack, 1984).

Despite all the focus on design methods, and their utility for service innovation, there is still a limited understanding of the design practices connected with these methods, and a lingering uncertainty when positioning the contribution of design to service innovation (Ostrom et al., 2015; Sangiorgi & Prendiville, 2015). There is concern that the popularized versions of design methods have been taken out of context, without the knowledge and skills that originally drove their success (Buchanan, 2015; Johansson-Sköldberg et al., 2013; Stephens & Boland, 2015). As more organizations invest in design methods as a means of achieving service innovation (Bason, 2017; Mager, 2009; UK Design Council, 2011), a pressing need arises to understand exactly what it is about design methods and their associated practices that catalyzes service innovation. To advance theory and practice, we believe this discussion must move beyond the popularized messages touting the general applicability of human-centric, visual, and multidisciplinary design methods.

When designing for service innovation, participation by non-designers in design methods has become prominent because of the collaborative nature of service (Sangiorgi, Prendiville, & Ricketts, 2014). Thus, growing attention has been paid to participatory design processes, especially co-design, whereby the affected actors are engaged in the design process (Freire & Sangiorgi, 2010; Sanders & Stappers, 2008; Steen, Manschot, & De Koning, 2011; Trischler & Sinnewe, 2012). Oftentimes, this has resulted in actors being invited to take part in design methods with the purpose of collective idea generation, providing feedback, or building ownership for implementation. The literature on involving various actors in design methods through co-design highlights a number of benefits for both end users and service providers (Hussain, Sanders, & Steinert, 2012; Steen et al., 2011; Wetter-Edman, 2012), but these benefits have not been strongly connected with service innovation. Instead, discussions about service innovation tend to focus on advancing new service development,

often neglecting the importance of the meaningful engagement of actors in the process (Holmlid, Wetter-Edman, & Edvardsson, 2017).

Despite oscillating debates about the emphasis on design methods within the field of design (Bayazit, 2004), there has been an ongoing attempt to understand what lies at the core of the practices associated with these methods. Early on, design methods were seen as a means of understanding problems in new ways (Jones, 1970). More recently, but along the same lines, there has been an emphasis on 'framing' as the core of how design enables innovation (Dorst, 2011). Framing, a concept first introduced by Schön (1983), involves the creation of a standpoint from which a situation can be perceived (Dorst, 2011). In relation to this idea, there has been a growing emphasis on the cognitive aspects of designing, such as abductive reasoning (Cross, 2006; Dorst, 2011; Kolko, 2010), as design's differentiating characteristic in relation to innovation. While understanding this way of reasoning in design is critically important, the focus on thinking has created a false dualism between mind and body, which runs counter to the pragmatist research that inspired much of the current discussion. Pragmatists like Dewey and Schön recognized that cognitive processes were not separate from, but intimately intertwined with, the explicitly embodied approach of acting (Rylander, 2009).

The literature discussing design methods for service innovation acknowledges positive byproducts arising from the use of these methods, such as spontaneous 'ah-ha' moments (Bitner et al., 2008) and embodied cognitive processes (Clatworthy, 2011). Yet, if you look at pragmatist writings that have been a major inspiration to design (Dalsgaard, 2014; Rylander, 2009; Steen, 2013), these experiences are not simply byproducts, but rather a central catalyst for change. In addition, design research has outlined the potential of participating in design methods to serve as a means of transformation (Sanders & Stappers, 2008; Sangiorgi, 2010; Vink, Wetter-Edman, & Aguirre, 2017); however, further analysis is needed in order to understand how these methods help to realize this goal. When adopting a pragmatist position, the process of engaging in design methods comes into focus. By returning to the early work of pragmatists, we can better understand the importance of actor participation in the experiential aspects of design methods.

2 Theoretical framing

In the following section, we outline our theoretical basis for understanding how the bodily experience of engaging with design methods is critical to the process of service innovation. First, we frame our pragmatist positioning and then we draw on an S-D logic perspective in order to connect to service innovation.

2.1 Adopting a pragmatist position

We align our understanding of design methods and their associated practices with a growing body of research articulating design's affinity with a pragmatist perspective (e.g. Buchanan, 2015; Dalsgaard, 2014; 2017; Rylander, 2009; Steen, 2013; Stephens & Boland, 2015), and more specifically with the concept of pragmatist inquiry (Dewey, 1938). This process of inquiry is, according to Dewey, 'the controlled or directed transformation of an indeterminate situation into one that is so determinate in its constituent distinctions and relations as to convert the elements of the original situation into a unified whole' (Dewey, 1938, pp. 104–105). As such, inquiry involves a process of sensemaking by reflecting on one's experience in a particular situation through both thought and action.

Seeing the use of design methods as a form of inquiry advances the role of experience and the bodily senses since pragmatist philosophy is innately concerned with embodied action (Bernstein, 2010; Shusterman, 2012). Dewey distinguishes between two kinds of experiences: the first is minimally reflected upon - it is felt and 'direct', as he calls it, like experiencing a cold shower; the second, called 'known' or 'indirect', is reflected upon, and includes lived experiences, which through reflection, become integrated (Hickman, 1998). Although the emphasis in Dewey's notion of experience is lived, embodied experience, he also includes thinking and conscious awareness in all human experience (Bernstein, 1971/1999). Experience, although often thought of as something occurring within an individual, is aesthetic by definition and created during interaction between the individual and their environment. Pragmatists discuss the aesthetics of active, creative engagement, recognizing 'that all action (artistic or political) requires the body, our tool of tools' (Shusterman, 2012, p. 3). In this paper, we pay particular attention to experience as the starting point of inquiry, something that pragmatists argue to be crucial when it comes to altering habitual action (Dewey, 1938).

