

**Please cite as:** Finsterwalder, J., Foote, J., Nicholas, G., Taylor, A., Hepi, M., Baker, V., and Dayal, N. (2017). Conceptual Underpinnings for Transformative Research in a Service Ecosystems Context to Resolve Social Issues – Framework Foundations and Extensions, *The Service Industries Journal*, 37(11-12), 766-782, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2017.1351550>).

**Conceptual Underpinnings for Transformative Research in a Service Ecosystems Context to Resolve Social Issues – Framework Foundations and Extensions**

Jörg Finsterwalder<sup>1\*</sup>, Jeff Foote<sup>2,3</sup>, Graeme Nicholas<sup>2</sup>, Annabel Taylor<sup>4,5</sup>, Maria Hepi<sup>2</sup>, Virginia Baker<sup>2</sup> and Natasha Dayal<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Business, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Environmental Science and Research (ESR), Christchurch and Wellington, New Zealand

<sup>3</sup> School of Health Sciences, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>4</sup> Department of Social Work and Human Services, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>5</sup> Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research, Mackay, Australia

\* Corresponding author

**Acknowledgment**

This research is part of a project titled “Involving the ‘hard-to-reach’ in making services reachable” and is solely funded by the New Zealand Government’s Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment’s Health and Society Research Fund during the period October

2013 to September 2016. The authors wish to acknowledge fellow researchers who have carried out case studies and participated in planning, analysis and discussion for the research throughout the project: Sue Carswell, Andrew Frost, Moana-o-Hinerangi and Tua Tauetia-Su'a.

## **Abstract**

A number of services within society are designed to improve the wellbeing of its members and transform lives. Some services focus on protection and support of vulnerable members of society, for example, those suffering the effects of drug use, mental health conditions, violence, or poverty. Clients of such social services may also come from minority or marginalised cultural backgrounds. Typically, social services aim to reduce disparities and enhance individual and population wellbeing. A major challenge for social policy makers and social service providers is to establish and maintain constructive engagement between the social services and those they are intended to serve. Some of these vulnerable clients are deemed 'hard-to-reach' (HTR) by policy makers and service providers. Yet, the transformation of lives requires the involvement of the focal actor (client) and their service or activity system, as well as the engagement of other actors, such as the social worker embedded in their service or activity system. This paper aims to further unpack a novel approach, called integrative transformative service framework. It extends its conceptualisation which fuses mainly three different approaches, namely Transformative Service Research (TSR), (Cultural-Historical) Activity Theory (CHAT) as well as (Regulatory) Engagement Theory (RET). By focusing on TSR, the paper identifies theoretical gaps in the framework and highlights the requirements of HTR which necessitate the inclusion of the two other concepts. Hence, the present paper continues

theory development. It parallels in more detail the three concepts to highlight their emergent links. This is to further establish the foundations for this novel approach and to amend its conceptual shortcomings. This leads to an extension of the framework to assist scholars and practitioners concerned with the transformation of actors' lives who face social issues.

### **Keywords**

Transformative Service Research, (Cultural-Historical) Activity Theory, (Regulatory) Engagement Theory, hard-to-reach, social services

### **Paper Type**

Conceptual paper

### **Introduction**

In society a range of social services have evolved to improve wellbeing, and protect and support vulnerable members of society, for example, in regard to drug use, mental health conditions, victimisation or poverty; issues that more recently have also found their way into the domain of service research (for example, Fisk et al., 2016). Social services aim to reduce disparities and enhance individual and population wellbeing, especially of minority groups or certain ethnicities. Public policy underpins the design and administration of the social services sector (Anderson et al., 2013). A major challenge for policy makers and social service providers is the services' ability to 'reach' and achieve constructive engagement with those they are intended to serve. Hence, some of these vulnerable clients may be deemed by policy makers and service providers as being 'hard-to-reach' (HTR) or 'hard-to-engage' (Boag-Munroe &

Evangelou, 2012, p. 210). However, because wellbeing, service co-creation and consumption amongst actors are intertwined (cf. Ostrom et al., 2015), the focus cannot only be on the engagement (or lack thereof) of the focal actor (for example, the client) in need but also has to be on the other actors, for example the ones facilitating the service (such as the social worker).

One goal of this paper is to further advance the topic of social service provision for 'HTR' populations and to increase the engagement and wellbeing of the parties involved. Another objective is to conceptually ground and further develop an approach which centres on enhancing wellbeing and could potentially more broadly be applied to different service contexts. This paper draws on Hepi et al.'s (2017) initial conceptual development of an integrative transformative service framework. The paper aims to further unpack and extend the framework. This is to establish a broader conceptual and theoretical basis. This study identifies shortcomings in Transformative Service Research (TSR; Anderson et al., 2013) that necessitate further theoretical development, especially in the light of HTR requirements, by drawing on (Cultural-Historical) Activity Theory (CHAT; Engeström, 2015; Leontiev, 1977) as well as (Regulatory) Engagement Theory (RET; Higgins, 2006; Higgins & Scholer, 2009). The three approaches which, according to Hepi et al. (2017), when used in conjunction, enable the construction of an integrative transformative framework that simultaneously focuses on wellbeing, activities and engagement embedded in one approach. A more detailed understanding of the framework and its extension can then further facilitate the resolution of social issues of HTR clients by improving the engagement and the uptake of social services, improvement of co-creative activities and provide scholars and practitioners with a framework which might be more universally applicable.

This paper is organised as follows. It starts by drawing on the initial conceptual development by Hepi et al. (2017) and provides a general perspective of the underlying contextual factors of the integrative transformative service framework. Derived from Hepi et al. (2017) these intertwined and embedded elements can be classified as: actor context, cultural context, service context and systems context. Next, the conceptual gaps are detailed with a focus on Transformative Service Research (Anderson et al., 2013) to highlight the necessity to incorporate Cultural-Historical Activity Theory's extension (Engeström, 2015) and (Regulatory) Engagement Theory (Scholer & Higgins, 2009). This is done by stressing the conceptual requirements derived from a HTR context. The subsequent section examines the 'fusion' of concepts and establishes the steps towards a conceptual integration more broadly. Based on the theoretical gaps identified, this is followed by an extended integrative framework which infuses further theoretical development. The next section then outlines the theoretical and practical implications. The paper then finishes with a conclusion and outlines future research.