According to Dewey, all inquiries start with primary, or empirical, experience. This experience can involve an unsettling situation, where assumptions and preunderstandings do not align with the experienced situation (Bernstein, 2010). An unsettling situation can cause confusion for the experiencer, sparking a process of inquiry, where the individual moves through a sensemaking process that involves both thinking and acting. For Dewey, the concept of situation is critical. The word 'situation' does not refer to a single object or event or set of objects and events. For Dewey, we neither experience nor form judgments about objects and events in isolation, but only in connection with a contextual whole. The contextual whole is what is called a 'situation' (Dewey, 1938).

Dewey suggests that it is the situation that sparks doubt, causing experiencers to feel unsettled. 'The indeterminate situation is characterized by being uncertain and unsettled. The situation is ambiguous, confused, and full of conflicting tendencies, and this renders us doubtful as inquirers. The situation is open to inquiry in a way that its parts "do not hang together" (Dewey, 1938, p. 107). Dewey suggests that we cannot come to terms with these situations through individual cognitive activities, but must both engage in and modify existing conditions, not merely 'mental' processes. In a situation, the experience of unstableness initiates a process of inquiry that includes reflecting on and reevaluating ordinary activities, or what is referred to in pragmatism as habit or habitual action.

Understanding how the destabilization of habit initiates the cycle of inquiry and mutates actors' actions over time is central to pragmatism (Arjaliès, Simpson, & Lorino, 2013). According to Peirce (as cited in Arjaliès et al., 2013, p. 135), a habit is 'a learned predisposition to undertake a standard course of action in response to specific circumstances, or to attribute standard meaning to specific events'. Along this same line of reasoning, Dewey considers habits to be central to human conduct as they enable actors to act without continuously thinking and planning their actions, conditioned by the consequences of past and present activities (Campbell, 1998; Garrison, 1998). As such, habits are grounded in our preconceptions and influence actions based on previous experiences that are continuously being put to the test in evolving situations. As long as a habit is deemed 'fit for purpose', based on the situated interpretation of circumstances, it will 'prevail as the normal way of doing things' (Arjaliès et al., 2013, p. 135). This makes habits remarkably persistent. In Dewey's words, a habit remains 'until the environment obstinately rejects it' (Campbell, 1998, p. 24).

When the habitual action is challenged and a disruption is experienced, that habit will be altered in order to better fit the individual's new understanding of the environment. A pragmatist position reinforces that actors' habits are being disrupted by situations that prompt a process of inquiry (Dewey, 1938). Thus, a nuanced sensitivity to experiences can reveal unease in a situation, triggering a change in the assumptions and habits of actors. If actors experience a habit as being inadequate, or inappropriate, they may transform their course of action and situation. From a pragmatist position, it is the aesthetic experience of an unsettled situation that activates inquiry and leads to habitual change. By gaining insight through their senses, actors can recognize a discrepancy between their prevailing course of action and the situation. Relating the concepts of inquiry and habit destabilization to the use of design methods, we posit that there are a multitude of situations where this interruption can occur. Before explaining how the destabilization of habitual action is connected to service innovation, we briefly explain service-dominant logic and the associated understanding of service innovation.

2.2 An S-D logic view of service innovation

S-D logic emerged in the 2000s as an alternative worldview for thinking about service (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; 2008). This worldview lies in contrast to a traditional goods-dominant logic, which focuses on the production of outputs through a value chain (Lusch, Vargo, & Wessels, 2008). Within a goodsdominant logic services are seen as a category of market offerings, whereas S-D logic recognizes service as the fundamental unit of exchange (Edvardsson, Gustafsson, & Roos, 2005). Through this perspective, service is defined as a process whereby actors integrate their resources for the benefit of other actors (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). For example, when a baker and a farmer make an exchange, an S-D logic perspective highlights that they are not simply exchanging bread and wheat, but rather the application of knowledge, skills and other resources needed for baking and farming. Here it is also important to note that, aligned with S-D logic, we use the term 'actor' in this paper to refer to any individual, not just limited to professional designers, who may be engaged in using design methods and involved in the process of service innovation.

As S-D logic has continued its evolution, there has been increased attention to the context in which resource integration takes place (Edvardsson, Skålén, & Tronvoll, 2012; Vargo & Lusch, 2008). In this way, S-D logic can help with the process of zooming out from the micro-level to better understand the bigger picture (Vargo & Lusch, 2016a). Within this more aggregate view, S-D logic emphasizes that service is enabled and constrained by institutions (Vargo & Lusch, 2016b). Institutions are defined as the socially-constructed rules, roles, norms and beliefs that endure to become 'the rules of the game' (North, 1990). Returning to the example of the farmer and the baker, S-D logic highlights that there are existing social norms and rules that guide how farmers plant and harvest wheat, how bakers bake bread, and how actors in these two roles interact. To enable novel forms of service, actors must work to change the institutions guiding resource integration within the given context (Vargo et al., 2015).