### **Setting the Scene — Contextual Factors**

This section details the four contextual factors relevant for the study of HTR scenarios. These are: actor context, cultural context, service context and systems context.

#### ***Actor Context: Hard-to-Reach Clients***

'Hard-to-reach' (HTR) populations have been defined in numerous ways. The term is congruent with a number of sub-populations including marginalised, hidden, forgotten, disadvantaged and age-specific populations – arguably macro population-based groups.

Micro-population groups that are deemed HTR are based on ethnicity, sexuality, disability or religious beliefs. It is put forward that HTR denotes groups that are problematic and costly to governments and the community due to the efforts required to engage with such groups (Flanagan & Hancock, 2010). However, some scholars argue that HTR has become a convenient way to denote sub-populations to depict certain characteristics and behaviours as avoidant and intentional (Featherstone et al., 2012), and are hesitant “to label any groups as hard-to-reach, feeling the label detracts from the notion that *client engagement is a responsibility of services* not individuals” (Cortis et al., 2009, p. VI, italics added).

Brackertz (2007) suggests to include demographic, cultural, behavioural, attitudinal and structural characteristics when defining HTR. Boag-Munro and Evangelou’s (2012) definition entails hidden populations, vulnerable, under-served, socially excluded, disengaged marginalised, non-(or disinclined) users, high risk or at risk, families with multifaceted needs, minority groups, ethnic populations and those with a reduced likelihood to access services. In some contexts, social exclusion has been used as a synonym for HTR (Mackenzie et al., 2012).

Boag-Munro and Evangelou (2012, p. 210) aim “to understand and engage with those who are characterised as ‘hard-to-reach’ or ‘hard-to-engage’” which they distinguish as the former applying to accessibilities, and the latter focusing on forming a relationship with the service in question. Yet, neither of these two conceptualisations resolve the problem that they place the burden and characteristics of being ‘hard-to-reach’ or ‘hard-to-engage’ exclusively upon focal populations (Brackertz, 2007). Hence, Hepi et al. (2017) suggest to regard the issue of HTR as a system problem rather than trying to put responsibility on a particular group of actors. In the following the term ‘hard-to-engagedness’ (HTE) is used to denote the systems approach.

### ***Cultural Context: Ethnic Disparities and Approaches to Wellbeing***

Most countries around the globe display a mix of cultural influences and ethnicities. Ethnicity is often correlated with health and social outcomes. For example, life expectancy of indigenous people is often lower than that of non-indigenous populations (Ministry of Health, 2017). Understanding health and wellbeing in context of a focal actor's culture, allows for suitable collaborative approaches of culture-related value and wellbeing co-creation in the social services (Productivity Commission, 2015). This implies that culture-specific approaches need to be developed, such as the concept of Whānau Ora (Chant, 2011; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2017) highlighted by Hepi et al. (2017), or the Fonofale model (Pulotu-Endemann, 2009). Whānau Ora references the concept of family wellbeing. It focuses on an approach which includes co-creative acts and engagement of the family and its strengths and capacity (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2017). Comparably, the Fonofale model depicts a 'house' with the foundations being family, the roof being culture and the pillars in between being physical, spiritual and mental health and other factors that influence health, all embedded in environment, time and context. Such culture-specific approaches are relevant to navigating health and wellbeing of ethnic populations and to addressing potential disparities.

### ***Service Context: Social Service Exchange***

To navigate health and wellbeing, often multiple actors engage in service-for-service exchange to co-create value (Vargo & Lusch, 2016a). Actors, such as client and social worker, are tasked to interact and integrate resources (Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2012) for wellbeing co-creation in social service exchange. For example, a client with drug and alcohol problems

needs to integrate their resources, such as information and time, to improve their situation by cooperating with a social worker who might provide counselling in an Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD) social service programme (cf. Hepi et al., 2017).

Social service refers to the diverse range of programmes that have been made available by a mix of public or private agencies to individuals and families who need assistance (Goodwin, 2005): “[S]ocial services aim to improve the wellbeing of clients by broadening access to the things in life they value (or by removing barriers to accessing these things)” (Productivity Commission, 2015, p. 31). Important aspects of social services are their perceived value as well as their accessibility to those in need. Mostly, social services engage users on a voluntary basis. However, some in particular involve the government using coercive power. Governments spend substantial amounts per year on health, education and other social services. Yet, resources available are finite and it is not possible to provide every service for anyone to receive (Productivity Commission, 2015). Governments located at macro level of a healthcare and wellbeing social ecosystem allocate resources towards where they will have the greatest effect.

### ***Systems Context: Social Service Ecosystems***

Systems thinking has more recently entered the service research domain (see, for example, Anderson et al., 2013; Chandler & Vargo, 2011; Fisk et al., 2016). A service system is a dynamic and adaptive network of exchange consisting of interactions among actors and resources (Spohrer et al., 2007). Different levels of service systems from low to high complexity can be distinguished as micro, meso and macro systems and “*practices, (..) activities, or processes may be replicated at any of the three levels*” (Chandler & Vargo, 2011,

p. 44, italics added). Systems can evolve over time. For that matter, the term service ecosystems (Chandler & Vargo, 2011) has been introduced. These systems are “relatively self-contained, self-adjusting systems of resource–integrating actors connected by shared institutional arrangements and mutual value creation through service exchange” (Vargo & Lusch, 2016a, pp. 10). A service ecosystems approach permits a better understanding of social issues impacting the different system levels and enables the establishment of measures that impact the enhancement of wellbeing (cf. Fisk et al., 2016). It has been pointed out that service ecosystems have a purpose “in the sense of individual *survival/wellbeing*, as a partial function of *collective wellbeing* (Vargo & Lusch, 2016b, emphasis in original).

A system designed to alleviate social issues can be labelled a social service ecosystem. The interplay between the actors within the system is governed by institutions, including local, state and national governments and other geopolitical governing organisations (Akaka et al., 2013a) on macro level as well as less formal institutions, such as family on micro level.

In social service exchange, in particular two micro-level service systems, namely the client’s and the social worker’s constitute important networks relevant for wellbeing co-creation and these are integrated into higher-level systems included in the social service ecosystem. This social service ecosystem comprises “a complex system of organisations, institutions and relationships (...) through which social services are funded, coordinated and delivered. (...) Government is a[n] (...) element of this system. Other important elements include non-government providers, philanthropic organisations, volunteers, family (...) and community-based bodies (...)” (Productivity Commission, 2015, p. XIII, 36).

## **Key Conceptual Underpinnings for an Integrative Transformative Service Framework**

Having more broadly established the contextual factors for social service provision of HTE, the following sections draw and expand on Hepi et al.'s (2017) integrative transformative service framework. The authors suggest that to improve engagement between a social service provider and a client, as one pillar, (Regulatory) Engagement Theory (RET; Higgins, 2006; Higgins & Scholer, 2009) is of relevance, as improving engagement will enhance wellbeing co-creation of the actor in focus. Hence, as another pillar, the authors connect engagement to the notion of wellbeing as addressed in the research stream of Transformative Service Research (TSR; Anderson et al., 2013). Improving engagement and wellbeing through co-creation is then viewed in a systems context focused on the service exchange between actors. It can be argued that actor engagement and wellbeing are linked through 'inter-activity'. In other words, any activity to co-create wellbeing requires the engagement of actors. The notion of 'activity' is central to (Cultural-Historical) Activity Theory (CHAT; Engeström, 2015; Leontiev, 1977) which serves as the final pillar to the framework devised by Hepi et al. (2017). Yet, Hepi et al.'s (2017) work falls short on identifying the conceptual gaps in TSR which lead to the integration of CHAT and RET. Therefore, this paper outlines TSR's conceptual gaps, HTE requirements and provides a systematic overview of the the three approaches. These are paralleled in Table 1. Theoretical shortcomings of TSR, requirements related to 'hard-to-engagedness' and the importance of an integrative approach are highlighted below.

-- Table 1 about here --

### ***TSR Shortcomings and Requirements of 'Hard-to-Engagedness' (HTE)***

TSR emerged from an integration of consumer and service research (Anderson et al., 2013), based on more established concepts, such as Transformative Consumer Research (Mick, 2006) and developments in service research (Ostrom et al., 2015). Hence, this newer conceptual development (TSR) with a focus on service and wellbeing appears to be a suitable starting point for the investigation of social issues where actors are tasked with transforming their attitude and behaviour and ultimately their lives by improving wellbeing. More specifically, the challenge of navigating actors deemed 'hard-to-reach' or 'hard-to-engage' towards adopting a new 'logic' in life seems to be a fitting context where the TSR framework (Anderson et al., 2013) can be applied. Yet, while TSR in its current form provides a framework and assistance to resolving HTE problems, complementary concepts or theories are required to properly cater for social issues relating to HTE.

While TSR focuses on creating change through service, the concept appears to be focusing on the provider enabling such transformation. Yet, although TSR can be classified as consumer-centric, the concept and its branding is service-centric (Kuppelwieser & Finsterwalder, 2016), driven by provider entities for the benefit of consumer entities. Yet, transformation might best be brought about in the life sphere, that is what *happens* within the *service system* of the *focal actor*, as outlined in the actor and system context sections above. Here, a focus on the 'doing' is required (Leontiev, 1977). In Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) activity as key concept is understood as "processes (...) that realise a person's actual life [and wellbeing] in the objective world by which [they are] surrounded" (Leontiev, 1977, p. 2). Here, and very fitting to complement TSR, CHAT's focus is on explaining human activity, such as behaviour related to HTE.

Furthermore, more so than TSR, CHAT places a very strong focus on the cultural component which, as outlined above, can be a crucial context to be considered when dealing with HTE.

TSR's conceptualisation further falls short on including a resource perspective. Such resource perspective, which includes the resources available to the focal actor, that is material as well as immaterial instruments that are used to deal with the object(ive) of the activity (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015), is lacking. This is particularly pertinent in the case of HTE as a focal actor's own resources might be depleted and they might be in need of other (actors') resources.

The latter also directly links to another conceptual gap in TSR which is actors' contributions to value co-creation (Finsterwalder & Kuppelwieser, 2011; Sweeney et al., 2015) that are needed for wellbeing transformation to occur, again a point that has been alluded to above as part of the actor and cultural contexts, by highlighting the importance of actor engagement as well as the importance of other actors' contributions, such as family in the vicinity of the focal actor.

Moreover, family and other institutionalised structures, for example, organisations, can play a crucial role in wellbeing improvements. Here in particular, rules as formal and informal conventions, guidelines, contracts, laws and other societal norms regulate activity in CHAT (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015) and need to be integrated into TSR. For example, certain ethnicities might have different cultural norms and rules that need to be taken into account (refer to cultural context above).

As much as such widening of the TSR concept by including CHAT might aid in generating a more activity-centric view of the focal human actor seeking to improve their wellbeing,

existing activity patterns will not be altered or new activities undertaken if the actor is 'hard-to-engage', that is, disengaged from wanting to transform their lives and giving up engrained patterns of thinking and behaviour. Furthermore, actors labelled 'hard-to-engage' might feel disengaged from interacting with a transformative service (cf. Boag-Munroe & Evangelou, 2012). Activities outside their usual 'set of activities' might not be desired to be undertaken. This is where the concept of engagement can bridge between wellbeing (TSR) and activity (CHAT). Higgins and Scholer's (2009) concept of RET focuses on value as a motivational force of either feeling attracted (positive value) or repulsed (negative value) from something. Such notion is critical in dealing with HTE issues as the focal actor might feel no attraction towards dealing with a social issue or a social worker to improve their situation. Here, HTE becomes a systems approach (systems context) which includes the ability of other actors to engage the focal actor. That is, first the engagement level of the focal actor needs to be identified. Second, the psychological state of the focal actor needs to be changed by focusing on their life sphere and activities. Third, resources need to be provided that enable an actor with potential resource constraints to engage and co-create value. Utilising appropriate resources (for example, group meeting spaces) and actors (for example, social worker) allow to institutionalise transformative practices, that is to routinise a different activity as new practice.