In this vein, S-D logic conceptualizes service innovation as a process of doing institutional work – creating, disrupting and maintaining institutions – to enable novel forms of resource integration (Koskela-Huotari et al., 2016; Vargo et al., 2015). In other conceptualizations and frameworks for service innovation (see Carlborg, Kindström, & Kowalkowski, 2014; Gallouj & Savona, 2009; Snyder, Witell, Gustafsson, Fombelle, & Kristensson, 2016; Witell, Snyder, Gustafsson, Fombelle, & Kristensson, 2016), innovation is understood from a firm-centric view as a novel output. Instead, by drawing on institutional theory, S-D logic reinforces the fact that service innovation involves a novel way of acting. Linking back to the previous example, service innovation could entail the farmer and baker working together to experiment with new ways of growing wheat that would help to create a better flour for baking bread. By engaging in divergent action, and not simply conforming to existing ways of working, the farmer and baker can contribute to reshaping institutions.

We take the S-D logic view of service innovation here not only because S-D logic is gaining traction in the fields of service research and design (see Kimbell, 2011b; Sangiorgi & Prendiville, 2015; Wetter-Edman, 2009; Wetter-Edman et al., 2014), but also because we see S-D logic's processual, institutional view of service as intimately aligned with a pragmatist perspective. In fact, some of the foundational contributions to institutional theory were grounded in pragmatism (see Hodgson, 2004; Veblen, 1899). Furthermore, we concur with previous researchers who have suggested that linking pragmatism and institutional theory can help to illuminate a more embodied and experiential understanding of action that is often missing within institutional theory (Nilsson, 2015; Weik, 2012). S-D logic can help to act as a glue in the process of synthesizing these research streams to into a unified, coherent theoretical framework by enabling us to zoom in and out of different levels of aggregation related to service innovation (Vargo & Lusch, 2016a). As such, while this understanding of service innovation as reshaping institutions is currently described mainly on the macro-level, by linking these perspectives, we can understand that reshaping institutions depends directly on the micro-level process of habit destabilization to enable divergent action.

2.3 Connecting micro and macro

To understand the connection between the process of habit destabilization and service innovation, we must examine the interplay between the micro-level (e.g. individuals and their interactions) and the macro-level (e.g. community and society). It is important to note that different things are not happening on the micro- and macro-levels; rather, it is a matter of the extent of aggregation being examined analytically. As service innovation is linked to changing institutions, we examine the connection between habitual action and institutions. One of the main contributions of classical pragmatists such as Mead and Dewey was to show how a theory of habitual action improves our understanding of social structures, or what we call here institutions. Pragmatists argue that institutions are, in fact, an aggregation of the habits and dispositions of individual actors, and these institutions rely on habitual action for reproduction (Gronow, 2012).

Institutional theorists also acknowledge that habits are a key link between actors and institutions, but tend to stress the downward pressure by institutions on habits (Hodgson, 2004). However, the recent literature on institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence, Leca, & Zilber, 2013; Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2009), which forms the basis for understanding service innovation in S-D logic, stresses that actors' actions can also contribute toward intentionally disrupting, creating and maintaining institutions. In order to reshape institutions, it is acknowledged that actors must be able to break away, if only slightly, from conforming to existing institutions or the current 'rules of the game' (Seo & Creed, 2002). Since habits are the central mechanism by which actors reproduce and conform to existing institutions (Gronow, 2012; Hodgson, 2004), the destabilization of habitual action is critical when it comes to enabling actors to intentionally reshape institutions through divergent action. As such, destabilizing habitual action at a microlevel is a necessary element of catalyzing service innovation at a macro-level.

3 Conceptualizing Aesthetic disruption

By integrating pragmatism and S-D logic, we develop the connection between habit destabilization and service innovation. On this theoretical basis, we now move on to the role of design methods as one potential catalyst of a multi-level process of change. Below, we conceptualize and explain aesthetic disruption through design methods and how this contributes to service innovation. This is followed by an empirical illustration where we contextualize our theoretical reasoning with an example from practice.

3.1 Aesthetic disruption through design methods

The central role of aesthetics and aesthetic experience in design practice and design methods has been discussed (Buwert, 2015; Folkman, 2010; Koskinen, 2016; Michlewski, 2008; Stephens & Boland, 2015; Tonkinwise, 2011). In interaction design and experience design discourse, the role of aesthetic experience has been prominent. Drawing on pragmatism, McCarthy and Wright (2004) suggest that involving all of an actor's sensory faculties is emotionally satisfying and fulfilling for the experiencer. Similarly, Petersen, Iversen, Krogh, and Ludvigsen (2004) see pragmatist aesthetics as a promising focus when designing complex systems with a focus on user-centricity. Research from these areas of design tends to focus on the role of aesthetic experience in the user experience. However, we are focusing here on how actors' use of their senses and their interactions with a given situation spark a process of inquiry through their participation in design methods.

In this paper, we align with Buchanan's suggestion that the role of design is to create environments that advance the process of sensemaking to aid actors in satisfying their intentions (Buchanan, 2015). We argue that it is by staging situations, in effect proposing environments where actors may sense contradictions, that design methods catalyze a process of inquiry, shifting individual assumptions and destabilizing habits. Design methods embed a series of events in order to support a process of reflection. This involves staging situations whereby actors may experience conflict, thus triggering inquiry. Informed by pragmatism, we refer to this interruption as *aesthetic disruption*. Aesthetic

disruption is a sensory experience that questions an actor's existing assumptions about a situation.