Rosenbaum et al. (2011) allude to intended and unintended effects of wellbeing and caution that negative effects of wellbeing co-creation might affect other entities. Intentionality is critical in regard to aiming wellbeing efforts at the appropriate target group in an appropriate manner. Yet, another type of intentionality needs to be taken into account, captured both by CHAT and RET. It is transformative agency of the focal actor which forms and

implements (new) intentions which change routines and conditions of an activity (Engeström & Sannino, 2013). Higgins and Scholer (2009) speak of goal pursuit.

In line with CHAT, the focus remains on the focal actor's activity system. Over time the transformation of the actor within the system (cf. Aal et al., 2015), embedded in the wider social service ecosystem, needs to be evaluated, monitored and potential accelerators and inhibitors (Hepi et al., 2017) require identification as they might aid in avoiding repulsion and enable attraction towards the value target (Higgins & Scholer, 2009).

In summary, it can be concluded that TSR offers a basis for resolving HTE issues, yet augmenting this concept is required by inclusion of approaches which not only complement but also enhance the TSR framework and close its gaps. Both CHAT and RET offer such features. Hence, Hepi et al. (2017) suggest an integrative transformative service framework to resolve HTE issues. The framework is outlined below.

### ***Conceptual Integration of the Three Pillars***

When viewing *co-creation of value* as the core of all concepts, i.e. as being constituent of wellbeing, activity, and engagement, it can be derived that co-creation mirrors an *activity* where one or several *engaged actors* apply knowledge and skills in service-for-service exchange (Vargo & Lusch, 2016a) to improve *wellbeing*. Applying co-creation language, Figure 1 depicts an adaptation and extension of Engeström's (2015) activity system as foundation to integrate Transformative Service Research (TSR), Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT), as well as Regulatory Engagement Theory (RET) in one framework.

-- Figure 1 about here --

The *activity system* (Engeström, 2015) encompasses a *focal actor's system*, with the system's core being the *actor's co-creative activity* surrounding a *value co-creation target* (Hepi et al., 2017) related to the desired experience (Engeström, 2001; 2015; Higgins & Scholer, 2009). The *co-creative activity* to achieve this might entail *levels of engagement* depending on the defined targets. Repeating *co-creative transformative activity* as a *routine* can be called *co-creative transformative practice* (cf. Engeström, 2015; Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 1997), which relates to a bodily and mental routine that could develop out of a *co-creative activity* but does not necessarily have to. This is indicated in Figure 1 by the dotted lines around the outer circle. A co-creative activity is facilitated by the actor feeling *engaged* (psychological state; Brodie et al., 2011; Higgins & Scholer, 2009) when they *actively engage* (behavioural component; Brodie et al., 2011; Verleye et al., 2014) in intentionally pursuing the *target of value co-creation* (Hepi et al., 2017) utilising proper means of goal pursuit (Higgins & Scholer, 2009), i.e. the appropriate *resources* (tools, signs) (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015), *co-creating with other actors who contribute* to the activity. While doing so, *rules, norms and beliefs* (Vänninen et al., 2015; Vargo & Lusch, 2016a) are followed. While the target of the actor's value co-creating activity might have a *general meaning on societal level*, there will be a *specific sense making of the target by the focal actor* (Engeström & Sannino, 2010), constructed by the activity system (Engeström, 2001). The value derived from the co-creative transformative activity hence, is based on the actor's frame of reference and is always contextual, i.e. determined through the eyes of the *actor benefitting* from the *value co-creation process* (Vargo & Lusch, 2016a) and based on their *engagement and holistic and meaning-laden experience* (Higgins, 2006; Scholer & Higgins, 2009; Vargo & Lusch, 2016a). For

example, through the 'doing', the focal actor might derive value from the experience of a primary activity but also from a secondary activity. Such distinction between primary and secondary activities stem from Higgins et al.'s (1995) earlier Activity Engagement Theory. For example, one resource can stimulate different primary and secondary activities or what actors can do with it (Higgins et al., 1995).

The activity system of a focal actor can be understood as constantly evolving through cycles of expansive learning via contradictions within the system and with other activity systems (Engeström, 2001). Activity systems have been compared to service systems (Wägar, 2011). Multiple activity or service systems would then constitute a (social) service ecosystem (cf. Chandler & Vargo, 2011).

### ***An Expanded Conceptual Integration***

Hepi et al. (2017) discuss the intersection of different activity systems by conceptualising two activity or service systems interconnecting with one another. When activity systems 'meet' tensions have to be defused and through meaning making a 'fit' of the two activity systems has to be achieved (Hepi et al., 2017; cf. Engeström, 2001; Engeström & Sannino, 2010) to enable actors' co-creation of value and wellbeing. Such 'fit' needs to be accomplished by creating a shared understanding of the *targets of value co-creation* (Hepi et al., 2017; cf. Engeström & Sannino, 2010; Higgins et al. 1995). This is vital, in particular when the focal actor interacts with other actors who assist in improving focal actors' wellbeing. Agreeing on a joint target of value co-creation then enables the *negotiation of value propositions* (Hepi et al., 2017). Only then, the target(s) can be intentionally and properly pursued and intended and unintended effects on actors can be identified or mitigated, such as the impact of the actor's

absence from home and negative effects on family members due to sessions with the social worker.

Derived from the notion of primary and secondary activities (Higgins et al., 1995), Hepi et al. (2017) suggest that there are also primary and secondary *targets of value co-creation*. For example, the primary target of 'value co-creation' for an unemployed focal actor might be to socialise with friends in their peer group, spending time outdoors pursuing hobbies (secondary target), rather than taking care of their own family's social and other needs, and hence this might be quite value co-destructive for the latter actors (Echeverri & Skálén, 2011; Plé & Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010). In the case of HTE, such targets need to be redefined and committed to, to enable value co-creation for wellbeing.

Together with the social worker the focal actor (client) might identify and agree that improving their eudaimonic wellbeing is the primary target, i.e. improving themselves physically and mentally (cf. Waterman, 1984), as well as their hedonic wellbeing (Anderson et al., 2013). The latter, that is to feel joy (Ryan & Deci, 2001), can be a secondary target, and in doing so this might decrease the repulsion from the target (Higgins, 2006) of transformative social change for wellbeing. In other words, pursuing the secondary target could lead to achieving the primary target. For example, activities in group sessions could include hedonic and hence very positive value experiences (Higgins et al., 1995), such as singing of culture-specific songs, which might prompt the focal actor to increase their own contribution towards transformative change, such as giving up alcohol.

In a similar vein to identifying primary and secondary targets and activities, for the accomplishment of value co-creation, it is equally important to identify primary and secondary resources and other actors. Primary other actors could be family members supporting the

transformation of the focal actor and might be key to the actor's transformation (cf. Te Puni Kōkiri, 2017) whereas secondary other actors, such as peer group or colleagues, might further assist focal actor's personal transformation. Equally, resources, such as exposure to nature as secondary resource, might aid in accelerating focal actor's transformation (cf. Hepi et al. 2017; see, for example, Mental Health Foundation, 2016/17) alongside primary resources, such as the mental capacity to be aware of the situation and willing to co-create for change.

During activities the actors integrate the elements of their activity systems and through a process of *sense and meaning making* value or wellbeing is co-created in collaboration amongst the actors (Hepi et al., 2017). Based on such a notion, it is put forward here that *co-creating value or wellbeing* (Blocker & Barrios, 2015) for a focal actor facing social issues needs to entail co-creative acts that have a focus on the *activities* in the *life sphere* of the actor and are meaningful to them.

More recently, the term "transformative value" (Blocker & Barrios, 2015, p. 265) has been introduced. This form of non-habitual and more extraordinary value co-creation occurs when actors elect to make new choices which challenge previous patterns of thinking and behaviour (cf. Blocker & Barrios, 2015). Transformations to improve one's wellbeing by removing engrained patterns, for example, reflected in ongoing heavy drug and alcohol abuse, will then create new ways of 'doing things'. Blocker and Barrios' (2015) notion of transformative value aligns with the notion represented in Hepi et al.'s (2017) framework which draws on Activity Theory (Engeström, 2015). As pointed out, it requires transformative agency of the focal actor (client) to form and implement intentions which alter routines and conditions of an activity (Engeström & Sannino, 2013). Other actors, such as the social worker, can assist here by establishing new ways of going about an activity, for example, the social

worker applying institutional practices of how to run a session with the focal actor (Hepi et al., 2017).

Hepi et al. (2017) point out that cultural practices might play a role in transforming the focal actor. Here, culture mentioned as one of the contextual factors above, comes into play. Culture has been particularly highlighted in CHAT (Engeström, 2015) and is also apparent in TSR (Anderson et al., 2013). Equally, Hepi et al. (2017) feature culture in their conceptualisation and relate to the importance of value in a cultural context (Akaka et al., 2013b) and culture-specific wellbeing approaches (Pulotu-Endemann, 2009; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2017). Yet, Edvardsson et al. (2011) put forward that value needs to be viewed as created in social systems and propose to use the term value-in-social-context. Hence, viewed through a cultural lens, wellbeing is co-created and the value perceived can be reconceptualised as value-in-sociocultural-context.

A further point noteworthy is the interrelationship of value co-creation and value co-destruction in wellbeing which did not receive much attention in Hepi et al.'s (2017) framework. As pointed out above, there might be unintended effects of wellbeing initiatives (Rosenbaum et al., 2011). Work by Plé and Chumpitaz Cáceres (2010) and Echeverri and Skållén (2011), not related to a wellbeing context, discusses the possibility of what is called value co-destruction amongst actors. Plé and Chumpitaz Cáceres (2010, pp. 431) define value co-destruction as “as an interactional process between service [or activity] systems that results in a decline in at least one of the systems’ well-being”. Value co-destruction in a HTE context can be very present relating to the focal actor’s activity system and when interacting with other activity systems. When the focal actor neglects their own wellbeing by, for example, drug and alcohol abuse, and when being under substance influence, domestically abuses other

actors, such as family members, this causes value co-destruction. Further, the actor might be co-destructive when intersecting with the social worker's service or activity system. Asked to alter routines and transform might create resistance or repulsion from the shared target of co-creation and transformative social change (Engeström, 2015; Higgins & Scholer, 2009) and, for example, they might refuse to pursue co-creative acts to improve wellbeing. Moreover, co-creative acts amongst multiple actors, for example, client and social worker, and their service or activity systems might cause ripple effects. For example, when government services coerce power for a focal actor to become a client at a social service provider, other actors, such as children of the client might have to be supervised or fostered by a third party during the focal actor's treatment. This might be co-destructive in regard to maintaining family cohesion.

The points mentioned above require an extension of Hepi et al.'s (2017) framework. Figure 2 provides a visualisation of the extended framework where two actors' activity (or service) systems intersect, taking the factors of value co-creation in a sociocultural context, primary and secondary value co-creation target 'fit', value proposition 'fit', primary and secondary resources and actors, primary and secondary transformative activities and practices (i.e., co-creation) as well as co-destruction into account.

-- Figure 2 about here --

### **Theoretical and Practical Implications**

The extended conceptual framework has several theoretical and practical implications relating to social service contexts and beyond. From a theoretical perspective, augmenting

Transformative Service Research's (TSR; Anderson et al., 2013) approach by including Activity Theory (CHAT; Engeström, 2015) as well as (Regulatory) Engagement Theory (RET; Higgins & Scholer, 2009) provides researchers with a stronger conceptual foundation for the analysis of social issues to improve wellbeing. This is due to the fact that the extended conceptual framework enhances TSR by two other relevant frameworks. Activity Theory takes into account that the actors in focus might pursue certain activities or routine activities (practices) which require revision and might necessitate potential change by the actors themselves or in conjunction with an intervention by other actors. Yet, the addition of Activity Theory alone is not sufficient for an in-depth analysis and resolution of social issues, as actors might only undertake a transformation of their own lives including their wellbeing when they feel engaged and are willing to engage in the changes themselves. Therefore, the inclusion of Engagement Theory is vital. The extended framework should better enable scholars to capture and analyse social issues and suggest improvements. Each actor's service or activity system can be analysed from different angles and also in interaction with other actors' service or activity systems.