A situation that leads to aesthetic disruption might be something that is very subtle or overwhelming. For example, when conducting ethnographic research through participant observation, actors may be triggered by surprising information that they gain through their senses. When constructing and examining a service blueprint to map out a user's journey, and the backstage processes, actors may notice new things, see different perspectives, and recognize conflicting needs that spark a process of reflection. By learning from their visceral experience staged through design methods, actors can be triggered to alter their own habitual action. In the following subsection, we bring the threads of our argument together to show how aesthetic disruption relates to service innovation.

3.2 Aesthetic disruption for service innovation

This research suggests that design methods stage aesthetic disruption, which in turn catalyzes service innovation. We develop this argument by drawing on the work of classic pragmatists, and the notion of experience as being of key importance to inquiry. Pragmatist writings posit that experiencing a surprising and uncomfortable situation sparks a process of inquiry that destabilizes actors' existing habits. Experiencing aesthetic disruption enables actors to see their habits – or standard courses of action – as no longer fit for purpose. We posit that these unsettling moments which spark habit destabilization can be staged through design methods.

Zooming out from the micro-level to the macro-level, and drawing on S-D logic, we see service innovation as a process whereby actors reshape institutions, or the enduring 'rules of the game', to enable novel forms of resource integration (Koskela-Huotari et al., 2016; Vargo et al., 2015). Service innovation involves actors engaging in divergent action aimed at altering the institutions that guide their actions. Since institutions rely on habitual action, destabilizing actors' habits on the micro-level is the foundation of actors' efforts to reshape institutions on the macro-level during the process of service innovation. Our core argument is summarized in Figure 1 below. On the micro-level, this figure shows an actor experiencing aesthetic disruption, which then sparks a process of inquiry leading to habit destabilization. When zooming out, the figure shows that this process is part of the macro-level as the same actor is shifting the shared ways of working within a larger network of actors, contributing to a process of service innovation.



Figure 1 Aesthetic disruption catalyzes service innovation by destabilizing actors' habits

3.3 Empirical illustrations of Aesthetic disruption in healthcare

To contextualize this theoretical discussion on how aesthetic disruption can catalyze service innovation, we describe an empirical example where actors employed design methods in the context of healthcare. This illustrative example shows how experiences staged using design methods, in this case contextual interviews and service prototyping, can spark habitual change for participating actors. The example draws on work being done by Experio Lab, a national centre for patient-focused service innovation that employs participatory service design methods within healthcare systems in Sweden. We present here one Experio Lab project, called Chronically Involved,¹ which brought together patients and a variety of service providers in a primary care setting, including nurses, doctors and administrators, to explore how they might radically improve the care of patients with chronic disease.

Early on during this design project, staff from the primary care centre went into patients' homes to conduct contextual interviews in the hopes of learning more about patients' experience of receiving care and living with chronic disease. The contextual interview is an ethnographic field method used in design,



Figure 2 A contextual interview conducted in a patient's home

combining observation and questioning (Blomberg, Giacomi, Mosher, & Swenton-Wall, 1993, pp. 123–155). Within this method, it is important that the interviews are conducted within a context of relevance, such as an existing service setting, in order to situate the insights generated through the interview (Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011). The primary care staff who conducted interviews felt that a change had been sparked inside them during the interview process. Through the experience of going into patients' homes, seeing the set-up, smelling the smells, feeling what their furniture felt like, and hearing the patients' stories, healthcare staff began to understand care and chronic illness from another perspective (see Figure 2).

These experiences were sometimes at odds with the staff's existing assumptions about their patients, formed through their regular interactions at the clinic. Previously, many of the healthcare professionals who participated held the assumption that healthcare provided the solution for patients, but through their experience of contextual interviews they came to realize that healthcare played only a small supporting role in patients' lives. After seeing individuals in context, the staff also started viewing the individuals they were interviewing not only as patients, but also as colleagues, friends and partners. These experiential moments of surprise during the contextual interviews challenged the staff's underlying assumptions about their patients and sparked a process of inquiry where staff started to question their existing habits. The staff no longer felt that they could continue communicating with and involving their patients in the same way during medical appointments. The discrepancy between existing habits and their experiences in the encounters within the contextual interviews are an example aesthetic disruption.

Another design method employed during the Chronically Involved project was that of service prototyping. Service prototypes have been described as representations of future service situations (Blomkvist, 2014). Some prototypes enable actors to perceive future situations through videos, images, maps or physical mock-ups, while others facilitate a more active and, arguably, engaging interaction. In this project, patients and service providers worked together to prototype five possible new solutions including: an appointment guide, an overview of the treatment flow, conversation cards, a diagnosis day and a new role for a chronic pain nurse. To prototype the new appointment guide, a mock-up of the physical guide was created and patients and service providers role-played how the guide could be used during a medical visit. By enacting different roles in the context of the clinic, participating actors could experience firsthand how this new tool may influence an appointment (see Figure 3).

Many of the patients involved expressed that their perspective on their relationship with their diagnosis and service provision had changed through the prototyping process. By developing and experiencing alternatives to the



Figure 3 Prototyping the new appointment guide in the clinic

Staging aesthetic disruption for service innovation

existing care delivery processes, patients' assumptions about their own agency were challenged. Through these situated enactments, patients experienced what it could be like to work with service providers in a way that was more person-centered and where they had more influence over decision-making. These disruptive experiences in context, staged through prototyping methods, altered patients' habits in their interactions with primary care staff.