Beyond the immediate relevance for social contexts, the extended conceptual framework contributes to the theoretical advancement of TSR and provides a broader conceptual basis for the analysis and enhancement of wellbeing in general. It is suggested that the extended framework could be applied to other contexts and wellbeing challenges, such as wellbeing-related issues connected to educational, base of the pyramid-focused or financial services amongst others. Scholars are encouraged to employ the framework to different contexts.

From an applied perspective the extended framework allows practitioners a more thorough analysis and understanding of the social issues faced by clients taking the three aspects of wellbeing, activities and engagement into account. Further, the fused conceptualisation of TSR and RET in an Activity Systems framework allows practitioners versed in CHAT the application of a very well established but now improved conceptual tool that builds on the existing Activity Systems framework. Hence, applying the extended framework should only require minimal effort for health and wellbeing practitioners already familiar with Activity Theory. The same should apply to scholars in the field.

### **Conclusion and Future Research**

The aim of this paper was to discuss the foundations for research on engagement with 'hard-to-reach' or 'hard-to-engage' clients with diverse cultural backgrounds in a social service scenario. This work has elaborated on HTR clients (actor context) who can come from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds (cultural context), and are meant to engage and co-create a service with a social service provider (service context). The approach focuses on the integration of the different activity or service systems, such as the client's and the social worker's and applies a service ecosystems approach (system context). Conceptual gaps in Transformative Service Research (TSR) have been identified, 'hard-to-engagedness' (HTE) requirements have been highlighted, and TSR has been paralleled to two complementary approaches, namely (Cultural-Historical) Activity Theory (CHAT) and (Regulatory) Engagement Theory (RET). A conceptual integration and combination of these approaches and contexts was derived from Hepi et al. (2017) and expanded on to established a broadened research framework.

Despite recent foci of service researchers on social issues (for example, Blocker & Barrios, 2015) and applications of TSR-related frameworks, such as Hepi et al.'s (2017) case study of an indigenous service provider and its clients, further empirical work is needed. This now includes the application of the extended conceptual framework that has been introduced in this paper.

## References

- Akaka, M. A., Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2013a). The complexity of context: A service ecosystems approach for international marketing. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21(4), 1-20.
- Akaka, M. A., Schau, H. J., & Vargo, S. L. (2013b). The co-creation of value-in-cultural-context. *Research in Consumer Behavior*, Vol. 15, 265-284.
- Anderson, L., Ostrom, A. L., Corus, C., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., Giraldo, M., Mende, M., Mulder, M., Rayburn, S. W., Rosenbaum, M. S., Shirahada, K., & Williams, J. D. (2013). Transformative service research: An agenda for the future. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), 1203-1210.
- Blocker, C. P., & Barrios, A. (2015). The Transformative Value of a Service Experience. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(3), 265-283.
- Boag-Munroe, G., & Evangelou, M. (2012). From 'hard to reach' to 'how to reach': A systematic review of the literature on hard to reach families. *Research Papers in Education*, 27(2), 209-239.

- Brackertz, N. (2007). *Who is hard to reach and why?* ISR Working Paper. Hawthorne, Australia: Swinburne University of Technology. Available from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.3/23213> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, A. (2011). Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research. *Journal of Service Research, 14*(3), 252-271.
- Chandler, J. D., & Vargo, S. L. (2011). Contextualization and value-in-context: How context frames exchange. *Marketing Theory, 11*(1), 35-49.
- Chant, L. (2011). Whānau ora: Hauora Maori models for kotahitanga/co-operative co-existence with non-Maori. *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 7*(2), 111-122.
- Cortis, N., Katz, I., & Patulny, R. (2009). *Engaging hard-to-reach families and children* (Occasional Report No. 26). New South Wales, Australia: Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.
- Echeverri, P., & Skålén, P. (2011). Co-Creation and Co-Destruction: A Practice-Theory Based Study of Interactive Value Formation. *Marketing Theory, 11*(3), 351-373.
- Edvardsson, B., Tronvol, B., & Gruber, T. (2011). Expanding understanding of service exchange and value co-creation: a social construction approach. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*(2), 327–339.
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive Learning at Work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work, 14*(1), 133-156.
- Engeström, Y. (2015). *Learning by expanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2010). Studies of expansive learning: Foundations, findings and future challenges. *Educational Research Review*, 5(1), 1-24.
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2013). La volition et l'agentivité transformatrice: perspective théorique de l'activité. *Revue internationale du CRIRES: innover dans la tradition de Vygotsky*, 1(1), 4–19.
- Featherstone, B., Broadhurst, K., & Holt, K. (2012). Thinking systemically – Thinking politically: Building strong partnerships with children and families in the context of rising inequalities. *British Journal of Social Work*, 42(4), 618-633.
- Finsterwalder, J., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2011). Co-creation by engaging beyond oneself: The influence of task contribution on perceived customer-to-customer social interaction during a group service encounter. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 607-618.
- Fisk, R. P., Anderson, L., Bowen, D. E., Gruber, T., Ostrom, A., Patrício, L., Reynoso, J. and Sebastiani, R. (2016), 'Billions of impoverished people deserve to be better served: A call to action for the service research community', *Journal of Service Management*, 27(1), 43-55.
- Flanagan, S. & Hancock, B. (2010). 'Reaching the hard to reach' – lessons learned from the VCS (voluntary and community sector). A qualitative study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 10(1), 92-99. Retrieved from: <http://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-10-92> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Foot, K. A. (2014). Cultural-historical activity theory: Exploring a theory to inform practice and research. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 24(3), 329-347.