As a result, staff and patients increasingly began to engage in actions that diverged from the norm in an attempt to realize patients as partners in their own care. In effect, they were collectively contributing to altering the entrenched rules around how patient and provider interactions should be carried out. The aesthetic disruption that the staff and patients experienced, staged through design methods (in this case contextual interviewing and service prototyping), catalyzed a groundswell of actors working to disrupt the existing role of the patient and change widespread norms concerning decisionmaking during care. Provoked by their experiences, some members of staff have initiated, and become involved in, a variety of large-scale processes of practice and policy change to help realize a new role for patients as healthcare partners.

This example illustrates our argument that by participating in design methods actors can experience aesthetic disruption that destabilizes their existing habits. In turn, this experience helps actors break away from existing institutions and actively work at reshaping those institutions, such as the norms of service delivery or the role of the patient, to enable new forms of resource integration. Drawing the macro- and micro-level perspectives together, we can see in this example that staging aesthetic disruption using design methods can catalyze service innovation. Furthermore, a pragmatist perspective on inquiry and habit highlights that change is triggered through action and experience. As such, these design methods not only have value in advancing a particular output, but are critical for staging situated experiences that challenge actors' assumptions and help actors break free from their habitual actions.

4 Contributions

This research suggests that staging aesthetic disruption using design methods sparks habit destabilization among the participating actors and catalyzes the process of service innovation. Through this work, we have contributed to service design literature in two principal ways: 1) by bringing experience and, in particular, aesthetic disruption to the fore as a key catalyst of change through design methods; and 2) by integrating pragmatism, design, service-dominant logic and institutional theory into a cohesive framework that brings together the macro- and micro-levels of design and service innovation. Below we discuss these contributions and their relationship with the existing literature.

Firstly, this article offers an alternative to the dominant emphasis on cognition in existing design literature (Kolko, 2010) and popular discourse (Brown, 2009; Martin, 2009). While we have taken an alternative perspective, we see this work as both a complement and an advancement of previous work done on framing and abductive reasoning (Cross, 2006; Dorst, 2011; Kolko, 2010), rather than a contradiction to it. Here, we forward this discussion by deepening the understanding of the bodily and experiential elements of design methods that trigger inquiry and are inseparable from the thinking process. By illuminating aesthetic disruption as a catalyst for service innovation, this paper advances research on the neglected element of aesthetics in design (Tonkinwise, 2011). This research advances the work of Stephens and Boland (2014) on aesthetic knowledge by highlighting the importance of disruption in connection to habit change for service innovation. Furthermore, we extend the research of Markussen (2013) on disruptive aesthetics in the context of urban design activism by positioning aesthetic disruption for widespread applicability and emphasizing the embodied experience of actors, rather than the materials that provoke them.

In doing so, this research presents insights for service design that are distinct from, but connected to, discussions within other design disciplines on topics such as: the role of embodied interaction in human-computer interaction (Dourish, 2001), 'making strange' in technology design (Bell, Blythe, & Sengers, 2005), users' aesthetic experience in interaction design (McCarthy & Wright, 2015; Wright, Wallace, & McCarthy, 2008), and the role of aesthetics in the emerging field of social design (Koskinen, 2016). In contrast to this previous research, we highlight the importance of actors experiencing disruption when employing design methods for service innovation. Aesthetic disruption is distinct from discussions about empathy, or understanding others' feelings through design methods (e.g. Battarbee & Koskinen, 2005; Koskinen, Battarbee, & Mattelmäki, 2003; Kouprie & Visser, 2009), in that it highlights experiences that challenge actors' own habitual actions. For instance, in our illustrative example, the aesthetic disruption patients experienced by participating in the prototyping process was not about empathizing with other actors, but challenging their own assumptions and habits around being a patient. While we emphasize the applicability of aesthetic disruption across design disciplines, it is particularly relevant to service design, which continues to focus on employing a participatory approach to service innovation (Sangiorgi & Prendiville, 2017).

Secondly, the integration of design, through pragmatism, with S-D logic and institutional theory shows the potential impact of design methods at different levels of aggregation. While most of the existing design literature discusses the implications of design methods at a micro-level (Vink, Wetter-Edman, Edvardsson, & Tronvoll, 2016), this article builds the connection between design and the process of reshaping institutions at a macro-level. By connecting

aesthetic disruption and institutional change, we respond to calls to acknowledge a more experiential understanding of institutional work (Lawrence et al., 2013; Nilsson, 2015; Weik, 2012) and suggest that it is through lived and embodied experiences that actors build the reflexivity necessary for contributing to institutional change (Suddaby, Viale, & Gendron, 2016; Voronov & Yorks, 2015). By making this micro-macro connection, this paper argues for the value of design methods as a practical approach to sparking service innovation, with implications well beyond the field of design, including in service research and institutional theory.

5 Conclusion

This paper advances the central role of experience and aesthetic disruption when employing design methods for service innovation. This conceptualization of aesthetic disruption can aid designers and other actors in more intentionally catalyzing service innovation through a focus on actors' experiences staged through design methods. Furthermore, by highlighting the role of aesthetic disruption as a central catalyst of change, this paper reinforces the value of some of the more traditional design skills, such as visualization and forming tangible artefacts, as well as the skills important for guiding actors through the process of inquiry, such as facilitation and coaching. This paper also reinforces the importance of taking the time to engage diverse actors in thoughtfully staged experiences when designing for service innovation. We argue that actors' experiences, when engaging in design methods, are not just interesting byproducts, but central to the process of service innovation. Furthermore, this research also suggests that the significance of design methods is not the methods in and of themselves or their outputs, but the experiences they stage for actors.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska – Curie grant agreement No. 642116. The information and views set out in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein. In addition, this research has been conducted with funding from Torsten Söderberg Foundation project No. E22 – Making sense of design work and Riksbankens Jubileumsfond project No. RMP16-1159.