- Goodwin, J. L. (2005). *Social Services*, Encyclopedia of Chicago. Retrieved from: <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1160.html> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Hepi, M., Foote, J., Finsterwalder, J., o-Hinerangi, M., Carswell, S. & Baker, V. (2017). An Integrative Transformative Service Framework to Improve Engagement in a Social Service Ecosystem: The Case of He Waka Tapu, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 41(4).
- Higgins, E. T. (2006). Value from hedonic experience and engagement. *Psychological Review*, 113(3), 439–460.
- Higgins, E. T., & Scholer, A. A. (2009). Engaging the Consumer: The Science and Art of the Value Creation Process. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(2), 100-114.
- Higgins, E. T., Lee, J., Kwon, J., & Trope, Y. (1995). When combining intrinsic motivations undermines interest: A test of activity engagement theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(5), 749-767.
- Kleinaltenkamp, M., Brodie, R. J., Frow, P., Hughes, T., Peters, L. D., & Woratschek, H. (2012). Resource integration. *Marketing Theory*, 12(2), 201-205.
- Kuppelwieser, V. G., & Finsterwalder, J. (2016). Transformative service research and service dominant logic: Quo Vaditis? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 28(1), 91-98.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1977). *Activity and Consciousness: Philosophy in the USSR, Problems of dialectical materialism*. Moscow: Progress Publishers. Retrieved from: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/leontev/works/1977/leon1977.htm> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Leontiev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, Consciousness, and Personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Retrieved from:

- <https://www.marxists.org/archive/leontev/works/1978/index.htm> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Mackenzie, M., Reid, M., Turner, F., Wang, Y., Clarke, J., Sridharan, S., et al. (2012). Reaching the Hard-to-Reach: Conceptual Puzzles and Challenges for Policy and Practice. *Journal of Social Policy*, 41(03), 511-532.
- Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand (2016/17). 'Connect with Nature' Campaign. Retrieved from: <http://shop.mentalhealth.org.nz/product/791-connect-with-nature-a4-poster>; <https://www.mhaw.nz/#connect-1> (accessed 01 April / 24 June 2017).
- Mick, D. (2006). Presidential Address: Meaning and Mattering through Transformative Consumer Research. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 33, 1-4.
- Ministry of Health (2017). Life expectancy. Retrieved from: <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/maori-health/tatau-kahukura-maori-health-statistics/nga-manahauora-tutohu-health-status-indicators/life-expectancy> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Ostrom, A. L., Parasuraman, A., Bowen, D. E., Patrício, L., Voss, C. A., & Lemon, K. (2015). Service research priorities in a rapidly changing context. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(2), 127-159.
- Plé, L., & Chumpitaz Cáceres, R. (2010). Not Always Co-Creation: Introducing Interactional Co-Destruction of Value in Service-Dominant Logic. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 24(6), 430-437.
- Productivity Commission (2015). *More effective social services*. Wellington: New Zealand Productivity Commission. Retrieved from: <http://www.productivity.govt.nz/sites/default/files/social-services-draft-report.pdf> (accessed 01 April 2017).

- Pulotu-Endemann, F. K. (2009). Fonofale Model of Health. Paper presented at the Workshop on Pacific models for health promotion, 07 September 2009. Wellington: Massey University. Retrieved from: <http://www.hauora.co.nz/resources/Fonofalemodelexplanation.pdf> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Towards a Theory of Social Practice: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243–263.
- Rosenbaum, M., Corus, C., Ostrom, A., Anderson L., Fisk, R., Gallan, A., Giraldo, M., Mende, M., Mulder, M., Rayburn, S., Shirahada, K. and Williams, J. (2011), “Conceptualisation and Aspirations of Transformative Service Research”, *Journal of Research for Consumers*, Vol. 19, pp. 1-6.
- Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 141-166.
- Schatzki, T. R. (1997). Practices and Actions. A Wittgensteinian Critique of Bourdieu and Giddens. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 27(3), 283-308.
- Scholer, A. A., & Higgins, E. T. (2009). Exploring the complexities of value creation: The role of engagement strength. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(2), 137-143.
- Skålén, P., Aal, K. A., & Edvardsson, B. (2015). Cocreating the Arab Spring Understanding Transformation of Service Systems in Contention. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(3), 250-264.
- Spohrer, J., Maglio, P., Bailey, J., & Gruhl, D. (2007). Steps toward a science of service systems. *Computer*, 40(1), 71-77.

- Sweeney, J. C., Danaher, T. S., & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2015). Customer effort in value cocreation activities improving quality of life and behavioral intentions of health care customers. *Journal of Service Research, 18*(3), 318-335.
- Te Puni Kōkiri (2017). Whānau Ora at a glance. Retrieved from: <https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/whakamahia/whanau-ora/> (accessed 01 April 2017).
- Vänninen, I., Pereira-Querol, M., & Engeström, Y. (2015). Generating transformative agency among horticultural producers: An activity-theoretical approach to transforming Integrated Pest Management. *Agricultural Systems, 139*, 38-49.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016a). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 44*(1), 5-23.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016b). Service-dominant logic 2025. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, online first. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2016.11.001>.
- Verleye, K., Gemmel, P., & Rangarajan, D. (2014). Managing Engagement Behaviours in a Network of Customers and Stakeholders: evidence from the nursing home sector. *Journal of Service Research, 17*(1), 68-84
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). The history of the development of higher mental functions. In Rieber, R. W. (Ed.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky. Vol. 4: The history of the development of higher mental functions* (pp. 1-251). New York: Plenum.
- Wägar, K. (2011). Expansive learning in a service system: insights from a study of car-service advisors. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences, 3*(1), 13-38.

Waterman, A. S. (1984). *The Psychology of Individualism*. New York: Praeger.

**Table 1. Overview of Key Concepts and Requirements of ‘Hard-to-Engagedness’**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Transformative Service Research (TSR)</b>	<b>(Cultural-Historical) Activity Theory (CHAT)</b>	<b>(Regulatory) Engagement Theory (RET)</b>	<b>Requirements of ‘Hard-to-engagedness’ (HTE)</b>
<b>Key concept or objective</b>	Creation of uplifting changes and improvements in consumer entities’ wellbeing through service(s).  (Anderson et al., 2011)	Activities that realise a person's actual life in the objective world by which they are surrounded.  (Leontiev, 1977).	Engagement as a psychological state as well as behaviour.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009; Scholer & Higgins, 2009).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Activation of psychological state of potentially disengaged actor(s).</li> <li>▪ Focus on activities within life sphere of actor to stimulate willingness to engage and contribute to improvement of own and other wellbeing.</li> </ul>
<b>Theoretical focus</b>	Integration of consumer and service research.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Meta-theory or framework to explain human activity.  (Foot, 2014; Vygotsky, 1978)	Theory which focuses on value as a motivational force experience.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ HTE or ‘hard-to-engagedness’ is a system problem.</li> <li>▪ Application of an integrated approach to improve impact of measures for HTE.</li> </ul>
<b>Practical focus</b>	Application to solve real problems.  (Mick, 2006)	Application to a range of disciplines and areas to analyse actors’ activity systems.  (Engeström & Sannino, 2010)	Explaining the value creation process and value from experience and engagement.  (Higgins, 2006; Higgins & Scholer, 2009; Scholer & Higgins, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Resolution of social issues of disengaged actors within focal system(s).</li> </ul>
<b>‘Logic’ of approach</b>	N.S.; consumer-centric; branding is service centric.	N.S.; activity-centric view of human actor in system context.	Value experience-centric with engagement strength	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focus on activity-centric view of (dis-)engaged focal actor as well as ‘other actors’ to increase value and wellbeing.</li> </ul>