We would like to thank our anonymous reviewers and the editors for their helpful suggestions. We would also like to express appreciation to Stefan Holmlid and Anna Rylander Eklund for their helpful feedback on early versions of this paper and Erin McPhee for the illustration support. And lastly, thank you to Experio Lab, all those involved in the Chronically Involved project and the design firm Doberman for their generous sharing of photographs from the above described project.

Notes

 See videos from Experio Lab's Chronically Involved project at the following linkshttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1eK_0APeUSs&index=3& list=PLrmJespYpJZNddOLUZsUa9xFMrZE6I7AChttp://experiolab.se/en/? project=kroniskt-engagerade.

References

- Andreassen, T. W., Kristensson, P., Lervik-Olsen, L., Parasuraman, A., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Edvardsson, B., et al. (2016). Linking service design to value creation and service research. *Journal of Service Management*, 27(1), 21–29.
- Arjaliès, D. L., Simpson, B., & Lorino, P. (2013). Understanding organizational creativity: Insights from pragmatism. *American Pragmatism and Organization-Issues and Controversies*131–145, July.
- Bason, C. (2017). *Leading Public Design: Discovering Human-Centred Governance*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Battarbee, K., & Koskinen, I. (2005). Co-experience: User experience as interaction. *CoDesign*, 1(1), 5–18.
- Bayazit, N. (2004). Investigating design: A review of forty years of design research. *Design Issues*, 20(1), 16–29.
- Bell, G., Blythe, M., & Sengers, P. (2005). Making by making strange: Defamiliarization and the design of domestic technologies. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 12(2), 149–173.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1971/1999). Praxis and Action: Contemporary Philosophies of human activity. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bernstein, R. J. (2010). The Pragmatic Turn. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Bitner, M. J., Ostrom, A. L., & Morgan, F. N. (2008). Service blueprinting: A practical technique for service innovation. *California Management Review*, 50(3), 66–94.
- Blomberg, J., Giacomi, J., Mosher, A., & Swenton-Wall, P. (1993). Ethnographic Field Methods and Their Relation To Design. In: Participatory Design: Principles and Practices. CRC Press.
- Blomkvist, J. (2012). Conceptualisations of service prototyping: Service sketches, walkthroughs and live service prototypes. In S. Miettinen, & A. Valtonen (Eds.), *Service Design with Theory* (pp. 175–186). Vantaa, Finland: Lapland University Press.
- Blomkvist, J. (2014). Representing Future Situations of Service: Prototyping in Service Design. Dissertation No. 618. In: Linköping Studies in Arts and Science. Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Brown, T. (2009). Change by Design: How Design Thinking Transforms Organizations and Inspires Innovation. New York: Harper Business.
- Buchanan, R. (2015). Worlds in the making: Design, management, and the reform of organizational culture. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation, 1*(1), 5–21.
- Buwert, P. M. (2015). An/aesth/ethics: The ethical potential of design. *Artifact*, 3(3), 4.1-4.11.

- Campbell, J. (1998). Dewey's conception of community. In L. A. Hickman (Ed.), *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a Postmodern Generation* (pp. 23–42). Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Carlborg, P., Kindström, D., & Kowalkowski, C. (2014). The evolution of service innovation research: A critical review and synthesis. *Service Industries Journal*, 34(5), 373–398.
- 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).
- Cross, N. (2006). Designerly Ways of Knowing. London: Springer.
- Dalsgaard, P. (2014). Pragmatism and design thinking. International Journal of Design, 8(1).
- Dalsgaard, P. (2017). Instruments of inquiry: Understanding the nature and role of tools in design. *International Journal of Design*, 11(1).
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Dorst, K. (2011). The core of 'design thinking' and its application. *Design Studies*, 32(6), 521–532.
- Dourish, P. (2001). Where the Action Is. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Edvardsson, B., Gustafsson, A., & Roos, I. (2005). Service portraits in service research: A critical review. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 6(1), 107–121.
- Edvardsson, B., Skålén, P., & Tronvoll, B. (2012). Service systems as a foundation for resource integration and value co-creation. *Review of Marketing Research*, 9(2), 79–126.
- Folkman, N. (2010). Evaluating aesthetics in design: A phenomenological approach. *Design Issues*, 26(1), 40-53.
- Freire, K., & Sangiorgi, D. (2010). Service design and healthcare innovation: From consumption to coproduction and co-creation. In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Service Design and Service Innovation (ServDes). Linköping, Sweden.*
- Gallouj, F., & Savona, M. (2009). Innovation in services: A review of the debate and a research agenda. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 19(2), 149–172.
- Garrison, J. W. (1998). Dewey's philosophy as education. In L. A. Hickman (Ed.), *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a Postmodern Generation* (pp. 63–81). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gronow, A. (2012). From habits to social institutions: A pragmatist perspective. In Ward, A., & Southerton, D. (Eds.). *The Habits of Consumption, Vol. 12* (pp. 26–44). Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies.
- Hickman, L. A. (1998). *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a Postmodern Generation.* Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2004). Reclaiming habit for institutional economics. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 25(5), 651–660.
- Holmlid, S., & Evenson, S. (2008). Bringing Service Design to Service Sciences, Management and Engineering. In: Service Science, Management and Engineering Education for the 21st Century. Springer.
- Holmlid, S., Wetter-Edman, K., & Edvardsson, B. (2017). Breaking free from NSD: Design and service beyond new service development. In D. Sangiorgi, & A. Prendiville (Eds.), *Designing for Service: Key Issues & New Directions*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Hussain, S., Sanders, E., & Steinert, M. (2012). Participatory design with marginalized people in developing countries: Challenges and opportunities

experienced in a field study in Cambodia. *International Journal of Design*, 6(2), 91-109.

- Johansson-Sköldberg, U., Woodilla, J., & Çetinkaya, M. (2013). Design thinking: Past, present and possible futures. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 22(2), 121–146.
- Johnson, M. (2015). The aesthetics of embodied life. In A. Scarinzi (Ed.), Aesthetics and the Embodied Mind: Beyond Art Theory and the Cartesian Mind-Body Dichotomy (pp. 23–38). Springer.
- Jones, J. C. (1970). *Design Methods and Technology: Seeds of Human Futures*. Musaw: Martin Ryder.
- Kaario, P., Vaajakallio, K., Lehtinen, V., Kantola, V., & Kuikkaniemi, K. (2009). Someone else's shoes-using role-playing games in user-centered service design. *Proceedings of the First Service Design and Service Innovation Conference* (ServDes) 119–134.
- Kimbell, L. (2011a). Rethinking design thinking: Part I. *Design and Culture*, *3*(3), 285–306.
- Kimbell, L. (2011b). Designing for service as one way of designing services. International Journal of Design, 5(2), 41–52.
- Kimbell, L. (2015). Service Innovation Handbook: Action-Oriented Creative Thinking Toolkit for Services Organizations. Amsterdam: BIS Publishers.
- Kolko, J. (2010). Abductive thinking and sensemaking: The drivers of design synthesis. *Design Issues*, 26(1), 15–28.
- Koskela-Huotari, K., Edvardsson, B., Jonas, J. M., Sörhammar, D., & Witell, L. (2016). Innovation in service ecosystems: Breaking, making & maintaining institutionalized rules of resource integration. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2964–2971.
- Koskinen, I. (2016). Agonistic, convivial, and conceptual aesthetics in new social design. *Design Issues*, *32*(3), 18–29.
- Koskinen, I., Battarbee, K., & Mattelmäki, T. (2003). *Empathic Design, User Experience in Product Design*. Helsinki: IT Press.
- Kouprie, M., & Visser, F. S. (2009). A framework for empathy in design: Stepping into and out of the user's life. *Journal of Engineering Design*, 20(5), 437–448.
- Lawrence, T. B., Leca, B., & Zilber, T. B. (2013). Institutional work: Current research, new directions and overlooked issues. *Organization Studies*, *34*(8), 1023–1033.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. Glegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Or*ganization Studies (2nd ed.). (pp. 215–254) London: Sage.
- Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2009). Institutional Work Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies or Organizations. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lusch, R., Vargo, S., & Wessels, G. (2008). Toward a conceptual foundation for service science: Contributions from service-dominant logic. *IBM Systems Journal*, 47(1), 5–14.
- Mager, B. (2009). Service design as an emerging field. In S. Miettinen, & M. Koivisto (Eds.), *Designing Services with Innovative Methods*. University of Art and Design.
- Markussen, T. (2013). The disruptive aesthetics of design activism: Enacting design between art and politics. *Design Issues*, 29(1).
- Martin, R. L. (2009). The Design of Business: Why Design Thinking Is the Next Competitive Advantage. Harvard Business Press.
- McCarthy, J., & Wright, P. (2004). Technology as experience. *Interactions*, 11(5), 42–43.