	(Kuppelwieser and Finsterwalder, 2016)	(cf. Engeström, 2015)	contributing to value experience intensity.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009; Scholer & Higgins, 2009).	
<b>Actors</b>	Service and consumer entities.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Subject engaged in the activity.  (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015)	Actor deriving value.  (Higgins, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Centrality of relation to (dis-)engaged actor(s).</li> <li>▪ Identification of engagement level of focal and other actors.</li> </ul>
<b>Other actors</b>	Collective.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Community as the set of actors involved in an activity.  (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015)	Other actors can be endogenous or exogenous to focal actors' goal pursuit.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inclusion of other actors in the vicinity of the focal actor as important contributors to actor engagement and wellbeing.</li> </ul>
<b>Resources</b>	N.S.; different types of resources, such as tools.  (cf. Skålén, Aal, & Edvardsson, 2015)	Material and immaterial instruments used to deal with the object(ive) of the activity.  (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015)	Proper means of goal pursuit.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provision of resources relevant to improving actor engagement and value co-creation in the actor's activity system.</li> </ul>
<b>Value</b>	Eudaimonic and hedonic wellbeing outcome.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Outcome of an activity.  (Engeström & Sannino, 2010)	Value experience as a force of attraction to or repulsion from target.  (Higgins, 2006; Scholer & Higgins, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identify value creating and value destroying (routine) activities for (dis-)engaged actor that lead to i wellbeing.</li> </ul>

<b>Target of value co-creation</b>	Consumer entity's wellbeing.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Object(ive) as the common, collective purpose and societal motive for an activity.  (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015)	Goal object or value target, i.e. the subjective pleasure / pain properties of the desired end-state.  (Higgins, 2006; Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	▪ Attention to focal actor's wellbeing.
<b>Co-creation</b>	Co-creation.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Activity.  (Engeström, 2015)	Goal pursuit activity and regulatory fit, i.e. whether goal orientation is sustained by the strategic manner in which it is pursued.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	▪ Enablement of targeted co-creative activity using appropriate resources and actors. ▪ Institutionalisation of transformative activity and routinisation as practice.
<b>Actor's contribution to co-creation</b>	N.S.; customer effort in value co-creation activities.  (Sweeney et al., 2015)	Division of labour in the performance of activity.  (Engeström, 2015)	N.S.; engagement and resource integration.  (cf. Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	▪ Stimulation of actor's contribution to own wellbeing transformation.
<b>Interactivity</b>	Creation of wellbeing as an interactional process.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Subject-to-object via mediating artefacts (instruments, rules, division of labour) and in context of the community.  (Engeström, 2015)	N.S.; interaction between actor and value target.  (cf. Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	▪ Navigation of focal actor to interact with system-related resources, actors and constraints.
<b>Impact</b>	Facilitation of wellbeing can have positive and	Accomplishment of an activity may lead to negative	Pursuing a goal in a proper way could also impact the	▪ Increase of engagement, willingness to co-create and transform own wellbeing.

	negative impact on other entities.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	outcome or experience for subject.  (cf. Leontiev, 1978)	value of the original goal object.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	
<b>Intentionality</b>	Directional and non-directional wellbeing processes possible.  (cf. Rosenbaum et al., 2011)	Transformative agency to form and implement intentions that change routines and conditions of an activity.  (Engeström and Sannino, 2013)	Goal pursuit.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification of target and direction of value co-creation.</li> <li>▪ Negotiation of target of value co-creation to achieve fit.</li> <li>▪ Negotiation of value proposition to achieve fit.</li> <li>▪ Pursueing target by changing routines and conditions of activities of focal actor.</li> <li>▪ Monitoring and planning for potential effects on other actors.</li> </ul>
<b>Institutions</b>	N.S.; organisations as service entities.  (cf. Anderson et al., 2013)	Rules as formal and informal conventions, guidelines, contracts, laws and other societal norms regulate activity.  (Engeström, 2015; Vänninen et al., 2015)	Attraction or repulsion towards a target due to shared beliefs, i.e. norms and standards.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inclusion of important institutions in co-creation processes for transformation which influence focal actor's wellbeing.</li> </ul>
<b>Unit / system level of analysis</b>	Micro to macro system.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Activity system in relation to other activity systems.  (Engeström, 2001)	Agent-to-object.  (Higgins, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focus on activity system(s) of (dis-)engaged actor(s).</li> </ul>

<b>Time / evolution</b>	N.S.; transformation of service systems.  (Skålén, Aal, & Edvardsson, 2015)	Activity systems shape and transform over lengthy periods of time; they realise and reproduce themselves.  (Engeström, 2001)	Strengthening / weakening engagement in goal pursuit can influence the value intensity of an object at a later time.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluation of transformation of actor within activity system.</li> <li>▪ Monitoring of transformation as contingent to actor's interaction with system.</li> <li>▪ Identification of accelerators and decelerators within system.</li> </ul>
<b>Relation to environment</b>	Macro environment influences wellbeing.  (Anderson et al., 2013)	Subject changes the environment with the external activity and affects own behavior.  (Vygotsky, 1997)	Environment as force which can act as an opposing interfering force in goal pursuit.  (Higgins & Scholer, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Considering actors' environment and interrelation.</li> </ul>

**Key:** N.S. = Not specified in original approach but expanded on or introduced by other scholars



Figure 2: Extended Integrative Transformative Service Framework (Based on Hepi et al., 2017)