Staging aesthetic disruption for service innovation

- McCarthy, J., & Wright, P. (2015). Taking [A]Part: The Politics and Aesthetics of Experience-Centred Design. MIT Press.
- Michlewski, K. (2008). Uncovering design attitude: Inside the culture of designers. *Organization Studies*, 29(3), 373–392.
- Miettinen, S., & Koivisto, M. (2009). *Designing Services with Innovative Methods*. University of Art and Design.
- Morelli, N. (2002). Designing product/service systems: A methodological exploration. *Design Issues*, 18(3), 3–17.
- Nilsson, W. (2015). Positive institutional work: Exploring institutional work through the lens of positive organizational scholarship. Academy of Management Review, 40(3), 370–398.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, A. L., Bitner, M. J., Brown, S. W., Burkhard, K. A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., et al. (2010). Moving forward and making a difference: Research priorities for the science of service. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(1), 4–36.
- Ostrom, A. L., Parasuraman, A., Bowen, D. E., Patrício, L., & Voss, C. A. (2015). Service research priorities in a rapidly changing context. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(2), 127–159.
- Patrício, L., Fisk, R. P., & Falcão e Cunha, J. (2008). Designing multi-interface service experiences: The service experience blueprint. *Journal of Service Research*, 10(4), 318–334.
- 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.
- Petersen, M. G., Iversen, O. S., Krogh, P. G., & Ludvigsen, M. (2004). Aesthetic interaction: A pragmatist's aesthetics of interactive systems. In *Proceedings of* the Fifth Conference on Designing Interactive Systems: Processes, Practices, Methods, and Techniques.
- Rylander, A. (2009). Design thinking as knowledge work: Epistemological foundations and practical implications. *Design Management Journal*, 4(1), 7–19.
- Sanders, E., & Stappers, P. (2008). Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *CoDesign*, 4(1), 5–18.
- Sangiorgi, D. (2010). Transformative services and transformation design. *International Journal of Design*, 5(1).
- Sangiorgi, D., & Prendiville, A. (2015). A theoretical framework for studying service design practices: First steps to a mature field. *Design Management Journal*, 9(1), 61–73.
- Sangiorgi, D., & Prendiville, A. (2017). *Designing for Service: Key Issues & New Directions*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Sangiorgi, D., Prendiville, A., & Ricketts, A. (2014). Mapping and Developing Service Design Research In the UK. Service Design Research UK Network. Retrieved from. http://imagination.lancs.ac.uk/outcomes/Mapping_and_Developing_Service_Design_Research_UK_%E2%80%93_Final_report_2014.
- Schön, D. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. London: Basic Books Inc.
- Seo, M. G., & Creed, W. E. D. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. Academy of Management Review, 27(2), 222–247.
- Shostack, G. L. (1984). Designing services that deliver. *Harvard Business Review*, 62(1), 133–139.
- Shusterman, R. (2012). *Thinking Through the Body: Essays in Somaesthetics*. Cambridge University Press.

- Snyder, H., Witell, L., Gustafsson, A., Fombelle, P., & Kristensson, P. (2016). Identifying categories of service innovation: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(7), 2401–2408.
- Steen, M. (2013). Co-design as a process of joint inquiry and imagination. *Design Issues*, *29*(2), 16–28.
- Steen, M., Manschot, M., & De Koning, K. (2011). Benefits of co-design in service design projects. *International Journal of Design*, 5(2).
- Stephens, J. P., & Boland, B. J. (2015). The aesthetic knowledge problem of problem-solving with design thinking. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(3), 219–232.
- Stickdorn, M., & Schneider, J. (2011). This is Service Design Thinking: Basics, Tools, Cases. N.J.: Wiley Hoboken.
- Suddaby, R., Viale, T., & Gendron, Y. (2016). Reflexivity: The role of embedded social position and entrepreneurial social skill in processes of field level change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 225–245.
- Tonkinwise, C. (2011). A taste for practices: Unrepressing style in design thinking. Design Studies, 32(6), 533–545.
- Trischler, J., & Sinnewe, E. (2012). The concept of on-going interactions in codesign: Insights from three different disciplines. In *Proceedings of the Third Nordic Conference on Service Design and Service Innovation (ServDes)* (pp. 277–286).
- UK Design Council. (2011). *Design for Innovation: Facts, Figures & Practical Plans for Growth*. London, UK. Retrieved from. https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/DesignForInnovation Dec2011.pdf.
- Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17.
- Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36, 1–10.
- Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2016a). Service-dominant logic 2025. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 34(1), 46–67.
- Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2016b). Institutions and axioms: An extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Research*, 44(1), 5–23.
- Vargo, S., Wieland, H., & Akaka, M. A. (2015). Innovation through institutionalization: A service ecosystems perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 44(1), 63–72.
- Veblen, T. B. (1899). The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study in the Evolution of Institutions. New York: Macmillan.
- Vink, J., Wetter-Edman, K., & Aguirre, M. (2017). Designing for aesthetic disruption: Altering mental models in social systems through designerly practices. *The Design Journal*, 20(sup1), S2168–S2177.
- Vink, J., Wetter-Edman, K., Edvardsson, B., & Tronvoll, B. (2016). Understanding the influence of the co-design process on well-being. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Service Design and Innovation Conference (ServDes)* (pp. 390–420). Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Voronov, M., & Yorks, L. (2015). "Did you notice that?" Theorizing differences in the capacity to apprehend institutional contradictions. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(4), 563–586.
- Weik, E. (2012). Introducing "the creativity of action" into institutionalist theory. *M@n@gement*, *15*(5), 563–581.
- Wetter-Edman, K. (2009). Exploring overlaps and differences in service dominant logic and design thinking. In *Proceedings of the First Nordic Conference on Ser*vice Design and Service Innovation (ServDes) (pp. 201–212).

Staging aesthetic disruption for service innovation

- Wetter-Edman, K. (2012). Relations and rationales of user's involvement in service design and service management. In S. Miettinen, & A. Valtonen (Eds.), Service Design with Theory. Discussions on Change, Value and Methods (pp. 107–116). Finland: Lapland University Press.
- Wetter-Edman, K., Sangiorgi, D., Edvardsson, B., Holmlid, S., Grönroos, C., & Mattelmäki, T. (2014). Design for value co-creation: Exploring synergies between design for service and service logic. *Service Science*, 6(2), 106–121.
- Witell, L., Snyder, H., Gustafsson, A., Fombelle, P., & Kristensson, P. (2016). Defining service innovation: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2863–2872.
- Wright, P., Wallace, J., & McCarthy, J. (2008). Aesthetics and experiencecentered design. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TO-CHI), 15(4), 18.
- Zomerdijk, L. G., & Voss, C. A. (2010). Service design for experience-centric services. Journal of Service Research, 13(1), 67–82.